U. S. Congress

Congressional Record

CONTAINING

THE PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES

OF THE

FIRST SESSION

OF THE

SIXTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

OF

THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA

VOLUME LIII

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1916

Congressional Record.

SIXTY-FOURTH CONGRESS,
FIRST SESSION.

VOLUME LIII, PART 2.

(PAGES 1057 TO 2100.)

Congressional Record.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *January 14, 1916.*

Rev. Boyd V. Switzer, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we can not always see and understand Thy purpose, but through the years of our national history we recognize that Thou hast formed and fashioned us with Thine own hand. Thou hast made us to become not only great but hast committed to us an increasingly great mission in the world. The instrumentalities of power committed to our hands, together with the large opportunities that Thou hast opened to us, are a divine revelation to us that Thou hast placed before us greater days than this Nation has ever known.

Give to us, we pray Thee, larger vision, more explicit faith in God, and such a divine power as that we may continue steadfastly to exemplify and maintain at all hazards the eternal principles of righteousness as the most vital of all things for the peace, happiness, and progress of the human race. In Christ's name we ask it. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ADMIRAL FLETCHER'S REPORT ON THE FLEET.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy in response to Senate resolution No. 60, transmitting the annual report of the commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet, dated August 15, 1915.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the report may be printed in confidence and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? There is none, and it is ordered that it be printed in confidence for the use of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask that the communication the Secretary of the Navy sent me be printed also with the same paper and in the same manner, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO. (S. DOC. NO. 244).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1915, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 7611) authorizing the Seaboard Air Line Railway Co., a corporation, to construct and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across what is known as Back River, a part of the Savannah River, at a point between Jasper County, S. C., and Chatham County, Ga., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Eastern Felt Co., of Winchester, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LIPPITT. I present a petition of sundry manufacturers of Rhode Island, urging action to cause the removal of the embargo on logwood and other dyestuffs. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate of the of the United States, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned, manufacturers doing business in the State of Rhode Island, respectfully urge your honorable body to take such action as will cause the removal of the embargo on logwood, which has been imposed by the British Government.

We respectfully represent that the continued enforcement of this embargo will force us to close our plants and will be of great damage to us financially, and will be the cause of throwing thousands of operatives in our State out of employment.

We also respectfully urge that action be taken by the United States in the line of having removed or materially modified the embargo placed by the British Government upon the free passage to the United States of all dyestuffs and chemicals that are used in manufacturing, and cite the conditions already existing as reasons for this request to our Government.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the Protestant Pastors' Association of Corsicana, Tex., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. OLIVER presented memorials of the Society of Friends of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the National Security League of Philadelphia, Pa., and a petition of Corporal Lucian D. Woodruff, jr., Camp, No. 64, Department of Pennsylvania, United Spanish War Veterans, of Johnstown, Pa., praying for an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Pennsylvania Association of Union Volunteer Officers of the Civil War, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called volunteer officers' retirement bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Oil City, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide pensions for civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented a petition of the Philadelphia Bourse, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the repeal of the so-called seamen's bill and for the enactment of legislation to develop a merchant marine, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Farmington, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to place a prohibitive tax on intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Cumberland County Hotel Men's Association, of Carlisle, Pa., remonstrating against national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented petitions of sundry citizens of the District of Columbia, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. McLEAN presented a memorial of the Retail Wine, Liquor, and Beer Dealers' Association, of New Haven, Conn., remonstrating against national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of New Haven, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Charles B. Bowen Camp, No. 2, United Spanish War Veterans, of Meridan, Conn., and a petition of the Department of Connecticut, United Spanish War Veterans, of Rockville, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish War, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of William Broadhead & Sons, of Jamestown, N. Y., and a petition of the Ford Manufacturing Co., of Waterford, N. Y., praying that a tariff be placed on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

301593

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the better protection of the forests of the country, which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine (for Mr. SHIVELY), from the Committee on Pensions, submitted a report (No. 43) accompanied by a bill (S. 3518) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was read twice by its title, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to that committee:

S. 85. George Jaggers.
S. 102. Barnet Hauver.
S. 107. David Phillips (alias Charles Gray).
S. 109. John R. Thompson.
S. 112. Frederick Schnetzer.
S. 122. James H. Goldsborough.
S. 171. Emma F. Webster.
S. 174. John A. Morris.
S. 176. Spencer J. Dyer.
S. 179. Jane E. Bloss.
S. 180. Cyrus Spooner.
S. 181. Delias W. Compton.
S. 207. Catherine Scheibel.
S. 212. Charlotte J. Smith.
S. 213. Lydia A. Smith.
S. 217. Daniel L. Tallcott.
S. 220. Aurelia M. Todd.
S. 364. Emma M. Bowman.
S. 367. Susie S. Flanders.
S. 422. Josiah P. Hackett.
S. 425. Andrew Jewell.
S. 524. William J. Young.
S. 529. Rebecca Hutton.
S. 530. Peter M. Miller.
S. 532. Thomas A. Carpenter.
S. 652. Mary Bresnahan.
S. 657. Josiah A. Dadmun.
S. 661. Irving W. Coombs.
S. 664. Samuel Hodgkins.
S. 688. Theophile A. Dauphin.
S. 691. John W. Wooley (alias John Wilson).
S. 693. William H. Steel.
S. 701. Frederick Ickley.
S. 713. Caroline E. Beck.
S. 714. Nicholas A. Bovee.
S. 715. Matilda J. Hampton.
S. 753. Harvey E. Berrin.
S. 762. Alverton H. Town.
S. 769. Ruby L. Knapp.
S. 774. Terance McGrath.
S. 806. Bridget Prickett.
S. 851. William Shaw.
S. 853. Horace H. Lockwood.
S. 857. George W. Sargent.
S. 858. Mary B. Yerington.
S. 860. Matilda Davis.
S. 864. Henry Wagoner.
S. 911. Rufus S. Maxwell.
S. 912. Herbert M. Starbird.
S. 914. Abbie F. Dyer.
S. 956. Henry J. McFadden.
S. 957. Harris B. Hubbell.
S. 958. Orin W. Goodale.
S. 981. Eliza M. Watkins.
S. 989. William Howard.
S. 998. Isaac H. Bodenhamer.
S. 1003. Eliza A. Gordon.
S. 1035. Americus V. Larrance.
S. 1036. Harriet A. Turnbull.
S. 1057. Emma D. Phelps.
S. 1058. Franklin H. Gillett.
S. 1109. George W. Halsey.
S. 1114. Lavina Hunter.
S. 1115. Abraham Jones.
S. 1116. William Kenyon.
S. 1117. Ebenezer C. Lafollett.
S. 1120. Catharine Mayer.
S. 1123. George Ringle.
S. 1126. Alfred P. Williams.
S. 1131. George E. Fleming.
S. 1140. Marion Clemans.
S. 1151. Susan M. Lysinger.
S. 1152. George W. Aldrich.
S. 1155. August Baker.
S. 1156. Samuel Dunham.
S. 1157. William C. Fickas.
S. 1236. Hacker Davis.
S. 1338. Amelia Hubbard.
S. 1348. James Wilson.
S. 1349. William R. Morrell.
S. 1353. Richard H. McWhorter.
S. 1380. George W. Hill.
S. 1411. George Bond.
S. 1435. George W. Adams.
S. 1442. Maria E. Bowers.
S. 1447. Charles P. De Forest.
S. 1448. Henry H. Geer.
S. 1457. Margaret Semple.
S. 1465. Henry H. Klock.
S. 1474. May Bell Anderson.
S. 1483. Eugene B. Fisher.
S. 1490. James S. Ames.
S. 1517. Henry J. Mullins.
S. 1620. Hannah R. Linton.
S. 1693. Sarah E. Hanes.
S. 1786. Nancy C. Fouts.
S. 1805. Mary Norton.
S. 1889. Napoleon Tulip.
S. 1925. Ann L. Elliott.
S. 1938. Martha C. Igo.
S. 1939. Jesse Thompson.
S. 1940. Bella Curry.
S. 1944. Susan Robinson.
S. 1961. Caroline J. Cromwell.
S. 2141. Gideon Mason.
S. 2195. Gabriel Anderson (alias Gabriel Oleson).
S. 2198. Joseph Lappier.
S. 2199. Samuel M. Terry.
S. 2234. Louisa Gaither.
S. 2235. John Wiebel.
S. 2245. Elander R. Grant.
S. 2249. Joseph Wentworth.
S. 2250. Edward A. Savage.
S. 2252. William O. Freeman.
S. 2256. Zadoc McFarland (alias Samuel G. West).
S. 2276. Robert R. Ferris.
S. 2277. Sarah E. Davis.
S. 2302. John Kemmer.
S. 2315. Mary C. Estes.
S. 2326. George Osten.
S. 2436. Joseph L. Buckley.
S. 2486. Christopher C. Blake.
S. 2535. William Wilkins.
S. 2547. True W. Lovering.
S. 2678. Eli W. Adams.
S. 2716. Lydia F. Goodaker.
S. 2787. Mary I. Fawcett.
S. 2790. Thomas B. Carey.
S. 2791. Jacob Conrad.
S. 2949. Rose A. Mooney, now Reed.
S. 3067. Sallie A. Hawks.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. NEWLANDS. From the Committee on Interstate Commerce I report back favorably with amendments the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee, and I submit a report (No. 44) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with the joint resolution as proposed to be amended, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES. We could not hear the request of the Senator.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask that the report of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, together with the joint resolution as proposed to be amended, authorizing an investigation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The resolution and report are as follows:

Joint resolution creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee.

Resolved, etc., That the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate and the Committee of the House of Representatives on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, through a joint subcommittee to consist of five Senators and five Representatives, who shall be selected by said committees, respectively, be, and they hereby are, appointed to investigate the subject of the Government control and regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, the efficiency of the existing system in protecting the rights of shippers and carriers, and in promoting the public interest, the incorporation or control of the incorporation of carriers, and all proposed changes in the organization of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the act to regulate commerce, with authority to sit during the recess of Congress and with power to summon witnesses, to appoint necessary experts, clerks, and stenographers, and to do whatever is necessary for a full and comprehensive examination and study of the subject and report to Congress as expeditiously as may be; that the sum of $25,000, or so much thereof as is necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution and to pay the necessary expenses of the subcommittee and its members, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Said appropriation shall be immediately available and shall be paid out on the audit and order of the chairman or acting chairman of said subcommittee, which audit and order shall be conclusive and binding upon all departments as to the correctness of the accounts of such subcommittee.

[S. Rept. No. 44, 64th Cong., 1st sess.]

JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CONDITIONS RELATING TO INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE AND THE NECESSITY OF FURTHER LEGISLATION RELATING THERETO.

Mr. NEWLANDS, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, submitted the following report (to accompany S. J. Res. 60):

The Committee on Interstate Commerce, having given consideration to the resolution (S. J. Res. 60) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee, reports the same back with certain amendments and recommends that, as amended, it do pass.

The following are the amendments suggested by the committee:

On the first and second pages, strike out the entire preamble.

On page 3, lines 3, 4, and 5, strike out the words "and report upon the subject of the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce," and insert in lieu thereof the words "the subject of the Government control and regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, the efficiency of the existing system in protecting the rights of shippers and carriers and in promoting the public interest, the incorporation or control of the incorporation of carriers, and all proposed changes in the organization of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the act to regulate commerce."

On page 3, lines 9 and 10, strike out the words "on or before the third Monday in December next," and insert in lieu thereof the words "as expeditiously as may be."

On page 3, line 10, strike out the words "a sum sufficient," and insert in lieu thereof the words "the sum of $25,000, or so much thereof as is necessary."

The reasons for recommending the passage of this resolution in its amended form may be briefly stated as follows:

It is well known that at every session of Congress many bills are introduced by different Members of the Senate and House having for their object the further regulation of carriers engaged in interstate commerce. This fact shows a continuing belief in the necessity of this kind of legislation, but a comparison of these bills displays a great variety of view as to what is necessary. While the individual initiation of legislation is an established principle, experience has shown that there are some subjects of congressional action which have become so complicated as to require a measure of coordinated and expert effort for their proper handling. Among these must be reckoned the subject of interstate and foreign commerce.

The system of governmental regulation of interstate and foreign commerce which has now been in operation for 28 years has resulted in the variation and enlargement of the extent and powers of regulation and in the accumulation of valuable experience for the guidance of Congress. Particularly is this true of the Interstate Commerce Commission, whose recommendations to Congress from time to time in relation to the general subject of regulation have been invaluable and many of which have been acted upon but some of which still remain to be considered. The growth of interstate and foreign commerce and the enlargement of the powers and duties of regulation have so increased the exactions on the Interstate Commerce Commission as to necessitate, in the public interest, a comprehensive consideration of the best method of dealing with the situation and of expediting the public business.

Adequate and well-managed transportation facilities constitute a prime necessity of business prosperity and are a common interest of all the people; and in order to afford these facilities and to enlarge them as the needs of commerce increase, the credit of the carriers, no less than the proper regulation of their operations, are matters of fundamental public concern.

In view of these considerations the committee believes that for any further legislation which may be undertaken by Congress in this regard the whole subject of governmental regulation should be deliberately and thoroughly studied in the light of experience and of the suggestions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the carriers, the shippers, and the general public with a view to adequately safeguarding the interest of the public and securing the establishment and maintenance of transportation facilities adequate to the needs of a growing and expanding commerce.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LIPPITT:

A bill (S. 3519) granting an increase of pension to Annie P. Marchant; and

A bill (S. 3520) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Holland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN:

A bill (S. 3521) to establish a United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3522) providing for the acquisition by a State, under certain conditions, of any lands therein which are or may become chiefly valuable for the development of water power; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 3523) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," approved February 17, 1911; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 3524) providing for the conversion of six Army posts into Federal reserve schools, providing for their establishment, course of instruction, and maintenance, defining the obligations of the students and graduates of such schools, and making an appropriation therefor; and

A bill (S. 3525) to increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 3526) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or cocoa leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

A bill (S. 3527) for the relief of John T. Melvin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 3528) granting a pension to Owen H. O'Neil; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 3529) to refund to John B. Keating customs tax erroneously and illegally collected (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3530) granting an increase of pension to Ozro F. Walker;

A bill (S. 3531) granting an increase of pension to William B. Dickey; and

A bill (S. 3532) granting an increase of pension to Darius S. Sanborn (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 3533) for the relief of Mike G. Womack (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 3534) granting a pension to Nancy Miller (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STONE:

A bill (S. 3535) for the relief of John Kelly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 3536) to provide for the storing and cleansing of imported Mexican peas, commonly called "gorbanzos"; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 3537) granting an increase of pension to James A. Gould (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3538) granting an increase of pension to James Somerville (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 3539) for the relief of John L. Moon; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 3540) granting an increase of pension to Delia Curry;

A bill (S. 3541) granting an increase of pension to Ida Critchell;

A bill (S. 3542) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Price;

A bill (S. 3543) granting an increase of pension to George W. McKelvey; and

A bill (S. 3544) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth McKeever; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 3545) granting an increase of pension to Garrett C. Brewer (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3546) granting a pension to Sophronia Porter (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STONE:

A bill (S. 3547) for the relief of Seemann & Co.; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 3548) granting an increase of pension to John M. Rupert; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 3549) authorizing the extension of Kenyon Street NW.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 3550) granting an increase of pension to George W. Grigg; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 3551) relating to the procedure in United States courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 3552) providing for the holding of the United States district and circuit courts at Hugo, Okla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 3553) for the relief of William G. Welles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FISCAL AFFAIRS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CHILTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 68), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the report of the joint select committee appointed under the act approved March 3, 1915, to determine the fiscal relations between the United States and the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 495), together with the hearings thereon, be printed with accompanying illustrations as a Senate document, and that 850 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GORE (S. DOC. NO. 243).

Mr. O'GORMAN. I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document an address delivered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] before the Merchants' Association of New York on December 9, 1915. It is short.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LIPPITT. What is the request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York requests that an address delivered by the Senator from Oklahoma before the Merchants' Association in the city of New York on December 9, 1915, be printed as a Senate document. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BACK RIVER BRIDGE, GEORGIA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill from the House of Representatives, the title of which will be stated.

H. R. 7611. An act authorizing the Seaboard Air Line Railway Co., a corporation, to construct and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across what is known as "Back River," a part of the Savannah River, at a point between Jasper County, S. C., and Chatham County, Ga., was read twice by its title.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the Senators from Georgia and South Carolina are very much interested in this bill, and I wish to ask unanimous consent that it be put upon its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator if the bill has been referred to the Committee on Commerce or whether a similar bill has been reported?

Mr. SHEPPARD. A similar bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. JONES. And reported from that Committee?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Practically; yes, sir. The War Department made a favorable report on the bill, and but for the fact that the House bill has been received, the subcommittee would have reported the Senate bill formally.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in the Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIMS OF AUSTRIA-HUNGARY, GREECE, AND TURKEY (H. DOC. NO. 576).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in relation to claims presented by the Governments of Austria-Hungary, Greece, and Turkey on account of injuries inflicted on their nationals during riots which occurred in South Omaha, Nebr., on February 21, 1909, and I recommend that, as an act of grace and without reference to the question of the liability of the United States, an appropriation be made to effect a settlement of these claims in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 14, 1916.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution that I ask may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) authorizing intervention in the Republic of Mexico was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the Republic of Mexico is and has been for a long time without a government, and as a consequence her territory has been devastated, her laws set at defiance, her people robbed, murdered, and driven from their homes and their property destroyed; and

Whereas American citizens residing and sojourning in Mexico have been murdered and robbed, their wives and daughters outraged, and their property confiscated and destroyed; and

Whereas our people have no protection from any power or authority in Mexico and none from their own country; and

Whereas it is the duty of this Government to protect its citizens in their lives, their liberty, and their property at home and abroad: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

First. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to intervene in the Republic of Mexico for the protection of the lives and property of American citizens residing and sojourning therein and for the establishment and maintenance, as long as it may be necessary, of a stable government in Mexico, adequate for the protection of the lives, the liberty, the independence, and the property of its people.

Second. That the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to use the Army and Navy forces, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the objects and purposes above set forth.

Third. That when a stable and efficient government is firmly established in Mexico, adequate for the protection of its people in their rights and of citizens and subjects of foreign nations therein, it shall be the duty of the President and of Congress to withdraw and surrender such government to the people of Mexico upon such conditions and under such guarantees of continued protection to American citizens and citizens and subjects of other nations residing or sojourning therein as are just and reasonable.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss the merits of the resolution I have offered at this time. I only want to say that up to this time the whole responsibility of dealing with the Mexican situation has been allowed to rest upon the President. It is a grave responsibility. He has been severely criticized for his policy of watchful waiting. I think we have all sympathized with the President in his hope that conditions in Mexico would right themselves without forcible interference on our part. I very much fear that that hope no longer has any foundation to rest upon.

Congress alone has power to declare war, and that is what intervention in Mexico means. Therefore Congress should courageously assume responsibility for whatever is to be done in that unfortunate country, and not leave it to rest upon the executive department of the Government.

I have offered the resolution in such form as to present the direct issue involved. There is no reason why we should seek to divide the responsibility with any other country or impose it upon the President. It is our responsibility and we should meet it calmly and courageously and that without delay.

I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, with the hope that the committee will take prompt action upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. STONE and Mr. LODGE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. I do not wish to interfere with the senior Senator from Massachusetts, but——

Mr. LODGE. I wish only a moment to ask to have something printed in the RECORD.

Mr. STONE. It is simply to make a request, and I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I was merely going to ask, Mr. President, that the resolution which I offered as a substitute for the resolution of the committee on April 21, 1914, may be printed in the RECORD, so that it may be easily accessible.

The Senate will recall that that was the time when we declared war or went to war with Victoriano Huerta. The war, of course, as we all know, has been brought to a successful conclusion, as our enemy Gen. Huerta has died in jail; but I wish, in this connection, I say, to print this resolution, because the

death of Gen. Huerta does not seem to improve the situation in Mexico materially. It was a resolution which represented the views of the Republican Party at that time and for which all Republican Senators voted, I think, without exception.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Would the Senator object to having the roll call upon the resolution also printed in the RECORD?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I should like to have the roll call printed. It is on the next page. Let the substitute be printed with the roll call.

Mr. STONE. What is the date?

Mr. LODGE. April 21, 1914.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, in that connection I ask that the amendment I submitted immediately following the adverse vote on the resolution offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] be printed with the roll call attached. It will be found on page 7582 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 21, 1914.

Mr. STONE. How long is the resolution?

Mr. GALLINGER. Did the Senator ask the question of me?

Mr. STONE. I inquire how long the matter is that the two Senators are asking to have inserted in the RECORD?

Mr. GALLINGER. They are both brief.

Mr. STONE. I think I should like to have them read.

Mr. GALLINGER. They were both submitted as amendments to the bill reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LODGE. The resolution I offered consisted of about a dozen lines.

Mr. LIPPITT. Let us have it read.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I should like to have the resolution read.

Mr. LODGE. I will read the resolution I have asked to have printed, or the Secretary can read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, and the matter referred to, entire, is as follows:

The SECRETARY. The committee proposes to strike out all of the House text of the joint resolution after the resolving clause and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

"That the President is justified in the employment of the armed forces of the United States to enforce his demand for unequivocal amends for certain affronts and indignities committed against the United States.

"*Be it further resolved*, That the United States disclaims any hostility to the Mexican people or any purpose to make war upon Mexico."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I offer as a substitute the amendment to the amendment which I send to the desk, which I put in the form of a resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts tenders an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the joint resolution. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. As a substitute for the joint resolution as reported by the committee it is proposed to insert the following:

"*Resolved, etc.*, That the state of unrestrained violence and anarchy which exists in Mexico, the numerous unchecked and unpunished murders of American citizens and the spoliation of their property in that country, the impossibility of securing protection or redress by diplomatic methods in the absence of lawful or effective authority, the inability of Mexico to discharge its international obligations, the unprovoked insults and indignities inflicted upon the flag and the uniform of the United States by the armed forces in occupation of large parts of the Mexican territory have become intolerable.

"That the self-respect and dignity of the United States and the duty to protect its citizens and its international rights require that such a course be followed in Mexico by our Government as to compel respect and observance of its rights.

"That to this end the President is justified in the employment of the armed forces of the United States to enforce his demand for unequivocal amends for affronts and indignities committed against the United States; that the United States disclaim any hostility to the Mexican people or any purpose to make war upon them."

* * * * * * *

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—36.

Borah	Crawford	Lodge	Sherman
Bradley	Cummins	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Brady	Dillingham	Nelson	Smoot
Brandegee	Fall	Norris	Sterling
Burleigh	Gallinger	Page	Sutherland
Catron	Goff	Penrose	Townsend
Clapp	Jones	Perkins	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Poindexter	Weeks
Colt	Lippitt	Root	Works

NAYS—47.

Ashurst	Johnson	Owen	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Kern	Pittman	Smith, Md.
Bristow	La Follette	Pomerene	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Lane	Ransdell	Swanson
Chilton	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Thomas
Clarke, Ark.	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Thompson
Fletcher	Lewis	Saulsbury	Thornton
Gore	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Vardaman
Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Walsh
Hollis	Newlands	Shields	West
Hughes	O'Gorman	Shively	Williams
James	Overman	Simmons	

NOT VOTING—12.

Burton	du Pont	Myers	Stephenson
Chamberlain	Gronna	Oliver	Stone
Culberson	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	Tillman

So Mr. LODGE'S amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire asks that the matter to which he referred be inserted in the RECORD. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the committee amendment, on line 2, page 2, by inserting, after the word "to," before the word "enforce," the words "protect American citizens and to"; so that, if amended, the paragraph will read:

"That the President is justified in the employment of the armed forces of the United States to protect American citizens and to enforce his demand for unequivocal amends for certain affronts and indignities committed against the United States."

* * * * * * * *

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—40.

Borah	Crawford	Lodge	Sherman
Bradley	Cummins	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Brady	Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Smoot
Brandegee	Fall	Nelson	Sterling
Bristow	Gallinger	Norris	Sutherland
Burleigh	Goff	Page	Townsend
Catron	Jones	Penrose	Warren
Clapp	Kenyon	Perkins	Weeks
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Poindexter	West
Colt	Lippitt	Root	Works

NAYS—43.

Ashurst	Johnson	Pittman	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Kern	Pomerene	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Lane	Ransdell	Smith, S. C.
Chilton	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Swanson
Clarke, Ark.	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Thomas
Fletcher	Lewis	Saulsbury	Thompson
Gore	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Thornton
Hitchcock	Newlands	Sheppard	Vardaman
Hollis	O'Gorman	Shields	Walsh
Hughes	Overman	Shively	Williams
James	Owen	Simmons	

NOT VOTING—12.

Burton	du Pont	Myers	Stephenson
Chamberlain	Gronna	Oliver	Stone
Culberson	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	Tillman

So Mr. GALLINGER'S amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I am puzzled to determine whether there is a disposition in this Chamber to stir up a sentiment calculated and intended to provoke armed conflict with the people of Mexico. I hope there is no movement of that kind afoot, but I am uncertain.

Mr. President, I believe it to be true that the one thing above all others done by this administration which has received the general approval of the American people is the brave, earnest, and continuing effort of President Wilson to keep this country out of war if it can be done with honor to the country and without undue sacrifice of the interests of the American people. The world has gone crazy about war. Ours is the only great Nation that seems to be sane. From every quarter of this country, and from all South America, we have heard only lament over the war madness in the world. It may be that there are a few people—I think only a few comparatively—in the United States whose blood has become heated and whose brains have become diseased with the fever of war. It is possible, aye probable, that if some men we know of had had the powers of the President—and it would not be difficult for us to think of such a man—the United States would have been embroiled in war, and possibly in more than one war long before this. We might have been, probably would have been in the circumstances I have presumed, already engaged in war both with Europe and with Mexico; but surely it can not be that the great body of the American people, who have no sinister motives, political or otherwise, desire to have this country so involved. The contrary must be true, and it is true, unless the people have changed their attitude overnight. What has occurred within a month or six months to change the attitude of men either in or out of Congress? What has occurred that should excite the minds of men with a sudden passion to arm our people and force them or urge them into war? I think that President Wilson is entitled to the gratitude of our people that he has steered our ship with strong hand and clear eye through the troubled waters without so far encountering a rock that wrecks. Sir, what reason is there now more than heretofore for precipitating this country into a conflict with Mexico?

Mr. President, there have been times when I believed that the President of the United States should not only be authorized but possibly directed to use the military forces of our Government to establish order in Mexico and to protect life and property there. But there has been no sentiment here of that kind, unless it is here now. There was a time when there was no

government in Mexico nor even the pretense of one; the whole country was in a state of tumult and disorder; there was no organization that was recognized by anybody as constituting a responsible government. The only government was that which followed warring generals from camp to camp.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri allow me one moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. FALL. I know the Senator does not mean to make a misstatement as to conditions. At the time he introduced his resolution Diaz was the recognized President and had been the President of Mexico for 30 years. There was no interval whatsoever. By an agreement between the revolutionists and Mr. Diaz, signed and recognized by this Government, De la Barra was recognized as the President of Mexico ad interim, and following him came the election of Madero. For three years there was a recognized government. It is only since this administration refused to recognize Huerta or anyone else as President of Mexico until its recognition of Carranza that chaos and anarchy have existed there. The Senator from Missouri certainly knows that.

Mr. STONE. Diaz was President for about 30 years. But because of the accumulating force of the revolution against him he abdicated and fled his country. Madero then became the President, but he was brutally murdered and the office was grasped by a murderous usurper.

Mr. FALL. I say that at the time the Senator from Missouri introduced and urged the passage of his resolution Diaz was yet the President. Diaz only went out as the President of Mexico by written agreement signed by the revolutionists, by which De la Barra, with the acquiescence of this Government, became the ad interim President of Mexico, and our minister continued in Mexico. That Government was continuously recognized down to the time of the assassination of Madero, when the present occupant of the White House refused from that time until the 19th day of last October to recognize any government.

Mr. STONE. I am not discussing my resolution; I have not referred to it; nor am I speaking of a particular date. I am stating what every Senator here knows to be true, that for years there has been no organized and responsible government in Mexico. We all know that for years there have been factions at war, with armies led by ambitious and contending generals. But there was no government. In the midst of that anarchy I thought it might be wise and proper for us to use force, if need be, to restore order and protect life. But in those days Senators on both sides were silent, or, if they spoke, they spoke in condemnation of intervention.

What is the situation now? Two and a half months ago, or thereabouts, the President recognized the Carranza government. It is now the de facto government of Mexico. We have all desired, or said we did, that some responsible government in Mexico should be established and recognized. Well, such a government in Mexico has been organized and recognized. But Villa and Zapata, sometimes cooperating with each other, were bitterly opposed to the recognition of the Carranza establishment and bitterly resentful because of it. As a consequence of the recognition of the Carranza government, the forces of Villa have been dissipated. Villa disappeared into the mountains of Chihuahua and Sonora, followed by a small band of two or three hundred men. Can we for a moment doubt that this band of resentful and lawless men, roaming through the mountains and sweeping down upon the plains when opportunity offers, will commit depredations?

Two or three days ago 16 or 17 Americans were murdered by these bandits. It is reported that since then two or three other Americans have suffered the same fate. I do not know whether that is true, but I would not be surprised if such crimes should be repeated for some time to come. There is every reason to expect their repetition. But, being fair with each other and fair to the country, can there be a doubt that Villa and Zapata will resort to any kind of lawlessness, making it as bad as possible, with the hope of embroiling the United States in a quarrel with the new government just established, and which these bandits would do anything to overthrow? Here are resolutions that look to war at once by a declaration of the Congress because of these one or two unfortunate incidents—incidents that we had every reason to anticipate and expect if the opportunity offered—and this drastic action is proposed within about 48 hours after we first hear through the newspapers of this tragedy; and this in the face of the fact that we are told in the press this morning—and that is all any of us know of it; it is impossible that we should have any other information—that a number of these murderers have been captured and executed.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. FALL. Is it not stated in that dispatch that they have been captured and executed by Americans, with a few Carranza soldiers from Madero accompanying them?

Mr. STONE. I saw a dispatch from El Paso that contained some statement of that kind. It said that an employee on the Hearst ranch, in Mexico, had led a number of men, in conjunction with some of the Carranza soldiers, and that between them they had captured and shot a number of the bandits. I do not know the facts as to that, nor does the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. No; nor does the Senator from Missouri nor the Senator from New Mexico know whether there has been any capture of any bandits either.

Mr. STONE. I did not say that I knew; I said that it was reported in the press this morning that this had been done. But what of it? Even if the Hearst ranchmen were present, so also was the arm and hand of the Carranza government. Moreover, it is reported, and in a way officially stated, that the Carranza troops in Chihuahua and Sonora are in pursuit of these criminals, seeking to run them down and bring them to justice.

Now, in the face of all that, within 48 hours of the happening of this tragedy, Senators, impetuous and flaming with a spirit of battle, rush in and ask us practically to declare war. Why, Mr. President, if a crime like this or analogous to this had been committed in the foothills of the mountains of California, as this was in the foothills of Sierra Madras, in Chihuahua, and the criminals had fled into the fastnesses of the California mountains, does anyone believe that there would have been the least likelihood of their capture within 24 hours or 48 hours or 60 hours? Of course they would have been pursued with a probability of ultimate apprehension.

Mr. President, it seems to me this is no time, least of all times within the last five or six years, when we ought to embroil our Government in serious trouble with Mexico. It is difficult for me to believe that any Senator here down in his heart really desires that. On the contrary, we ought to aid, so far as we can aid, the Carranza government to establish itself firmly, to maintain its authority, to restore order, and to do all the things that a responsible government is obligated to do. It has been only six or eight weeks since that government was recognized and in form established. Only the other day, so to speak, the country was beset with roving armies at war. Now that there is a government just beginning its work, can it be that gentlemen do not want peace? Are we going to cooperate from the floor of the Senate with Villa or Zapata to embarrass or to overturn this government before it has had a chance to demonstrate what it can do? Again I say that this of all times is a time when we ought not to engage in untoward and dangerous agitation.

Mr. President, these resolutions can go to the Committee on Foreign Relations for the consideration of that body; but I indulge the hope, whatever the committee may do, that the Senate of the United States will look with disfavor upon any such movement as that projected here to-day. I do not know what may develop in the future, I do not know what our duty may be at some future time, but I say it is a most inopportune time now to raise a question of this kind.

I hope Senators on that side and also on this side will view this whole subject in a broad way, and let us do what we can to encourage and aid the new government in Mexico. Let us uphold the hands of our President, who is doing everything he can to aid the government of Mexico, acting chiefly through their own instrumentalities, to bring about peace and order in that unhappy country. We are not going to have war. I do not believe Senators upon that side would vote for war.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. STONE. Just a moment, please. Mr. President, I warn gentlemen that this is a dangerous adventure if they are striving to make this matter the subject of partisan politics. If the President of the United States desired to play politics with a great international question like this, involving so much of life and hope and future possibilities; if he were capable of that, probably the best thing that could happen to him and to his party would be to have war declared against Mexico or some other nation. If there should be a war raging in November, the chances of his reelection to the Presidency would be augmented a hundredfold. His reelection would be a certainty. But, happily, the President is not built that way. He is too great to play that rôle. He will not drag great questions of this kind into the mire of domestic party politics; and I express the deep and firm conviction that the American people are behind the President in his efforts to preserve peace and peacefully to aid in

establishing an orderly government in the long-distressed Republic of Mexico. You can play politics, if you wish, gentlemen.

Now I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Missouri, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, did me the honor two days ago to ask me what I would do, if I were in the President's place, in reference to the Mexican situation. I answered offhand frankly what I would do; and I now ask the Senator from Missouri, who is in the confidence of the President and the administration, to answer with equal frankness what the President and his administration intends to do to protect the lives and property of American citizens in Mexico. The people of the country, South as well as North, are anxiously waiting for an answer; and I trust the Senator from Missouri, who stands at the head of the Committee on Foreign Relations, will, so far as he is informed, enlighten the public mind on the subject.

Mr. STONE. I am not the spokesman of the President. He can speak for himself far better than I could speak for him. However, I hope it is the fixed intention and purpose of the President to use his influence and power to prevent any unseemly and unwise action on our part at this time. I hope it is not the intention of the President at this time to ask the Congress to authorize him to send troops into Mexico, and I hope he will not at this juncture commit any act within his own authority that would precipitate a conflict between Mexico and the United States. I hope it is his intention to do whatever he can to aid in strengthening Carranza's hands in Mexico to the end that he may be given a fair and full opportunity to prove whether he can maintain an orderly and effective government in that Republic. I hope that is his policy, and I hope it will be ours, for in all reason we ought to give Gen. Carranza a chance to test out what he can do.

I am amazed, Mr. President, that grave and experienced Senators should raise such questions at this time, at this time of all times, when this experiment is in its beginning, when Carranza is just gathering his energies together with a view to doing things—that right in the infancy of this movement toward an orderly establishment—that Senators should seize upon an incident like that we have been discussing, not only to discredit the Carranza government, but even to excite our own people into a mad movement to demand its overthrow. For God's sake, let us give Carranza a chance. Let us rather strengthen his hands and see what he can do.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I assume entire responsibility for the resolution that I have offered. The Republican Party is not responsible for it. Not a single Senator on this side of the Chamber except myself is responsible, directly or indirectly, for the resolution that has been offered. I join in the hope expressed by the Senator from Missouri that this question may not be a political one.

The resolution was not offered with any idea or intention of criticizing the conduct of the President in dealing with this grave and important question. I think it is unfair to the President that Congress should sit idly by and do nothing more than to criticize the course of the President, because I think the responsibility rests upon us and not upon the President of the United States. I have said that I do not desire at this time to discuss the merits of this resolution. I do not know why the Senator from Missouri should do so in advance of the consideration of the resolution by the committee of which he is a member.

Something should be done, Mr. President, in this emergency by somebody to relieve the situation as it exists to-day. American citizens are losing their lives in Mexico day after day as the result of the conditions that prevail there. If Congress comes to the conclusion that we should leave matters as they are without affording protection of any kind to our citizens in that country, well and good. If, on the other hand, it should be believed by Congress that steps should be taken, even to the extent of intervention, to protect our citizens in Mexico, then I think that is a matter that Congress should deal with and not the President.

I have been one of those who have been exceedingly reluctant to take strong measures in dealing with affairs in Mexico. I have sympathized very much with the view of the President that we should resort to all proper means in advance to prevent intervention or war, but I must confess that I see no hope ahead of us at this time except through that means. If other Senators, if Congress, can find some better means of protecting our citizens in Mexico than that of resorting to force, and that shall be successful, nobody will be more gratified than myself; but my position about it is this: We have been talking about this question and agitating it day after day since Congress has met in this session. We are accomplishing nothing by that means. Senators on the other side are contending that it is an attack upon the President of the United States, and are defending it upon that theory alone. But, Senators, that is not the question to be determined. It is not a question whether the President is right or wrong. The question is, and we should assume the responsibility of it: What shall be done by the American Government in order to protect its citizens in Mexico? We have no right to shift that responsibility upon the Executive department or upon any other country. It is a question that we should deal with frankly and courageously and determine what the country ought to do under these circumstances.

I have submitted this resolution for the purpose of making that direct and positive issue for Congress to determine, whether we shall do the one thing or the other, and I am quite content to leave it in the first instance to the Committee on Foreign Relations and finally to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senate, I will endeavor in a few words to set the record right.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], the chairman of that great committee which must deal with questions of foreign relations, asks if it is the intention of Senators on this side to ally themselves with Pancho Villa, with Zapata, and with other revolutionists and bandits in Mexico against the recognized government. I answer, sir, for myself, most emphatically, no; and when the Senator voted so to ally himself on April 21, 1914, I explained to him then what he was doing, and I then denounced such an alliance, as I denounce it now.

I have before me a copy of the remarks which I made at that time, sir. I asked then:

> What message are you sending to my people on the border of this country? What message are you sending to the people of Texas, of Arizona, of New Mexico, of California? What message are you sending to the families of those women outraged by the people whom you invite to become allies of the United States in its attack upon Victoriano Huerta? What message are you sending to the fathers and brothers and mothers and sisters of those Americans who have died in Mexico, where they were invited to go by the silver tongue of your Secretary of State?

I said further at that time:

> In the eyes of the Nation, or at least in the eyes of these outraged citizens of other nations, under the peculiar circumstances existing as they do, with Pancho Villa and Carranza marauding with impunity because they can not be reached by Spain or England or Germany—they control no ports, they touch no seacoast, and the only power that can reach them is the United States of America, unless we choose to permit the passage of armed forces of other nations through our borders—under these peculiar circumstances this Nation, under its flag, stands to-day as a "fence" for the burglars, the bandits, the looters, the murderers of northern Mexico.

Sir, in view of the fact that there is to-day pending before the Senate of the United States a request from the President that we now join him in an official recognition of the bandit Carranza, I submit that it is the duty of the Senate to speak and to raise its voice against an alliance with any bandit or any murderer. It is our constitutional duty to advise the President as to the appointment of an ambassador, and the Senator forgets that that question is here. The Senator forgets that we are performing our duty constitutionally in advising the President of the United States in reference to Mexican matters, since the President has seen fit to send to this body the name of an ambassador to the court of a bandit and murderer. These are strong words, sir, but this appears to me to be the time when strong words should be used in the Senate.

Mr. STONE. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. FALL. With pleasure.

Mr. STONE. The Senator said that I had proposed to make an alliance with Villa and Zapata. I do not recall that I ever made any such suggestion.

Mr. FALL. The Senator voted to ratify the action of the President of the United States in sending armed forces to Vera Cruz. As he said, and as the President himself said later, "We have gone down to Mexico to serve mankind if we can find out the way." That was his purpose in sending troops, and the result was the elimination of Huerta and the placing of Carranza in the capital city of Mexico. I did not mean to say that the Senator in announcing his vote for the resolution ratifying the President's action announced that he voted for an alliance with Carranza and Villa.

Mr. STONE. But what is the vote the Senator referred to as being a vote of alliance with Carranza and Villa and Zapata?

Mr. FALL. Your vote on the resolution of April 21, 1914, I referred to it for the purpose I have shown. I then warned the Senate of the United States against the message that the President was sending to these people.

Mr. STONE. The Senator also said that he would not vote to recognize or to consort in an official way with any bandit or murderer. Do I understand that the Senator desires a recognition and consorting with Huerta?

Mr. FALL. Huerta has gone to a place where the Senator hopes he will never go, Mr. President, and therefore I am not advised of any alliance with Huerta.

Mr. STONE. I do not know where he has gone.

Mr. FALL. I do not know, but I have an idea.

Mr. STONE. I wish to say, if he has gone to a place where I do not desire to go, then all the more significant is my question whether the Senator desired an alliance with that sort of a man.

Mr. FALL. The Senator's memory is very short. On more than one occasion in the Senate of the United States I have stated that I would follow the President of the United States in the nonrecognition of Huerta, and I have done more than the Senator from Missouri has done for the President of the United States in this matter. I have addressed audiences in various States and joined in debate upon this proposition with parties attacking the President's policy in nonrecognition of Huerta, in which I attempted in my feeble way to defend the President.

Mr. STONE. If the Senator would not recognize Huerta or Carranza or Villa or Zapata, what plan of government does he have in mind?

Mr. FALL. Now, the Senator is getting to it. If the President of the United States had asked that question of anyone knowing Mexico, and not of one sent down there and influenced by pique or other considerations; if he had asked that question before——

Mr. STONE. I ask it now.

Mr. FALL. I will undertake to reply to that at a later time.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. FALL. I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico this question: When he says that the Senator from Missouri voted for an alliance with Carranza and with Villa, will the Senator not say that nine-tenths of the Members of the Senate also voted the same way? Can he say they thought they were forming an alliance?

Mr. FALL. I am always glad to have an interruption from a gentleman who knows so much about the subject and recalls so well what took place. I, myself, voted for the resolution ratifying the act of the President of the United States, and I said, in so voting, I wanted it understood that I believed the President of the United States was actuated by other motives than simply those expressed in the resolution. I could not believe that the President of the United would be actuated by motives of private pique inducing him to plunge the United States Government into a quarrel between himself, Woodrow Wilson, and Victoriano Huerta. It is because I read other words into the resolution, because I believed that it really meant that finally some American blood was running through the veins of the President of the United States, and that behind it he meant that he was sending the troops to Vera Cruz for the purpose of showing definitely to the Mexicans, and to the other people of the world, that American citizens would be protected and that their murders would be avenged; for these reasons and not those expressed in the President's message I voted to ratify his act, and I would so vote again.

It makes no difference, Mr. President, upon what plea the President of the United States would put it. I would vote for doing anything whatsoever that I believed would induce in the slightest degree the protection of Americans wherever they might be. I said in that speech that I wanted to leave the record so that my children hereafter, after my voice was silent, in reading the RECORD would know what induced me to vote to ratify the President's act.

He had an ulterior motive, and you know it. He announced it at the Brooklyn Navy Yard when he preached the sermon over the dead bodies of the 17 marines carried there for burial. He announced that they had not gone there for the purpose of requiring a salute to the flag, but that they had gone there to serve the Mexicans themselves. We all knew it at that time, and we know it now. Otherwise stultification is the answer. No salute has ever been fired, nor since that date has it ever been demanded.

Now, Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. FALL. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. It is a very small point, but at the time of which the Senator is speaking, after the Vera Cruz business, is it not true that our particular ally and pet was not Carranza but Villa?

Mr. FALL. Ah, Mr. President, certainly. The message which came from Carranza at that time was this. I use the Spanish expression—two words in Spanish—to explain it, and I interpret it: "We have not desired trouble with the United States—'hasta hora'—'until now.'"

The United States Government sent out from the White House a statement calling attention to the fact that Villa differentiated when he sent his message: "We have not desired trouble with the United States 'hasta hora'—'up to the present time'—nor in the future." They congratulated themselves upon the fact that Villa placed his seal of approval upon our occupation of Vera Cruz, although Mr. Carranza denounced our action.

Mr. President, further than that I call the attention of the Senate of the United States to the fact that it was reported—and I asked for information as to its truth, as I am asking again—that Carranza demanded the evacuation of Vera Cruz; that Carranza with his armed forces menacing the troops of the United States within 100 yards or less of the waterworks near Vera Cruz, his men there facing the Funston forces, murdering such men in cold blood as happened to wander from our lines into his—that Carranza then demanded himself, at the muzzle of his guns, the evacuation of Vera Cruz.

I want to know whether that is not true. It is reported in public speeches in papers that this is one of the grounds upon which Mr. Carranza has sought to make himself prominent in Mexico, that Villa acquiesced in our occupation of Vera Cruz and Carranza denounced it and forced the evacuation of Vera Cruz at the muzzle of his guns.

I do not mean to say, Mr. President, of Mr. Carranza's action that I know or have definite knowledge. I am asking for it in a resolution which was adopted here the other day.

What caused the evacuation of Vera Cruz? And I should like to have the official correspondence.

The Senate wants a little information and there is further information which I would like to have. I would like to have a copy of the order sent with the marines to occupy the customhouse at Vera Cruz. I would like to know if they did not have strict orders, and if they were not written, that they would occupy the customhouse, the post office, and the railroad yards at Vera Cruz, and that they should not return any fire until each individual was located, some particular individual who was shooting, and that they should not return it until after the Mexican shooting had been located and seen to fire again. In other words, I should like to know if they did not go there with their death warrant in their hands. I should like to know if there were not written orders to that effect in existence. I have not seen the orders. I think the Senate would like to see them if such orders were ever issued.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, urges us to assist Mr. Carranza, to hold up Carranza's hands to give him an opportunity, to afford him some chance to prove that the President of the United States was right. He asks the Senate of the United States to enter into an alliance with Carranza to prove that the President of the United States was not mistaken in his recognition.

The Senator says that we should not inject politics, but the President of the United States, in making a political speech at Indianapolis upon this subject, said:

> These Mexicans have a right to spill as much blood as they please and so long as they please.

He said to his audience and the newspapers report "applause," "applause":

> This is not your business and it is not my business.

And now he asks us to support one of the factions.

In passing, Mr. President, I want to say to you, sir, that Mr. Carranza's power is not supreme in any 1 of the 27 States nor of the 2 territories of the so-called Mexican Republic; that he has no recognized authority in the State of Guerrero, where Zapata and, strange to say, De la Torre, son-in-law of Porfirio Diaz, control the State, as I am informed.

The Urrietta forces to-day are supreme in the State of Durango. He has no recognized authority in the State of Oaxaca—that great State, the birthplace of Juarez and Diaz. He has but little or no recognized authority in many other States.

I call attention to another statement of the Senator. He said that Carranza has men pursuing the murderers of these Americans—sufficient armed troops. Who are they, sir? Will the Senator answer who were the companions in arms until two weeks ago of the murderers who shot down Watson and his companions?

The greater portion of the men of Rodriguez's command and of Reyna's command and of Villa's command, surrendered in Juarez and in other places, some of them in Chihuahua, practically the entire garrison of Casas Grande, 156 miles south of El Paso and on the road where these men were murdered. They have been for from three to five years companions in arms in the career

of looting and murder. The same thing is true of the garrison in the city of Chihuahua. It is reported with just as much accuracy, I think, behind it as the other reports which the Senator is receiving from there that a troop train of Carranza's soldiers left the depot but 10 minutes before the train upon which these Americans left, and it is yet a mystery, something that is not known to the Americans, from the best information I have, whether it was troops from the Carranza derailed train that committed these murders or whether they were, as it is said, bandits. If they were bandits, then where were the Carranza troops ahead of the train upon which these Americans were murdered? I tell you, Mr. President, we need some information about Mexico, and we need it now.

Now, sir, I am not going further into this matter at this time. I have been quietly endeavoring to content myself in awaiting the answer of the President of the United States to the request unanimously adopted by the Senate that he should send in certain documents to the Senate and certain information with reference to the very proposition which we are now discussing. What assurances have you obtained, not only as to the willingness of Carranza to protect Americans, but as to his ability to do so?

I read a note from the honorable Secretary of State to the effect that to intervene now would be a great breach of faith; that we could not do it without Mr. Carranza's consent having once recognized him. In the first place, as an American I deny the main premise. In the second place, I want to ask what authority had the Secretary of State to choose a leader in Mexico, and to recognize him, until he had, as other Secretaries have done, provided for the protection of Americans in Mexico. Why did he not demand of this man assurances of his ability to protect Americans before extending to him recognition and active assistance? That was the time to secure from him the "permission," which he says we are now under obligation to obtain, that we should have the privilege of going in there to protect our citizens whom he can not or will not protect.

One of the greatest figures of Mexican history, the great figure of Mexican history, Mr. President, Benito Juarez, the man who to-day is worshiped by every Mexican peon and whose memory is reverenced by every intelligent Mexican wherever he may be, did not think it beneath his dignity to agree with the United States that in the event he could not protect American citizens he would invite our intervention, and that if upon sudden occasion the necessity should arise we would have the right to go in with our armed forces and protect them without his invitation. Why could not the Secretary of State obtain such an agreement from Carranza—Carranza, who stands rejected by the people of Mexico themselves; who, when he went into the City of Mexico under the muzzles of our guns at Vera Cruz, was not able to remain there; whose outrages were such that I will guarantee that if the notes of the Brazilian minister come in here the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] will be astounded that this Government could ever have seen fit to recognize Carranza as first chief or in any other position of authority?

Mr. President, the President of the United States has been more than once warned as to what the result would be in the loss of American life if he continued a policy, which was inaugurated by his predecessor in office, of allowing Mexican troops of one faction to go through the boundaries of the United States and attack troops of another faction. I myself two years ago, in a most respectful letter to the President, through his Secretary of State, in an endeavor to give him some information—although, of course, he considered it from a prejudiced source—and to give him some insight into what was going on and of the condition of mind of the Mexican people and the condition of facts as to the Mexican situation, warned him then that the action of his predecessor, Mr. Taft, in allowing the Madero soldiers freely to go through our borders upon our trains and to attack Orozco and other revolutionists at different points, had resulted in the loss of numerous American lives, in the outrage of American women, and in the holding for ransom of American men. I produced and I have called to the attention of the Senate of the United States the sworn testimony in the case, embodied in the report made by one of your subcommittees to this body, wherein the evidence concerning Inez Salazar brought out that the result of Mr. Taft's action then was to cause the outrage of American women, the murder of American men, and the destruction of American property, because we had taken sides with one faction. On July 22, 1912, during Mr. Taft's administration, I denounced his action then as causing the murder of Americans. I can say now that the unfortunate action of the President of the United States in not only recognizing the Carranza government, but in actively assisting that government with arms, as he is now doing, and in guarding its troop trains containing 5,000 soldiers proceeding from Eagle Pass, within our borders, to Agua Prieta—guarded by our own military against attack by bomb or otherwise; I say to you now, with all due sense of the import of my words, that that mistaken action of the President of the United States is responsible for the death of the 17 Americans in Chihuahua.

Mr. President, Villa had been the pet of the United States. George Carothers, a special representative, had been with him from practically the outbreak of the revolution up to the time when he went to Agua Prieta.

The Senator from Missouri is again mistaken in his facts when he says that before the recognition of Carranza the Villa army was dissipated. What are the facts, Mr. President? Pancho Villa left the city of Chihuahua with 15,000 men, estimated when they arrived at Agua Prieta by the Army officers of the United States at 13,000, exclusive of those who were with Rodriguez at Cananea. He traveled across mountains for 250 or 300 miles with no source of supplies, the last hundred miles being practically over the burning desert with not a drop of water upon it. He traversed canyons 3,000 feet deep, with sides almost as precipitous as the walls of this building. He climbed mountain peaks and went through defiles of the mountains through which only a burro or a trained horse could go to reach his enemies at Agua Prieta and Naco.

The Government of the United States, which had upheld him, which had held him out as a great warrior and a patriot, which had had a special representative with him, receiving special favors from his hands, the man to whom the Secretary of State addressed communications of an official character rather than address them to Carranza—and the records of the State Department will show it and the records of Carranza's department will show that the first break that came between him and Villa was brought about by machinations of American agents, and that one of the acts of these agents and of the Secretary of State, which Carranza denounced at a cabinet meeting, was the sending of telegrams from the Secretary of State to Pancho Villa, one of his subordinate officers, instead of to himself, when they were both in the same town of Chihuahua. When Pancho Villa arrived at Agua Prieta he found that instead of a garrison of something like 1,500 he had veteran troops, including 4,000 Indians, to contend with, and over 5,000 troops, including the Indians, who had been delivered in Agua Prieta while he was wending his way through the mountains and across the plains by the American Government. With the tongues hanging out of the mouths of his men, he attacked and was repulsed by the artillery conveyed through the United States for this purpose by leave of the Secretary of War and of the President of the United States.

When the garrison of Nogales, under the constitutional governor of the State of Chihuahua, Randall, sought to resist the occupation of that town, it was not only attacked by Obregon's troops marching through the interior but coming to their assistance, on the soil of the United States and in American trains under guard of American troops, was another contingent of Obregon's army from Agua Prieta; and when Nogales was evacuated by Randall and by Villa, and Villa returned to the attack or to threaten an attack upon Agua Prieta, again Obregon's troops were loaded on American trains on American soil, guarded by American soldiers, and taken to Agua Prieta for the purpose of resisting him.

Now, I ask what must be, under these circumstances, the condition of mind of a bloody murderer whose occupation it has been, at least at one time in his life it is said, to accept 500 Mexican pesos to murder a man whom he did not know? What impression do you make upon his mind? I say, if you by your action drive that man to murder American citizens, you are responsible for the murder, and you can not shirk it by appealing to nonpartisan discussion.

Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri has repeatedly called attention to the fact that as long ago as 1911 he intoduced in the Senate a resolution calling for armed intervention in Mexico, couched in almost the terms of the resolution introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS], and which he so strongly denounces this morning. "Consistency, thou art a jewel." The Senator from Missouri has told us of the courageous words which he used then, and I want to say to the Senator from Missouri that my heart went out to him, sir. I admired him for that action, more, possibly, than for any other action, with all my respect and my love of the Senator from Missouri. My heart was with him. It is true that I was not at that time in this body. My State was yet a dependent Territory, waiting upon the pleasure of the Congress; but as soon as I came into this body I endeavored in every way possible to show to the Senate and to the people of the country the true conditions, as giving an excuse for following the action then proposed by

the Senator from Missouri. I want to say to him, sir, that I respected him as one man who then knew enough about conditions and had the manliness to tell the Senate of the conditions in Mexico and to ask that the Senate and the Congress of the United States place in the President's hands the power to protect American citizens.

But, Mr. President, there is a word which is corrupting this Government in its every department; there is a word which, if the present administration is allowed to write "finis" upon this Mexican chapter, should be engraved upon the tombs of the victims of these Mexican murderers, and that is the word "acquiesce." The Senator, representing a sovereign State in this great Union of States, doing his duty to his constituents as he then saw it and as, I believe, he was most faithfully performing it, demanded the protection of American citizens by the armed forces of the United States when there was a recognized government of 35 years duration, when we had an ambassador in the City of Mexico and Mexico had an ambassador here, when at every consulate in Mexico there was an American consul and at every consulate here there was a Mexican consul, when there was an orderly, recognized government, the only disturbance at all which took place being the capture of Juarez, on our borders across from El Paso. That was at a time when, by written agreement between the representatives of Diaz and the representatives of Madero, De la Barra went in as the President. There was no interim whatsoever; Diaz went out and De la Barra went in, and the credentials of our ambassador were handed to him immediately. Succeeding him came an election, in which Madero was declared the President. Mr. Taft was operating under those conditions. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Missouri was right then; I believe that he is wrong now; I believe that he has been inoculated by the germ which, if allowed to continue its insidious ravages, is going to bring this great Nation down, down, down, until it will not deserve, any more than it will receive, the respect of China or of the weakest nation in the world, and that is the germ denominated by the word "acquiesce."

The Senator said in his speech that, as he could receive no support from this side of the Chamber nor from his own, he "acquiesced"; that the President of the United States sent for him and asked him not to urge the passage of the resolution, and that he "acquiesced"; and that he had continued since that time to "acquiesce." I say to him, sir, who has had much more experience in affairs than I have had, that that word "acquiesce" will be the requiem of the Democratic Party. You are "acquiescing" in everything which comes from the White House, without asserting your manhood; you are "acquiescing" in anything that does not come direct but which may be conveyed by the back doors of this Chamber. With the exception of a few of you, you have "acquiesced" in a change of policy on practically every matter of importance to-day in the United States.

You have asked us, why this change of sentiment; why this hurriedness to be prepared now to do in Mexico what we would not do in years past? I ask you why the President of the United States a year ago told the people of the United States that no nation would attack us; why he told you, in Congress assembled, and told the people generally, at the outbreak and during the continuance of the European war, that we needed no greater Army? Why did he say we needed no more munitions of war? Why did the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], who is always so ready to attack American interests, make his speech backing the President of the United States in this Chamber less than a year ago against preparedness? Why has the President of the United States now advocated preparedness? You ask what are the changed conditions in Mexico. I ask what are the changed conditions in the world.

If this Nation is to-day in a position where it is likely to go to war with any country under the heavens which country it was not likely to have trouble with a year ago, tell me the name of that nation; kindly give me some information, for I am laboring in the dark. What are the changed conditions demanding now an entire change of policy on the part of the administration of this Government? We are left in the dark just as you were left in the dark, and by a ukase from the White House compelled to change right-about face, in the face of your platform pledges, on the Panama Canal tolls matter in one day, without an explanation from one of you. Accepting the demand from the White House, you "acquiesced."

Ah, Mr. President, if the people of the United States can be brought to utter that word upon every occasion, the time is not far distant when this so-called Republic of ours will be a thing of the past, and the prophecies of those who have written against democratic government in times past will have been fulfilled, when Macaulay's vision will have become truly prophetic. Democrats, just write that word "acquiesce" across your banner and go before the people at the next election with it.

Mr. LEWIS and Mr. LIPPITT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I take it that at 2 o'clock, under the rule, the regular order of business will be resumed, and I trust that between now and that time I may have concluded such observations as at this moment is my intention to enter upon.

The eminent chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], in making reference to the tendered resolutions here from the Republican side this morning, very fitly characterized what must appear to the American public to be the real object on the part of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber—politics. If this country could be seriously convinced that the real object of those eminent gentlemen on the other side who have presented in these ill characterizations of the President, the vicious denunciations of every act, as well as the indictment in every form of criminal arraignment those he has assumed to recognize as authority in Mexico—if this country at large believed that the only object of the assailing opponents was to protect American citizenship, establish order, and maintain the honor of the Republic, they might hope for approval of their course. But one of the delusions ever indulged by the leaders on the other side is that the mass of the public of our country are deluded as to their real purposes and deceived as to their true object.

The time has come, Mr. President, when to the country it must be made apparent that the leaders of the other side are only reaching out into the gloom they feel to grasp anything that can be held out as a political hope before their party.

Now that the civil conditions of our Nation will not justify the continued assaults that they have made upon them; when the financial success and the splendid prosperity of business have closed the doors to their constant assaults under the cry of panic and disaster; when brilliant diplomatic negotiations, directed by proven statesmanship on the part of the President of the United States, have carried this country to a victorious conclusion of the most serious international entanglement with which the Nation has been involved since the Civil War; and now that there can be no longer opportunity afforded to cry "failure" in this achievement, upon which they may hang some hope for political issue—when none of their political expedients seemed to seize the American mind to sufficient weight to promise results, then arose to their minds a fortuitous circumstances—the much-to-be-deplored murder of American citizens in Mexico, at the hands of those who by their nature were murderers in any community, under any circumstances, wherever opportunity afforded.

How quickly did the eminent gentlemen on the other side—these eminent leaders—see what they thought at last was an issue. Suddenly plunged before their hopeful eyes their opportunity. It is to cry, "On to the war in Mexico! Americans have been murdered, and Democracy is indifferent, the President neglectful, the country dishonored." In the final analysis the political cry of my able friends on the other side to any condition or event is, "Help me, Cassius, or I sink!"

But, sirs, what be the truth? It is that it is a delusion under which you rest, eminent Republican Senators, to assume that the great mass of the American country will not pause to consider your real object, and will not measure by your past conduct your present action. It will be from all this that they will judge the sincerity and object of your now proposed undertakings.

Said the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], that upon the head of this administration will now rest the responsibility for the murder of these 13 Americans. Sir, so far as I am concerned, I look to no source whatever to find exemption from holding the perpetrators of this crime to the very fullest responsibility by the laws of man and the vengeance of God. They have killed Americans. To me it is enough that it neither had justification nor excuse. But I can not allow my honorable opponents to indict the Democracy as being responsible for the offense, or to assume, in their efforts to find some party issue, that the American people can be persuaded into the belief that any action on the part of the president on the one hand or of the Democratic side of the Senate on the other could have averted this atrocious deed. But I do say to the distinguished Senators leading this assault that if there shall be a source to which the mind of a just man shall address itself to ascertain the moving cause, for original responsibility for this dastardly act, they will find it in the course of eminent Senators on the other side, and shall say to you, as the humble prophet in Isreal said to the King, "Thou art the man!"

Truly, as the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] has said, for years under both administrations, that preceding this of ours and ours succeeding its predecessor, Mexico has been in trouble. Mr. President, Mexico has continued like a caldron in revolution of fire and flame. This condition stimulated in some directions by the demand of its poor for justice; in other directions by the cry against those who have monopolized the land of their earth; on the part of others who rose up to vindicate the murder of their dead relatives and to punish those who had murdered them ruthlessly. But, sir, whatever might have been the motives leading these different factions, there remains the truth that they were engaged in these conflicts ceaselessly, without order, in every aspect of revolution, riot, incendiarism, and murder! When this administration upon coming into power sought in every form to maintain peace in Mexico and not violate our honorable relations with our southern neighbors, all in accordance with our promise to guarantee them every form of protection that could be afforded without intruding ourselves upon their institutions or government, what aid did our honorable opponents on the other side give?

I recount from memory the record of their course. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]—I invite his attention—arises this morning and presents a resolution which, he says—and his word is ever sufficient—is a copy of one he presented some years past touching our entering into Mexico, this demanding our Government to intervene in Mexico and overthrow all local government. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], in support of the Senator from Massachusetts, cites what could have been done had we paid more heed to Villa and less to Huerta. Well, shall the Senate remember or shall it forget what was done by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the Republican leader of the Foreign Relations Committee, who this morning arose and by his resolution added flames to this fire that had been ignited for political objects on the part of the leaders of the opposition? When the President of the United States gave opportunity and part recognition to Villa, hoping that he might bring order out of chaos and resolve the then present furies into the calmness of civil government, what did the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts do in behalf of his party? I invite his memory—and I speak of him with that respect I hold him in. He arose on this floor and brought forth the London Telegraph, an English daily paper, then fighting the attitude of America, and the Senator had read in the United States Senate an article from England indicting Villa as a "murderer, as a bandit, as a creature in whom combined were the elements so detestable and congested, the vices so criminal that civilization should not grant him mercy, much less a government of democracy grant him recognition."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I simply wanted to call the attention of the Senator from Illinois, inasmuch as he is inviting the attention of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts to his remarks, to the fact that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is not on the floor.

Mr. LEWIS. The Senator from Massachusetts presented the resolution this morning. I regret that the Senator is not on the floor. I thought I saw him for a moment. I shall be very glad if the Senator shall find it agreeable to have the Senator from Massachusetts return to the floor and do me the honor to be present, and, if compatible with his comfort, to remain during the debate which he, to some extent, inaugurated.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I can not oblige the Senator; but, inasmuch as the Senator was continually appealing to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and calling his attention to various things, I thought perhaps it ought to appear in the RECORD that the Senator is not on the floor and has not been for half an hour to my knowledge.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that some 15 minutes ago the Senator from Massachusetts told me he was not feeling well and that he intended to leave for home, and I suppose that is where the Senator is at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If the Senator from Illinois should say anything personal, the Senator from Massachusetts can read it in the RECORD and answer him. The Senator from Illinois has been most courteous in his references.

Mr. LEWIS. It was the Senator from Massachusetts who tendered from his high place this condemnation from England of Villa, and thus by such invited all of those in Mexico who opposed Villa to assume that here in this Senate there was no combined body behind the President in recognizing to any extent Villa. Every opponent of Villa could assume that it was the opinion of an honorable body in the membership of this Senate that this man Villa, whom the President then sought to recognize and give opportunity, was esteemed among them as the manner of man denounced by the anathema and accusation contained in this English denunciation. So, Mr. President, was it unnatural that we, the Democracy and its President, could get no combination of support in Mexico to carry out and execute the hopes to which the Democratic President might have at that time aspired, and which was the object on the part of our Government—of lending aid wherever possible to anyone who gave a sign of capacity to restore peace, enforce order, and maintain government?

Then, Mr. President, we recall constantly the failure on the part of our honorable opponents to lend us aid at times when we needed it in behalf of any opposing those whom we thought exercised baleful influence in Mexico; when we sought to do that which we felt justice compelled as to Huerta—force him out of his usurped presidency—and I speak of Huerta delicately; he is dead. In this Christian body we adopt the motto of the Stoics, "De mortuis, nil nisi bonum," and of this dead I shall speak no ill, but the necessities that required our action received in nowise the support of our honorable opponents, and thus they let all of Mexico again see that in our opposition of the one, as in our assistance to the other, we had no united support from our opponents, who at that time could have aided, by joint action in the Senate, to bring about peace, could there have been but the aspect of a combined United States Senate behind their American President.

Now, sir, in this last effort Carranza is chosen to be recognized because of the display he made of his strength and his position of advantage. Is he chosen, as our eminent friend, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], or as the able leader of the minority of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], or others, would leave the charge, merely at the caprice of the President, without information or justification upon the conditions? No. Will not my eminent opponents be just to history and inform the United States of America fairly that it was only after consultation with the large and principal countries of South America—Argentina, Brazil, and Chile—neighbors of Mexico, bound by the same ties, held by the same sacred religion, animated by the same motives, and inspired by the same aspirations, knowing as they must have known better than all other sources what was best for their neighbors and their blood kin—that it was from these that there came the suggestion, as well as the proof, that Carranza was at the time the most promising solution of the then disturbing problem and that upon their request and manifestation of facts the recognition was accorded? Then it was that Carranza was recognized.

What followed from our honorable friends? Hardly had a movement been made looking to recognizing Carranza in such manner that he might have given aid to the President, established peace in Mexico, smoothed these discordances, harmonized these belligerencies, and established in that country peace, when the very first movement on the part of America, the naming of an American representative as ambassador to protect American citizenship in Mexico, was met in this body on the part of our honorable opponents with an obstruction to his confirmation or the authorization of any power to him to protect Americans by first creating the query from the Senate: "To what Government is he authorized? To what authority is he committed? Where are the things worthy of being recognized?" And they are yet preventing the American ambassador to Mexico from exercising any authority in Mexico. By these tactics of obstruction they again paralyzed all efforts on the part of the administration to obtain peace or order, or to have an agent in the Government of Mexico who might have negotiated events which could have prevented the very infamy that has transpired against these very Americans for whom our honorable opponents so lately manifest such tender solicitude.

Let this be understood: The American people are not fooled; and this late cry of great interest in Americans in Mexico on the part of our eminent friends will be well understood as an anchor to windward for a political issue. It is easy to recall that American citizenship is readily aroused at the announcement of the murder of an American. We recall from history that two presidential campaigns in this country, subordinating all the civil issues that had been made, were carried, one upon "sailors'

rights" because two sailors were hung on the yardarm in a distant sea, and the other in the approval and glorification of an officer of the Navy because he executed those who had assaulted an American in the waters of the south seas. It is a natural thing for our honorable opponents to hope that this history might be duplicated, if the foundation for an issue could only be had and a political opportunity provided.

What is therefore proposed now by the Republican leaders in this Senate? The real test of the purpose of the opposition is in the course they propose. What are our honorable friends asking? What thing are they seeking? What is the thing they ask the American Congress to do? The only remedy they propose is one which would produce the almost universal murder of whatever Americans should be found in Mexico instead of 13. They ask that this Government, as a Government, should intervene and usurp the powers of Mexico, and as a Government proceed to administer the affairs of Mexico through the armed hand of intervention, without recognition in Mexico of any force or government, civil or military.

Mr. President, what would be the result of such action if our eminent friends on the other side should really prevail in such a course?

Mr. President, before I answer that I should like at this time to pause to ask that the unfinished business be laid aside for a few minutes that I may conclude my remarks.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair will be compelled to lay the unfinished business before the Senate. The Chair will then recognize the Senator from Illinois to continue his remarks, as there is no objection.

Mr. LEWIS. I thank the Senate——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business will be laid before the Senate, and the Senator from Illinois will then proceed.

Mr. LEWIS. The Senator from California [Mr. WORKS], in fortification and support of the Senator from Massachusetts, brings forward his resolution for intervention by our Government in Mexico. Can it be possible that the distinguished Senator from California does not recognize that the Government's intervention would mean war? How could we defend ourselves without munitions and guns if we had war in Mexico, and could we get these to Mexico without sending them into Mexico? Then what would come of the embargo the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] has been demanding against arms and munitions from America, and where is that humane love of peace, and his expressed Christian horror against all forms of war when they serve the objects addressed to Europe? Surely the Senator must see that war must be the only result of this resolution tendered on the part of the eminent Senator if successful of passage.

Then, Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], than whom there is neither an abler man in brain nor a nobler in heart honoring the opposite side of this Chamber, suggested in his observations that, so far as he was concerned, it was immediate intervention for the purpose of protecting our citizenship. But the distinguished Senator from Idaho, some time past, on the floor, when we were considering outrages in Mexico, voiced the real condition that would confront America from intervention when he said, "If we ever go into Mexico, the American people will never come out." Mr. President, the Senator was not expressing his desire that we should remain, nor his hope that we should remain; but he did express, sir, that which he well knows America, in some quarters, would voice—that we shall remain. It is because Mexico would recognize that we intervened in her Government through the Government of the United States, and that by this evidence we had come to remain. All official expression on our part that we were there to restore order and depart would be useless. Their leaders know that every advance in government from recorded time, of Israel to Egypt and from Egypt to Israel—from Rome to Greece—was under the pretense of temporary occupation for the purpose of ameliorating some then existing condition. They remember Alamo and Texas. Then, sir, Mexico would know, if ever we passed this resolution of intervention, that we had marched in to take Mexico. Then, sir, Carranza with all his forces, Villa with all his forces, Zapata with all his forces, the brigands from the mountains, the murderers from the fastnesses, the women from their homes, the children in the streets, would come in a common Mexico against the gringo, and all of Mexico would then be in arms to defend their own against those whom they believed had advanced to possess it—the United States. Then would come murder, rapine, and slaughter.

Far from establishing peace, we would establish war of such duration, war of such years, war of such depredation, or of such a destruction and irretrievable loss of American sons as well as American honor, that no concession, no benefit that can be conjured in the mind of any person, would be a compensation for the results we would suffer.

Then what else would we have by this resolution tendered by our opponents? Sir, we have held out to South American countries that it was our intent to execute that policy called the Monroe Doctrine to its spirit, and for ourselves under no conditions to allow the United States under any guise to intrude upon their country. We have of late, through our President, assured them that we expected to build them up as far as we could, to aid them wherever we might. Think you not they, seeing this conduct in Mexico, would not promptly take fright? Think you that they would not behold that as a beginning of a policy they long charged us with possessing, and which they claim in hypocrisy we have disguised? Know you not that these sister lands would cry that we now at last have moved to the object we long contemplated—the appropriation of the countries to the south, South America—one Western Hemisphere under the control of the United States?

Then money would come from these affrighted countries to Mexico. There would be support from these by men and arms for Mexico, every form of sustenance and aid given to Mexico that her victory may be their security and that our defeat may be their victory. War of greater proportions than ever contemplated would be precipitated on the United States from all Latin America.

Then, Mr. President, what would follow in Europe? I ask my opponents to behold the condition America is in to-day. The patriotism of America and the splendid statesmanship of Woodrow Wilson have brought peace where deadly conflict was threatened by our German national neighbors, and now—

> Those who late met in the internecine shock
> Now in well-beseeming ranks march all one way.

Germany has yielded to America. Austria has yielded to America. America for the first time in history establishes how one government, as against the world, by moral persuasion was able to indent its doctrine of humanity in warfare upon Europe's battle plans and have it acquiesced in by civilization. Without war, without the death of Americans on the battle field, without the destruction of commerce and agriculture, without the tramp of troops marching through the cities, without wasted fields, without stricken homes and mourning mothers and murdered children—in peace before God, America, our own—with her flag flying to the stars before the world, admired by nations and blessed by mankind has maintained by the code of universal justice and brotherly love the honor of her Nation and the friendship of the world.

Will our honorable opponents decline to applaud this? Now what will become of it, I ask you, if the policy you now propose as to Mexico should succeed in this body?

I am courageous enough and emboldened to reply to my own inquiry. Mr. President, we will not disguise the fact that these nations with whom we have had some differences, with prospects at times of serious altercation, still carry in their hearts the resentment of those who, believing themselves right, stand before the world vanquished. Their native sons in America have denounced the administration, characterized unfairly the President, and for want of proper knowledge on the subjects, have in haste blamed the United States for that for which we are wholly irresponsible.

But, my learned Senators, if this resolution of intervention were to carry in this Congress and this Government go into Mexico, and as a result we have brought on us the combined warfare of their people and aids which would surely follow, do you not think, then, these European countries, perceiving our predicament, beholding our confusion, and seeing their hour, would not choose it to vindicate by arms what in justice they could not do in diplomacy?

Should any repetition of these unfortunate horrors on the sea continue or the unjust obstruction of our commerce be persisted in, and we be called upon to again protest in order to maintain the law of humanity and justice to all in the world, what would follow? Our European opponents would flaunt us, oppose us, defy us. Seeing us busily occupied, as we would be, in Mexico, our European opponents would be conscious of our inability to defend ourselves from the east and the Atlantic and they would choose that as their hour to vindicate themselves against us by arms.

You, Senators, have educated them. You have educated Mexico. You have been holding up to the world that your country was now the most dastardly nation on earth. You have indicted her as a coward. You have told every enemy she ever had that she was defenseless before the world. You have heralded everywhere that America had neither arms nor munitions; that her Army was useless, her Navy decayed, and that she lacked spirit on the part of her Commander in Chief. That

we had a supine and shrinking President; and then you have asserted that we are without spirit in America to repair these breaches to which you have pointed with gratification as you held up your country as a weak and comtemptible thing, deserving only the disdain and derision of its foes. Do you assume that the enemies in Europe would not profit by this situation as you would have made it, and would not avail themselves of it to every advantage possible, but ever to the embarrassment of the United States? Think you that, encouraged by the revelations you have given them, they would not be found to be a combined body against us in such an hour? This would be the fruits of the tree you would plant.

Then, I say to the distinguished Senators, to what will they lead? Have they contemplated to what end it would all come if the intervention were by the Government of the United States, intervening in Mexico and usurping all form of government there, and by power assume to take the place of the administration of all military and civil affairs as against any Mexican power or Mexican citizenship in a Mexican country?

Mr. President, I have assumed to offer a remedy for our present situation—one that achieves all that is necessary and avoids all that could endanger us. I offer it, of course, with that diffidence that one should have who is conscious of these motley conditions in Mexico and of the inability of any one man so far removed to comprehend the whole situation completely. But I tender a method that is in harmony with the policy of what the Democracy believes to be for the welfare of America and in no wise against the interest of Mexico itself. It is that, as we have recognized Carranza and sought to give him encouragement to maintain a government of peace and stability, we now authorize the President of the United States to protect all Americans and to punish all those who have violated their security, not by intruding into the Government of Mexico, not by usurping the regularly constituted power, not by producing more chaos in their country and rendering their citizens homeless and without a land, but, to the contrary, that he shall cooperate with the Government he has recognized, ascertaining from it if at this hour it can seize the offenders, punish them, and maintain the future peace and security of American citizenship. If Carranza can not prove that he can by immediate action, if he is powerless by virtue of the lack of force in competition with rivals who surround him, then that the President of the United States be authorized to render the aid of the American troops and the American Navy to the full extent as, in his judgment, would seem adequate, and to accomplish the end sought for America. Mr. President, we gave such aid in China to protect the Christians against the assaults of the Boxers, and subsequently under another administration—Republican—moved our marines into Nicaragua for suppressing a rebellion there, bringing order out of chaos and establishing the protection of American citizens and the security of American property. We have duplicated these protections in Haiti. We have, therefore, the precedents sufficient and conclusive. Let us emulate these established precedents for Mexico.

I tender the resolution to authorize the President of the United States to this cooperation; feeling that in doing so he will have the armed force sufficient to assure the protection; that he will not invade Mexico to usurp it; that he will not take the Government from those where it is established; that he will not frighten citizens to hate us on the theory that we have come to take their land and invade their country and with the power of conquest to appropriate it to America. Thus, with their cooperation and aid, we can secure the result for which all seek and pray.

Mr. President, there is no man not touched with the recital of the murder of one of his countrymen. I think it was Menander who gave us the famous observation of the slave poet Terence: "Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto."

That is the sentiment of us all. We are men, and all things human touch us. But, sir, this body should never be reduced to where prejudice or inflammatory sensation should control deliberations. On the street, such may be, in the home, unhappily; throughout the thoroughfares, impossible to avoid; but, sir, the waves of resentment or partisan hatred must break and fall back when they strike the portals of this Senate. To every advance of such spirit our vigil at the gates must respond, "Thus far and no farther shall you come." On this altar must ever burn the lamp of justice, with its incense of humanity floating out to man. This flame shall not be snuffed out by the winds that would fan into enmity to us countries on the opposite part of our land who would punish our recreancy by the killing of our children in thousands while our honor as a Nation dies before the world.

In this, the Senate of the United States, let there never be a man who may indict this assemblage as a body that for any expedient of politics, on any chance of party victory, we so lost control of our judgment or so forgot our duty as to do the act that would make America lose forever confidence in the United States Senate as the legislative body of secure wisdom, sure action, and just results. For this the Constitution created this body as the preservation of the citizenship of this Republic against the fury of excitement and the madness of passion.

Therefore, Mr. President, I bring forth the resolution which I have tendered, assured, as I am, that if we will give support ungrudgingly, confidence without division, to the head of our Government as the President of the United States in such an hour as surround us, there will be established now security to the citizen for the future, punishment of those who have wronged him in the present, and this through the processes of a civilized Government, to the protection of every American citizen wherever he is and to the continued honor of America in her now exalted place in history.

I take the liberty at this point to ask that my resolution may be now read as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

The Secretary read as follows:

Concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. LEWIS January 13:

"*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the President of the United States be authorized and empowered to order the Army of the United States, or any necessary part thereof, to the country of Mexico and to there cooperate with any force there existing which to the President shall seem appropriate for the object of protecting the citizens and property of the United States and to punish those violating the security of United States citizens, and to authorize the President to use the military and naval forces of the United States in Mexico to the same extent as now by law permitted the Navy in Nicaragua and Haiti for the protection of American rights."

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I submit the resolution. I thank the Senate for its close attention and great courtesy.

Mr. STONE. The Senator simply wishes that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. COLT obtained the floor.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will the Senator from Rhode Island allow me?

Mr. COLT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I should like to know whether the resolution has been referred or not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was introduced yesterday and printed and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understand that, and now the Senator from Missouri, if I understood him correctly, moves its reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There can be no trouble about the matter. The Senator from Illinois simply had it read as a part of his speech.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I misunderstood the Senator from Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senate bill 381, the Philippine government bill, is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and the Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, I can hardly conceive of a more difficult undertaking than the transplanting of the Anglo-Saxon system of self-government in the Philippines. I do not mean to say that this is an impossible undertaking, but I do mean to say that it can only be accomplished in time, and that as to the length of time it will take no man can now predict.

I am aware that this bill is only a step in this direction, and that the United States will still retain a large measure of control. The bill, in fact, is simply a confirmation of our settled line of policy to install in the Philippines, step by step, the American system of self-government.

In this discussion we have constantly used the term self-government without defining its meaning. It is true that President Wilson's definition that self-government is not a form of constitution but a form of character has been quoted several times. While the President's words on this subject are most apt and comprehensive, I would like to state, at this stage of the discussion, what I conceive to be the essential characteristics of self-government in an Anglo-Saxon sense.

Self-government with us does not signify merely an extension of the franchise, the representative system, and the division of the government into separate departments, but it signifies much more. Self-government, as we understand it, means the supremacy of law in the sense "that no man is punishable or

can be lawfully made to suffer in body or goods except for a distinct breach of law established in the ordinary legal manner before the ordinary courts of the land."

In other words, this supremacy of law means the entire absence of any arbitrary or discretionary power on the part of the Government to deprive any person of life, liberty, or property except by due process of law in the ordinary courts.

This supremacy of law further signifies equality before the law, which means that we have no administrative system of law such as prevails in France and other countries of Europe. The acts of Government officials are controlled by the same system of law as that which controls the ordinary citizen. This is another safeguard against the exercise of arbitrary power.

This supremacy of law in an Anglo-Saxon sense further signifies that our right to personal liberty, and all our individual rights, are based upon custom and usage and not upon general abstract propositions; that these rights were secured to the individual by the decisions of the courts in the conflict between the people and the Crown; and that the bill of rights in our Federal Constitution is nothing more than putting into statutory form preexisting rights.

It follows that the essence of the Anglo-Saxon system of self-government is a complex legal system based upon custom and usage and representing a growth of centuries.

Our history also demonstrates that this form of government can only be successfully carried on by an intelligent people long accustomed to self-restraint, experienced in the art of government, and who are imbued with a legal spirit.

This legal system of self-government seems to be specially adapted to a democratic form of government. It combines liberty with order. It is the only system under which a democracy extending over a large territory has been able to exist for any considerable period of time. This is illustrated by the fact that France has had 12 constitutions in the past century and a quarter, and it is further illustrated by the history of the Central and South American Republics during the past 100 years.

Mr. President, it is this system of government, as shown by the present bill, as well as by the organic act, which we are attempting to establish in the Philippines.

If the present bill passes, I can imagine the Governor General, following the precedent recently set by us, appearing before the Philippine Legislature for the purpose of explaining the provisions of this act. I can imagine him taking up section 3 and saying: "Gentlemen, this section contains our Bill of Rights—rights which lie at the very foundation of our Government. I have only time to refer to three or four of these paragraphs:

"That no law shall be enacted in said islands which shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or deny to any person therein the equal protection of the law.

"That no law impairing the obligation of contracts shall be enacted.

"That no law shall be passed abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition the government for redress of grievances."

"In order to ascertain the meaning of these and other important paragraphs in this section I must refer you to the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and the other Federal courts, the decisions of the various State courts, and to various textbooks, such as Cooley on Constitutional Limitations. These books comprise several thousand volumes. I regret that they are not published in Spanish. At the same time, as many of the questions raised are of great difficulty and complexity, and as some of these decisions are conflicting and not altogether clear, I do not think anything would be gained by a translation into another language."

Mr. President, the bill of rights contained in section 3 of this bill is the supreme law of the Philippine Islands. I do not know how far these laws interfere with or break down the customs, habits, and usages of the Philippine people, and, consequently, I do not know how soon they can be enforced.

There are two difficulties in the way of establishing self-government in the Philippines which must be overcome.

In the first place, you must abolish such customs, habits, and usages as are inconsistent with this bill of rights. When you consider the tenacity of customs and usages, especially among oriental peoples, the magnitude of this task is apparent.

In the second place, you must accustom the people to carry on the Government according to American methods. They must, of course, first give their consent to our principles of government, and this consent must then ripen into a habit. These principles must also satisfy the moral judgment of the people. Not until these conditions, which can only be brought about by education and long experience, exist will the people of the Philippines have solved the problem of the kind of self-government in which we are educating them.

Mr. President, if we are to continue our policy of establishing self-government in the Philippine Islands, I can see no danger in the present bill, because we still retain, in substance, the government in our own hands. Although the bill provides for the election of a senate by the people, we must remember that all legislative power is curtailed and limited by the bill of rights, by the veto power, and by a provision which reserves to Congress the right to annul any act of the legislature. So far as the executive and judicial departments are concerned, I understand that this Government still retains, in substantial matters, full control, either directly or by appeal.

The fact is, Mr. President, we are trying out a great experiment in government in the Philippines—an experiment which I believe is new in the world's history—and in order to try out this experiment we must from time to time increase the power of the Philippine people over their own affairs.

In dealing with this great subject I believe a liberal policy is better than a narrow policy, and for that reason I would leave the word "independence" in the preamble if the people so desired. History teaches that to deal with colonies in a fair and liberal spirit is by far the best policy. This word "independence" will be an inspiration to the people. It will help them in their long march toward self-government. Nor can I see any good reason why the United States should not promise the people independence when they have established a stable government founded upon the American model.

If we pursue a wise and just policy toward the Philippines, and thereby win the confidence and affection of the people, it is more than probable that, like Canada and Australia, they will prefer, if we so elect, always to remain a part of this great Republic.

Mr. President, the committee have given full and careful consideration to this subject, and I think that the present bill embodies the only action which this country should take at this time. In my opinion, we should not at present think of casting the Philippine people adrift on the stormy sea of self-government and independence. Those who understand the conditions existing in these islands fully realize that this would be most hazardous. Nor would I take any action at present in the line of asking other powers to join us in guaranteeing the independence of the Philippines. We have recently seen what national guaranties amount to in time of war.

The truth is, whether willingly or unwillingly, we are charged with a grave responsibility toward the Philippines, and let us not hesitate to continue to fulfill that obligation with the calmness, patience, and conscious strength of a great nation. Let us never be open to the charge of bad faith toward this liberty-loving people.

But, assuming that the time had now arrived when we deemed it just and proper to make some radical change in our policy toward the Philippines, I believe it would be unwise to make any such change during this world crisis. We have enough grave questions on our hands without further complicating the situation.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Philippine bill has already been read, and I ask now that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the committee amendments. I believe it will not be necessary to read the bill, but only to take up the amendments in their order.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, before the bill is read for amendment, I should be glad for a few moments to submit some remarks, if the Senator from Nebraska has no objection.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I shall be glad to have the Senator from Minnesota discuss the bill.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, it was not originally my intention to make any remarks on the pending bill, but the discussion has taken such a wide range and in some respects has assumed such a peculiar phase, that I feel it incumbent upon me briefly to express my views.

It is unfortunate that this question has been brought into the political arena, but surely we Republicans are not to blame for that. The Democratic Party in their convention in 1900, when they nominated Mr. Bryan for President, made the question of imperialism one of the most prominent issues in their platform. That issue, as now presented by this bill and as it was presented by the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore, is, to be sure, in a more diluted form than the doctrine of imperialism as proclaimed in 1900; but after all, Mr. President, it seems to me it is mischievous in the highest degree. Impressed, as I am, with the conviction that this proposed legislation, including the preamble, will be not only harmful and deleterious to the Philippine people themselves, but also to the welfare and interest of the United States, I feel that I can not remain silent.

What were the conditions that confronted us, Mr. President, and what was the situation we found in 1898 when we took

possession of the Philippine Islands? While those islands had been occupied by the Spaniards for over 300 years—for some 325 or 330, as I recall—yet they had failed during all that period to develop the country and to give the people of the Philippine Islands any real self-government; in fact, it might be said that those people were at that time a schoolless, a roadless, and well-nigh a landless people. I mean by that that their titles to land were extremely vague and uncertain; they were in most instances titles by occupancy. They had had no experience in self-government, and were composed of a multitude of tribes and of several races.

Looking at the map of the country we find in the north the great island of Luzon, with an area of about 41,000 square miles. The most intelligent of the natives there were the Tagalogs, who numbered something like 2,000,000 people. As to the remainder of the people, while many of them were nominally Christians, they were in a great degree uncivilized. They ranged all the way from the Tagalogs down to the Negritos and the head-hunters. The inhabitants of the islands were not a homogeneous people. While they were in the main from the Malay race, yet they may be grouped into three great classes. In the islands of Luzon and Mindoro perhaps, the principal, the most intelligent, and the most representative people were the Tagalogs and some of the Ilocanos. South of those islands is what is known as the Visayan Group, composed of six or seven large islands. The Visayans are a different people to some extent, although fundamentally like the Tagalogs. Though of the Malay race, they have a considerable admixture of Chinese and Spanish blood.

There is a feeling of ill will and hostility, which still remains to some extent, or at least a want of confidence between the Visayans in the Visayan Group and the people in Luzon, the Tagalogs; in other words, the Visayans, who are in larger numbers than the Tagalogs, for there are some 2,500,000 of them, have no confidence in the Tagalogs and do not desire to be ruled by them.

Then, south of the Visayan Group, we have the great island of Mindanao, and southwest of that the Jolo or Sulu Archipelago. Mindanao and the Sulu Group are inhabited to a large extent by the wildest and most savage people in that country, the Moros, who are Mohammedans. The people in those islands had scarcely been brought under subjection and control by the Spaniards. They had no self-government, for the Spanish government in the Philippine Islands was practically a quasi military government, which ruled the people through the army, through the priests and the friars of the church. What little self-government they had in their local municipalities was only nominally such in fact. Even in those municipal organizations, in their barrios, as they are called, the priests were the controlling factor, and we all know that at that time a large portion of the best land in the archipelago was owned by the friars and that a large proportion of the people of the Philippine Islands were mere tenants, cotters, cultivating the land.

The people of the islands had become so restless and desperate under Spanish tyranny and despotism that as early as 1823 there was a rebellion, which the Spaniards suppressed by the sword. In 1896, two years before Dewey sailed into Manila Bay, there was another rebellion against the Spanish Government, which the Spanish Government suppressed partly by the sword and partly by buying off the leaders with money.

When we took possession of the islands such was the condition of their people. They were utterly helpless, not accustomed to any self-government, and speaking a variety of languages and dialects. Perhaps only about 8 or 10 per cent of the most civilized and the most intelligent among the so-called civilized tribes could speak Spanish. The remainder spoke a variety of dialects. The Tagalogs had one dialect, the Visayans another, and the Ilocanos another, and while they could converse with one another in these respective dialects, they had practically no books, no literature, and their school system, such as it was in the islands under Spanish rule, was the feeblest imaginable. Nominally there were about 2,000 schools in the islands, but the annual appropriations for all those schools was less than $300,000, and the bulk of that appropriation was devoted to the schools in Manila. It will readily be seen, in view of that condition and that small appropriation, what a limited opportunity for education the poor Filipino people had; and most of that education was of a religious character. I am not finding fault because of that, but I simply call attention to the fact that what little education they did get in the schools of those days was mostly of a religious character, not of a character that would broaden their intellect and make them capable of becoming a self-governing and self-sustaining people. As a matter of fact, when Dewey sailed into Manila Harbor the poor Filipinos were more oppressed, more tyrannized over, and in a more deplorable condition than were the people of Cuba.

When we took possession of the islands, what did we do? We were confronted by three alternatives. We could have relinquished the islands into the hands of the Spaniards, which would have been to have tied the hands and feet of the poor Filipino people and to have put them back into Spanish tyranny and oppression. We might have given them what they, or, at least some of them, now pine for—independence. In their condition at that time independence would have led to chaos, butchery, and destruction. We have evidence of that fact, Mr. President, for in 1899 when Aguinaldo inaugurated his rebellion against the United States, and, by the aid of Mabite—I think that was his name—established a government, and adopted a constitution at Malolos, we know how tyrannous, how oppressive, and how arbitrary that government was. Anyone who would not then support Aguinaldo's government was butchered in cold blood. There are many instances where Aguinaldo's party in those days buried men alive. So, I say, Mr. President, that if we had turned the Filipino people over to themselves at that time it would have led to utter chaos, and to their destruction.

The other alternative was, that we might have left them there, helpless, as they were, to become the prey and to be seized and occupied by one of the great powers—Japan or Germany—who, in those days and ever since, have been anxious to secure colonies.

There was only one righteous, moral thing for us to do after we had taken possession of the Philippine Islands. It would not have been just and right for us to hand them back into the oppression and tyranny of the Spaniards; it would not have been proper to have handed them over to themselves, in their then condition, and leave them to the self-destruction that would have been sure to follow; it would not have been right to leave them in such a condition that they might have been absorbed by some great power, like Japan or Germany, or some other nation. We did the only righteous thing we could have done. We assumed possession and control of the Philippine Islands, and set about educating, civilizing, and training those people as no people of that kind or quality have ever before been taught, trained, and civilized.

There was as much justification, after we had taken possession of those islands, for our occupying them and establishing a good government there as there was for our taking possession of Cuba, occupying that country, and establishing a civil government there. And what a record we have made in the Philippine Islands! Is there any American citizen anywhere who is not proud of that record?

We have established a system of public schools, in which our own language, the English language, is taught; we have given them an abundance of roads; we have improved their harbors; we have furnished them with pure water in their cities; we have established a telephone and telegraph system; we have sounded and charted their harbors and their islands; we have built lighthouses, and made navigation safe; we have extended the railroad system of the country; and we have aided them in every possible way; but still the work is incomplete.

Compare the work of other countries with people of such blood—and most of these people, as I have said, are primarily of the Malay blood—compare our record with that of the Dutch in Sumatra and Borneo; compare it even with that of the English in India, or with that of the French in Cochin China, or with that of the Spaniards in the Western Hemisphere before the South and Central American States became independent, and it will be seen that no nation can point to such a record as we have made in the Philippine Islands in civilizing those people and making them fit for self-government and citizenship.

But, as I have said, the work is incomplete. While we have done a great deal of good there, much remains to be done. Their school system is only half developed; only about half of those who are of school age can find school accommodations, and there is an insufficient number of teachers in the islands. We had at one time 1,000 American teachers in that country, and, to my mind, it was a great mistake ever to diminish the number, which has been reduced to somewhere about 600. But the result of our educational system is that we have made the English language among the growing generation the paramount and leading language of that country, and if we are not interfered with, if our work is allowed to go on as we have planned it and carried it on, within a generation we shall have the people of those islands an English-speaking people. Taking young and old together, there are to-day in the islands more people who speak the English than who speak the Spanish language.

The great trouble is, Mr. President, that after the children have gone to school and have learned the English language, when they return to their homes they hear nothing but Spanish or one of their dialects—that of the Tagalogs, or that of the

Ilocanos, or that of the Visayans. It is the same trouble that we have experienced here in our schools when we have sent Indian children to school. We have had many prosperous Indian schools here. The Indian children have attended them, have received a high degree of education, and become efficient and proficient; but when they returned to their tribes and to their affiliations they would relapse and lose the progress and attainments they had acquired in the schools. And so there is danger here.

I am very ambitious, as an American citizen, to see the great work that we have done in the Philippine Islands carried on to success.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. NELSON. I have read the report of Gen. McIntyre, just published.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir; certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I desire to ask the Senator from Minnesota one question, or possibly two questions: First, Is English the native language of the Filipinos?

Mr. NELSON. As a race they have no native language. They have a variety of languages.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But is English their native language?

Mr. NELSON. No; nor is Spanish.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is English one of their native languages?

Mr. NELSON. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. Now, how would the Senator like to have somebody say to us that unless we would learn to speak Norwegian or German or French they were not prepared to recognize that we were civilized?

Mr. NELSON. Oh, that cuts no figure in the question. I simply referred to it as an incident. The fact that they have learned the English language, instead of the Spanish language, does not necessarily make them more civilized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; but——

Mr. NELSON. And the interrogatory of the Senator is a little wide of the mark. It does not relate to the question of civilization at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, then, if the Senator will pardon me——

Mr. NELSON. It relates to the other question, and that is, while the Filipinos are under our control and under our possession naturally, as American citizens, we prefer to have them speak the language of our country instead of the language of Spain. What is more, they have no single language of their own. There are perhaps over a dozen—probably 20 or 30—different dialects in those islands. They are not a homogeneous people.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that. Of course the Senator and I are the very best friends in the world.

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And when we ask one another questions and when we debate we do it purely for the purposes of instruction and never for purposes of antagonism.

The Senator says—and he says very properly, too—that he does not contend that these people would prove that they were any more highly civilized by speaking English than by speaking Spanish.

Mr. NELSON. I want to correct the Senator from Mississippi before he goes a little astray.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not gotten through.

Mr. NELSON. While we are on this matter of language it does not necessarily follow that one language is intrinsically more civilizing than another; yet I am enough of an American citizen to believe that a man who speaks the English language and is educated in American schools is a little more civilized, a little more intelligent, and more worthy of American citizenship than a man who speaks some other language or dialect. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will be obliged to admonish the occupants of the galleries that it is against the explicit rules of the Senate to exhibit approval or disapproval of any remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I would not do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If it is repeated, the Chair will be obliged to request the Sergeant at Arms to clear the galleries. The Chair trusts it will not be necessary to refer to this matter again.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to say something to my good friend the Senator from Mississippi——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator let me finish?

Mr. NELSON. And I say it in the most Christian spirit. I am not anxious to make a long or extensive speech.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know that.

Mr. NELSON. I am only making a few scattering remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. And I should be greatly delighted if the Senator from Mississippi would not interrupt me too much on this occasion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not going to do so; but since the Senator has surrendered to one interruption I thought he might leave me uninterrupted long enough to finish the question.

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator takes the position that in America when a man can speak the American language, which happens to be English, he is better prepared for American tasks and American duties than if he could not I agree with him absolutely; but the Senator is taking the position that when a man in the Philippine archipelago speaks the English language, therefore that man is better able to grapple with Philippine archipelago questions than if he did not.

Mr. NELSON. Oh, no.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And, if I understand the Senator, he has taken the position that we can not yet quite turn loose the Philippine archipelago because so few of the people there speak English, and there are so few school-teachers there who teach English.

Mr. NELSON. Oh, that is only a part of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, I should like to ask the Senator a question. How many school-teachers does he think would be necessary to teach German or French in the Philippine Islands in order to make the people of the Philippines more fitted for self-government?

Mr. NELSON. I should like to ask what the teaching of German and French has to do with the Filipino people?

Mr. WILLIAMS. They are equally foreign with English.

Mr. NELSON. That does not matter. They are not the language of our country; and it is our country that has taken these people in charge. We have taken them in hand and are educating them in our system of government and giving them our system of education. Why should we not use our own language instead of German or French or Tagalog or any other foreign tongue?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then we had better use their respective languages, whatever they are; and whenever we send American school-teachers there to teach Tagalogs and Visayans and all the balance of them in a language which they can not even understand in the primary grades we are committing an act of stupidity. We ought to send no American teachers there unless they can teach the native children in the native language.

Mr. HITCHCOCK and Mr. LIPPITT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I wanted to suggest to the Senator from Minnesota that the best reply to the Senator from Mississippi is this: The teaching of the English language in the schools of the Philippine Islands is preeminently necessary, because unless a single language is taught there will be no coherency or solidarity to the Philippine people. The only hope of ultimate independence for the Philippine people is to give them a common language.. With 8 or 9 or 10 or 15 Filipino dialects there is no hope for independence, no hope for solidarity, no hope for union of action. It is not because we desire to impose the English language upon them so much as it is a desire to give them a common language in which they can understand each other and by which they can govern each other.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me one moment further? Then I will sit down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota further yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In reply to the Senator from Nebraska, I wish to say that the nation of all modern times with the most solidarity is Switzerland, with the most homogeneity of purpose and tradition and ideal, and that throughout Switzerland there are spoken three languages—German, Italian, and French—and that some 90 per cent of those people who speak either language do not understand anything of the other two.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The situation which has been discussed here with relation to the language is not so important in the Philippine Islands on this account: The natives there are taking to the English language. There is an almost unquenchable thirst for more knowledge in the way of the English language.

Five hundred thousand children are going to the English schools, where none of the grades are taught anything but the English language. All of that indicates a desire upon their part to acquire the English language, and I do not apprehend that there is going to be any difficulty in the matter by reason of the fact that we have the English language there.

Mr. NELSON. I suppose the Senator from Colorado is aware of the fact that the Senator from Mississippi thinks it would be just as well to teach them Tagalog or the Visayan language or French or German.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not French and German, but Visayan or Tagalog, at least.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think if they were averse to taking the English language, if it were obnoxious to them, a different situation would be presented. Under those circumstances I believe it is better for a nation that seizes territory to conform to the language of the country. But here they are enthusiastic over learning the English language, and consequently it is not a source of irritation upon their part that the English language is taught there.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will allow me just a moment, I should like to call attention to another very important consideration, and perhaps the most important consideration, in regard to teaching the English language in the Philippines, and that is the fact that when a Filipino child has been taught to read and to write in English he has opened before him a great storehouse of knowledge. He has access to instruction on almost every great subject in the world. If he is taught to read and write in the Tagalog language there is no literature available. There is no accumulation of books in the Tagalog language; and he is scarcely better off in reading and writing in that language than though he were without the ability to read or write in any language.

Mr. NELSON. But, Mr. President, there is one reason paramount to my mind beyond everything else why the English language is of great value and of chief value to those who desire to be informed and instructed in the principles of self-government. So far as I know, Mr. President, there are no governments in the world where the system of free local self-government, free government in the broadest and most generous sense, exists as it does among English-speaking people. No man can be familiar with the history of free governments, or what may be called parliamentary governments, unless he is familiar with the English language and with English constitutional history, which lie at the basis of our system of government.

Mr. President, while we performed a great work for the people of Cuba—and we had to go back there once after we had let them loose—yet that task was insignificant as compared with the great work we have done in the Philippine Islands. Look at the progress that has been made in that country within 15 years. They are to-day further advanced as a whole in the matter of self-government than are the people of India, who have been under British control for nearly 200 years.

When in the distant future the history of this country is written, no page of American history will be brighter, no page will evoke the pride of American citizens to a higher degree, than will that page which portrays our record and our work in the Philippine Islands. That work, however, as I have said, is still incomplete. Their school system ought to be developed to a much greater extent, and, as Gen. McIntyre says, their agricultural resources ought to be developed to a greater extent. While we have built them a large system of magnificent roads, extended their railroads, improved their harbors, established sanitary regulations in the country, and established local self-government, still in two respects Gen. McIntyre finds that the people are still behind—in their agricultural development and in their educational development. As I said a moment ago, only about half of the children in those islands of school age can now attend school, and there is an insufficient supply of teachers. The native supply is almost exhausted, and we have reduced the American teachers from 1,000 to about 600 or a little more.

I think one of the greatest works we ever accomplished and one of the best pieces of missionary work we ever did was when we sent to the Philippine Islands 1,000 American school-teachers to educate those people and to put them in the way of becoming a civilized, self-respecting, and self-sustaining people.

I have read the interesting report of Gen. McIntyre, and in that report he states substantially—I am not quoting his exact language—that while the Filipino people are in favor of the highest degree of self-government, yet a large proportion of the better class of people are utterly opposed to absolute independence. The Filipino politicians who are shouting and crying for independence all insist, knowing, as they do, that they would not be able to maintain their independence against other countries, that even if we do give them independence we ought to retain a sort of guardianship and friendly oversight to protect them against the inroads of foreign nations.

Mr. President, if the Philippines were as near our shores as is Cuba, it might be an easy thing to exercise a protectorate; but in those distant parts to exercise a protectorate such as we could do in Cuba would be hardly possible without keeping an army there, constructing expensive fortifications, and keeping a part of our fleet there. So if we have to exercise a guardianship to protect those people from being swallowed up by other great nations and coming under jurisdictions that would never think of giving them the liberty and freedom that we have given them—while we have to exercise that guardianship, had we not better retain control of the country and let its people exercise the highest degree of independence?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. NELSON. Wait until I get through, and then the Senator can ask me a question.

Mr. SHAFROTH. All right.

Mr. NELSON. There is a difference, to my mind, between self-government and independence. We can give them the highest degree of self-government and still let them exercise that government under the Stars and Stripes under the protection of the American people.

I now yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, the issue that I wish to make with the Senator is that they are not asking for a protectorate. Let me read the Senator a statement which was made by the representative of that people before the Senate Committee on the Philippines. He was asked the question whether a protectorate was desired, and here is what he said:

> We do not want any protectorate if we get independence. You would not want it, because it would be unfair and unjust to the United States; and we would not, because protection can never be afforded without impairment of the absolute freedom of the protected States, and we are more concerned about the substance of freedom than about the word "independence." If we are going to have independence, we want real independence and not merely nominal independence.

I will state to the Senator that the commissioner, when he appeared before us, further said that America did not ask for a protectorate when she got her independence, and he made the assertion also that no government that ever had won its independence ever asked for a protectorate.

Mr. NELSON. I am surprised that the Senator from Colorado should compare the Filipino people in their present condition with the condition of the thirteen colonies at the time they won their independence.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, well, Mr. President, when people are struggling for liberty you will find that the same motives prompt them, whether there is a high degree of education or not. But I want to say that what they fear, no doubt, is that an iron-hand policy may be pursued by our Government at some time. They, no doubt, would like a protectorate if they were sure that the United States would never step in with an iron hand; but, as a matter of fact, in the case of every people that have been under the control of another nation there is at times a change of sentiment in the nation that conquers; and the possibility that that iron-hand policy may be invoked is what they dread more than they do conquest by another nation.

Mr. NELSON. I will ask the Senator from Colorado whether we have ever given any other people in the broad world reason to suppose that the American people would impose the iron hand upon them?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, Mr. President, there have been times over there when the iron hand has been invoked. Ex-President Taft in his statement said that perhaps the majority of the Americans over there wanted a firm, iron-hand policy, and he combated it and said that it would not do; that you would have insurrection if that were to occur. Now, of course, men are fearful of what may occur in the future, and they would rather take the chances of not being subjugated by some other country than to take the chances of a change in sentiment in our own country perhaps, the result being that an iron-hand policy might be invoked.

Mr. NELSON. All this, Mr. President, is visionary. It is only a few of those cantankerous politicians over there, whose meat is politics and who live and die politicians, that advance such gospel. No sane man, I take it, can ever have the opinion that we, the American people, now or in the future, would ever impose the iron hand, as it is called, upon those people or upon any other people on the face of the earth.

In this connection I wish to quote from Gen. McIntyre's report bearing on this question. He says:

> While I have given above the public views of the political parties of the islands, I am convinced that no serious part of the Filipino people

desires separation from the United States at this time, and that the serious people of the islands are wholly without belief that they can foresee clearly the day they would desire this separation.

That is from a report printed just a few days ago, made by Gen. McIntyre. My own honest conviction is that, apart from a few political agitators who live by the dissemination of such doctrine, as Aguinaldo lived by during the rebellion of 1899, the great mass of the people in the islands are glad to remain under the American flag and are thankful that they have such a great father as Uncle Sam overseeing their welfare. They are quite content, if we give them a fair degree of self-government, to remain under his protection. It seems to me that the proper course is to give those people a high, fair, and good degree of self-government, but to let them remain under the Stars and Stripes as a part of the domain of the United States of America. It will be of great benefit to us and we will be of great benefit to the Philippine people. Let me read what Gen. McIntyre has to say about the city of Manila:

The city of Manila is fast becoming, if it is not already, the most beautiful of the larger commercial cities of the Far East.

In addition to being the capital of the islands, it is the chief commercial port and business center. It is the location also of the larger industrial plants.

Mr. President, what was the condition in that city when we took it? Outside of the Spanish buildings, the convents, churches, and schools, it simply consisted of shacks, and the only water they had to drink was the putrid water of the Pasig River that comes down from Laguna de Bay. We have now made Manila into a great city. We have established there one of the best sanitary systems known. We have given them a system of pure water such as they never had before; we have given them a system of schools there; and we have given them commercial connections with all the other islands, so that city is becoming the great metropolis of the Orient. That city will not only prove a blessing to the Filipino people themselves but in the hands of the American people it will be the commercial emporium of the East. It will be the jobbing center, the one resting place where American people can go with their trade and traffic and be at home. It will be a place where if we have a fleet, as we have always had in the China seas, it can go there and find a haven of rest and be at home in those oriental countries.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President——

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. COLT. I have the highest opinion of the judgment of the Senator from Minnesota and I consider this a very difficult question. I would like to ask the Senator if in the government of the Philippines he would pursue the colonial policy of Great Britain in the government in India? The government of India by Great Britain is an absolute form of government, so far as Great Britain is concerned, in all matters of sovereignty, but the Government of Great Britain permits the people of India to pursue their own local habits, customs, usages, and religion, not interfering with them in any way, except that Great Britain retains the absolute power of sovereignty.

I should like very much to ask the Senator from Minnesota whether he thinks we should pursue the same colonial policy with respect to the Philippines that Great Britain pursues with respect to India, and further, whether there is any intermediate course between that policy of mere sovereignty and the policy which we have heretofore pursued in the Philippines, namely, of establishing the American form of government there?

It seems to me that this is a practical question, and I would like very much to know what is the Senator's view as to the kind of policy America should pursue?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have no specific paregoric to offer on the floor of the Senate. The science of government, as the historian Macaulay has well said, is an experimental science. To lay down in a hard and fast rule what would be the best for the Philippine Islands as compared with the system that England has pursued in British India would be utterly useless. We have not adhered to that policy so far. Nothing that we have done in the Philippine Islands will compare with what the English have done in British India or what the French have done in Cochin China, or what the Spaniards did in their day of glory in the Western Hemisphere. We have inaugurated a new system in the Philippine Islands, as I call it, an American system, and we will build upon that system, fortified and strong, regardless of what has been done in other countries. Those are my views, and so again I say I have no specific paregoric to offer on this occasion or for the relief of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think I agree with the description which has been given to us by the Senator from Minnesota, with regard to our relations in the Philippine Islands and what we have done for the people of those Islands. I may not agree with the Senator with respect to his conclusion. I ask, therefore, is it in the mind of the Senator from Minnesota that the relation between the Philippine Islands and the United States should ever be entirely severed?

Mr. NELSON. I will be very frank with the Senator. I think not. For the good of the Philippine Islands, for the good of the people of those Islands, it never ought to be severed. That is my candid opinion.

Mr. CUMMINS. I rather inferred that was the position of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. That is my position, and I am very free to express it. For the good of the Philippine Islands, it is better to have them operate their self-government under the Stars and Stripes than under any other flag or even under their own flag.

We talk about how people pine for independence and how it is better for them to give them just what they want. We have an illustration, Mr. President, in the matter of the Boers during the Boer War. There were no doubt a great many people in America who sympathized with the Boers and who held that they were entitled to self-government, no matter if it was not a good government, that is was their government, and they ought to have what they wanted. The war came, the Boer rebellion was suppressed, and what is the result? A government has been established in South Africa under the British flag, under the guardianship of the British Empire, better than any government which the Boers ever possessed or ever thought of possessing.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

Mr. NELSON. I will yield in just a minute. The people of the Dutch Republics are to-day better governed and have more rights and more liberties than they ever had during the palmy days of the Boer Republic. Now I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. WORKS. The Senator has said that it would be a good thing for the people of the Philippine Islands if they should be permanently retained by this Government.

Mr. NELSON. Retained under the auspices of our Government with a measure of self-government.

Mr. WORKS. Does the Senator think it would be a good thing for the people of the United States?

Mr. NELSON. I do, most emphatically. It is because of my love for this country and my pride in its flag and its institutions that, first of all, I want to retain the Philippines. We acquired those islands by the valor of American seamen and American troops. We did not go there as pirates. We did not go there to exterminate the people. We went there as friends. We found them in a quasi-civilized condition. We have blessed them, educated them, established a system of government there such as they never dreamed of before and such as we have no right to be ashamed of. Pray, what should we do at this time; scuttle the ship and cast it adrift?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. NELSON. I am utterly opposed, Mr. President, to this startling policy, as though the American people, after they had established a good government over a people, civilized them, and put them on their feet, were after that period a menace and danger to those people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator has given great thought and patriotic consideration to this question——

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator be kind enough to talk a little louder?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I said the Senator from Minnesota has given very profound thought and patriotic consideration to this question, as he does to all great public questions. Before he takes his seat I want to call his attention to an extract from a book which has been placed in my hands, Our Philippine Problem, by Mr. Willis. In speaking of the benevolence of the American people there and the spirit of humanity which characterized our dealing with the Filipinos, I call the attention of the Senator to the following. The author says, on page 23:

Further than this, "very drastic military methods" were adopted—

Speaking of the American control—

"Crops, houses, and villages were destroyed or burned for the purpose of depriving insurgents of means of support, and reconcentration was finally resorted to.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, to save the time of the Senator, if he will allow me, there is no use of reading the Old Testament. What he reads relates to the suppression of the Aguinaldo rebellion, in 1899, and there is no occasion to go back to those days.

Mr. VARDAMAN. No; I beg pardon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor by the courtesy of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. VARDAMAN. This author goes on:

> Crops, houses, and villages were destroyed or burned for the purpose of depriving insurgents of means of support, and reconcentration was finally resorted to. Gen. J. F. Bell estimated in 1902 that one-sixth of the natives in Luzon died as the direct or indirect result of the operations, a figure which would mean a total death roll of at least 600,000 persons.

That seems to me almost incredible, but I find facts almost equally startling in their brutality set out in other books which I propose to submit to the Senate at a later period.

Mr. NELSON. It is the opinion, then, of the Senator from Mississippi that our government in the Philippine Islands has been a bloody, tyrannous, and arbitrary government. Is that the Senator's opinion, and is it for that purpose that he quotes that author?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I just wanted the Senator's opinion of the accuracy of this statement. I am frank to say to the Senator that I do think it has been very, very tyrannous, bloody, and arbitrary.

Mr. NELSON. I want to say to the Senator I know nothing about the writer of that book. I never heard of him before nor do I take any stock in his statement; but I wish to say in that connection that there was undobutedly some violence and bloodshed at the time of the suppression of what I call the Aguinaldo rebellion. Let all remember what the facts were. Aguinaldo and his associates got up a rebellion in the Philippine Islands in 1896. That rebellion was suppressed partly by arms, mainly by paying off the leaders and sending them to China, to Singapore, and Hongkong. Aguinaldo at the time Dewey sailed into Manila was, I believe, at Hongkong. He was brought over there at his own request to help the Americans in driving out the Spaniards, for at first we had only our Navy there. We had very few soldiers at first. After we succeeded in eliminating the Spaniards Aguinaldo took it into his head that he would drive the United States troops out of the islands and take possession of the government. He held a convention at Malolos, in Luzon, and they adopted a sort of a constitution and organized an army. They set up a rebellion and the last part of our war in the Philippine Islands, if you can call it such, was in suppressing that Aguinaldo rebellion. Of all the good things we did in those early days for the Filipino people, of all the blessings we conferred upon them, the chief was the suppression of that wild, reckless, savage rebellion of Aguinaldo. If he had succeeded in that rebellion and obtained control of the country, the Filipino people would have been in a far worse condition than they were even under the worst condition of Spanish tyranny in that country.

No, Mr. President; I feel that while I am willing to give the Filipinos as high a degree of self-government as they are capable of exercising, I still want them to exercise that government under the Stars and Stripes. I want a place in those islands where the American people and the American troops, and the American Navy will not be strangers and be driven away from the shores. I want a place in the oriental countries so that when we send our fleets into those eastern waters, as we have done for years and as we will continue to do, there will be a haven—a home for our ships—where they can go and be taken care of and meet with the same treatment that they receive in ports of the United States here at home.

Pray, what injury or what damage would it be to the Philippine Islands? Is it any detriment; is it any damage or injury to the people of Cuba that we exercise a sort of supervisory power under the Platt amendment? Is it any harm to the people of Canada that Great Britain has the supreme sovereignty there, and can oversee them in the hour of distress? Is it any danger; is it destructive to their liberties, for the people of the Boer Republics in South Africa to have a government established there under the auspices of the flag of Great Britain?

No, Mr. President; let them remain under the flag of the United States; let them be a part of our dominion, but give them as much self-government as you please, even such as we have in some of the States, if they deserve it and are fit for it.

I am opposed to the preamble of the bill. I regard it as trifling with the American people; as trifling with the Filipino people, to say that at some time in the future we will let them have their independence if, in our judgment, we think it is for the best.

My idea is that we ought to say to the Philippine people, We will give you all the highest degree of self-government that you can stand—that you are fit to exercise—but aside from that we want you to remain under the protection of the United States so that you will not be liable to self-destruction or to the invasion of any foreign country.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I do not want to annoy the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. Oh, it is no annoyance. I am glad to hear from the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I am interested in the Senator's discussion of this question. I should like the Senator to explain how he is going to determine the capacity of the Filipino for self-government until the Filipino is given an opportunity to try. It is not self-government to permit him to govern himself under American supervision. That is not self-government, as I understand it.

Mr. NELSON. You have self-government in Mississippi, have you not?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. And yet you are a government under the United States of America. Pray, does it do injury to the people of Mississippi?

Mr. VARDAMAN. The people of Mississippi stand on an equal footing with the people of every other State in the Republic, but that is not true of the Filipinos. The people of Mississippi are sovereigns. The citizens of the Philippine Islands are subjects. In the American citizen is vested all the just powers of government, while the Filipino exercises only such right as the United States may accord him.

Mr. NELSON. Oh, no; they are not subjects.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Filipinos ought to have the right of self-government given to them. To put the question more accurately, the right of self-government should not be withheld from the Filipinos. The people of Mississippi exercise those rights which inherently belong to them as sovereigns.

Mr. NELSON. We have no subjects in this country. That term is foreign to American institutions and foreign to American law.

Mr. President, owing to the interruptions I have taken up more time than I intended when I first rose to speak. I feel, Mr. President, that we have done a great work in the Philippine Islands in educating the people there, in teaching them the principles of good government, in building up the country, giving them schools, roads, railroads, good harbors, lighthouses, and everything of that kind, and we have done a great work in establishing a civil government there, a civil government in which practically now the control of the government is in the hands of the Filipino people. They have a majority to-day of the Filipino Commission and the lower house of the Filipino Legislature is entirely composed of those people. I think a majority of the judges of the supreme court and the judges of what they call the courts of first instance are Filipino people. Most of their municipal officers are Filipinos. Most of their school-teachers, barring some 600 and odd American teachers, are of their own nationality.

Now, the science of government is a progressive science. We will increase this system of government as fast as they are qualified to exercise it. We will aid them in every way possible.

I feel, as I have said before, that in two directions they need further help. I am not here to criticize the present government of the islands. That is unnecessary and wide of the mark, but I feel that in two respects they need help.

They need help in the educational field. They ought to have about twice as many schoolhouses and twice as many American teachers as they have there to-day.

In addition to that, they ought to be encouraged and developed more in the matter of agriculture. In that direction they have been exceedingly slack and have failed to make the progress they might have made in that country. It is a curious thing—and Gen. McIntyre's report points it out—that there is a colony in the island of Mindanao of some 52 American employees who have settled down there and formed an agricultural colony. They were men in the civil service of the government and were discharged. They have married native women and settled down there and have become successful and prosperous farmers, more prosperous than any of the Filipinos. That is a great object lesson, especially there in the island of Mindanao where the home of the Moros is.

It would undoubtedly be a good thing if here and there Americans would settle in the rural communities and give the natives an object lesson in the matter of agriculture, and thus in a way serve them as we have served them with our school system.

No, Mr. President; I have a love for my land as if it were my daughter. I am willing to smoke the pipe of peace or carry the tomahawk in war, but, Mr. President, I can not for a moment harbor the idea that now or in the near future we ought to scuttle and cast adrift the Philippine Islands after

we have made them into such a prosperous and happy country as they are to-day. Let us retain those islands under the American flag. Let Manila become the great commercial emporium of the East for the distribution of American products and American goods. Let us show to those eastern people that we have a great city and those islands under the American flag. We can become a civilizing power not only for the Philippine people but for the people in the adjacent islands, in the Malay Archipelago, and the people in India and in Cochin China and Cambodia, and for the teeming millions in China. American influence, if it is retained in those islands, will by and by permeate the entire oriental country and work for its civilization.

What started Japan on the road to progress? It was the advent of the American fleet there away back in the fifties. It was Commodore Perry's visit to Japan. They then commenced to turn over a new leaf and become a great country. After our possession, with the control and experience we have had in the Philippine Islands, our influence will be effective and permeate the whole Orient.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. NELSON. No, Mr. President; let us never scuttle the ship. The American flag was hauled up over the bay of Manila, on Corregidor Island, at its entrance. Let no American be foolish enough or base enough for political reasons or any other to tear down our flag.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator from Minnesota referred to the fact that Manila may become a great distributing point of commerce. Is the Senator aware that there is a charge now and always has been a charge from San Francisco to Manila of $4 per ton more than from San Francisco to either Hongkong or Shanghai? Does the Senator not realize that on the arc of the great circle ships sail from point to point, if it is possible for them to do so, and that arc of the great circle would go to the north, near the ports of Japan and to Shanghai?

To distribute freight from Manila would require the unloading in other vessels of the ocean-going vessels, and owing to that fact it never could be made a distributing point for the Orient. Hongkong is the distributing point for Great Britain, and so is Shanghai. Why? Because the ocean vessels go in there, and they unload from the ocean vessels to river vessels. Consequently, there is a minimum cost in transferring the freight. But if you have to carry it 640 miles to Manila, and there reload into another ocean vessel, and then unload the cargo from that ocean vessel into a river vessel there would be such a high amount of cost for freight that it would be impossible to make it a distributing point or a commercial point in the Orient.

Mr. NELSON. Such an argument, with all due respect, seems to me to be aside from this great question and of a Lilliputian character. If it is important, Mr. President, to Great Britain to hold the ports of Singapore and Hongkong to retain their trade in the Orient, why is it not as much so to the United States to have a place like Manila in those oriental countries—in the midst of the great Malay Archipelago, with Sumatra and Borneo on one side, and with China, Japan, and the other countries to the north?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I wish to say simply that I only referred to the points of distribution in answer to the very position the Senator has himself taken.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, the spirit of our institutions, the form of our Government, is abhorrent to the idea or purpose of holding colonies under the sword or waving our flag over an alien and unassimilable people that can not in all time become an equal factor with our States in working out our destiny. I am astonished at the utterances just submitted to us by the experienced and honored Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON]. He insists we should hold these people in subjection on account of the great blessings we are bestowing on them and of the possible value, commercial or otherwise, that the Philippine Islands may yet be to us. He speaks in glowing terms of their liberty under our flag, of their independence under the blessings of our sovereignty. Every word of his remarkable address is the old time-worn language in excuse of tyranny. The suggestion or the open advice that we should keep these people forever under our control is not only the essence of tyranny but violates every promise we ever made to the people of these islands, as well as every principle on which our own Republic is founded. We must not let our admiration of our work in developing these islands blind us to the rights of these people or the duty we owe ourselves as exemplars and forerunners in the cause of human liberty. There is no such thing as my freedom under your control. No government can impress its ideas or ideals of government on an alien people while holding the victims under the sword and reading the Declaration of Independence and waving over their heads our emblem of the free.

Mr. President, we can not longer afford to spend our time and vast sums of money, wrung from the poor of our own land, in educating the inhabitants of the archipelago. The task is more than good sense or good morals will justify when we see so many of our own people in our own land, as needy and far more deserving of our charitable solicitude than these people, lying under a tropic sun in the remotest islands of all the seas, and crying to be let alone and spurning your misdirected and unwelcomed benefactions. Every people on the earth has that particular form of government best adapted to their condition. If a better general conception of a better government prevails, the old will pass away. The particular form of government of any people is an expression of their idea of the best possible one for them. The king rules only where the people consent, and only as long as that acquiescence exists. So let it be with the people of the Philippines.

Mr. President, we went into those islands without reason and remain there without any just cause to stay. They do not want us, and we do not need them. They are 3,000 miles farther from our shores than London or Berlin or Paris. From the Atlantic seaboard they lie exactly through the globe, and from New York it is as near to go through the Suez as the Panama Canal to reach them. They are no help to our trade or commerce. They are a menace in times of peace, a veritable danger to our prestige, if not a deep humiliation at the end of any war with any maritime nation.

Aside from these considerations, a greater reason for getting out is the violation of the Monroe doctrine involved in going there. We can not maintain the Monroe doctrine and hold dominion over these islands. But the supreme and compelling reason, to my mind, for getting out of there is because it is wrong to stay there. It is unjust, tyrannous, to them and a shame to us. What becomes of our boasted love of liberty while we hold an alien and unwilling people under the sword? The effect of such a policy on our people at home is, and must necessarily be, deprecated by all who love our institutions and glory in our history. Practicing usurpation on other people's rights will soon blind us to our own, and that justice and equality which we now revere will easily, on slightest hope of personal or State aggrandizement, give way to such temptation and visions of power, dominion, and glory as will veil the better and higher things that now engage our attention and hold our love.

The object lesson which the Senator from Minnesota presents of the American in the Philippines giving lessons in government does not compensate for the injury done our own people in beholding the object lesson of usurpation and injustice which we are by force dealing out to those people.

Mr. President, from the very first I opposed taking or holding these islands. I shall vote for any bill that will take our troops away from there at any named date, and the sooner it takes effect the better I will like it.

It is none of our business to tell those people what form of government they must have. Let them solve that problem as best they can. They are asking no advice; they ask only for freedom. Let them have it.

Mr. President, the right of the case seems so plain to me, all in favor of these unwilling subjects of ours, that it is hard to find any excuse for withholding justice from them except in case of some great personal interest so blinding the advocate of their further oppression that he loses sight of the rights of man. Others, maybe, are led by that self-sufficient consciousness of superiority that finds no hope for any people out of hearing of their precepts and advice. God spare the Philippines from both.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to this discussion, and I would now say nothing but for the fact that I think there are some things which we have done in the past, as well as some things which have been done to us in the past, which will help us on this occasion to do the hardest thing for mankind to do, and that is to put himself in the other man's place and judge from the other man's standpoint rather than from his own possibly selfish standpoint. For instance, Mr. President, the phrase "iron hand" has been used in this discussion. It is said that the people of America are incapable of using the iron hand upon another people. Let us remember that in the not so very dim and distant past the people of enlightened New England governed themselves by "blue laws" and governed the Indian with the flintlock and the sword. Let us not forget that the people of Virginia not so long ago governed themselves by that same high standard expressed in the bill of rights of that State, but it was not until about 1830 that the people of Virginia repealed the law upon

her statute books, making it unlawful to kill an Indian on Sunday; and yet a people with that kind of record are fooling themselves in the belief that they can use despotism upon another people and not use it just as every other people on earth have used power against another people when it was in their hands.

Mr. President, just before the people of the United States declared their independence and fought for it, certain things went forward in the British Parliament, even as we now are considering the rights of other people. Then, as now, people who had met and declared themselves superior in wisdom and morals to another people and had elected themselves to be the rulers of that other people, expressed themselves as to what was then the great American character and the great American civilization, even as we are now expressing ourselves of the Filipinos. It is very interesting to observe what the lords in the House of Lords and the great men in the House of Commons in England thought in the years 1774 and 1776 of the American people and of our civilization. It was for the purpose of putting those thoughts and comments into the RECORD that I arose. It seems to me most pertinent now that we should know what our rulers in anterevolutionary days thought of our ambitions and efforts to obtain self-government. It is instructive to us in getting correct bearings on that most difficult of problems, to wit, putting oneself in the other fellow's place. I read from the English parliamentary debates.

The Earl of Sandwich said this in the year 1775:

THE EARL OF SANDWICH. The noble lord mentions the impracticability of conquering America; I can not think the noble lord can be serious on this matter. Suppose the colonies do abound in men, what does that signify? They are raw, undisciplined, cowardly men. I wish instead of 40,000 or 50,000 of these brave fellows they would produce in the field at least 200,000, the more the better, the easier would be the conquest; if they did not run away, they would starve themselves into compliance with our measures. I will tell your lordships an anecdote that happened at the siege of Louisburgh: Sir Peter Warren told me that, in order to try the courage of the Americans, he ordered a great number of them to be placed in the front of the army; the Americans pretended at first to be very much elated at this mark of distinction, and boasted what mighty feats they would do upon the scene of action; however, when the moment came to put in execution this boasted courage, behold, every one of them ran from the front to the rear of the army, with as much expedition as their feet could carry them, and threatened to go off entirely if the commander offered to make them a shield to protect the British soldiers at the expense of their blood; they did not understand such usage. Sir Peter finding what egregious cowards they were, and knowing of what importance such numbers must be to intimidate the French by their appearance, told these American heroes that his orders had been misunderstood; that he always intended to keep them in the rear of the army to make the great push; that it was the custom of generals to preserve the best troops to the last; that this was always the Roman custom, and as the Americans resembled the Romans in every particular, especially in courage and love of their country, he should make no scruple of following the Roman custom, and made no doubt but the modern Romans would show acts of bravery equal to any in ancient Rome. By such discourses as these, said Sir Peter Warren, I made a shift to keep them with us, though I took good care they should be pushed forward in no dangerous conflict. Now I can tell the noble lord that this is exactly the situation of all the heroes in North America; they are all Romans; and are these the men to fright us from the post of honor? Believe me, my lords, the very sound of a cannon would carry them off, in Sir Peter's words, as fast as their feet could carry them. This is too trifling a part of the argument to detain your lordships any longer. The noble earl then went on to abuse the Americans for not paying their debts; he made no doubt that the real motive of their associations was to defraud their creditors. That the Congress, on which the noble lord had passed high encomiums, was a seditious and treasonable meeting of persons assembled to resist the legal and just authority of the supreme legislative power; and however dignified by his lordship, or any other noble lord, he should always continue to describe it by the latter appellation as its only true and proper name.

Of course this was a slander against the American character and soldier; but who can say that the noble lord who uttered it in 1775 was not in as good faith then as are the Senators here now who deny the ability and the right of the Filipinos to govern themselves?

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator who it was that stated that?

Mr. CHILTON. I gave the Senate his name. This was the utterance of the Earl of Sandwich in the House of Lords of England in 1775.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CHILTON. Oh, yes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course the Senator from West Virginia does not agree with the sentiments expressed by the noble lord whom he has just quoted?

Mr. CHILTON. No more than I agree with the noble Senators upon the other side in their criticisms of the Filipinos at this time.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator will pardon me, Mr. President, I have been in the Senate during the greater part of this debate and I have not heard anybody question the courage of the Filipinos and have not heard any aspersions upon the character of the Filipino people. I should like very much if the Senator from West Virginia thinks that they have been slandered in any way, to have him point out by whom and when that occurred.

Mr. CHILTON. Oh, Mr. President, I have not said that any one has been slandered, and that is not at all my point here to-day. I am simply calling back to the mind of the Senate the admonition in Holy Writ, "Judge not, that ye be not judged." I am trying to get the Senate in the frame of mind in which possibly the American Colonies were in 1774, when another people had the power over them and were dictating the terms upon which they might have self-government, and when England made just as great a mistake in the courage of the people of Vermont and Massachusetts and New Hampshire and Rhode Island as possibly we may be making now in the ability and in the patriotism of the Filipino people.

Mr. President, I have read many speeches made in England just before our independence began, but I do not want to read all of them. They are all to the same effect. They called us a backwoods people, without courage, without ability for self-government, without education to govern ourselves. They talked about a protectorate over us. They stated then that we would become subject to some other kingdom, and mentioned some of the Scandinavian powers that would probably come over and take possession of us whenever Great Britain should release her protecting hand from us. In other words, Mr. President, all the reasons which Senators have given to-day why we should not do the noble, the generous, and the fair thing with the Filipinos now were offered in 1774 and 1775 as reasons why England should not extend to us the God-given right of self-government. All of the reasons offered against us then are being offered now, and I am simply putting the two positions side by side and asking that we put ourselves now where we wanted England to put hereself 100 years ago—that is, "in the other fellow's place." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, without reading them, to put in the RECORD certain other speeches of the same period that the Senators may to-morrow read them and digest them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that privilege will be granted.

The extracts referred to are as follows:

[From Debate on an Address to the King upon the Disturbances in North America, 1775.]

Col. Grant said he had served in America and knew the Americans well; was certain they would not fight. They would never dare to face an English army, and did not possess any of the qualifications necessary to make a good soldier; he repeated many of their common-place expressions, ridiculed their enthusiasm in matters of religion, and drew a disagreeable picture of their manners and ways of living.

[From debate in the Commons on the petitions for reconciliation with America, 1775.]

Capt. LUTTRELL. * * * Sir, that the Colonies are inseparably united to the Imperial Crown of this realm I trust will never be denied by the friends of either clime; but, though it has been asserted America can subsist without our commerce, I believe nobody will say she can flourish without our protection. If we abandon her to her present miserable situation, she must soon sue to us or to some power for succor. In securing their lives and properties the Americans must ere long experience the fatal consequences of being exposed to the depredations of marauders and lawless ruffians; they will soon cry aloud for the reestablishment of those judicial authorities that have been imprudently overturned and which are necessary not only to the welfare but the very existence of the subject among the rudest nations of the globe. Sir, I fear, indeed, the Americans at this hour can not properly be styled the most civilized people in the known world, but an unfortunate fatality seems to have awaited that unhappy country for a series of years past.

[From debate on the disturbances in America in consequence of the stamp act, 1776.]

(By Lord Chancellor Northington.)

If they withdraw allegiance, you must withdraw protection, and then the little State of Genoa, or the kingdom, or, rather, Republic, of Sweden, may soon overrun them.

[From further debate on the bill for regulating the government of Massachusetts Bay, 1774.]

(Hansard's Parliamentary History, p. 1303.)

Mr. STANLEY. These bills certainly affect the interior policy of America and are intended for the better regulation of its internal government. Whatever may be the opinion of that propriety of regulation with the Americans I know not, but their submission to the laws of some country is necessary, as I can not conceive the independence of an American colony to exist whilst the balance of power remains in Europe, supported and protected by armies and navies. These people must resort to some State, and it must be a Protestant one; and were they to unite themselves with any other State than this, they would meet with a yoke and burden which they would not wish to bear. It is said by some that this is driving them to a state of slavery; by others that this proceeding will be ineffectual. As to the latter, if we do not go far enough, we are certainly on the right side; but I can not sit still and see with indifference the authority of this country submitting to every indignity they shall offer us. There are but two ways of governing mankind—by fórce or by consent.

(By Mr. St. John.)

It is not, sir, the strength of America that we dread; they have neither men, army, nor navy. What, then, have we to fear? Do we dread the loss of our trade? No, sir; the avarice of the Americans will prevent that. They theaten us with not paying their debts, but I am afraid, if we give way to them, they will not allow that they owe us any."

[From Parliamentary Debates, 1782.]

(By the Earl of Shelburne.)

With respect to America, he has always considered her independence as a great evil which we had to dread and to guard against. He had spoken of it in this manner for years past and when he believed he was joined in sentiment by every man in this country. He had always believed and declared that the independence of America was an evil as much to be apprehended and dreaded by America as by Britain. This had always been his opinion, and he had constantly labored, by every means in his power, to persuade men that this was the case in his applications to private men and to public men, to individuals and to bodies of men; he had always held the doctrine that the independence of America was an evil to be equally guarded against by both countries. He wished to God that he had been appointed to urge that proposition and to maintain it before Congress. He wished to God that he had been called to prove by argument the assertion that the independence of America must be as prejudicial to herself as to Britain. He would have gone much greater lengths and said much more at the bar of the Congress than he ever said in his place in the British Parliament.

Mr. CHILTON. My thought is that we can not be truly a free people as long as we hold another people in subjection, and these old speeches of 1774, 1775, and 1776 ought to come in thunder tones to warn us that what we craved then we should not deny to others now.

Mr. President, one other point. We can never have a discussion upon this floor without our friends on the other side bringing up the Democratic platform. Some of the Senators on the other side may not look upon it as they do the Constitution, and most of them may not regard it as they regard the Bible, but it is the greatest comfort to me and, in my judgment, it holds out the greatest promise for good government and progress in this country that recent years have directed the attention of the Republicans to the force and the power and the virtue of Democratic platforms. I am glad to see that they are willing to square their action to a Democratic platform, and I am glad to see them insist that we shall square our conduct to the demands of a Democratic platform.

Mr. President, I do insist now that the Democratic Party has been consistent in its policy regarding the Philippines if it has ever been consistent concerning anything—and I am always ready to take up the gage that it has been. I am always prepared to maintain, and think I can show from the record that we do come as near to sticking to our platform as any other party ever did. Of course, there are instances of Senators who never are wrong and who can settle the question of baptism, for instance, or any other point to their own satisfaction and who condemn to eternal damnation the man who does not agree with them. There is no use to argue with such men.

Why, Mr. President, men have been arguing for a hundred years how Philip and the Eunuch ordained baptism, and yet on a question of that very kind, a question upon which different minds might well come to different conclusions, my mind's eye has in view now Senators who would condemn to eternal damnation as being wrong those who believe in immersion. They have settled it in their own minds; and so with Senators who believe in sprinkling. So it is with platforms. Platforms are general statements of a party upon general questions. We could not look years and years ahead and decide how the details should be settled as to the Filipino question. However, Mr. President, the Democratic Party has stated from the start that imperialism is wrong; that it is against the idea that should control government in the United States for this great people to hold another people in subjection. From the beginning the Democratic Party has set its face against that idea, and it stands there to-day, and in its platform of 1912, which I now ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, it sets forth exactly the position of the Democratic Party to-day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from West Virginia to print in the RECORD the matter referred to will be granted.

The section of the Democratic platform of 1912 referred to is as follows:

THE PHILIPPINES.

We reaffirm the position thrice announced by the Democracy in national convention assembled against a policy of imperialism and colonial exploitation in the Philippines or elsewhere. We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder, which has involved us in enormous expenses, brought us weakness instead of strength, and laid our Nation open to the charge of abandonment of the fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers.

In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our Government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases.

Mr. CHILTON. That means that we will promise the Philippine people definitely, as a part of the plan of this Government in dealing with them, that they shall have independence and a government of their own, free from the control of the people of the United States; that we will give them the blessings of free government, which we fought for and obtained.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

Mr. CHILTON. One moment. Something has been said about the glorious record of the people of the United States in the Philippines. I agree with the statements which have been made to that effect. It is a glorious record, a splendid one. We will read it with pride in the future. The part that the Republican Party has taken in it I concede. The part that the people of the United States as a whole have taken I concede, with patriotic pride. We are all proud of it; but the best is yet to come; the proudest part is yet to be. There is nothing that we have done that will ever shine so brightly as the final act when we, as a free people, say to the Filipinos, "Go and work out your own salvation, free and untrammeled by any foreign government on earth." The Democratic Party is now hastening to that consummation.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. CHILTON. Yes.

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator says that the policy of the Democratic Party on this question is to promise the Filipino people their independence.

Mr. CHILTON. And to give it to them; yes, sir.

Mr. LIPPITT. What the Senator said was that it was the policy of the Democratic Party to promise it.

Mr. CHILTON. There is no need of the Senator and myself bandying words. I stand on that platform. I have made the plank concerning the Philippines a part of my remarks. It was a definite promise to them to give them independence as soon as a stable government could be had, and, as I construe it, not an indefinite promise to depend upon our will, caprice, or pleasure. As I read the platform, we propose to put it down definitely that they are to have it at a fixed time. That is the Democratic position, and I am going to vote for it.

Mr. LIPPITT. That may be the Democratic position, but it is not the position as outlined in the bill now before the Senate for discussion.

Mr. CHILTON. Oh, yes; it is.

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not know how the bill may be amended, but the bill that is now before the Senate promises the Filipino people their independence "when, in the judgment of the United States, it will be to the permanent interest of the people of the Philippine Islands"; and that was the statement which the Senator made a moment ago, that the position of the Democratic Party was that they would promise, and that is the position of the Democratic Party as indicated in their platform of 1912.

Mr. CHILTON. I merely want to say to the Senator, in response to that suggestion, that I have not yet voted for this bill. I am not arguing what this bill is; I am telling the Senator what is the Democratic position; and we are going to whip this bill into shape to meet the promises of the platform.

Mr. LIPPITT. I wish the Senator would tell me what the Democratic position is. The Democratic position as stated in the platform in 1912 was that they would promise the Filipinos their independence on certain conditions.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, the Senator says——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks that the Senators give the reporters an opportunity to get what they say. Will the Senator from West Virginia allow the Senator from Rhode Island to complete his statement?

Mr. CHILTON. I have the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that, but the Senator from West Virginia yielded to the Senator from Rhode Island, and the Chair thinks the Senator from Rhode Island should have an opportunity to complete his statement.

Mr. CHILTON. I yielded to the Senator to ask a question, and I supposed he had asked it.

Mr. LIPPITT. For the joyousness of the debate I will now listen to the Senator from West Virginia for a few moments.

Mr. CHILTON. The Senator asked me to tell him and to try to make him understand what the Democratic position is. I can only repeat, Mr. President, that there is no use for the Senator and me to bandy words. The Senator is not going to

agree with the Democratic position, and there is no use for me to tell him a thing that, even though it came from the angels in heaven, he would not believe and would not understand unless it suited his side. Whenever it comes to a question of politics the Senator has his own peculiar iden, and that is that the Republican Party is always right and the Democratic Party is always wrong. As to everything else he has a most beautiful character and is most delightful in every walk of life; but when it comes to talking about the Democratic platform and the Republican platform his whole idea is to entangle the Democrats and to make the way smooth and plain for the Republicans. I say to him again that even though it were told him by an angel from heaven he would not believe. [Laughter.]

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I rather like eulogies on my personal character. I am always pleased to have somebody say something nice about me. What I might do if something was told me by an angel from heaven I do not know, but when it is told me by the Senator from West Virginia I usually question it. [Laughter.]

I want to say now that I rose to ask the Senator a question, because he said that the policy of the Democratic Party on this question was to promise the Filipinos their independence; and he then said that he stood upon the Democratic platform of 1912 upon the subject, which is also a promise to promise the Filipino people their independence.

On this phase of the question it seems to me there are just two positions that can be taken by the Senate of the United States: One is to give these people their independence now and the other is to say nothing about the question of their independence. It is not within the power of this Senate of the United States to promise to the Philippine people anything about what some subsequent Senate may do. We have the power to grant the Philippine people independence. We have not the power to promise the Philippine people that some succeeding Senate will grant them their independence. It seems to me it is a very unwise position for us to put ourselves in to attempt to promise something that we have not the power to carry out. It is deceiving the Filipino people into believing that they have an assurance when they do not have it. It is not justice to ourselves, and it is simply belittling the whole question.

Either the Democratic Party must grant the Filipino people independence or they must leave the question to be decided by some other Congress that is willing to decide it. For them to undertake in this Congress to promise those people that a Congress of 1920 or 1930 will grant them independence, either on the condition that it is for their own advantage or on any other condition, is making a promise that they are not in a position to carry out.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. CHILTON. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Mr. STONE. When will the Senate adjourn?

Mr. CHILTON. It automatically adjourns at 5 o'clock under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia moves that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn until Monday at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 17, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 14, 1916.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

W. Burch Lee, of Minden, La., to be surveyor of customs in customs collection district No. 20, with headquarters at New Orleans, La., in place of Robert L. Knox, removed.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Second Lieut. Richmond Trumbull Gibson, Coast Artillery Corps, to be additional second lieutenant in that corps with rank from June 12, 1915.

The above-named officer was nominated to the Senate on December 10, 1915, and confirmed by that body on January 10, 1916, under the name Richmond Turnbull Gibson, a graduate of the United States Military Academy, for appointment as additional second lieutenant in the Coast Artillery Corps with rank from June 12, 1915. This message is submitted for the purpose of correcting an error in the name of the nominee.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Capt. Harold C. Fiske, Corps of Engineers, to be major from January 12, 1916, vice Maj. Horton W. Stickle, retired from active service January 11, 1916.

First Lieut. Earl North, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from January 12, 1916, vice Capt. Harold C. Fiske, promoted.

CAVALRY ARM.

First Lieut. James E. Abbott, Sixth Cavalry, to be captain from April 5, 1915, vice Capt. Frank Tompkins, Tenth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Rowland B. Ellis, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be captain from April 13, 1915, vice Capt. Louis R. Ball, Eighth Cavalry, retired from active service April 12, 1915.

First Lieut. Selwyn D. Smith, Tenth Cavalry, to be captain from April 17, 1915, vice Capt. Samuel D. Rockenbach, Eleventh Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. George F. Bailey, Second Cavalry, to be captain from July 2, 1915, vice Capt. Robert E. Wood, Twelfth Cavalry, retired from active service July 1, 1915.

First Lieut. Clarence C. Culver, Third Cavalry, to be captain from September 14, 1915, vice Capt. John W. Wilen, Thirteenth Cavalry, who died September 13, 1915.

First Lieut. Frederick G. Turner, Thirteenth Cavalry, to be captain from October 4, 1915, vice Capt. Robert C. Williams, Fourteenth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Frank B. Edwards, Twelfth Cavalry, to be captain from October 31, 1915, vice Capt. Frank O. Whitlock, Second Cavalry, retired from active service October 30, 1915.

First Lieut. William C. Gardenhire, Fourth Cavalry, to be captain from December 17, 1915, vice Capt. Joseph C. Righter, jr., Tenth Cavalry, who died December 16, 1915.

First Lieut. Benjamin O. Davis, Cavalry, unassigned, to be captain from December 24, 1915, vice Capt. Walter C. Short, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Edward C. Wells, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be captain from January 4, 1916, vice Capt. Albert A. King, First Cavalry, detached from his proper command.

Second Lieut. Henry W. Hall, Fourth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from April 5, 1915, vice First Lieut. James E. Abbott, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edwin V. Sumner, jr., Second Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from April 13, 1915, vice First Lieut. Rowland B. Ellis, Fourteenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Arthur E. Wilbourn, Thirteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from April 13, 1915, vice First Lieut. Raymond S. Bamberger, Second Cavalry, retired from active service April 12, 1915.

Second Lieut. Ernest G. Cullum, Fourth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from April 17, 1915, vice First Lieut. Selwyn D. Smith, Tenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. William W. Erwin, Seventh Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from May 17, 1915, vice First Lieut. Clarence K. Lyman, Fourth Cavalry, who died May 16, 1915.

Second Lieut. Herbert H. White, First Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from June 20, 1915, vice First Lieut. Fred H. Coleman, Fourth Cavalry, detailed in the Ordnance Department.

Second Lieut. Chauncey St. C. McNeill, Eighth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from August 19, 1915, vice First Lieut. Hayden W. Wagner, Fifteenth Cavalry, resigned August 18, 1915.

Second Lieut. Frank K. Ross, Sixth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from September 1, 1915, vice First Lieut. George L. Morrison, Fifth Cavalry, resigned, August 31, 1915.

Second Lieut. Herman Kobbé, First Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from September 14, 1915, vice First Lieut. Clarence C. Culver, Third Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John A. Warden, Fifteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from October 4, 1915, vice First Lieut. Frederick G. Turner, Thirteenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John B. Johnson, Third Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from October 31, 1915, vice First Lieut. Frank B. Edwards, Twelfth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Victor M. Whitside, Fifth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from December 17, 1915, vice First Lieut. William C. Gardenhire, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Claude DeB. Hunt, Thirteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from December 24, 1915, vice First Lieut. Benjamin O. Davis, unassigned, promoted.

Second Lieut. N. Butler Briscoe, Fifteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from January 4, 1916, vice First Lieut. Edward C. Wells, Fourteenth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. James P. Barney, Second Cavalry, an additional number in his grade, to be captain from December 17, 1915, the date on which he would have been promoted to fill a vacancy in that grade in his arm had he not been retired from active service, and to be an additional number in that grade.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named citizens to be assistant paymasters in the Navy from the 12th day of January, 1916:

Edward R. Eberle, a citizen of Arkansas;
Robert B. Huff, a citizen of New York;
Andrew L. Huestis, a citizen of New York;
Malcolm G. Slarrow, a citizen of the District of Columbia;
Benjamin S. Gantz, a citizen of South Dakota;
Raymond N. Hickman, a citizen of Indiana;
William D. Alexander, a citizen of Maryland;
Homer C. Sowell, a citizen of Georgia;
Morton L. Ring, a citizen of Massachusetts;
Raymond M. Bright, a citizen of Pennsylvania;
Vernon H. Wheeler, a citizen of South Carolina; and
Louie C. English, a citizen of Georgia.

POSTMASTERS.

RHODE ISLAND.

Joseph A. Hughes to be postmaster at Pawtucket, R. I., in place of John W. Little. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1915.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

William H. Coleman to be postmaster at Columbia, S. C., in place of George H. Huggins. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

TEXAS.

A. H. Buie to be postmaster at Ennis, Tex., in place of A. H. Culver, resinged.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 14, 1916.

COAST GUARD.

Third Lieut. Charles Eaton Anstett to be second lieutenant.
Third Lieut. Thomas Sylvester Klinger to be second lieutenant.
Third Lieut. Frederick August Zscheuschler to be second lieutenant.

BOARD OF CHARITIES.

John Joy Edson to be a member of the Board of Charities of the District of Columbia.

George M. Kober to be a member of the Board of Charities of the District of Columbia.

POSTMASTERS.

MICHIGAN.

John W. Currigan, Lyons.
William L. Ferry, Eau Claire.
Thomas T. Fralick, Copemish.
Paul D. Palmer, Sunfield.
Nathan C. Thomas, Caledonia.

MONTANA.

Philip B. C. Goodwin, Butte.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Philip W. Sherburne, Pittsfield.
John A. Willey, Sanbornville.

OKLAHOMA.

Charles L. Wilson, Cherokee.

OREGON.

Harry M. Fensler, Myrtle Point.
Harry C. Gist, Yamhill.
F. H. Laighton, Seaside.
W. P. Quinlan, Grants Pass.
Homer S. Wood, Independence.

TENNESSEE.

L. N. Alley, Oakdale.
R. H. Green, Covington.
Dossie O. Thompson, McEwen.

TEXAS.

Herschel C. Connally, Rosebud.
W. J. Smith, Crystal City.

VERMONT.

Frank H. Tyler, South Londonderry.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *January 14, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father in heaven, touch the hearts of these Thy servants and guide them through the changing scenes of the new congressional day that they may address themselves with firm and steadfast purpose to the problems which confront them and fulfill the obligations resting upon them as faithful servants of the people. And Thine be the praise through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PENSIONS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 8493) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio calls up a pension bill and asks unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8493, an omnibus pension bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8493, with Mr. HENRY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pensions laws—

The name of John W. Priest, late of Company F, One hundred and fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Meranda, late of Company C, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Baker, late an ordinary seaman, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ella Day, widow of William Henry Day, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment, and Company A, Thirty-fourth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Johnson, widow of Henry W. Johnson, late of Company C, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William A. Parr, late of Company G, Seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. McDanield, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Wilson, late of Company A, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joshua Shriver, late of Company E, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Murray Myers, late of Company C, Forty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Hershberger, late of Company A, Fifteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Retheiser, late of Company C, Twenty-sixth Regiment, and Company K, Ninety-ninth Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James P. Tindle, late of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Deborah Hart, widow of James S. Hart, late of Company B, Third Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Davis, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James McGhie, late of Company D, Ninety-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry L. Phillips, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Winfield S. Hunter, late of Company L, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. Webb, late of Company I, Thirty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Maximillian Schneider, late of Company M, Twenty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary P. Rous, widow of Percy Rous, late of Company E, Fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Evans, late of Company C, First Battalion United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Gardner, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Angelette Van Buskirk, widow of John O. Van Buskirk, late of Company D, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. White, widow of William B. White, late of Company I, Forty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Baker, late of Company D, One hundred and seventy-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Stanford, helpless and dependent child of Emory M. Stanford, late of First Battery Wisconsin Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Fry, widow of John T. S. Fry, late of Company C, Fortieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emily Thorn, widow of Denison R. Thorn, late of Company G, First Regiment New York Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Holdridge, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment New York Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Newton D. Ward, late of Company F, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Patrick Kenyon, late of Company E, Ninety-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth M. Cooper, former widow of Oliver J. Haddock, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Daniel Connor, late of Company K, Thirtieth Regiment, and Company E, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah C. Parish, widow of Joseph H. Parish, late of Company G, Sixty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frances M. Woods, widow of George B. Woods, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Burke, widow of John Burke, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jane Cone, widow of Byron Cone, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles R. Hayward, late of Company E, One hundred and fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Mumah, late of Independent Battery I, Pennsylvania Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred Wheelden, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment, and Company B, Eighth Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oliver C. Smith, late of Company E, Thirty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaretha Johler, widow of Philip Johler, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment United States Reserve Corps, Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Heely, late of Company B, Twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mabel F. Coen, widow of Charles G. Coen, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Perlia J. Wilcox, widow of Jeremiah C. Wilcox, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment Iowa Cavalry, and of the Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Josephus Williams, late of Company A, Thirty-fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael Devine, late of Company L, Second Regiment New York Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Silas A. Reynolds, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Gross, widow of Reuben Gross, late of Company A, Fifty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of George Amyx, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Martin, late of Company F, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Gipson, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Corn, late of Company G, Fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Foster, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander D. Green, late of Company K, Forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. Beveridge, late of Company F, Sixty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Seth Loomis, late of Company M, Seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lorena S. Thatcher, widow of Hiram E. Thatcher, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ingalls Evans, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Almeda Goodwin, widow of Charles H. Goodwin, late of Company D, Thirty-first Regiment, and Company D, Thirty-second Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John W. Johnson, late of Company K, Fifty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Jacobs, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John P. Overton, late of Companies G and H, Third Regiment Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas W. Hill, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Silas Morgan, late of Company P, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ruth C. Baldwin, former widow of John Gosman, late of Company D, Twentieth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Lawler, widow of James Lawler, late of Company K, Thirty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ellen M. Brant, widow of Henry I. Brant, late of Company C, First Regiment Connecticut Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucy M. Griswold, former widow of Henry Kimberly, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sophie M. Kinnicutt, widow of George R. Kinnicutt, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Willis, late of Company H, Third Battalion, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ananias Cameron, late of Company B, Fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George E. Halstead, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louis G. Weinschenk, helpless and dependent child of Edward Weinschenk, late of Company A, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and in Company B, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John A. Melcher, late of Company H, Thirty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alvin M. Owens, late of Company E, Fifty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen L. Freel, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca A. Searles, former widow of Michael Heater, late of Company B, Sixty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William Moses, late of Company C, Thirty-fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ethan A. Bradish, late of Company A, Forty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. M. Burk, late of Company K, Twenty-ninth and Thirty-sixth Regiments Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Armer, late of Company E, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin E. Hoy, late of Company I, Forty-fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Stapp, late of Company B, Forty-eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henrietta M. Majors, widow of Pleasant P. W. Majors, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John R. Mullennix, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah Cate, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathaniel Patterson, late of Company F, Forty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cynthia A. Ivers, widow of Charles W. Ivers, late of Company E, Twenty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Imogen P. Ingersoll, widow of Charles T. Ingersoll, late acting assistant surgeon United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Allen J. Pheips, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment, and Company F, Forty-fifth Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah S. Brewer, widow of Oliver Brewer, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment, and Company G, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Catharine Bucher, widow of Joseph L. Bucher, late of Company E, Seventy-eighth Regiment, and Company K, One hundred and second Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie E. Nelson, widow of Edward Nelson, late of Company D, Sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Ida Nelson, helpless and dependent daughter of said Edward Nelson and Jennie E. Nelson, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Jennie E. Nelson, the name of said Ida Nelson shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Jennie E. Nelson.

The name of Pheoby J. Streeter, widow of Andrew J. Streeter, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Viola R. Brackett, widow of George Brackett, late captain of the hold, United States ships *Antona* and *Kennebeck*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary R. Franklin, widow of William H. Franklin, late of Company K, Twenty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pey her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John G. Corbett, late of Company B, Sixty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alonzo F. Murden, late of Company B, Seventy-seventh and One hundred and thirtieth Regiments Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Paris Meadows, late of Company L, Sixth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Coles, late of Company B, One hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Helen M. Litchfield, widow of Andrew F. Litchfield, late assistant surgeon, Two hundred and first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of James M. Silvey, late of Company K, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Orr, late of Company H, Sixty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William K. Smith, late of Company B, Fifty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John B. Kelley, late of Company K, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Atcheson, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Wilson, former widow of Marion D. Fortner, late of Company K, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherina Tarleton, widow of Thomas W. Tarleton, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of David B. Marshall, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Long, late of Company E, Twenty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret J. Wadsworth, widow of Job Wadsworth, late of Companies F and A, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Stephen J. Miller, late of Company B, One hundred and seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per conth in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Howard, late of Company G, Seventy-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Estella M. Howlett, former widow of George W. Baldwin, late of Company A, Third Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Theodore W. Goodsell, late of Company C, Ninety-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ezra Cather, late of Company K, Thirty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leroy W. Clark, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard B. Linville, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and Company E, Thirty-fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathaniel F. Berry, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah C. Foster, widow of Samuel H. Foster, late of Company I, Tenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Henry B. Hale, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Gall, late of Fiegles sharpshooters' company, Seventy-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dominick Dennedy, late of Company K, One hundred and eighty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert C. Holder, late of Company D, Eighty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Leach, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Davis, late of Company H, Twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edmund T. Connelly, alias John Marks, late of Company B, Twenty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Evalyn Wakefield, widow of Hezekiah B. Wakefield, late of Company A, Fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Edith Stella Wakefield, helpless and dependent child of said Hezekiah B. Wakefield, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Evalyn Wakefield, the name of said Edith Stella Wakefield shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Evalyn Wakefield.

The name of John W. Baker, late of Company M, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Tilman, late of Company G, One hundred and tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward T. Wolfe, late of Company B, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen Clevenger, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriet E. Carpenter, widow of William B. Carpenter, late assistant surgeon Fifth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Siler, widow of Francis M. Siler, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George Hull, late of Company E, Ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mortimer F. Sperry, late of Company D, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah H. Hunter, widow of Malick Hunter, late of Company B, Ninety-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Ann M. Ellenberger, widow of Abraham Ellenberger, late of Company A, Van Horn's battalion, United States Reserve Corps, Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Marsh, widow of Edwin Marsh, late of Company K, Twenty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria Pierce, widow of James T. Pierce, late of Company M, Sixth Regiment New York Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Aaron Fanshaw, late of Company E, Twenty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jeptha Tucker, late of Company A, Twenty-second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph H. Thomas, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Smith, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel W. Hicks, late of Company F, First Regiment Michigan Engineers and Mechanics, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Johnston, late of Company E, Forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Farr, late of Companies E and D, Sixty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Garthwait, widow of Matthew Garthwait, late of Twentieth Battery, Indiana Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Kinley, widow of Seth Kinley, late of unassigned Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Parish, widow of David Parish, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John G. Powers, late of Company G, Twenty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mahala Lewis, widow of James J. Lewis, late of Company I, Forty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Christy, widow of Thomas J. Christy, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Nichols, late of Company A, Eightieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis Shuber, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Farrell, widow of Daniel Farrell, late of Company G, Seventy-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Robert J. Pense, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Collins, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Dart, late of Company D, Fifty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Postelwait, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Farnsworth, former widow of Edward G. Foss, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, Unassigned Veteran Reserve Corps, and Company D, Twenty-fourth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Lucretia M. Postlewait, former widow of Nicholas P. Wycoff, late of Company C, Thirtieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William J. Sexton, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas H. Bailey, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Massachusetts Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward L. Fisher, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Hunter, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nelson N. Boydston, late of Company B, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emily Bashaw, widow of Alfred Bashaw, late of Company I, Seventy-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Mamie Bashaw, helpless and dependent child of said Alfred Bashaw, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Emily Bashaw the name of said Mamie Bashaw shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Emily Bashaw.

The name of Charles A. Lauman, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment, and Company K, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment, Illinois Infantry, and Companies F and H, Thirty-fourth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William R. Wolbert, late of First Battery Minnesota Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William B. Rutledge, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joel K. P. Wood, late of Company G, Forty-seventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Nelson, late of Company I, Twenty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Denby, late of Company H, Seventh-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John S. Barnett, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alvin D. Mohr, late of Fifth Independent Battery, Ohio Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Wittenmyer, late of Company D, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Angeline Kelchner Wolfe, former widow of Eleazer A. Kelchner, late of Company A, Seventy-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Lewis W. Chase, late of Company D, Ninety-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Triplett, widow of Joshua D. Triplett, late unassigned, Eleventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Matilda A. Manning, widow of Ezra L. Manning, late of Company H, One hundred and fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie Tompkins, widow of William M. Tompkins, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William F. Braught, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Holland, widow of John Holland, late of Company I, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and Company D, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James R. Johnson, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Peterson, late first-class boy in the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ira H. Phillips, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna Young, former widow of Samuel Cornell, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Alvah K. Palmer, late of Company K, Second Regiment New York Veteran Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Snyder, late of Company G, Forty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lemuel R. Wilcox, late of Company C, Second Regiment New York Veteran Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriet A. Voelz, widow of William Voelz, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Clark, widow of Jerome B. Clark, late of Company F, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Philip Ruebel, late of Company C, Major Daniel Abby's Scott County battalion, United States Reserve Corps, Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jerome Dano, late of Company A, One hundred and twenty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lavinia Weast, widow of Jacob Weast, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jane Hoover, widow of David H. Hoover, late of Company G, Two hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Gilliland, late of Company C, Seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lydia Hawkins, widow of Richard Hawkins, late of Company D, Fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Taylor, late of Company H, Thirty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 785. John W. Priest.
H. R. 855. James Meranda.
H. R. 863. James Baker.
H. R. 901. Ella Day.
H. R. 902. Mary Johnson.
H. R. 930. William A. Parr.
H. R. 933. John W. McDanield.
H. R. 962. David Wilson.
H. R. 967. Joshua Shriver.
H. R. 968. Murray Myers.
H. R. 969. Wm. C. Hershberger.
H. R. 984. William Retheiser.
H. R. 998. James P. Tindle.
H. R. 1005. Deborah Hart.
H. R. 1023. William Davis.
H. R. 1056. James McGhie.
H. R. 1289. Henry L. Phillips.
H. R. 1323. Winfield S. Hunter.
H. R. 1324. John R. Webb.
H. R. 1383. Maximilian Schneider.
H. R. 1385. Mary P. Rous.
H. R. 1407. William Evans.
H. R. 1408. William C. Gardner.
H. R. 1409. Angelette Van Buskirk.
H. R. 1410. Mary J. White.
H. R. 1416. John Baker.
H. R. 1419. George W. Stanford.
H. R. 1432. Elizabeth Fry.
H. R. 1434. Emily Thorn.
H. R. 1437. William Holdridge.
H. R. 1489. Newton D. Ward.
H. R. 1490. Patrick Kenyon.
H. R. 1498. Elisabeth M. Cooper.
H. R. 1510. Daniel Connor.
H. R. 1512. Sarah C. Parish.
H. R. 1516. Frances M. Woods.
H. R. 1517. Mary Burke.
H. R. 1518. Jane Cone.
H. R. 1519. Charles R. Hayward.
H. R. 1520. Henry Mumah.
H. R. 1524. Alfred Wheelden.
H. R. 1525. Oliver C. Smith.
H. R. 1612. Margaretha Johler.
H. R. 1613. Daniel Heely.
H. R. 1628. Mabel F. Coen.
H. R. 1631. Perlia J. Wilcox.
H. R. 1632. Josephus Williams.
H. R. 1646. Michael Devine.
H. R. 1650. Silas A. Reynolds.
H. R. 1782. Elizabeth Gross.
H. R. 1798. George Amyx.
H. R. 1806. George Martin.
H. R. 1811. James Gipson.
H. R. 1815. Joseph Corn.
H. R. 1817. John J. Foster.
H. R. 1819. Alexander D. Green.
H. R. 1850. John R. Beveridge.
H. R. 1873. Seth Loomis.
H. R. 1884. Lorena S. Thatcher.
H. R. 1904. Ingalls Evans.
H. R. 1906. Almeda Goodwin.
H. R. 1983. John W. Johnson.
H. R. 2013. Isaac Jacobs.
H. R. 2041. John F. Overton.
H. R. 2073. Thomas W. Hill.
H. R. 2076. Silas Morgan.
H. R. 2079. Ruth C. Baldwin.
H. R. 2080. Mary Lawler.
H. R. 2081. Ellen M. Brant.
H. R. 2084. Lucy M. Griswold.

H. R. 2115. Sophie M. Kinnicutt.
H. R. 2174. William Willis.
H. R. 2182. Ananias Cameron.
H. R. 2183. George E. Halstead.
H. R. 2190. Louis G. Weinschenk.
H. R. 2215. John A. Meicher.
H. R. 2216. Alvin M. Owens.
H. R. 2219. Stephen L. Freel.
H. R. 2226. Rebecca A. Searles.
H. R. 2227. William Moses.
H. R. 2228. Ethan A. Bradish.
H. R. 2233. John F. M. Burk.
H. R. 2265. George Armer.
H. R. 2266. Benjamin E. Hoy.
H. R. 2270. Isaac Stapp.
H. R. 2294. Henrietta M. Majors.
H. R. 2459. John R. Mullenix.
H. R. 2494. Elijah Cate.
H. R. 2528. Nathaniel Patterson.
H. R. 2532. Cynthia A. Ivers.
H. R. 2550. Imogen P. Ingersoll.
H. R. 2552. Allen J. Phelps.
H. R. 2561. Sarah S. Brewer.
H. R. 2565. Catharine Bucher.
H. R. 2572. Jennie E. Nelson.
H. R. 2610. Pheoby J. Streeter.
H. R. 2636. Viola R. Brackett.
H. R. 2659. Mary R. Franklin.
H. R. 2660. John G. Corbett.
H. R. 2669. Alonzo F. Murden.
H. R. 2745. Paris Meadows.
H. R. 2746. Joseph Coles.
H. R. 2750. Helen M. Litchfield.
H. R. 2784. James M. Silvey.
H. R. 2794. William Orr.
H. R. 2799. William K. Smith.
H. R. 2804. John B. Kelley.
H. R. 2811. Joseph Atcheson.
H. R. 2847. Elizabeth Wilson.
H. R. 2955. Catherina Tarleton.
H. R. 2987. David B. Marshall.
H. R. 2988. James Long.
H. R. 2992. Margaret J. Wadsworth.
H. R. 3185. Stephen J. Miller.
H. R. 3188. William Howard.
H. R. 3189. Estella M. Howlett.
H. R. 3190. Theodore W. Goodsell.
H. R. 3216. Ezra Cather.
H. R. 3217. Leroy W. Clark.
H. R. 3219. Richard B. Linville.
H. R. 3230. Nathaniel F. Berry.
H. R. 3245. Sarah C. Foster.
H. R. 3262. Henry B. Hale.
H. R. 3277. Thomas Gall.
H. R. 3280. Dominick Dennedy.
H. R. 3282. Robert C. Holder.
H. R. 3285. Charles H. Leach.
H. R. 3403. William Davis.
H. R. 3416. Edmund T. Connelly.
H. R. 3426. Evalyn Wakefield.
H. R. 3435. John W. Baker.
H. R. 3436. George W. Tilman.
H. R. 3438. Edward T. Wolfe.
H. R. 3724. Stephen Clevenger.
H. R. 3753. Harriet E. Carpenter.
H. R. 3761. Mary Siler.
H. R. 3763. George Hull.
H. R. 3765. Mortimer F. Sperry.
H. R. 3784. Sarah H. Hunter.
H. R. 3786. Ann M. Ellenberger.
H. R. 3808. Mary Marsh.
H. R. 3809. Maria Pierce.
H. R. 3810. Aaron Fanshaw.
H. R. 3869. Jeptha Tucker.
H. R. 3870. Joseph H. Thomas.
H. R. 3871. William Smith.
H. R. 3874. Samuel W. Hicks.
H. R. 3880. George W. Johnston.
H. R. 3973. James Farr.
H. R. 3975. Eliza A. Garthwait.
H. R. 3977. Margaret Kinley.
H. R. 3980. Sarah E. Parish.
H. R. 3988. John G. Powers.
H. R. 3989. Mahala Lewis.
H. R. 4318. Sarah A. Christy.
H. R. 4333. Thomas Nichols.
H. R. 4350. Lewis Shuber.
H. R. 4356. Mary A. Farell.
H. R. 4357. Robert J. Pense.
H. R. 4358. Robert Collins.
H. R. 4363. Frank Dart.
H. R. 4389. William Postelwait.
H. R. 4490. Sarah A. Farnsworth.
H. R. 4503. Lucretia M. Postlewait.
H. R. 4509. William J. Sexton.
H. R. 4521. Thomas H. Bailey.
H. R. 4551. Edward L. Fisher.
H. R. 4839. Andrew J. Hunter.
H. R. 4884. Nelson N. Boydston.
H. R. 5102. Emily Bashaw.
H. R. 5107. Charles A. Lauman.
H. R. 5112. William R. Wolbert.
H. R. 5116. William B. Rutledge.
H. R. 5122. Joel K. P. Wood.
H. R. 5123. Charles W. Nelson.
H. R. 5128. Robert Denby.
H. R. 5278. Alvin D. Mohr.
H. R. 5281. Henry Wittenmyer.
H. R. 5339. Angeline Kelcher Wolfe.
H. R. 5387. Lewis W. Chase.
H. R. 5408. Mary C. Triplett.
H. R. 5485. Matilda A. Manning.
H. R. 5609. Annie Tompkins.
H. R. 5614. William F. Braught.
H. R. 5666. Mary A. Holland.
H. R. 5705. James R. Johnson.
H. R. 5829. William A. Peterson.
H. R. 5861. John S. Barnett.
H. R. 5913. Ira H. Phillips.
H. R. 5919. Anna Young.
H. R. 5959. Alvah K. Palmer.
H. R. 5960. Henry Snyder.
H. R. 5961. Lemuel R. Wilcox.
H. R. 6003. Harriet A. Voelz.
H. R. 6185. Mary E. Clark.
H. R. 6355. Philip Ruebel.
H. R. 6497. Jerome Dano.
H. R. 6514. Lavinia Weast.
H. R. 6515. Jane Hoover.
H. R. 6618. William Gilliland.
H. R. 6634. Lydia Hawkins.
H. R. 6705. William Taylor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill for amendment, as follows:

The name of Jennie E. Nelson, widow of Edward Nelson, late of Company D, Sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Ida Nelson, helpless and dependent daughter of said Edward Nelson and Jennie E. Nelson, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Jennie E. Nelson, the name of said Ida Nelson shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Jennie E. Nelson.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The language in respect to this particular bill seems to be a little out of the ordinary. It reads as follows:

The name of Jennie E. Nelson, widow of Edward Nelson, late of Company D, Sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Ida Nelson, helpless and dependent daughter of said Edward Nelson and Jennie E. Nelson, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Jennie E. Nelson, the name of said Ida Nelson shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Jennie E. Nelson.

It seems to me that that is setting a trap up the stream and down the stream at the same time. You catch them coming and going. It does not make any difference what happens, somebody is going to connect up with Uncle Sam's pay roll.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing unusual about this provision. It is simply a provision authorizing the payment of $12 per month to a widow because of a helpless child, and as long as the child lives the $12 will be added to the pension of the widow and paid in her name; in all, $24 per month; but it also provides that in case of the death of the child this additional $12 per month shall then cease. It further provides that in case of the death of the widow herself, the mother, then the name of the child shall pass to the pension roll, and the $12 will be paid to the helpless child instead of to the mother. This is the usual language employed in cases of this sort where a pension is paid for the benefit of a helpless child.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, in commenting upon this particular pension, I think, as far as my observation of private pension bills is concerned, this is an unusual provision. It is very rare, at least, that such a provision as this appears in a private pension bill. I desire to call the attention of the committee to the report on the bill, which says, respecting this particular case:

H. R. 2572. Jennie E. Nelson, aged 67 years, is the widow of Edward Nelson, who served as a private in Company D, Sixtieth Regiment New York Infantry, from October 2, 1861, to October 16, 1862, and from December 24, 1863, to March 20, 1865.

The soldier was pensioned under the general law at $30 per month for disease of lungs and heart.

He and this applicant were married February 28, 1867, and were recognized as husband and wife to the date of his death, October 26, 1904. She was paid his accrued pension and has been pensioned as his widow at $12 per month since October 27, 1904, under the general law (certificate No. 597180), and now seeks increase of pension by special act of Congress by reason of having the care, custody, and support of a helpless and dependent child of the soldier by the name of Ida Nelson. It is shown in evidence presented this committee that this daughter has been helpless and dependent since the age of 3 months, which resulted from an attack of fever, paralyzing the throat and affecting her mental faculties, so that she is now and has been since prior to age of 16 feeble-minded and helpless, and that she was born September 7, 1871; that neither this claimant nor the child are possessed of any property; that they have no income from any source except the claimant's pension of $12 per month, which it is recommended be increased to $24 per month, provided that in the event of the death of the dependent child, Ida Nelson, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine; provided further, that in the event of the death of the mother, this claimant, the dependent child's (Ida Nelson's) name shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the limitations and provisions of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the death of her mother, this claimant.

The point I want to raise is this, that in the event of the death of the mother herself an imbecile child is left, and then is it proposed that the Government of the United States shall pay to this imbecile child a certain sum of money instead of providing that it be paid to the guardian or next of kin who has charge and custody and control of the imbecile child? I do not see how you can carry out the provisions of the law.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. My understanding is that the Pension Commissioner himself will provide for that by requiring the appointment of some suitable person to take the money for the helpless child.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, there is a provision of law which provides that if a person becomes insane or is insane that the person in custody of that individual shall receipt for the pension.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Of course this money will not be paid to an insane child, but to a guardian for the child.

Mr. LANGLEY. It is the universal practice in the Pension Office to do just what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] has stated will be done in this case.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. There is nothing unusual about this. This is the usual practice. The Pension Commissioner, under the law, takes control of that.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Chairman, the present pension law provides that where there is an imbecile child and that child is pensioned, being under the age of 16, the pension may continue throughout the life of the child, as I understand it. Is not that the law?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. It would continue at $2 per month, as I understand it.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman from Kansas is right.

Mr. TAGGART. Where the pension of the helpless child begins before it is 16 years of age.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Yes; but only at $2 per month.

Mr. TAGGART. Possibly so.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of George Hull, late of Company E, Ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out lines 7 to 10, inclusive, on page 25, being the name of George Hull.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 25, by striking out the paragraph included in lines 7, 8, 9, and 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 12 of the bill for the purpose of offering an amendment to strike out the paragraph contained in lines 15 to 18, inclusive, being the name of Silas Morgan.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to return to page 12 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I now move to strike out lines 15, 16, 17, and 18 on page 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, strike out lines 15, 16, 17, and 18.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Nelson N. Boydston, late of Company B, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, on page 30, lines 17, 18, 19, and 20.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, strike out lines 17, 18, 19, and 20.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, because of the death of this soldier, Maj. Nelson N. Boydston, I move this amendment, and in this connection desire to say a word or two to call the attention of the House to the fact that this soldier had a most remarkable record in his long and faithful service in defense of the preservation of his country and in behalf of the freedom of human slaves. He enlisted at the very first call of his country and served four years two months and two days—to the end of the war. During all of that service the statement of his superior officer sets forth that he never once failed to stack his gun at night. He never spent a minute in the hospital; he never drank a drop of liquor; and while he was promoted step by step from a private to a lieutenant colonel, he states that he served three years of that time side by side with the late lamented Col. Henry W. Lawton, who was killed in the Philippines. He also says that in all of his procedure in the war when foragers were sent out they were always instructed by him to purchase such supplies as were needed; where they found women and children needy they were to contribute of whatever means they had to their relief; and where he found men in his regiment who were given to heinous conduct in foraging expeditions he declares that he invariably used the "short shrift." I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this tribute is due to this soldier, one of the bravest, one of the most faithful, and one of the most loyal of the many heroes who entered the Union Army from the thirteenth congressional district of Indiana. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 30, by striking out the paragraph included in lines 17, 18, 19, and 20.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Emily Bashaw, widow of Alfred Bashaw, late of Company I, Seventy-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Mamie Bashaw, helpless and dependent child of said Alfred Bashaw, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Emily Bashaw the name of said Mamie Bashaw shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Emily Bashaw.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask if the same conditions exist in reference to this particular pension which existed in the Nelson case?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. This is exactly similar to the other provision?

Mr. HOWARD. It is; yes, sir.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. What is the question the gentleman asked?

Mr. HOWARD. I want to find out whether the same conditions exist in reference to this particular pension as the other?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. The same conditions. That is the usual provision in all cases where $12 is paid because of a helpless child. It is paid to the parent during the life of the child.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, in the rapid manner in which the bill is being read for consideration it is almost impossible to keep up with the process, but I want to call attention before we finally vote on this measure to three pensions which I noted, having just read page 15 of the report. It seems that the little town of Mena, Polk County, Ark., has been suddenly and prominently put on the map in the granting of pensions. I see that John W. Baker, aged 69 years, has only been allowed $30 a month for a service of 1 year 7 months and 21 days, while in the same little bailiwick George W. Tilman, who is 71 years old, who only served 7 months and 21 days, is allowed an increase to $36 a month.

A little further down is Edward T. Wolfe, aged 68 years, late private in Company B, who served 2 years 10 months and 26 days, with a record that is almost unequaled in the War between the States, and I see that the committee only gives him $30 a month. Stephen Clevenger, aged 67 years, post-office address not given, is only getting $24 a month. Now, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of my colleague, whoever he be, who has introduced these bills, I think when my good friends Tilman, Baker, and Wolfe commence to compare notes when these bills get back home it is going to be very embarrassing to my colleague, and I think that all of these men ought to be put on an equal footing and draw the same amount. I can not see any reason why Mr. Tilman, under this report here, should get $36 a month and my good old friend Baker should get only $30, or this gallant old soldier Wolfe only receive the meager sum of $24 a month. Now, of course, we all understand the modus operandi of these private pensions. That has been discussed. I have not got anything to say about the granting of these pensions. I have already said all I expect to say about these pensions, but I think it is an outrage, gentlemen, to show this favoritism in the granting of these pensions.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. It does not seem to me it is right. Here are these poor old fellows toddling about in misery and want, as this report shows, all of them indigent, if they were not they could not get a pension, and here is a distinguished Representative in Congress from Mena, Ark., going to the Committee on Pensions and asking that we given Tilman $36, Baker $24, and Wolfe $30 a month. It is not fair. It is not right. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to my distinguished friend and colleague.

Mr. LANGLEY. I desire to ask the gentleman if he is familiar with the facts in each of these cases? Does the gentleman know whether one man is helpless and needs an attendant while the other does not, and their financial condition? Does the gentleman know that these considerations are very material in guiding the Committee on Invalid Pensions to reach a conclusion in each case?

Mr. HOWARD. I will answer my good friend by saying my little smattering of medical knowledge would lead me to believe that my old friend Baker here was in a worse fix than my friend Tilman. [Laughter.] Now, here is this poor unfortunate creature Baker. He served a year and 7 months and 21 days, and here is this man Tilman, who served but 7 months and 21 days. Now, just listen, gentlemen.

The claimant was last examined—I am speaking about my friend Baker now, who is getting only $30 a month—the claimant was last examined by a board of surgeons on November 16, 1914, when he was rated at $30 a month for paralysis. I am not going further.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Read that other word.

Mr. LANGLEY. Read the whole statement.

Mr. HOWARD. Is there a doctor present? [Laughter.]

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will say for the gentleman that he said he had only a smattering knowledge of medicine.

Mr. HOWARD. I do not know what this is, but whatever it is is horrible. It must be horrible. But anyhow he is suffering from rheumatism, all drawn up with rheumatism, suffering pain and agony every moment of every hour of every day in the year. He is wholly unfitted for earning his support by reason of injuries sustained by a fall, having his shoulder and his right hip badly crushed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOWARD. He is supplemented by the testimony of others, indicating that his property consists of a house and two city lots; that he has no other means and no income from

any source except his pension, which it is recommended be increased to $30 a month. Now, here is Mr. Tilman, a fine old gentleman I know, 71 years old, who goes out and fights 7 months and 21 days only as against a year and 7 months and 21 days for Baker. It happened that my good old friend Baker fought exactly one year longer than Mr. Tilman. Now, it says that this gentleman had something the matter with his heart and his lungs, and he had one of these peculiar hernias.

A MEMBER. Tell us what it is.

Mr. HOWARD. I would call it inguinal hernia. The last certificate by the board of surgeons, dated September 18, 1913, shows the claimant rated at $30 a month for diseases of the lung and heart, on an equal footing with Baker, which was right, absolutely right, and up to that good hour he did not have any hernia. He developed this hernia between 1913 and 1914. Now, the medical testimony presented to this committee indicates that the claimant is unfitted for manual labor by reason of impaired vision, both eyes, and infirmities from age and diseases.

Now, Mr. Chairman, without burdening the House any further with the details of these reports, it occurs to me that in the interest of fairness and fair play, when the Treasury door has swung wide open to this class of citizens, with no hindrance or hurdle that can be put in the way, it is useless for anybody to say anything here against these pensions. I would as soon try to stop a Texas cyclone with an Army blanket as to stop these pensions.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HOWARD. In just a minute.

But there ought to be an equality between these old Union soldiers. Here are three pensions for Mena, Ark. I know that Mena is a splendid little community and I know from its location that it needs a little artificial stimulant in the way of a little extra pension money in there. I congratulate my colleague from Arkansas that he has been able to locate in one bill three pensions in one town in a Southern State. It shows that he is active, that he is energetic, and that he is an able Representative of his people. But I do not want my friend to be embarrassed when he goes back home.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The substance of the gentleman's argument, as I get it, is that no one resident of this fair city should be treated "Mena" than any other? [Laughter.]

Mr. HOWARD. That is exactly it. The gentleman has said it much better than I could. These people live in Mena, and this Representative is exemplifying the name of this town by treating two of them "Mena" than he did another. [Laughter.] My speech is not made so much for the purpose of calling attention to the inequalities of these pensions, because it has existed ever since I have been in the House, but I want to call the attention of my distinguished colleague to the fact that when he gets back home he is going to find he has made two enemies by this beneficent act of his of putting two men on the pension roll at a lower rate than another one.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I will.

Mr. EMERSON. Did you read from the description of this case that Baker has some property and Tilman has not? Had you noticed that feature?

Mr. HOWARD. Well, I do not think that makes any particular difference, because under the general law multimillionaires are drawing pensions from this Government. That does not make any difference with the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman is mistaken about that, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the talk of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD]. Now, personally, there is no man in this House I think more of than I do of the "Schley" gentleman from Georgia; but he is simply against pensions and against all pensions. I am for all pensions. That is the difference between us.

Mr. HOWARD. That is a very wide difference.

Mr. THOMAS. That is a very broad difference. I am going to get every pension that I can to go down to Kentucky. I would rather they would go to Kentucky than up into the icicles of Maine, and why should we not pension these old soldiers? I believe we ought to do it. I am a Democrat. There is not a man in this House who does not know that I am a Democrat of Democrats. [Laughter.] My father was a Federal soldier. If I had been old enough, I would have been in the Rebel Army. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOWARD. I believe that.

Mr. THOMAS. And to-day I am in favor of pensioning not only Federal soldiers, but every Rebel soldier. [Laughter.]

Now, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] gets up and talks and talks [laughter], and the other gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] also. I understand Mr. TRIBBLE has got an item in the bill here for a pension down in his country, too [laughter]—trying to rob the Government, you know—and the first thing you know SCHLEY HOWARD will slip in a bill for some fellow down in his country. [Laughter.]

I do not know about the merits of these particular bills about which they are talking, but I do know the gentleman from Ohio, Gen. SHERWOOD; I do know old JOE RUSSELL, from Missouri [laughter], and I know that those men and the other men upon that Pension Committee will not place in that bill any item that should not be there. [Applause.] And so I will say to my friend SCHLEY, you are butting your head against a stone wall. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my good friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS] that I admitted that. There is no necessity to prove it. I admit it.

Mr. THOMAS. Then why should you continue to be so foolish? That is what I want to know. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOWARD. If the gentleman will yield——

Mr. THOMAS. Why, certainly; always. I never fail.

Mr. HOWARD. I have butted in foolishly, I admit.

Mr. THOMAS. Everybody admits that. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOWARD. But I did it for the purpose of correcting an inequality in the three pensions at Mena, Ark.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not believe there is any inequality about it. When Mr. WINGO, from that district, introduced those bills, and such men as Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri and Mr. SHERWOOD approve them, I do not believe there is any inequality. You have got to prove it to me now, and I will give you a piece of advice, and that is to stay still hereafter. [Laughter.] That will be better, because we are going to pass these bills for these old soldiers, because they deserve them. That is the whole thing of it. [Applause.]

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. And the gentleman is glad to see some of the money going into the Southern States?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I want to see some of the money go down South, even to Georgia and these other Southern States.

Of course, everybody knows that I am a Democrat. But this stuff of these two gentlemen from Georgia, Mr. SCHLEY HOWARD and Mr. TRIBBLE, getting up here every time we have a pension bill is foolish. They hop up and raise the mischief about something and do not know what they are raising it about, and my advice is that they quit it. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, there have been up to this time in this Congress 4,000 private pension bills introduced. In the case of every bill that is introduced the examiner for the Pensions Committee, Mr. Ives, who has been detailed by the Pension Office to do that work, and who has had 25 years' experience in the Pension Office—and he does not know who introduced the bill—makes his report on that bill, and if there is a favorable report it goes to the subcommittee of this committee. Then, if there is a controversy, it goes to the full committee.

Take this case, for instance, of Stephen Clevenger, aged 67 years. His service was seven months and two days. He enlisted in January, 1865. He saw no battle service; and, in considering the value of a pension bill, the service of the soldier is always considered. And furthermore, if he is disabled, whether his disability occurred on account of the war or since, that is always considered, so that the pension examiner considers all these questions and makes his report, and his opinion on a question of this character, where all the evidence is before him as to the service of the soldier, when and where his disability occurred, is of more value than the opinion of a Member on the floor of the House, who only reads the report and does not know anything about the circumstances of the soldier's disability.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. While I know that anything that a Member may have to say on this bill will not have any effect to prevent its passage, still I think the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] deserves the praise of this House for pointing out the inequalities he has discovered in these bills, and the matter ought to have the consideration that it deserves.

I would be the last Member of this House, notwithstanding I am from Texas and am the son of a Confederate soldier, to withhold a pension from a worthy Union soldier who is entitled to receive it. But I do say that there are inequalities in this bill. I have heard the gentlemen who are pressing the pas-

sage of this bill state that the reason why one man in this bill gets $50 per month and another gets only $20 per month is because of his being in worse condition financially, and perhaps in worse condition physically. I heard the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] say, on the other hand, that the term of service counted. I have no doubt that these things have been taken into consideration, but I want to call the attention of the House to a case mentioned here on page 59 of the report of this committee, where it is proposed to increase his pension from $17 per month to $24 per month. The case is this:

H. R. 3724. Stephen Clevenger, aged 67 years, late a private in Company A, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Infantry, from January 2, 1865, to August 4, 1865 (length of service, 7 months 2 days), is now a pensioner under the general law at $17 per month on account of rheumatism, diarrhea, and resulting disease of rectum.

Here is the medical evidence of his present condition upon which it is purposed to base his increase of pension, namely:

Medical and other information furnished this committee indicates that the claimant is in such physical condition as to prevent him from earning his support by his own labor by reason of rheumatism, enlarged prostate, cystitis, piles, associated with rectal ulcers.

Now, what worse physical condition could a man be in than that?

Mr. ASHBROOK. He might be blind.

Mr. BLACK. So he might. Now the report further states that the soldier has no property or income except his pension. There you have a man who is totally disabled, physically. He has no property, and no other income except his pension; and yet this bill grants a pension of only $24 per month, whereas other provisions in this bill grant private pensions amounting to as high as $50 per month, under conditions which I do not think are any more meritorious.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. SHERWOOD. The evidence does not show that his disability was contracted in the service. That is the point.

Mr. BLACK. The point I make, Mr. Chairman, is simply this, that these bills are introduced by Members of this House asking, some of them for a pension of $20 a month, some of them for a pension of $30 a month, some of them for a pension of $36 a month, and some of them for as high as $50 a month. It does seem to me that there ought to be some equality about this. I believe that the system as now practiced by this House in reference to these pension matters is wrong, and the sooner it is corrected, the better.

There ought at least to be some measurable equality.

Of course I admit that there are circumstances sometimes that justify the granting of these private pensions, but the abuse of the thing is what I am striking at and I do say that there is abuse along this line.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Does the gentleman think a man who had a very short service, after the war was practically ended, should have the same compensation as one who served a long time while the war was actually raging?

Mr. BLACK. No, I do not.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. I should like to suggest to the gentleman that God Almighty said that those who get in at the eleventh hour are given as good a seat in heaven as anybody else.

Mr. BLACK. I thank the gentleman for the suggestion.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. We have not been proceeding upon that high plane here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLACK. I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended two minutes, so that I may reply to the question which the gentleman from Missouri desires to ask.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Does the gentleman notice that this man Clevenger enlisted in January, 1865?

Mr. BLACK. I do.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Only about three months before the surrender of Gen. Lee.

Mr. BLACK. I notice that; yes.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. And my information from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD], who is an authority upon military matters of the Civil War, is that this man saw no actual service. There were no battles fought after that. Now, does the gentleman think he should be paid the same amount as a soldier who was engaged in the active part of the war, and who served longer?

Mr. BLACK. No, I do not, and I have taken no such position; but I call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri to the fact that, on page 58 of the report, appears the case of George W. Tillman, of Mena, Ark., who served only 7 months and 21 days—or only 19 days more than the case just referred to—and yet he is granted a pension of $36 a month; a difference of $12 per month, notwithstanding the very short difference of time in their respective terms of service. I say there is no equality in that, and I again protest against it.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. But the gentleman will notice that his service was from 1862 to 1863, in the midst of the war, while the other man served from January until August, the greater part of which time was after the war was over.

Mr. LANGLEY. And he saw no actual service in fact.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. He saw no actual service.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, I notice that this Stephen Clevenger, who is allowed $24 a month under H. R. 3724, on page 59 of the report, whose case has just been spoken of, had been recommended for $24 a month by the board of surgeons, but his application denied. Therefore this committee allowed him the $24 which had been recommended by the board of surgeons. That is the reason.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of William R. Wolbert, late of First Battery Minnesota Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out lines 14, 15, 16, and 17, inclusive, on page 31. The beneficiary is dead.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 31, by striking out the paragraph included in lines 14, 15, 16, and 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a statement about the bill. It originally contained 201 names. Three have died since the bill was prepared. Eighty-eight per cent of this bill includes bills of the Sixty-third Congress. We were crowded out of two regular pension days in the last session of that Congress, and 88 per cent of the names in this bill are to cover bills introduced by Members in the last Congress and reintroduced in this Congress, having been passed upon before.

There are in this bill 133 claims for invalid pensions, representing original pensions amounting to $2,953 monthly, which total monthly amount has been increased by $1,399, making a total annual increase for invalid claims of $16,788, the average increase per month for each being $10.44.

There are in the bill 68 widows and helpless children's claims, having original pensions of $630 monthly, which have been increased $748 monthly, making the toal annual increase for these claims $8,976, or the average monthly increase for each claimant $12.80. The total annual increase carried in the bill is $25,764. Included in the above are 10 original widows' claims allowed at $12 per month and 5 helpless and dependent children's claims allowed at $12 per month.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if no Member wishes to occupy time, I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the same do pass as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HENRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, on the Private Calendar, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8493) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. CALLAWAY made the point of no quorum, but subsequently withdrew the point.

COAL AND OIL LEASES.

On motion of Mr. FERRIS the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 406) to authorize exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium, with Mr. CULLOP in the chair.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire if the amendment changing the number of the section has been agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed by the Clerk that that amendment has been adopted.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Oklahoma to the fact that at the bottom of this section it says:

And the tract and deposits of oil or gas therein shall thereafter be subject to lease as prescribed in section 16 hereof.

The sections have all been renumbered.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; but we will change that after we get through with the section.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I moved to strike out the last word, but I desire to withdraw that amendment and offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming withdraws the pro forma amendment and offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 23, strike out the words "patent for one-fourth," and insert the words "leased for one-half"; and after the word "permit," in line 24, add "at a royalty to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I called attention to the very extraordinary provisions of this section last evening. This is a leasing bill, and yet the provision in this section is such that one-quarter of all of the oil lands of the country could be patented, and patented without expense or cost to the patentee. Gentlemen will say that they feel that it is necessary to give the explorer in a new field, or the wildcatter, this bonus in order to encourage him to develop. Well, if that is true, it is a very large price to pay for the inauguration of a leasing system. We now dispose of our oil lands under a law that requires thorough and complete development and the payment of $2.50 an acre. If it is necessary to give away one-quarter of all the oil lands of the country without price and without requiring development, in order to start a leasing system or to make a leasing system successful, then it must be confessed that we are paying a very large price for this system.

Not only that, but the land it is proposed to give away would in every case be the best of the land. In the first place, a prospecting permit is granted for 640 acres, 1 square mile, or 2,560 acres, or four sections, depending on the distance from a producing well. If oil is discovered at any point on that area the permittee may then select from the area of this prospecting permit the most desirable one quarter of the same, or any one quarter, and receive a patent for it out of hand and without cost.

That, of course, will mean that a driller, having started at a point which the geological conditions indicate are the most favorable for oil development and having discovered oil, will select the best portion of his area, and two or three or even one such permittee might take the entire dome and practically all of the valuable land in a given field, returning to the Government only the comparatively worthless land lying outside of the oil dome or oil basin, as the case may be. Some of the oil lands in California are worth millions of dollars to a quarter section, and yet we are proposing to give from one quarter section to a full section of lands to these people.

I realize that this is done in good faith. The trouble is that gentlemen have not sufficient faith in the system they are proposing; they have not as much faith as I have. I do not believe that it is necessary to give away 25 per cent of the oil lands of the country, and the best 25 per cent of it, in order to get men to lease and develop oil lands.

There are other reasons than these why this should not be done. Why are we entering on a leasing system? In order that the people of the country may receive revenue? No; because no one receives any of the revenue except the people of the general country in which the development is to be. It all goes into the reclamation fund under the bill, and we hope when it becomes a law that one-half will be retained within the State for schools and roads. But in no event does it go into the Federal Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. We are therefore not inaugurating a leasing system with the idea of enriching the people of the United States. I believe we must come to a leasing system whether we like it or not. That being so I have favored a leasing system because of the hope that it will bring us a larger income for local use from mineral deposits, but there are other arguments in favor of a public leasing system. One of them is that through the public control that comes under a leasing system you may prevent waste, and so control the operation as to prevent, on one hand, development not warranted by the market and, on the other, the plugging of wells and failure to produce, with a view of enhancing the price when the product is actually needed.

If these benefits are to be obtained under a leasing system, they can only be obtained in the largest and best way by having all the lands under this control; and if instead of retaining these lands in public control under a leasing system we patent 25 per cent of them, and the best 25 per cent, we lose that control over a large part of the territory which we seek to secure under our legislation.

Of course all this is on the supposition that the provision we have been discussing will be carried out in accordance with its terms. It probably would not, and therefore holds out a hope of patent that, except in a few favored or fortunate cases, would not be realized.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman knows about the situation in the oil and gas country, and he knows it costs a good deal to drill a well for oil or gas?

Mr. MONDELL. I had some painful experience in that line some years ago.

Mr. BORLAND. There is an outlay of considerable expense. Does the gentleman think that anybody could be induced to prospect upon public land and locate oil or gas at a depth of 500 feet or more upon the mere prospect of obtaining a lease in competition with others; or is it not necessary that they have some more substantial right?

Mr. MONDELL. I have tried to make it clear that I have more faith in the leasing system than these gentlemen who are handling the bill seem to have. Answering the question directly, yes. Under a proper, straight leasing system, under a reasonable system you can secure more development, in my opinion, of the right sort than you would obtain under this provision of legislation.

Mr. BORLAND. What is the proper system of leasing?

Mr. MONDELL. A system under which the opportunities are made definite the leasehold secure the acreage sufficient and the royalty reasonable. May I suggest that all of the development in the oil fields of Oklahoma has been under lease. That answers the gentleman's question. There is no ownership there. There is the greatest oil development in modern times, and none of the operators hold an acre of land. There is no doubt about that. If you give men proper leases, real legitimate operators would prefer to have a lease to half a section rather than a patent to a section, particularly when there is grave doubt of your getting the patent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has again expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, in a word, the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming seeks to strike out the inducement offered to a prospector. The House will undoubtedly want to know what the present law is. Under the present law in mining oil on public lands the developer gets all of the land by a payment of $2.50 an acre, which is a nominal sum, in the event that you strike oil. Under our provision he gets one-fourth of his prospecting permit and we retain three-fourths of the developed oil land for the benefit of the Government. The amendment of the gentleman, of course, is all out of harmony and is entirely awry with every contention that he has made heretofore. He has been against the bill in its entirety, because he wanted the lands for patenting and taxation and all that sort of thing. The committee has anticipated that some controversy of this kind might arise, though hardly expecting it from the gentleman because this is at right angles with all of his other contentions, and we have had this put up to the Geological Survey and to the Interior Department, had them analyze it and justify it, and

I have their verdict here summed up in a few words. The Interior Department says:

The reason it is advisable, after the discovery of oil or gas by a permittee, to give him a patent for one-fourth of the area covered by the permit is to induce citizens to undergo the labor and expense of prospecting for and finding workable deposits of oil or gas. The present mining laws and the mineral development of the country have been largely secured without expense to the Government because of the reward held out to the prospector in the form of a patent for the lands containing the deposits. While present laws are ill adapted to the discovery or disposition of oil or gas, it is doubtful whether the mere prospect of a lease would stimulate prospecting to the same extent as would a reward in the shape of a patent for a part of the land upon which oil is discovered. Furthermore, the oil claimant may desire to have the fee simple to a small area on which to erect permanent improvements, houses for his men, etc., and this provision will enable him to get patent for a limited area for those purposes. (b) The reward of not exceeding 160 acres within a 10-mile limit and not exceeding 640 acres without the 10-mile limit is not too great when it is borne in mind that the sinking of an oil well may involve expenditures of from $5,000 to $75,000, and that in many cases the expenditure of thousands of dollars will result in dry holes, the exploration being repeated several times before a paying well is disclosed. In any event, the United States is left with three-fourths of the area covered by the original permit, the value of which has been demonstrated by the drilling operations and discoveries of the permittee. (c) Ninety days within which the permittee may secure a patent for the areas given him as a reward for his discovery is not too long, because of the fact that he may be 60 or 100 miles from the local land office, requiring considerable time to proceed thereto from his claim, the preparation of the necessary proofs, in the form of affidavits, plats, etc., as a basis for the application for patent. Homestead settlers upon unsurveyed lands are allowed 90 days after survey within which to present their applications.

We knew the Geological Survey had charge of this, and we knew that they knew the practical side of it, that they had gone over it, and made surveys and drillings and tests and prospecting holes, and this is what they say:

The issuance of a patent for one-fourth of the area covered by the prospecting permit to drill for oil or gas is merely the prospector's reward for his expenditure of time and money in the discovery of such deposits. The Government reaps the advantage in the enhanced value of the remaining portions of the area covered by the prospecting permit. This enhanced value will be much greater than the cost of such prospecting operations and will be somewhat commensurate with the value of the property obtained. If the Government is not to do the prospecting work itself, it must hold out some inducements to have the work done by others. The improvement of the remaining three-fourths of the area is such a valuable return for the concessions granted that there should be little quibble as to the size of the reward.

(b) The reward, in the bureau's estimation, is not too great. The permittee within the 10-mile zone is probably taking less risk and incurring a lesser expenditure than would be the case as regards the permittee beyond such zone. It is doubted whether a lesser reward would prove sufficiently attractive to induce capital to make the large expenditures required in oil and gas prospecting. The cost of a single well in California often times runs from $25,000 to $50,000, while in other sections of the country it runs from $3,000 to $15,000.

If a man takes $75,000 and goes out onto the public domain—onto worthless, poor land—and expends $75,000 to develop that and make that land worth something, if he gives the Government three-fourths of it and only retains one-fourth of it for himself by reason of discovery, he has certainly done pretty well by the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I really hope the House will not agree to the amendment, for the reason that I fear the gentleman wants to make unpopular a bill that now holds out some inducement to these people. We want the bill to work. We want the bill to be a razor that will shave. We want a bill that will accomplish something. The gentleman does not like the legislation. I am sorry that he does not, but surely we can not agree to permit him to make the bill inoperative by amendments that are all out of joint with all of his views. We must beware of the "Greeks bearing gifts."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto conclude in 15 minutes, 10 minutes of the time to be occupied by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and 5 minutes by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry, but it seems impossible for the Committee on Public Lands, whatever it may do, to satisfy the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. For hours he has declaimed upon the floor against the policy of the committee retaining title in the Government to this character of resources upon the public domain. He has insisted in other bills that he himself has introduced that the Government part with all its title to the public lands. When we come to this bill, however, where we have a provision in it that does grant a title in fee simple to one-quarter of a certain area the gentleman objects. The ground of his objection to the policy of the committee has been that it means absentee landlordism; that it deprives the States of their power to tax the land within their borders, but when we come to the provision of this bill we eliminate, in part, this objection that he has made. We grant title in fee simple to a portion of the land. Then he turns squarely about face and says he objects to that; and now he is in favor of absentee landlordism; now he is in favor of the States being deprived of their right to tax that portion of the public lands. Why, in general debate upon that very bill, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman used this language:

The one thing that affects us most immediately—the one thing that renders the bill obnoxious to practically everybody in all the vast area to which it applies—is the feature that proposes to lay for all time a burden of Federal royalty and take it out of the community, make Uncle Sam an absentee landlord in a larger way and under conditions certain to be more onerous and trying to live under than any system of landlordism established since the beginning of time.

We certainly expected when we came to this provision, where we grant title to one-fourth of the land in the prospecting permit to the man who made the discovery, that would have been one provision in the bill, at least, that would meet the approval of the gentleman from Wyoming. But we find here that he assails this provision quite as bitterly as he has assailed other provisions of the bill, regardless of the fact that he is abolutely inconsistent in the position which he takes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the reason for this departure from the general policy that has been pursued, so far as it relates to this particular resource—the matter of oil? There is very good reason for it. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wyoming knows better than most of us that oil is not discovered by merely going upon the land. The gentleman knows that it requires a very large expenditure of money before any discovery is made. The gentleman knows that usually these oil lands are upon the desert. The gentleman knows that every acre of these lands is subject to entry of the surface, with the reservation of the oil on them; and the gentleman knows, too, that under an act of Congress recently passed it is open to the entryman to disprove the mineral character of that land, and get title not only to the surface but in the oil itself, if it be there. The gentleman knows, too, that if his proposition be adopted, away from those proven and developed fields, in many portions of the country, with not a sufficient inducement to prospect that land, it will lie undeveloped, and that the time will come when the private owner will get the full title to the land under the provisions of the act that I have mentioned, without reference to the mineral character, because the Government will not be in a position to assert it, and the lapse of time will be strong indication that it is not mineral and no effort made to develop or discover it.

Now, with the provision we have we offer a liberal inducement to the prospector to go upon the land and discover oil, if there be oil there. If he makes the discovery, he has added value, tremendous value, to all of the remaining Government land in that vicinity. That is not true of water-power sites; that is not true of coal, because the Geological Department of the Government can determine that fact, but they can not with reference to oil. So it is very clearly in the interest of the Government, even to the extent of parting with a portion of its title, to reward the man who goes upon the land and thereby adds millions of dollars of value to the other lands belonging to the Government, and that he be given this reward in this particular case. And the reason, as I have said, is because the mineral character of that land, so far as oil is concerned, can not be determined by the Government, can not be determined by anybody except by putting a drill upon the land and drilling down to find out whether there is oil in commercial quantities or not.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I sympathize with the gentlemen of the committee. I realize the trying situation they are in. They have brought in a bill here that, in the first place, as to its fundamental principles, is objected to by an overwhelming majority of the people of the territory which it affects, a bill which contains a great many features which are believed to be very unwise and harmful by those from the region affected who are favorable to the general principles of the bill. They have been very unhappy in their work and the results which they have obtained, and I do not wonder they feel bitter about it, and if they get any consolation through abusing me and misstating my position, why,

all well and good. I am as much opposed to the provision which gives away 25 per cent of the land, which takes from the control of the Government 25 per cent of the land, as I would to a provision which would render the bill inoperative. I believe leasing legislation can be so drawn as to be workable, but I do not believe it is in the interest of development; I do not believe it is in the interest of proper control to have any such provision as this in the bill. The chairman of the committee did not attempt to defend this provision. He read from statements made by the Secretary of the Interior and the Chief of the Bureau of Mines. Why, certainly the Secretary of the Interior is for it; it is his provision. Everybody understands the Secretary of the Interior suggested this proposition; that it never occurred to a member of the committee. It was never contained in any leasing bill until the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation, I presume, with the California oil men, concluded this would be a wise thing.

Probably it was well intended. Of course, he was defending it. Why should he not defend his own child? It was his proposition. He wants it done. Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], having misrepresented my position half a dozen times, I trust in the future will remember that I am and have been for coal and oil leasing legislation if we can have a fair, reasonable, and workable bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield?

Mr. MONDELL. And the gentleman knows very well that what he has been quoting from my statements are an expression of the opinion of those people who oppose leasing legislation and of the fears that are still in the minds of the people of the West, who have brought themselves to the belief that whether we like it or not we must accept it. This provision will simply add to the difficulties, add to the confusion, and largely reduce the benefits which we hope to secure, if benefits may be secured, through a medium of this sort.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the gentleman then disclaim as being an expression of his own views the quotation I read from the RECORD?

Mr. MONDELL. Those are my views. The gentleman has quoted a part of what I said. I said that we objected to the Government being a landlord and taking a toll from our resources without giving a part of it to our State for our development. And certainly we do. I mean that. But in the very same speech, as the gentleman knows—and it is useless for me to continue to reiterate it because my position is well known, and I trust the gentleman will not again attempt to misstate it—I said I was for this class of legislation if we can get it in a workable form, and it is just as important to my people that we be not overliberal in a harmful way as it is important to them that it shall not be overrestrictive in a harmful way. And I am against this provision, because no such unnecessary and harmful liberality is required in order to put a leasing system on its feet, and it will bring confusion and bring harm. The patenting provision will not only confuse and complicate the situation if carried out in accordance with its evident intent, but it is objectionable from the fact that it is not likely to be administered for any length of time in a free and impartial way. Let some one who has a prospecting permit bring in a bonanza well and the cry go up that the Government is giving away property valued at millions of dollars. Do you not imagine there would be some difficulty in getting a patent? Let those answer who are now trying to secure patents to oil lands. If a patent were finally secured in such a case, would not a cry go up at once for the Secretary to amend his rules, which, in the exercise of his wide discretion he would have the right to do, so that nothing of the kind could happen again? Some rule would be adopted under which few would ever get the opportunity for a permit or patent. We would then have the ill effect of this provision and little or no benefit from it.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that, on page 13, line 20, the word "sixteen" be stricken out, and the word "eleven" be inserted in lieu thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, Mr. Chairman, on page 13, line 20, the word "sixteen" has reference to a section that was stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. That section, the Chair desires to state, has not been read yet.

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, yes; it has. We have just concluded it. On line 20, page 13, I want to strike out the word "sixteen" from the text, and insert in lieu thereof the word "eleven."

The CHAIRMAN. Is that a committee amendment?

Mr. FERRIS. No; it is not a committee amendment. It is an amendment that we now desire to make. It is a reference to another section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 13, line 20, strike out the word "sixteen," and insert the word "eleven."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 16. That all permits, leases, and patents of lands containing or supposed to contain oil or gas, made or issued under the provisions of this act, shall be subject to the condition that no wells shall be drilled within 200 feet of any of the outer boundaries of the lands embraced within any permit, lease, or patent, unless the adjoining lands have theretofore been patented or the title thereto otherwise vested in private owners, or unless the lessees or patentees of such adjoining lands shall, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, agree to the drilling of wells and removal of the oil or gas from the 200-foot tracts or reservations herein created, and to the further condition that the permittee, lessee, entryman, or patentee will, in conducting his explorations and mining operations, use all reasonable precautions to prevent waste of oil or gas developed in the land, or the entrance of water through wells drilled by him to the oil sands or oil-bearing strata, to the destruction or injury of the oil deposits. Violations of the provisions of this section shall constitute grounds for the forfeiture of the permit, lease, or patent, to be enforced through appropriate proceedings in courts of competent jurisdiction.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 13, line 21, strike out the figures "16," and insert "11."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves to strike out the last word. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. I wanted to ask the chairman of the committee in regard to the meaning of this section. I notice that it says:

That the permittee, lessee, entryman, or patentee will, in conducting his explorations and mining operations, use all reasonable precautions to prevent waste of oil or gas developed in the land or the entrance of water through wells drilled by him—

And so forth.

Now, it is my understanding, if I am correctly informed, that the Bureau of Mines has found some way of sealing the gas strata in an oil well so as to prevent the useless waste of gas where there is no immediate market for it; that instead of allowing the gas to be turned loose in the atmosphere as a permanent waste it can be sealed up in the strata and kept there until such time as there is a market for it. Can that requirement be imposed upon the lessees and permittees under this section?

Mr. FERRIS. It can. That is one of the purposes of the section.

Mr. BORLAND. In what way would you require it besides this forfeiture? Is there any supervision that takes place before the forfeiture is ordered?

Mr. FERRIS. We have a section later on—section 30—that authorizes the Secretary to make any needful regulations and work out any detail to bring about these results. And I have the justification here of both the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines and the Department of the Interior, if the gentleman would care to have it. I think more of it, however, is on this drilling provision.

Mr. BORLAND. I think it would be well, if the gentleman will, to put that in the RECORD. In the Oklahoma gas fields, and in the southern Kansas fields, as the gentleman knows, persons have been anxious to find oil, because there is a market for the oil. They frequently find gas above the oil strata, and in many cases the gas has no immediate market unless they have money enough to pipe it to the town. It is used for nothing except the small portion used by the operator in drilling or for power on the ground. It is necessary to conserve this gas. It is worth something to people in the cities, where they have use for it.

It is worth nothing at the place of production, but if it could be conserved until a market for it could be established, then it would be very useful indeed to the wage earners and consumers in the cities. The same is also true as to the locations where gas is found, and it seems to me that instead of waiting to forfeit a man's lease, there should be some supervision exercised by the Secretary of the Interior in the nature of requirements for drilling and the methods of drilling, and so on, that would compel the conservation of that gas.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's suggestions are very timely, and that is one of the advantages of the leasing process. In the first place, the initial rights of the oil developer only attach on the making of a lease drawn by the Federal Government. If the land went to patent immediately the exact thing would happen that the gentleman complains of. It has happened a good many different times in my own State. Men are eager for the oil, which is very valuable, and they do not pay much attention, unless they are compelled to, to the gas, which is not so very valuable.

This section is written to bring about proper supervision and to prevent the condition of which the gentleman complains. In addition to that, over in section 30 we specifically provide language giving the Secretary extended authority to place these regulations in effect. The language used in section 11 is:

That the permittee, lessee, entryman, or patentee will, in conducting his explorations and mining operations, use all reasonable precautions to prevent waste of oil or gas developed in the land, or the entrance of water through wells drilled by him to the oil sands or oil-bearing strata, to the destruction or injury of the oil deposits. Violations of the provisions of this section shall constitute grounds for the forfeiture of the permit, lease, or patent, to be enforced through appropriate proceedings in courts of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. BORLAND. If the gentleman will pardon me at that point. I am not complaining of the section, I simply want to understand that it goes to the full extent expected. Reasonable precautions may be a matter of judgment in the mind of the patentee, but if there are regulations provided that he must comply with, that would be a different proposition. If you undertake to forfeit his lease, you must forfeit it for not complying with some regulations, and not on the question of taking reasonable precautions.

Mr. FERRIS. Hear what the Geological Survey has to say about the proposition. I read:

The language used in lines 20 to 23, of section 15, is considered sufficient in connection with section 31, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to prescribe the necessary rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of the act, to permit of the promulgation of rules which will prevent waste of resources, either open waste or by reason of water menace. It is considered far better to have such provisions generally stated, rather than to attempt to enumerate them in detail, because the rule of statutory construction that the inclusion of some is the exclusion others would undoubtedly be invoked to the detriment of the property interest of the United States.

I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that the same question that he has brought up arose in committee, and I thought we perhaps had better go on and say first just how the gas and oil should be handled; but the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey people, who are familiar with it, came to us and said to us that if we gave them the authority provided in section 30, and we used the language in this section 11, it would give them authority to do everything necessary in the interest and for the benefit of the Government. Here is what the Interior Department says:

The provisions for the exercise of all reasonable precautions to prevent waste and water troubles, in lines 20 to 23, seem to be fairly adequate, although the section would be strengthened if line 20 were changed to read, "use such reasonable precautions as shall be specified by the Secretary of the Interior to prevent waste of oil or."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. I understand the Secretary of the Interior says, "reasonable precautions, to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior." I understand you use that provision?

Mr. FERRIS. In the last paragraph of section 30 we provided generally and specifically and in every way to do all that we desired to do, so that it is not necessary at the end of every section to repeat such a provision. The matter has been resubmitted to the Secretary, I may say to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Mines is one of the most important bureaus in the Government, and is doing exceedingly good work, but all of its recommendations ought not to be taken too seriously. That bureau has probably made more discoveries in the last two years of old matters that were known before it was created than any other bureau of any Government ever did in the same length of time. Recently it reported in its annual report that it had discovered a new process for the production of gasoline which would reduce the price of gasoline, and which would certainly reduce the relative price of gasoline as compared with crude oil, and between the time that was written and the time it was printed and submitted to Congress the price of gasoline, in connection with this wonderful discovery, rose some 5 or 6 cents.

Mr. MADDEN. It is still going up.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of three minutes' time debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to defend the Bureau of Mines. As a matter of fact, I do not think the bureau requires any defense. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois himself is a friend of the bureau.

Mr. MANN. I certainly am.

Mr. MONDELL. And perhaps the bureau itself will not object to the little friendly fling he took at them. They have been pretty active in announcing discoveries, some of which some of us have thought we had heard of, in a way, some time ago. But it is true that the bureau, or a gentleman by the name of Rittman connected with that bureau, has discovered a new method under which they are producing a large additional amount of gasoline from the crude oil. There are, of course, other methods.

I happen to know something about the Rittman method by reason of the fact that an oil company of my State has recently entered into an agreement with the Bureau of Mines, under which they are to use the Rittman process, and they are now erecting quite a large refinery, I am told, to put the Rittman process to the test and to develop under it, and they expect to be able to produce a largely increased amount of gasoline from our crude oil.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Why do they have to enter into an agreement? Is not the process open to the world?

Mr. MONDELL. I understand that if they make any improvements on the process those improvements are not to be patented by them but left free to all who may desire to use them.

Mr. MANN. What control has the department over the process which it has discovered and given to the world?

Mr. MONDELL. The Rittman process is patented, as I understand, patented in the interest of the Government.

Mr. MANN. Patented for the use of anyone who may use it?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; upon agreement to certain conditions.

Mr. MANN. By whom has that money been collected?

Mr. MONDELL. My understanding is that that was not the intent. The intent was to have the process patented for the use of the people generally, and to allow anyone to use it who would use it for increased development. That is my understanding of it, and therefore those who use this process must make some sort of an arrangement under which the public shall get the benefit of all improvements which are made in the process.

Mr. MANN. I had supposed that that process was open to the world to use. If it is not, it ought to be; and if anybody has to make a private agreement with somebody in the Department of the Interior for the use of a patent which the Government has paid for producing, then we ought to know about it.

Mr. MONDELL. I think that is a matter of public interest. We have a bill before us covering many pages, under which a great many agreements will be made by the Secretary of the Interior as to matters and things, and I think it entirely proper that an agreement should be made in regard to those patents for the protection of the public. This is, however, only one feature of the good work of the Bureau of Mines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time on this section has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 17. That all deposits of oil or gas and the unentered lands containing the same and classified as oil or gas lands, or proven to contain such deposits, except, however, those embraced in any prospecting permit during the life of the same, those patented or for which application for patent by the permittee is pending under the provisions hereof, may be leased by the Secretary of the Interior through competitive bidding under general regulations in areas not exceeding 640 acres and in tracts which shall not exceed in length two and one-half times their width, such leases to be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of such royalty as may be fixed in the lease, which shall be not less than one-tenth in amount or value of the production, which royalty, on demand of the Secretary of the Interior, shall be paid in oil or gas, and the payment in advance of a rental of not less than $1 per acre per annum thereafter during the continuance of the lease, the rental paid for any one year to be credited against the royalties as they accrue for that year. Leases shall be for a period of 20 years, with the preferential right in the lessee to renew the same for successive periods of 10 years upon such reasonable terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, unless otherwise provided by law at the time of the expiration of such periods: *Provided further*, That upon relinquishment or surrender to the United States, within six months

from the date of this act, by any locator or his successors in interest of his or their claim to any unpatented oil or gas lands included in an order of withdrawal, upon which oil or gas had been discovered, was being produced, or upon which drilling operations were in actual progress January 1, 1914, and the claim to which land was initiated prior to July 3, 1910, the Secretary of the Interior may, within his discretion, lease, on such reasonable terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to such locator or his successors in interest the said lands so relinquished, not exceeding, however, the maximum area of 640 acres to any one person, association, or corporation, said leases to be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of a royalty of not less than one-eighth of the oil or gas extracted or produced from the leased premises or the proceeds thereof, each lease to be for a period of 20 years, with the preferential right in the lessee to renew the same for succeeding periods of 10 years, upon such reasonable terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

With the following committee amendment:

Amend, on page 14, in line 18, by striking out the figures "17" and inserting the figures "12."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the consideration of the proviso on page 15, line 16, running over onto page 16 and down to and including line 12, be postponed until the end of the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California objects.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] has just asked to pass over this proviso which relates to the California oil lands, and the gentleman from California [Mr. CHURCH] has objected. I do not know the reason for the request or the objection.

I wanted to make an inquiry concerning this provision. I believe this proviso is in the identical language that it passed the House last year. There has been a good deal of discussion on this subject. Legislation relating to it has been pending for a number of years. Different proposals have been made. Last year, when we inserted this provision in the bill, I thought it was entirely agreeable and satisfactory to these oil prospectors, or oil owners, or whatever they may be called, in California, Wyoming, and elsewhere. I may be mistaken in my recollection of it. I know I thought we were very liberal to them, more so than they were entitled to. My understanding is now that, having secured this much in prospect, without any possibility of taking this much away from them, they now want more, the old cry of "More, more!" Having secured a chance that they would have been glad to have received in the first instance, when it looks as though that was certain to go through, then they say they must have something else which will give them greater rights.

I want to say to the gentleman in charge of the bill that I think we have gone quite the full length in favor of these people, who have no legal rights, or if they have legal rights are unwilling to stand upon them—that we have gone quite as far as we ought to go, indeed a little further than we ought to go, in this provision in the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago I asked unanimous consent that this proviso go over. The committee are entitled to know why I asked that. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], as usual, has pretty well stated the historical phase of the proposition. This provision appeared last year in two forms. First it was in the so-called Church bill, proposing permanent relief for the California oil development. Then it was added as an amendment to this bill on the floor, and passed the House and went over to the Senate. It later passed the Senate in an enlarged form; later got into conference and died. The oil men think we are not doing half enough for them. The California Representatives here on the committee and in the House think we are not doing half enough for them by this provision. They have earnestly urged, here and elsewhere, that Congress do more than this does. On the other hand, the Navy Department and the Department of Justice have been taking a hand in this matter. The Department of Justice has been carrying on some suits out there. The Navy Department has made some so-called naval petroleum reserves there. They are now debating in their minds whether, in giving the permission granted in the bill, we are not doing too much. I had some conversation over the phone with both those departments this morning, and they were anxious that we let this provision go over to the end of the bill, feeling that they wanted to wire to some field men they have out there to see if even this was not doing too much for them. I told the Navy Department this morning that I would ask that this proviso go over to the end of the bill, and that would give them a little time to find out whether or not this proviso as it stands was satisfactory to them. I personally can see no objection to it going over to the end of the bill, but objection was made.

Mr. MANN. Which department was that?

Mr. FERRIS. The Navy Department.

Mr. MANN. Last year the Navy Department did not wake up until this bill was disposed of, and this year they have been asleep ever since. Have they just now awakened again?

Mr. FERRIS. Let me state what they have done. The Navy Department, anxious to conserve what they think they should, called on the President to make some withdrawals of land called naval reserves.

Mr. MANN. I know about that.

Mr. FERRIS. And they feel that after the President has issued that order these reserves ought to be passed over to their jurisdiction. Of course, the House knows that the disposition of land has always been in the Interior Department, and, in my own judgment, ought to continue there, and it would be impracticable to allow two departments to dispose of land. I tried to explain that to them this morning.

My own notion is that the proviso as it is in the bill is the thing that ought to be done. I have no doubt that it will ultimately be found entirely satisfactory to all of the departments, but just at present they seem to want a little more time. Of course, they will have a chance at it in the Senate, and also in conference, so if there is any change needed later it can be done. This amendment bears the recommendation of the Interior Department this year. It also was recommended last year as an independent bill. However, they still want to investigate further, and they hope that the House will allow them to do it without agreeing to this provision. In other words, what we are doing is not half of what the oil men claim they are entitled to, and the two departments are of the opinion that we are doing too much, and they want to investigate further. The committee, in inserting the provision, is entirely with the Interior Department, and thinks that at least this much relief ought to be had. The committee feels that it has done its duty in doing this. I believe that the Government ought to do this, and I have not so far seen my way clear to do any more. With that statement the House can take any action it sees fit.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Oklahoma knows that a year ago a separate bill on this subject was not considered in the House for some time, because at that time the Navy Department wanted a little more time to investigate and talk it over. Now, I am quite in sympathy with the Navy Department on this subject, but it does seem to me that if they have any rights, as they have, they have had plenty of time to think it over.

Mr. FERRIS. I am inclined to think perhaps that is true, but they have some additional views on the subject, and in addition to that—I want the House to know all about this—of course in 1909, when the first withdrawal order was made, a lot of people were mining for oil on some of these lands and made a big strike in oil and large capital was invested.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERRIS. The same controversy was up last year, and the Public Lands Committee was anxious to do full justice to the oil men, and we invited the three departments to meet and get together and see if they could not agree on what was just and best. At that time all three departments apparently agreed to this proposition and it passed the House by unanimous consent as an amendment to this bill when it was up before. It went to the Senate and passed the Senate even in a more liberal form to the oil men. My own opinion is that if you adopt this provision, thereby causing the oil men to relinquish their claim to a patent, clean up this whole mess, and require them to begin to pay a fixed and determined royalty to the Government we will have done a wise thing. I think this will finally be the conclusion of the three departments, as it is now the opinion of the Interior Department.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee as to the extent of the oil lands to which this provision applies, the number of acres withdrawn, and the number of acres on which the Government is now contesting the right of the prospectors?

Mr. FERRIS. I can give the gentleman a pretty good idea. The oil fields where the most of this controversy arose are in California and Wyoming. They have struck an oil field in California, called the San Joaquin, which is about 300 miles long and from 6 to 10 miles wide. I think there are 5,000,000 acres withdrawn altogether, but not all involved in this. I think there are about 17,000 acres involved in this rich strike. They are clamoring for patents, and this amendment requires them as a condition precedent to relinquish all claims to a patent, and then

they can come in and have a lease of 640 acres and pay one-eighth royalty on it.

Mr. STAFFORD. This does not include the lands in litigation which last June were held by Judge Bludsoe to have been appropriated unlawfully by the Southern Pacific Railroad, the estimated value of which was $250,000,000 or $300,000,000.

Mr. FERRIS. It gives the Secretary of the Interior the discretion to lease those lands to them when they are willing to relinquish their claims for patents.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not know whether those lands involved in that suit would come under this provision.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; I think so. It is for the purpose of cleaning up all this trouble out there.

Mr. STAFFORD. Those lands are said to be worth $250,000,000 or $300,000,000.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not know about the value of them, but one receiver has impounded $1,200,000 of oil on one tract and has over a million dollars on deposit. This litigation is holding California back, and it is a proposition that requires the very best attention of the House. The two gentlemen from California sitting near me know more than I do about it, and perhaps the gentleman from Wyoming does, although for three or four years I have had this under observation in one form and another as it has come before the committee. The committee thinks that if you can have the oil operators now clamoring for patents come in under a lease and begin to pay the Government one-eighth royalty, it will be the best thing that can be done under the circumstances. It will be the thing the Government could do with the land if the controversy had never arisen. It does not sacrifice any interest of the Government. It really protects its interests. There is, I think, some different views among the departments, but this does not sacrifice anything to any of them. We can also hear them in the Senate and in conference on it if they desire to be heard.

Of course it is true, as above said, that the Interior Department in reporting on this bill makes reference to this proviso under discussion. They recommend it. They are for it. I present herewith the part of their report on this proviso:

The proviso to the section is remedial in its nature, designed to meet existing conditions in the oil fields. There are at present many developed oil wells upon the public domain held by those whose claims are invalid under existing law, for the reason that no discoveries were made prior to the date of the withdrawal of the lands from entry or because the original locators were "dummies." These persons have no legal rights, but their large expenditures and the ensuing development present an equitable situation which this proviso is designed to relieve by giving them the right to secure a lease to the deposits so developed, upon payment of a royalty of not less than one-eighth of the oil or gas.

Last year this same provision passed the House. It also had the indorsement of the Interior Department. I quote here their report of last year on this same matter as an independent bill:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, April 17, 1914.

Hon. SCOTT FERRIS,
Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. FERRIS: I am in receipt of your request for report on H. R. 15661, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain unpatented public lands on which oil or gas has been discovered. The measure is peculiarly applicable to conditions existing in the oil fields in the State of California, but may apply to a lesser extent to similar claims in the State of Wyoming and other portions of the public domain.

On July 3, 1910, there were promulgated various orders of withdrawal made by the President, under the authority of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat., 847), withdrawing from location and entry areas of public land believed to contain valuable deposits of oil and gas, pending classification and the consideration by Congress of the advisability of enacting legislation better adapted to the production and disposition of these minerals than the present general mining laws.

Prior to the withdrawal and the act of Congress mentioned, many claims had been initiated or attempted to be initiated under the provisions of the general mining laws to lands within the areas subsequently withdrawn. With respect thereto Congress provided in section 2 of the act of June 25, 1910, supra—

"That the rights of any person who, at the date of any order of withdrawal heretofore or hereafter made, is a bona fide occupant or claimant of oil or gas bearing lands, and who at such date is in diligent prosecution of work leading to discovery of oil or gas, shall not be affected or impaired by such order so long as such occupant or claimant shall continue in diligent prosecution of said work: *And provided further*, That this act shall not be construed as a recognition, abridgment, or enlargement of any asserted rights or claims initiated upon any oil or gas bearing lands after any withdrawal of such lands made prior to the passage of this act."

The latter clause had reference to certain withdrawals theretofore made by the Secretary of the Interior.

In the case of H. H. Yard (38 L. D., 59) the department ruled that a placer location for 160 acres made by eight persons, and before discovery of minerals thereon transferred to a single individual or corporation, was invalid because not preceded by a discovery of mineral and could not, under the law, be perfected by the transferee upon a subsequent discovery. Many existing claims for deposits of oil and gas being for this reason invalid, Congress passed the remedial act of March 2, 1911 (36 Stat. 1015).

It now transpires that numerous locations upon lands containing oil and gas deposits were made by associations of individuals for and on behalf of corporations or other individuals and not in the interest of the locators, and covered a larger area than could have been embraced in single locations by their principals. Such locations have been held illegal by various decisions of the Department of the Interior and the courts. It appears, however, that many such locations have finally passed by transfer, lease, or contract into the hands of oil operators who in good faith and without actual notice of any defect in title have, at large expense, drilled and developed producing wells upon the tracts, and that the cancellation or denial of the claims under existing law will result in depriving these operators of their labor and expense. The condition is recognized and temporary relief proposed in H. R. 15469, recommended by this department and favorably reported by your committee, which bill proposes to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into temporary arrangements with the operators for the disposition of the oil or gas and the proceeds thereof pending final determination of title. However, as stated in my said report of April 10, 1914, H. R. 15469 will give temporary relief only and does not provide a method for disposition of the lands or the deposits after final adjudication of the cases if the claims of the applicants be finally denied. H. R. 15661 proposes to provide for this condition by authorizing the locators or their successors in interest in cases where oil or gas has been discovered, was being produced, or upon which drilling operations were in actual progress January 1, 1914, upon lands the claims to which was initiated prior to July 3, 1910, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, upon surrender to the United States by the claimant of his interest in the defective location to lease to him the lands so occupied, improved, and developed, not exceeding in any case 2,560 acres, upon payment by such lessee of a royalty of not exceeding one-eighth of the oil or gas extracted or produced. This measure will, in my opinion, not only afford relief to operators who, as stated, have in good faith made large expenditures in the development of oil or gas from such lands, but will operate to relieve the land department from a large amount of expense and work in investigating and adjudicating claims to such lands presented under the general mining laws.

It is in line with the general policy of the bill for the future leasing of oil, gas, and other minerals now before your committee and before the Senate, but because of its being designed to meet and cure an existing condition properly forms the subject of a separate and remedial measure.

I recommend the enactment of H. R. 15661.

Very truly, yours, FRANKLIN K. LANE.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask for 15 minutes to discuss this section and a number of the provisions.

Mr. FERRIS. Let us see if we can not get some agreement as to closing debate. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of 40 minutes all debate on the section and amendments thereto be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto be limited to 40 minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Fifteen minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Wyoming and 25 minutes by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Fifteen minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Wyoming and 25 minutes by the gentleman from Oklahoma. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of stirring up things here so that gentlemen will need to have considerable time in which to reply. In fact my remarks on this occasion will be with a view to reaching an understanding later with regard to some of these provisions. I first want to call the attention of the committee to certain provisions in this section which are identical with the provisions in the section relating to coal. I desire to have the attention of the chairman of the committee, because I think the committee ought to remedy this situation. You provide here for a lease under competitive bidding, but in lines 2 to 4, and down in line 10, you provide what the lessee shall pay, and make no reference to the bonus or additional royalty that might be paid under competitive bidding. You provide for competitive bidding, expecting a bonus or additional royalty, and later provide that the lesesee shall pay only the royalty fixed before the bidding and the price per acre assessed against the land. You would have some difficulty in collecting your bonuses, in my opinion, under that provision. Further, I want to call the attention of the committee to the period of the lease. You provide in the case of coal for an indeterminate lease. In this case you provide for a lease of 20 years and in the case of water power for a lease of 50 years. To one who did not understand the genesis of this legislation that might seem extraordinary, but the fellow who wrote the bills did not write them all at the same time, and he had different views at different times; and then, when they were all brought together, of course all these different views appeared in the bill. I am not charging any one occupying a seat on this floor with having done that.

The indeterminate lease is the best lease, in my opinion, for oil as well as coal, and I prepared an amendment to this section in harmony with the provision in the coal section, but I realize that the committee will not accept anything that may be offered, even though their judgment commend it, and therefore I shall not offer the amendment, knowing it would not be worth while to do so.

I want to talk a little while about this matter of relief. It is unfortunate in a way, very unfortunate, for the States that are interested in this legislation that there has been any question

before the committee with regard to relief for the oil men, for that question has overshadowed the entire legislation in all of its provisions. The hearings, page after page, hundreds of pages of them, have had to do in the main with the hearings of oil men who desire some remedial legislation. The men who have appeared before the committee seeking remedial legislation have been interrogated as to whether they approved the provisions of the bill. Of course they did. There was not anything so extreme or extraordinary that could be written in the bill that they did not approve, providing they got what they wanted. Everyone familiar with the situation knows that is true, and it is most unfortunate that it is true. Otherwise many of the provisions of the bill that I have discussed at length would have been more thoroughly discussed before the committee than they have been. We have not had the support in many matters that we would have had had it not been for the great questions involved relative to the relief of the oil men. I am not criticizing anyone in that connection. I simply regret that the situation was as it was.

Now, as to the relief provision of this bill. You are really doing very little for the California and Wyoming oil men in this legislation in your provision for relief beginning on line 17. If you did not have that provision in the bill at all, the oil men might fare better, because under the discretion lodged in the Secretary of the Interior he could lease 640 acres to these people, and you do not allow him to lease any more in your bill. They might be better off under his discretion if he leased to them, taking into consideration their equities, and it is to be assumed that he would do that. They might be better off without this legislation if they secured a lease, because in that case the minimum royalty would be one-tenth, whereas here you fix it as one-eighth. So that without any criticism of the committee in connection with this particular matter, let us not be embarrassed by any suggestion made from the outside that we are doing too much, because as a matter of fact we are doing very little, assuming, of course, that the Secretary, exercising his discretion, would lease to them under the minimum terms of the bill the maximum acreage provided for under the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. If it were not for this provision of the bill, would it not be open to competitive bidding, and is not the Secretary required, in other words, to have competitive bidding?

Mr. MONDELL. That is true, assuming these operations were to come under the sections of the bill providing for competitive bidding, but that brings to my mind another thing. Let us look at that in another way. These men were in the nature of prospectors when they started. They started into a new field. Some of them expended $75,000—and I am speaking now of the California cases—in discovering oil on a single tract. Under the provisions of your bill, which I mildly criticized a short time ago, were they to do that in the future you would give them a patent to from a quarter section to a section of their land. What they did a few years ago was to develop what was then a comparatively undeveloped field.

If they were to do it in the future, under the bill, they would receive title to a quarter of the land contained in their prospecting permit. As to whether or not the committee has done all that it should do in relief of these cases I think I can speak without bias, because this provision in the bill, if fairly interpreted, would, I think, except for the matter of acreage, save the situation for the oil men in my State—the few who are affected by it—but you must take into consideration the general situation, and particularly the California situation. There is a serious question of interpretation involved in the provision contained in line 24, "The claim to which land was initiated," and so forth.

In some cases the whole matter will hinge on the determination of the Interior Department as to what constitutes the initiation of a claim. I am assuming the department will want to be fair, but the department has made some rather far-reaching decisions in times past as to what constituted an initiation of a claim. The courts have gone far in their decisions as to what constitutes an initiation of a claim or right. There has been some confusion between the initiation of a claim and the establishment of a right. Now, if the department shall not attempt to hold that the initiation of a claim and the establishment of a right are the same thing, and liberally construe the words "initiation of a claim," then most of the cases which are governed by those words will come through in good shape. The department should be liberal in their construction as to what constitutes an initiation of a claim. I heard a gentleman connected with one of the departments the other day express himself to the effect that they would hardly consider as an initiation of a claim a mere paper claim, a mere setting of a stake. Well, I hope that would not be the view of the department under this legislation, as that is about what often constitutes an initiation of a claim on oil land. The oil locator goes on the land and places his stakes, large or small, carefully or casually, as the case may be, at each corner of his claim or thereabouts. He may sink a 10-foot hole or he may not. He goes to the county clerk of the county and records his claim, pays $2.50, and that is about all that he can do that is worth while until he begins actual drilling operations. It sometimes requires months for men to get into a position to actually drill. These lands, many of them, are far distant from a railroad; they are out in a new country; it is difficult to get capital; it takes time to get machinery, and it may be months, it may be a year or more, after the man has gone through this simple performance of staking and recording his claim, before he can begin drilling. And if the department should attempt to hold that he must have done something in the way of drilling to initiate a claim, that he must have done something more than the oil man ordinarily does, then few will be safe under that particular provision of the bill.

Now, very briefly, I want to state what I think the Congress may very properly do in this relief legislation. I think the committee might very properly say that where a man was on the ground before the Taft withdrawals and in good faith had made some motion toward establishing his claim, and subsequently went on and developed oil, that man ought to have a patent. If we give him a patent, we will not be doing any more than it is proposed to do under the provisions of the bill to the man who in the future under the same circumstances, the withdrawal excepted, does the same thing. Such a man was there before there was any withdrawal, but the withdrawal bill only saved him in case he was actually drilling at the time of the passage of the withdrawal bill, and there might have been some very good reasons why he could not be drilling at that time, and therefore he was not saved by the provisions of the withdrawal bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. LENROOT. Upon what authority does the gentleman make that statement—that there must be actual drilling at the time?

Mr. MONDELL. He must have made discovery or be actually in possession—I do not remember the exact language—but actually in possession and doing work looking to the discovery and development of oil.

Mr. LENROOT. But not necessarily actual drilling.

Mr. MONDELL. That is practically what it comes to in many cases. The gentleman knows that the man if not drilling must be preparing to drill, or, having drilled, must have continued development operations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. May I have just one minute more, in order to finish that sentence?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has control of the time.

Mr. RAKER. I yield two minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. I thank the gentleman from California. Now, the department is bound by the language of the withdrawal act, and there are many cases where men were not doing those things that clearly bring them within the withdrawal act, and yet who were acting in just as good faith as the man who was brought within the provisions of the withdrawal act. In such cases it seems to me there should be no question about the man being entitled to his patent. He would be entitled to his patent under the same conditions under your bill. Now, when he began, after the Taft withdrawal—and do not let us be carried away with the idea that those men generally went on there in an attitude of contemptuous defiance of the Taft withdrawal law—there were comparatively few people who believed the Taft withdrawal law had any force or effect—I do not believe it did—until the Supreme Court said otherwise. Where men went on after the Taft withdrawal and proceeded diligently to the discovery of oil and the development of the claim, they ought to have a lease without question and should not be limited to 640 acres, because in many such cases larger areas have been developed, are piped and pumped together, machinery has been installed, and everything arranged and going. It would not be in the public interest to compel such plants to divide up and operate as separate units, so long as the public gets oil at the same price. The public has no concern as to whether one man in such a case or one company has 640 acres or twice that amount. And so it seems to me in the one case patent should be issued without question, and in the other case an opportunity be given for a lease in such excess of the minimum fixed by the bill as may be necessary to provide for the development that

has taken place, and the royalty in such case should be fixed by Congress and at a reasonable rate.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. I have 10 minutes, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. Ten minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Just a word, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Wyoming. In the first place, this withdrawal order, which is the primary cause of all this condition, or the last paragraph of it, is in this language:

All locations and claims existing and valid on this date may proceed to entry in the usual manner after filing investigation and examination.

That, Mr. Chairman, meant, and has been so declared by the courts, that anyone upon these claims at the date of this withdrawal order, in compliance with the placer-mining laws, was not affected in any way by this withdrawal order, but could proceed to patent. And the Land Department has been allowing claims wherein they have complied with the placer-mining laws that were in existence at the date of the withdrawal of the order.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman further than to make this suggestion. The gentleman knows that the department has gone far in determining what constituted a compliance with the placer laws. In some cases the people who were in good faith are held not to be in compliance with them.

Mr. LENROOT. The Land Department in that respect has followed the ruling of the Supreme Court of California, and has taken as its guide the rule laid down by that court. And the United States district court for the southern district of California has adopted the same rule applied by the Land Department and the Supreme Court of California.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves seven minutes.

Mr. NORTON. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Now, under these terms of the proposed law one can secure a permit for two years to 2,560 acres, where there are no producing oil wells within 10 miles of the tract. What rights would the lessee have to the surface of the land? Would he have the right to graze that land and keep all other parties off of it? There does not seem to be any provision made for that.

Mr. RAKER. He has the control of the entire amount of the lease.

Mr. NORTON. Of the 2,560 acres?

Mr. RAKER. It is up to the Secretary of the Interior to so regulate it. He will be protected.

Mr. NORTON. It occurs to me that considerable abuse might arise as the bill is now framed.

Mr. RAKER. It is provided that he get full protection. If there is any land that he does not need for drilling and it is agricultural land, he is fully protected.

Mr. NORTON. Do you hold that entries for agricultural purposes might be made for the surface of the land during the time of the lease?

Mr. RAKER. I think so.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, if you will pardon me, there is some section here that provides that at the time of making the laws there can be some provision of that kind made.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HOUSTON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 7611. An act authorizing the Seaboard Air Line Railway Co., a corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto across what is known as "Back River," a part of the Savannah River, at a point between Jasper County, S. C., and Chatham County, Ga.

The message also announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On January 14 1916:

H. R. 136. An act granting an extension of time to construct a bridge across Rock River at or near Colona Ferry, in the State of Illinois; and

H. R. 4717. An act to authorize Butler County, Mo., to construct a bridge across Black River.

COAL AND OIL LEASES.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 18. That rights of way through the public lands of the United States are hereby granted for pipe-line purposes for the transportation of oil or natural gas to any applicant possessing the qualifications provided in section 1 of this act to the extent of the ground occupied by the said pipe line and 10 feet on each side of the same under such regulations as to survey, location, application, and use as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, and upon the express condition that such pipe lines shall be constructed, operated, and maintained as common carriers: *Provided*, That no right of way shall hereafter be granted over the public lands for the transportation of oil or natural gas except under and subject to the provisions, limitations, and conditions of this section. That failure to comply with the provisions of this section or the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior shall be ground for forfeiture of the grant by a court of competent jurisdiction in an appropriate proceeding.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

On page 16, in line 13, strike out the figures "18" and insert "13" in lieu thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 17, in line 4, strike out the words:
"A court of competent jurisdiction."
And insert:
"The United States court for the district in which the property, or some part thereof, is located."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment by adding after the words "United States," in line 5, the word "district."

Mr. RAKER. That ought to be.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by inserting, after the words "United States," in line 5, the word "district."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the Clerk overlooked one amendment, in line 18.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was going to call attention to that. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 18, strike out the word "ten" and insert the word "twenty-five."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. When this section was under discussion in the last Congress I called attention to the fact that there was only one law on the statute books relating to the public land providing for oil pipe lines. That is a law passed from 15 to 16 years ago, if I recollect rightly, applying only to Colorado and Wyoming. It is a rather liberal, but not too liberal, a law. Under its provisions a wider area is allowed for the right of way than under this section, and opportunity is given for taking from the adjacent public land the material that may be required for the construction. It is a most excellent bill, and last year I attempted to amend this provision by saving from repeal that Wyoming and Colorado pipe-line law under which we have built some very good pipe lines in Wyoming. I think some have been built in Colorado. The provisions of this section are very illiberal. They are not sufficient to give fair opportunity for the building of large pipe lines such as are essential to a large oil business. I wish it were possible to amend it by at least saving the Colorado and Wyoming pipe-line law. That is evidently impossible from the present attitude of the committee, and I realize that no amendment would be favorably received liberalizing this section, therefore I offer none.

Mr. RAKER. On that last statement, the gentleman does not mean that, because the committee were very anxious when they considered this very matter to make it so wide there would be no question that the people would have opportunity to have enough land to build their pipe lines upon. Fifty feet would not have been objected to if they had thought it was necessary. Does not the gentleman believe that material—stone and dirt—can be procured from the adjoining land under the provisions of this section, as provided for in lines 19 and 20 and 21, under the rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary?

Mr. MONDELL. Of course, if you have a good-natured Secretary, and he feels that he has the authority to give away Uncle Sam's property without express provision of law, then that might be done; but there is nothing in this law warranting the Secretary of the Interior in allowing any material to be taken even on a strip 50 feet wide, much less from the adjacent land.

I do not understand how any considerable pipe line can be built under this provision. I said that a year ago, but I have gotten sort of tired calling attention to these things, which seem

to me to be so clear. Think of a provision of this kind from a committee upon which is a gentleman from a State producing more oil and needing more pipe lines than any other State in the Union! I am amazed that the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] should allow a provision of this kind to appear in the bill without at least an earnest protest, because I do not believe that under the provisions of this section you can build the oil pipe lines necessary to carry the oil in California or Wyoming. It is an awful handicap, and I know of no reason why there should be such a handicap. I know of no public interest to be served by such a handicap. Fifty feet is the maximum; no right to take any material for the pipe lines. Why, certainly it is not a satisfactory provision.

Mr. RAKER. I think that the argument that the gentleman is making is not well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 17, by inserting from line 7 to line 14, inclusive, the following:

"PHOSPHATES.

"SEC. 14. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to lease to any qualified applicant under this act any deposits of phosphates or phosphate rock belonging to the United States, under such regulations and upon such terms as are herein specified, through advertisement, competitive bidding, or such other methods as the Secretary of the Interior may by general regulations adopt."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk is not through reading the amendment. The amendment embraces two or three sections.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry is in order. What I wished to ascertain was whether this was to be treated as one amendment or considered by sections.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I think we had better read it section by section.

Mr. MANN. That is always done.

Mr. FERRIS. That will give everyone an opportunity.

Mr. MANN. It is in order to ask unanimous consent to consider it section by section.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment, being so long and it being an entire substitution for the phosphate material, be read section by section and so considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the amendment be read and considered section by section. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word, and is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Just for the purpose of making a facetious remark. This section says, "The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to lease to any qualified applicant under this act." Section 2 of the bill did read "any applicant qualified under this act," and the committee carefully changed it to read "any qualified applicant," and left out the words "under this act." They did it in line 12 and again at the bottom of the page in line 22, and they insert it again on page 3, and all through the bill elsewhere they were very careful to strike out the words, "under this act" on the ground that it was superfluous language, as it is; and, having taken the trouble by amendment to strike out "under this act" where it was superfluous language, why do they take the trouble, while writing a new amendment, to insert it?

Mr. FERRIS. It is undoubtedly an error of omission. We will gladly take it out now, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Of course I know how it occurs. It is not the fault of the committee.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois, I move that on page 17, line 9, the three words "under this act" be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the committee amendment by striking out the words "under this act," in line 9.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 17, insert committee amendment beginning with line 15 and ending with line 23, as follows:

"SEC. 15. That each lease shall be for not to exceed 2,560 acres of land, to be described by the legal subdivisions of the public-land surveys, or, if unsurveyed, to be surveyed at the expense of the lessee in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations governing the survey of placer mining claims: *Provided*, That the land embraced in any one lease shall be in compact form, the length of which shall not exceed two and one-half times its width."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to an oversight. It is very evident that the astute bureau chiefs were not wide-awake to their opportunities when this phosphate bill was drawn in the bureau; otherwise there would have been the same provision here that we find in the coal bill, providing that they shall divide the land into leasing blocks and lease those blocks. Of course, it is true that the opportunity presented in leasing phosphate is not so great as in leasing coal, because there are 50,000,000 acres of withdrawn coal land and 19,000,000 acres of classified coal land and less than 5,000,000 acres, so far, of classified phosphate land; but there would be quite a lot for the department to do in dividing up into leasing blocks even 5,000,000 acres of phosphate land. They have overlooked that opportunity. [Laughter.]

Now, seriously, this is the sort of a provision that we should have had under the coal section, under which land could be leased, leaving it to the individual to go out and prospect this land and find where the mineral is and determine what land he can economically mine, and then apply for a lease.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman refers to the provision in section 3, line 15, and other places where it speaks about marking the land or dividing it into blocks or tracts of 40 acres each. The idea was taken up by the committee, and I suggested that the word "blocks" ought to be taken out, leaving it "tracts," 40-acre tracts being well known by the survey. The suggestion was made, and after I heard it I thought it was wise. The coal lies in peculiar shape, the territory being very heavy and deep in places, and the Secretary might desire to reduce the size of tracts from 40 acres each and let them be in various blocks, not calling them 40-acre tracts. It would do no harm, and in other words would be practically carrying out the real intention of the provision of the survey of the public land which is provided for in this bill.

Mr. MANN. I will ask both gentlemen what is the distinction between a block of 40 acres and a tract of 40 acres?

Mr. MONDELL. I pass that up to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

Mr. RAKER. If I may answer the gentleman, I will say that there is none. They are both intended to mean the same thing. The only difference is that in the public domain we know what a 40-acre tract is. When put in the form of a block in this case it would be a 40-acre tract just the same.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] entirely missed the purpose of the provisions in the coal-leasing section to which I have referred. Here are leasing provisions that contain no reference to the dividing up of the lands into leasing blocks. There is no necessity for anything of that sort. It is not necessary for the Government to send out a great force of men to prospect and develop, and spend a large amount of money for the purpose of deciding how big a tract should be included here and how small a tract there in a mining lease. Not in one case out of a hundred would they ever get it in a way that would be satisfactory to anyone who wanted to lease. This provision is in proper form. It provides for the leasing of the lands, and leaves it to the lessee to go out upon the public domain where these lands are situated, do his prospecting, find how and where the veins lie, the places where they can be successfully attacked, locate the place for storage tracks, survey out his land in compact form, and then ask for a lease. Of course, the Secretary still has the discretion to cut down the area and to change its form, to make it compact, but the prospector takes the initiative. He does the work, he spends the money, and of course he finally comes to a conclusion that is really satisfactory to himself.

But in the coal sections you are proposing to send wandering bands of prospectors, educated down here in the mines of Washington, I suppose, out to my State to prospect and develop, and determine just where coming lessees may want to locate a coal mine or where they ought to locate it. Well, after some of these fine-haired young men have had the experience I had as a youth in trying to find coal veins where they were hidden, and in trying to find where they could be successfully opened and mined, they may not be so happy over that provision. We may get our revenge in that way.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman is not objecting to this section because it makes the proper disposition to get a survey?

Mr. MONDELL. No; I am calling the attention of the committee to the fact that when the man wrote this section

he was in his right mind, but he was overlooking the opportunity of the bureau. When he wrote the other section, he was thinking about what the bureau might want to do in the matter of wandering back and forth over the public domain at public expense, trying to do something that the lessee alone is competent to do and prefers to do or pay for doing, rather than have the Government attempt to do it for him in an unsatisfactory way.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. A little while ago my colleague [Mr. MANN] made some statement in reference to the Bureau of Mines. My colleague [Mr. MANN] seems to find some fault with the Bureau of Mines. I do not know why, but I judge for reasons satisfactory to himself. Now, the question came up as to what pay, if any, Dr. Rittman received from this discovery of the extraction of gasoline and benzol and totuol from crude oil. I want to say that Dr. Rittman does not receive one cent nor does the Government receive one cent from it.

Mr. MANN. There was no suggestion made that he did. Nobody dreamt that he did.

Mr. FOSTER. The matter was talked of, and it might be in doubt as to whether that was the case or not. That is the reason I mentioned it. I did not say my colleague said Dr. Rittman had received anything, but in the colloquy between the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and my distinguished colleague [Mr. MANN] it might be left as a possible inference that there was some doubt whether Dr. Rittman did not get something out of this patent or that it went to the Government. As I say, there is absolutely nothing in that, because Dr. Rittman in patenting this process did so in the interest of the Government. But the Government has already given to half a dozen firms the right to manufacture under this process, with the understanding that whatever improvements may be made in this process the Government shall have the right to give them to any other firm and that the rights shall be free. Now, that is all there is about that. I might say that the Government patented it so that it might give to any responsible firm that desires it, if it is really going into the manufacturing business, a chance to use it.

Mr. MANN. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. Can any responsible firm use it unless the Director of the Bureau of Mines permits them?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. MANN. Does my colleague think that is right?

Mr. FOSTER. There has never been a refusal on the part of the Government to permit them to do that.

Mr. MANN. I do not know about that. I presume my colleague may not know.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, I do not know all that goes on in the Bureau of Mines, and I do not pretend to speak in that way; but I do believe it when they tell me they have never refused the use of this formula to any firm that came to them and said that they wanted to engage in the extraction of gasoline or these other products.

Mr. MANN. The truth is that they have given permits to less than half a dozen concerns.

Mr. FOSTER. About a half dozen.

Mr. MANN. Under an agreement that is longer than your arm, which every concern has hesitated to enter into; and notwithstanding this wonderful improvement which is going to reduce the cost of gasoline, there has been up to date practically no gasoline made under it.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be true up to this time.

Mr. MANN. I do not say that it is not a good thing, but I think it would look better, and at least be more modest, if the Bureau of Mines would tell about something which it had really accomplished instead of always thundering in the index and telling about something that it has accomplished when, as a matter of fact, it has not yet begun.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken about that. The process I have no doubt will be a success.

Mr. MANN. I am not mistaken, because I read their report, and I can point out many places in their report this year where that is all that there is to it.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman has often criticized the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. MANN. Let me assure my colleague that I have missed a thousand opportunities to criticize the bureau when it ought to have been criticized. [Laughter.] And I have taken many opportunities of complimenting the bureau when it did something.

Mr. FOSTER. I think in criticizing it in this case the distinguished gentleman from Illinois is mistaken.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has just got his information from the Bureau of Mines now.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; because I was not sure as to some details. I thought I was right, but wanted to be sure.

Mr. MANN. There are not many people who can hypnotize my colleague from Illinois. He is usually very cool, but the Director of the Bureau of Mines has hypnotized him, and he is really not responsible for what he says on the subject here. [Laughter.]

Mr. FOSTER. Let me say this: The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], always alert, I might say is usually right, but sometimes mistaken, and in this case I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is this for mutual admiration?

Mr. FOSTER. No, it is not; but I am his friend.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. I can say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON] that there is a mutual admiration society between my colleague and myself. There is on my side, anyway.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I can say that I have a great admiration for my colleague from Illinois, and I did not rise to criticize him. I do believe that he was a little severe in his criticism of the Bureau of Mines. Let me say this also to the committee, that the Bureau of Mines has adopted a course which has not always been adopted by all other departments of the Government, and that is that no discovery is ever made, so far as the Bureau of Mines is concerned, where the employee is permitted to take out a patent for it in his own interest. It has always been given to the Government, given to anyone who wants to use it. The employees, too, are always loyal to the bureau in all its work in this regard. That can not be always said of every other department of the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. In a moment. An employee of the Bureau of Mines, I think, patented a safety device, a breathing apparatus, with which one could go into mines where he could not go without using such an apparatus. His device reduced the weight of the apparatus one-half. These machines had all been formerly imported from foreign countries. That is another illustration of what the bureau is doing. They do not permit an employee to take out a patent, and he reaps no benefit himself. That is done in all those cases.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman explain to the committee how this bureau places that restriction upon the individual right of an employee from taking out a patent for his own invention?

Mr. FOSTER. If they make that rule, the employee lives up to it. If he does not, they would expect him to get out of the service.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not know whether it was a condition of employment or not. Of course an employee has a right to patent his own invention, and, of course, if he would not observe the rule he could take out the patent and leave the service.

Mr. MANN. There is quite a question as to whether he has a right to take it out if he does it at Government expense.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Supreme Court has held that he has the right.

Mr. FOSTER. Dr. Rittman immediately when he made this discovery, I understand, was offered a large salary to go with a private concern with this discovery, but being loyal to the Government he preferred to stay with the bureau, and he remained there. He gave his valuable discovery to the people of the United States for their use without charge and without the Government reaping any benefit from it.

Now, I say this in justice to the Bureau of Mines because I believe it is fair that I should say it. The Bureau of Mines is doing good work. I think it is doing splendid work in all its undertakings. As to oil and gas, what they have been able to do in Oklahoma has been worth thousands of dollars. And so it has been in many States.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. I will.

Mr. FERRIS. I want to supplement the gentleman's statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I repeat that I want to supplement what the gentleman from Illinois has said. I have not consumed a great amount of time in the defense of anybody or eulogizing anybody, and do not intend to. I want to supplement what the gentleman has said by saying something about what the Bureau of Mines has done in our State. I visited a month ago, just before Congress convened, the largest oil field in the country, where the oil sand is 300 feet deep. It is a big boom oil town and a large field. They told me that they had relied largely on the geological survey of the Bureau of Mines and getting great benefit constantly from that source. I thought that was a practical example of one instance where one bureau of the Government was doing some good. I got this information from the oil men and the drillers, and they said it was passing strange and remarkable how often they hit it. I had the idea, as a good many Members have, that a good many of these investigations and bulletins were paper propaganda without much substance, but, as a matter of fact, their prophecies and field notes and notations were as a rule on where to go and where to bore for oil had been wonderfully correct.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, anyone acquainted with an oil field must know something about the great waste that takes place in the way of oil and gas. The gas is usually turned loose and permitted to burn day and night. I know it has been so in the country I came from, and if a discovery can be made whereby that gas can be preserved for the use of the people in the way of fuel, it is of great benefit to save it. I think the Bureau of Mines went into the oil fields of Oklahoma and demonstrated how they could wall off the gas, leave it in the ground until such time as they should need it for fuel and lighting purposes. I think that is worth a great deal to the people of that southwestern country.

These are a few of the things the Bureau of Mines has accomplished.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman knows that the methods of casing off gas has been in use a great many years. I presume the system adopted by the Bureau of Mines is an improved system, but still we have been casing off gas from oil wells for many years.

Mr. FOSTER. You have done that with a casing that you put down the oil well. That is not what I mean; I mean walling off the gas by cement and mud.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, that was done years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. That method has been worth a great deal to the people of the southwestern country in showing them how it can be done.

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. Owing to the war potash has been barred from export from Germany. I understood that the Bureau of Mines was seeking to develop a potash field in California, and I think they said that there was a small plant. Has the gentleman any opinion or information about the success of that experiment?

Mr. FOSTER. I can not give the gentleman any information in regard to that.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I can give some information in regard to the experiment, although it was not conducted by the Bureau of Mines. One of these days I may say something about the Bureau of Mines, because I have been collecting some interesting information concerning that bureau and its activities. I will simply let my colleague know, because it is his duty as chairman of the Committee on Mines to defend whatever they do, whether it be bad or indifferent. I know he would not like to defend anything bad or indifferent.

Mr. FOSTER. No; I could not do that.

Mr. MANN. I am not so sure of that; the gentleman could do it and could do it well, because he has just demonstrated that. [Laughter.]

When I came to Washington this fall I read in one of the daily newspapers a statement coming from one of the experts, I think in the Department of Commerce, telling how the Government by its investigations had found a way of making potash commercially of kelp on the Pacific coast. Just what the Department of Commerce or its expert had to do with that I do not know, although they had rushed in where angels fear to tread and told how it was being done. The experiment had been conducted by the Department of Agriculture, so it was neither in the Interior Department nor in the Department of Commerce; but the expert said, "Now we are free from Germany; now we are able to produce potash on a commercial scale out on the Pacific coast, and we are doing it."

While out there last spring I visited the commercial plant at San Diego—about as big as a dog house, not much larger—and it never had been operated and has not been yet. But this expert told us how we had become commercially independent, and that is like a good deal of the stuff we are fed on at times. And let me say it is not because it is a Democratic administration, because it was just the same when it was a Republican administration. [Laughter and applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting committee amendment, beginning page 17, line 24, and ending page 18, line 25, as follows:

"SEC. 16. That for the privilege of mining or extracting the phosphates or phosphate rock covered by the lease the lessee shall pay to the United States such royalties as may be specified in the lease, which shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior in advance of offering the same, which shall be not less than 2 per cent of the gross value of the output of phosphates or phosphate rock at the mine, due and payable at the end of each month succeeding that of the extraction of the phosphates or phosphate rock from the mine, and an annual rental payable at the date of such lease and annually thereafter on the area covered by such lease at such rate as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior prior to offering the lease, which shall be not less than 25 cents per acre for the first year thereafter, 50 cents per acre for the second, third, fourth, and fifth years, respectively, and $1 per acre for each and every year thereafter during the continuance of the lease, except that such rental for any year shall be credited against the royalties as they accrue for that year. Leases shall be for indeterminate periods upon condition of a minimum annual production, except when operation shall be interrupted by strikes, the elements, or casualties not attributable to the lessee, and upon the further condition that at the end of each 20-year period succeeding the date of the lease such readjustment of terms and conditions may be made as the Secretary of the Interior shall determine unless otherwise provided by law at the time of the expiration of such periods."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting committee amendment, beginning page 19, line 1, and ending page 19, line 8, as follows:

"SEC. 17. That any qualified applicant to whom the Secretary of the Interior may grant a lease to develop and extract phosphates, or phosphate rock, under the provisions of this act shall have the right to use so much of the surface of unappropriated and unentered lands, not exceeding 40 acres, as may be determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be necessary for the proper prospecting for or development, extraction, treatment, and removal of such mineral deposits."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

POTASSIUM OR SODIUM.

SEC. 19. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to grant to any applicant qualified under this act a prospecting permit which shall give the exclusive right to prospect for chlorides, sulphates, carbonates, borates or nitrates of potassium or sodium, or associated similar salts on public lands belonging to the United States for a period of not exceeding two years: *Provided*, That the area to be included in such permit shall not exceed 2,560 acres of land in reasonably compact form.

The committee amendments were read, as follows:

In line 11, page 19, amend by striking out the figures "19" and inserting the figures "18."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Amend, in line 12, by striking out the words "and directed."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Amend, in line 13, by inserting, after the word "any," the word "qaulified."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Amend, in line 14, by striking out the words "qualified under this act."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Amend, in line 17, by striking out the word "public."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, just what is the object in striking out the word "public" here?

Mr. FERRIS. Well, there was some question whether public land took in reserved land. The gentleman from Illinois knows that in one form or other there have been a lot of reserves—bird, and different kinds of reserves, by Executive order under the Pickett Act, and we made inquiry to know if public land meant land which was subject to entry or not. Did it mean all lands belonging to the Government? And there seemed to be some question, and some of the committee and some of the department were of the opinion that if we said public lands it would only refer to the 330,000,000 acres of land not yet subject to entry, and we want to include a lot of these bird reserves and forest reserves and other reserves.

Mr. MANN. Does it include a post-office building?

Mr. FERRIS. No; we have some exceptions back here.

Mr. MANN. Where are those?

Mr. FERRIS. Back in the first section.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, I know——

Mr. FERRIS. We omit national parks, naval reservations—and I will say to the gentleman that there is not a section here that directs the Secretary to make leases.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman is involving it. If you strike out "on public lands belonging to the United States" entirely, then you leave it as it is provided for in section 1, where you provide what lands may be investigated; but you change that in this section by saying on "lands belonging to the United States"; and you provide in section 1 "that deposits of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium," which includes what is in here, shall be subject to disposal in the manner provided in the act, and then you make certain exceptions. Now you change it entirely in this section.

Mr. FERRIS. Does not the gentleman think, even granting what he says is a fact, that under lines 11, 12, and 13, which authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue regulations and to promulgate them, we would hardly expect or assume the Secretary would make a lease of that sort?

Mr. MANN. Well, I do not know. The Secretary is to make rules and regulations. We supposedly give the right to go wherever we let them go.

Mr. FERRIS. But there is nothing here that is mandatory on the part of the Secretary, that he is to lease it.

Mr. MANN. Practically it is mandatory because it is not a matter of favoritism, and can not be a matter of favoritism.

I do not see why the gentleman would not be perfectly safe in striking out the language, "on public lands belonging to the United States."

Mr. FERRIS. Then what shape would we be in?

Mr. MANN. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized then to grant prospecting permits giving the exclusive right to prospect for chlorides, sulphates, carbonates, borates, or nitrates of potassium or sodium, or associated similar salts; and he is given that right under the terms of this bill. I do not think we ought to give a right to somebody to demand of the Secretary of the Interior a permit to go and occupy a piece of land that the Government itself wants to occupy at the time.

Mr. FERRIS. Neither do I.

Mr. MANN. It is not necessary to use that language to cover everything you want in the bill.

Mr. FERRIS. Then let it go out.

Mr. MANN. I think it ought to go out.

Mr. FERRIS. What we have tried to do—I will say we got hung up on the proposition of public lands, that public lands only mean unentered lands——

Mr. MANN. I understand.

Mr. FERRIS. The committee struck it out because, of course, if there is any sodium or phosphates or potassium on these bird or other reserves we want to get it. All of these reserves should be included and we did this in an abundance of safety.

Mr. MANN. If we have those anywhere, we want to get it at any place. That is true, as a matter of fact.

Mr. FERRIS. There was a little controversy as to what "public lands" meant. I hope the gentleman's amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will state his amendment to the Clerk.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in lines 17 and 18, the words "on public lands belonging to the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 19, by striking out, in lines 17 and 18, the words "on public lands belonging to the United States."

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, a request for information. Now may I have the matter read as it would appear as amended?

Mr. MANN. Read the section as it would be as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the section as it would read as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to grant to any qualified applicant a prospecting permit which shall give the exclusive right to prospect for chlorides, sulphates, carbonates, borates, or nitrates of potassium or sodium, or associated similar salts, for a period of not exceeding two years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries.

COAL AND OIL LEASES.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 20. That upon showing to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that valuable deposits of one of the substances enumerated in section 18 hereof have been discovered by the permittee within the area covered by his permit, the permittee shall be entitled to a patent for 640 acres of the land embraced in the prospecting permit, to be taken and described by legal subdivisions of the public-land surveys, or, if the land be not surveyed, by survey executed at the cost of the permittee in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. All other lands described and embraced in such a prospecting permit, from and after the exercise of the right to patent accorded to the discoverer, and all other lands known to contain such valuable deposits as are enumerated in section 18 hereof and not covered by permits or leases, may be leased by the Secretary of the Interior, through advertisement, competitive bidding, or such other methods as he may by general regulations adopt and in such areas as he shall fix, not exceeding 2,560 acres, all leases to be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of such royalty as may be specified in the lease and which shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior in advance of offering the same and which shall not be less than 2 per cent on the gross value of the output at the point of shipment, and the payment in advance of a rental, which shall not be less than 25 cents per acre for the first year thereafter, not less than 50 cents per acre for the second, third, fourth, and fifth years, respectively, and not less than $1 per acre for each and every year thereafter during the continuance of the lease, except that such rental for any year shall be credited against the royalties as they accrue for that year. Leases shall be for indeterminate periods upon condition that at the end of each 20-year period succeeding the date of any lease such readjustment of terms and conditions may be made as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, unless otherwise provided by law at the time of the expiration of such periods.

Also, the following committee amendment was read:

Page 19, line 22, strike out the figures "20" and insert "19."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 21. That in addition to areas of mineral land to be included in prospecting permits or leases the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, may grant to a permittee or lessee under this act the exclusive right to use, during the life of the permit or lease, a tract of unoccupied nonmineral public land, not exceeding 20 acres in area, for camp sites, refining works, and other purposes connected with and necessary to the proper development and use of the deposits covered by the permit or lease.

Also, the following committee amendment was read:

Line 10, strike out the figures "21" and insert "20."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Also, the following committee amendment was read:

Line 13, strike out the word "exclusive."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Also, the following committee amendment was read:

Lines 14 and 15, strike out the words "nonmineral public."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the committee amended section 18 on the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. In order to make the bill harmonious, it seems to me, there should be a change here.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. This section relates to land other than is necessarily covered by section 1. It may be nonmineral.

Mr. MONDELL. That is true; but it seems to me that in using your language, "belonging to the United States," in this case there is even greater danger than there would be in other cases.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Wyoming will permit, we are not to that amendment yet. It will be the next amendment reported. We are on the one just preceding that.

Mr. MONDELL. We are on the amendment including the words "nonmineral public."

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The "nonmineral public" there is involved in the question I have raised. There is a little difference; but if there was reason for that change in the other section, there is more reason here, because no one would apply for a lease on lands for the purpose of extracting these minerals unless they contained the minerals, or they believed they did, whereas one might apply for any sort of land for this purpose. The gentle-

man from Illinois [Mr. MANN] suggested a post-office site. A post-office site might be the very tract one might desire.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield; yes.

Mr. NORTON. The provision in paragraph 1 provides for the distribution of lands containing deposits of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium. Now, this paragraph provides for the disposition of 20 acres of land to the permittee or lessee which does not contain mineral.

Mr. MONDELL. Not necessarily contain mineral. All the more reason, it seems to me, why, if there is any danger, as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, you should not include the all-embracing term "belonging to the United States." This would seem to be a case where the term to use is "public lands."

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will notice, however, that a lease is made in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior and is for unoccupied land.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, all the leases are in the discretion of the Secretary.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I do not think so.

Mr. MONDELL. Absolutely.

Mr. MANN. Well, I do not think so.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman can not find a place in that bill where there is any right to lease except as the Secretary may grant it.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, that is true; but where we use the term that a department head may do a certain thing in his discretion, that means in his discretion. Where we authorize him to do it, that means he is required to do it when the conditions are presented.

Mr. MONDELL. I am not so sure as to that.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee concerning a matter that occurs to me in connection with this paragraph.

This paragraph provides for the leasing of a tract of unoccupied land, leasing the surface right, for use by the permittee or the lessee. Now, is there anything in this bill which would prevent anyone from going on the land covered by a permit and using the surface right for grazing purposes or agricultural purposes, or is there anything in this bill which would prevent one desiring to secure title to the surface rights of lands included under the lease from going on and securing the surface right for agricultural purposes?

Mr. FERRIS. I am not just sure that this section has that in contemplation. This is a section authorizing the leasing of some additional areas for camp sites. This is what the department says in justification of it:

> There will be numerous instances, particularly in the case of phosphates, potassium, and sodium deposits where the land actually occupied by the minerals will be so rough and mountainous or swampy that it will not supply a proper site for the reduction or refining works or for camp ground for the miners, and it was, therefore, deemed necessary that the Secretary should have the discretion to grant the lessees a tract of vacant nonmineral land suitable for those purposes. This is in line with the general mining law which, in addition to allowing a patent for the lands actually containing mineral, permits the miner to obtain a mill site for not exceeding one-fourth the area of a lode claim upon which to put reduction works or other structures used in connection with his mining or milling operations.

Now, these minerals—potassium and sodium—are found in the desert. There are lakes of them—as a rule, sunken lands—where salt and sodium and potassium are found, and the department says the ground is sometimes so marshy and wet that it is not suitable for the erection of camp houses and is not suitable for camp sites.

Now, that may not quite answer what the gentleman asked, but I think it applies partially to it.

Mr. NORTON. This paragraph provides for the leasing of areas of coal or gas as well as potassium. This has a general application, has it?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. Now, here is a question which I would like to have the gentleman reply to. Make it a hypothetical case: In case I should seek a permit for prospecting for oil on 2,560 acres I would secure that permit for two years, or a permit is granted to me for two years to prospect for gas; could I use that 2,560 acres during that two years for grazing purposes or agricultural purposes? Could I keep everyone else off who might desire to secure a surface right for agricultural or grazing purposes?

Mr. FERRIS. Of course, if you leased both the surface of the land and the deposits you could, but if you will turn back to the paragraph you will see that the leasing of deposits is provided for in one place, and elsewhere we provide for the leasing of the surface.

Mr. NORTON. You say you do provide for that in the bill?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. On page 23, if the gentleman will allow me, old section 25, new section 24, it is all taken care of, I think.

The Chairman. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 15, after the word "land." insert the words "belonging to the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 22. That the Secretary of the Interior shall reserve the authority and shall insert in any preliminary permit issued under section 18 hereof appropriate provisions for its cancellation by him upon failure by the permittee or licensee to exercise due diligence in the prosecution of the prospecting work in accordance with the terms and conditions stated in the permit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, lines 20 and 21, insert the words "GENERAL PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO COAL, PHOSPHATE, OIL, GAS, POTASSIUM, OR SODIUM LEASES."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 22, strike out the figures "22" and insert the figures "21."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 23, insert after the word "reserve" the words "and may exercise."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 24, strike out the word "preliminary" and insert the word "prospecting."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lines 24 and 25, strike out the words "section 18 hereof" and insert the words "the provisions of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment by the insertion of a new section.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman wait until I offer an amendment?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I certainly will.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] if that is an amendment in lieu of the committee amendment now pending?

Mr. LENROOT. It is to strike out a portion of the bill, including an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 23, after the word "authority," strike out "and shall insert in any prospecting" and insert in lieu thereof "to cancel any prospecting permit and shall insert in every such."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, the only purpose of this amendment is to make the language grammatical, which it is not now. It accomplishes identically the same purpose that was intended by the language heretofore used.

Mr. FERRIS. I have no objection to that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, in order to harmonize with the amendment, I move that, after the word "him," in line 1, page 22, a comma be inserted, so that the condition will relate back to the authority.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 1, after the word "him," insert a comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PARKER of New Jersey:

"After section 21, on page 22, at line 4, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 22. That every lease or patent of coal, oil and gas, phosphates, potassium, or sodium provided for in this act shall be on the condition and shall provide that the business shall be so carried on that all profits on the original cost of the plant in excess of cumulative annual profits at a rate or per cent of such cost to be fixed in such lease or patent and not to exceed an annual cumulative profit of 25 per cent of such cost shall be annually distributed by the holder of such lease or patent among the persons who purchase from him according to the amount paid him by such purchasers in the year; and to this end every such lease and patent shall be on condition and every such lease or patent shall provide that detailed accounts shall be kept of construction and operation in such form as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior and annual statements thereof filed on such day as he may order, so that the original cost and the totals of every branch of the business may be ascertained at any time: *Provided, however,* That profits may be invested in permanent improvements and may then be paid over to the person entitled thereto by scrip or certificates of such investment, on which local legal interest shall accrue and be paid annually until they shall be made part of a funded debt or preferred stock at not over the said legal interest. And every such lease or patent shall provide that expenses for salaries, offices, and other headquarter expenses and commissions shall be reasonable and subject to approval by the Secretary of the Interior, and shall be limited annually to not over one-quarter of the money spent for material and labor in construction and operation. And that prices or rates for the articles mentioned in this act shall be equal in each locality according to quantity and cost, and shall be fairly apportioned as to different localities."

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the time of the committee to give any more argument on this subject than I gave the other day. It is sufficient to point out that whenever Government grants are made which are either franchises or grants of property that ought to be conserved like franchises for the benefit of the public, some proper limitation ought to be made upon the profits to be derived by the holder, so that all of the benefits shall not go to the holder and leave none to the public. The holder should receive a liberal profit, and this amendment proposes 25 per cent on his original investment every year as a limit. In order that the profits may be fairly ascertained it is also provided that exorbitant expenses for headquarters and for other things outside of the real work shall not be incurred.

This is not a new thing, except in this particular use of the principle. It is the principle of the cooperative store and of the mutual life insurance company. It is a principle that sooner or later will be applied to great public grants of this sort.

As I have said, I will not take the time of the House, because I hardly expect that without perfection by a committee of this House having the matter in charge any such great change as this is likely to be adopted in the Committee of the Whole; but I have felt that on every bill involving a grant of public property for private use for the benefit of the public this principle ought to be presented by me in the form of an amendment, so that it may receive the mature consideration of the members of the committee. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I feel an interest in the proposition presented by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER]. Mr. Blackstone tells us that a corporation has no right to exist except for the public good, and that every corporation is an arm of the Government. We have seen this Government extend its arms out into the hands of greed, and then we have seen those arms turn back and cudgel humanity to death, and take the proceeds of our toil and walk off with millions. So far as I am concerned, I do not propose while I am here to turn loose any corporation or lease that extends God's blessings into the hands of a lot of fellows, then pull the bridles off and say "Go it." I want to keep the bridles on all the way through. Men with power are prone to use it for their own private gain. Almighty God tells us that where a man's treasure is, there shall his heart be also. So you have got to keep the bridles on people who have great power. Otherwise they will run away with suffering humanity. I just want to stack up by the side of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BORLAND). The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO COAL, PHOSPHATE, OIL, GAS, POTASSIUM, OR SODIUM LEASES.

SEC. 23. That no person, association, or corporation, except as herein provided, shall take or hold more than one lease of each of the classes of deposits herein named and described during the life of such lease; no corporation shall hold any interest as a stockholder of another corporation in more than one such lease; and no person shall take or hold any interest or interests as a member of an association or associations or as a stockholder of a corporation or corporations holding a lease under the provisions hereof which, together with the area embraced in any direct holding of a lease under this act, or which, together with any other interest or interests as a member of an association or associations or as a stockholder of a corporation or corporations holding a lease under the provisions hereof, exceeds in the aggregate an amount equivalent to the maximum number of acres allowed to any one lessee under this act; and the interests held in violation of this provision shall be forfeited to the United States by appropriate proceedings instituted by the Attorney General for that purpose in any court of competent jurisdiction, except that any such ownership or interest hereby forbidden which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held for two years and not longer after its acquisition.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 22, strike out lines 5 and 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 22, line 7, strike out "23" and insert "22."

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 22, line 25, strike out the words at the end of the line, and at the beginning of line 1, page 23, "any court of competent jurisdiction," and insert "the United States court for the district in which the property or some part thereof is located."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment by inserting after the words "United States," in line 1, page 23, the word "district."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by inserting after the words "United States," in line 1, page 23, the word "district."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This section limits individuals and corporations to a single lease of oil, coal, gas, phosphates, or sodium land, and attempts to prevent corporations and individuals from holding an interest in more than one lease. The provision is rather long and involved, and I presume is entirely intelligible if one takes time to exame it carefully.

Yesterday I called attention to the fact that there would probably be a good deal of difficulty in granting leases to railway companies over the question as to whether any stockholder in a railroad company could have an interest in another lease; and if so, to what extent.

It seems to me that that might involve a good deal of difficulty and a good deal of trouble, and the way to remedy it would be to strike out the provision allowing the railroad company to take leases. My own opinion is that the leases under the conditions fixed would not be worth much to them ordinarily.

I want to call attention to the very marked difference between this bill and the water-power bill in the matter of the number of interests that one may acquire. There is a great multimillionaire water-power company out West that has been referred to here a number of times, the name of which I do not recall, but it is a sort of bugaboo held up as the type of monopoly that should be avoided, and yet the fact is that under the water-power bill the Secretary of the Interior could lease to that octopus all the water powers in the United States on the public domain. There is no limit to the number of water-power leases that could be acquired by a single individual. The Secretary could lease them all to any one corporation. That is the provision in regard to the sort of development of which there is said to be very great danger of monopoly.

Now we come to mining coal. There has never been a monopoly of mining coal or sale at the mine of bituminous coal in this country. As a matter of fact, Federal bureaus have rather bewailed the fact that competition was so very intense between bituminous coal miners and operators that they were tempted to neglect proper regulations for safety and were tempted and almost compelled to be wasteful in their operations.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. COX. Has there been an attempt on the part of the miners or operators to get the department to consent to some kind of a combination which would not be a real violation of

the Sherman antitrust law and yet one which would aid them in this particular?

Mr. MONDELL. I did not know that there had been such an attempt.

Mr. COX. I know that they did make that attempt in my State.

Mr. MONDELL. I know that the Government has felt that the competition between the bituminous coal operators was so keen as to make it difficult for them to provide the necessary means for conditions of safety or to adopt less wasteful methods. As to the class of enterprises, to wit, water power, with regard to which there is said to be the greatest danger of monopoly, we have made no effort to prevent a monopoly in the holdings. On the contrary, we have left it to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior to lease to any one monopoly all of the wonderful water powers of all the public domain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of 10 minutes all debate be closed on this section and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, it occurred to me during the discussion of the water-power bill that there ought to be some limitation or restriction on the authority of the Secretary. But you have assumed that the Secretary will exercise a wise judgment and a proper discretion in leasing, and that he will not allow a monopoly to be established or maintained.

Still there have been Secretaries of the Interior who were not highly esteemed on this floor. There have been Secretaries with regard to whom very unkind things have been said, and still we place in the hands of anyone who may become Secretary of the Interior authority to lease for water-power development all the public lands in the entire United States that might be used for that purpose to one corporation or to one individual.

When we come to coal, an industry in which there never has been a monopoly, an industry in which it is difficult to establish anything like a monopoly as to mining and sale at the mines, we provide that no individual or corporation shall have more than one lease. I shall not offer an amendment—first, because I would not expect it to be adopted under the present frame of mind of the committee; and, second, because it is not absolutely essential that it should be adopted at this time. But I venture that it will be necessary to modify this section if we are going into the leasing business. We can not confine one individual or one corporation to a single lease anywhere in the United States.

The coal-leasing bill I introduced provided that no individual or corporation could hold two leases in the same immediately competitive field. I made that provision, perhaps, out of excess of caution, but it is certainly as far as we ought to go. A man who has a coal lease in Wyoming certainly ought to be allowed to have one in Washington if he desires because there is no competition between the two fields. A man with an oil lease in California ought not to be denied one in Montana. The oils are of different character, and they enter into an entirely different territory. They do not compete with each other in any possible way. In fact, as to oil, it is not clear to me that any hard and fast limitations as to the number of leases one was interested in was necessary. It has seemed strange to me that these two provisions of legislation presented by the same committee—one following quickly on the heels of the other—should have such divergent provisions in regard to this matter of leases. The only explanation is in the one heretofore suggested, that the clerk who wrote the bills in the Department of the Interior had one idea of the matter at one time and another view of it at another, and that in their consideration of the matter the committee never got the two things adjusted and failed utterly to carry the same thought or theory throughout the legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the very reason that brought me to the support of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] brings me to oppose the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. I undertook the support of the gentleman from New Jersey because he was seeking to provide for the people to share in the profits and to put the bridles upon the corporations that may control these institutions hereafter. But I have been sitting here for about three weeks, and it seems to me that if the gentleman from Wyoming has anything to talk about it must be for a press bureau out in the West that defends him and big business, and they are taking account. There is one consolation, however, I have in listening to him, and that is that it reminds me of the verse of the Scripture where it says, "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." He has been on the floor all of the time.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Of course, I will yield. I have been led into temptation a few times and have got caught. Now, if you have got your hook, put it in my gill.

Mr. MONDELL. In the power bill, the gentleman from Texas did not put the bridles on the discretion of the Secretary to lease all of the power in the country to one corporation.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. I have done what I thought best all the way along without bringing up any obstruction, and I just want to state this in regard to the gentleman's position. The second law book that I ever passed an examination on told me that the prime object of all government is to restrain the strong and vicious, assist the weak and helpless, establish and maintain that which is right, and condemn and prohibit that which is wrong, and so when these strong and vicious institutions that are created by law, called corporations, that live without mercy and do business without charity, and know no God, and know no law, because they have no neck to break and no soul to damn—when they are to be considered, I think they ought to be restrained, especially when they prey upon the weak and helpless, and so I am opposed to the gentleman's whole process, so far as I have been able to understand what he has been shooting at since I have been here.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the period at the end of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 5, strike out the period at the end of the line.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to debate his amendment?

Mr. MANN. No; debate is closed.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FERRIS) there were—ayes 22, noes 20.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. I would like to see some Democrats stay in the House once in a while, however.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, even the withdrawal of this amendment would not make clear the fact that during the discussion of this leasing bill the better part of the afternoon there have been present only 10 Democrats and about 20 Republicans, and the bill is of great importance.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 24. That no person, association, or corporation holding a lease under the provisions of this act shall hold more than a tenth interest, direct or indirect, in any agency, corporate or otherwise, engaged in the sale or resale of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium obtained from such lessee; and any violation of the provisions of this section shall be ground for the forfeiture of the lease or interest so held.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6, strike out the figures "24" and insert the figures "23."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not understand the purpose of this section in this bill. It seems to me that it puts a restriction and limitation on trade that is very bad. That section forbids a coal company or a lessee under this bill establishing an agency of its own to sell its own coal. It would be impossible for it to sell coal through an agency of its own. It seems to me that the legislation would simply require an additional middle man in the coal business. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma, what is the purpose of that section in the bill, and if that would not be the effect of it?

Mr. FERRIS. What effect?

Mr. STERLING. Would it not have the effect of preventing the coal company from establishing an agency of its own for the commerce of its coal at a distant point from the mine?

Mr. FERRIS. No; I think not. If the gentleman is through, I will answer him and give him the view of the committee and the department.

Mr. STERLING. I would like to have the gentleman answer me.

Mr. FERRIS. The requirement that no lease shall be assigned——

Mr. STERLING. Oh, no; I refer to section 23, which prohibits the ownership of more than one-tenth interest in any agency for the sale of coal.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think so. Complaints came before the committee to the effect that where the producer of the coal was also the carrier of the coal and was also to be the selling agent of the coal it developed a bad condition.

The gentleman knows that all through Pennsylvania in the anthracite regions they have had strikes, troubles, and various oppressions that have appalled the whole country, and out in Colorado last year the gentleman will recall that she had all kinds of labor troubles, and she had to have out the militia all the winter, and we had a congressional investigation. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] went out and sat there with his committee for weeks hearing about their troubles.

Mr. STERLING. But I call the gentleman's attention to the language of the section. It does not have reference to the railroad that carries the coal, but prohibits the mining company from owning more than a one-tenth interest in any agency for the sale or resale of any coal—its own coal.

Mr. FERRIS. There is specific provision in the coal part of the bill that does divorce production from carrying, and one of them is that the railroads are entitled to mine it for their own use, and can only take one lease for every 200 miles——

Mr. STERLING. But suppose a coal mine is developed under this law at one point, and at some distance from the location of the mines it desired to establish an agency for the sale of its own coal, it would have some one there to handle its coal, which would be purely an agency for the sale of its own coal. Now, this section would prohibit that. That may not have been the purpose, but the language of this section will produce that effect. The result of it will be this, it seems to me, that every company or lessee under this law that develops a coal mine and desires to sell the coal at some distant point, it would have to sell to some independent concern, which is creating an additional middleman in the sale of the coal. It would just add that much expense to the consumer's price. I do not believe the gentleman can make anything else out of this section.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman's opinion is in entire variance with the Geological Survey, is in entire variance with the Bureau of Mines, and with every bit of testimony we have. On the contrary, they assert that at times it would have a very salutary effect on the consuming public not to allow the coal producer to also control the agency that sells the production, and, too, oftentimes the railroad that carries it, and thereby charge the public just what it pleases for the coal.

Mr. STERLING. A mining company must sell its coal, and what is the difference whether it sells it direct from the mine or sells it at some distant point through some agency that has been established by the mining company? If that is not permitted, then it will be bound to sell its coal to some other concern which would necessarily add an additional profit to the product and sell it to the consumer at the increased price.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, certainly it is the purpose of the committee and it is my opinion that the language properly bears the construction the committee intended and that was there should be no interference or prohibition upon the part of the producer of coal to sell wherever it chose and to whomever it chose. It may establish offices throughout the entire country if it itself is the principal. That is not the kind of an agency that is referred to in the section, but here is a selling corporation whose business is the sale or resale of coal, and the purpose, then, was to prohibit a greater than one-tenth interest in such a corporation or in such an agency of that class.

Mr. STERLING. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes, sir.

Mr. STERLING. I think the purpose of the committee, as the gentleman states it, is all right, but this section of the bill does not so state it. This bill permits the very thing you seek to prevent and prohibits the thing you seek to encourage, if the gentleman has stated the intent of the committee correctly.

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. STERLING. But the language of this bill prohibits such an agency. It does not say corporate agency that buys and sells coal and that would not be an agency at all. If a mining company should ship coal to a distant point and sell to a corporation or to an individual who buys it for the purpose of resale, that is not an agency. It is an independent concern, representing no principal. This bill forbids ownership in agencies, not in independent concerns buying and selling on its own account. I expect it was the purpose of the committee to prohibit the mining company from owning more than a one-tenth interest in any kind of concern that does that kind of business, and I think that would be all right. But by this you say "agency," and the explanation of the gentleman of the purpose of the committee does not relate to an agency at all.

Mr. LENROOT. Let me ask the gentleman. Suppose a producing company establishes an office in some city under its own name and sells coal in that city; is that an agency?

Mr. STERLING. Purely an agency, and it could not be maintained under this bill.

Mr. LENROOT. It is not, according to my theory of the legal definition of the word "agency."

Mr. STERLING. No; I would not think so. I think they ought to be allowed to own agencies and sell their own coal. It would make no difference whether it was individual or corporate, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to say to the gentleman if that is true, then all the restrictions we put in the previous sections seeking to avoid monopoly become absolutely valueless, because if a coal company can organize a corporation, having no relation or privity with the Government in this line, then you might as well strike out the previous section.

Mr. STERLING. The gentleman does not understand my point. It would not make any difference whether they engaged an individual or a corporation to handle their product. Presumably such an agency would handle it without charging an additional profit.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STERLING. Just right there. It would simply handle the product for the owner, as the agent of the owner, either on a commission or a salary. Now, the owner ought to be allowed to establish an agency and sell his own product, whether an individual or a corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STERLING. Let me just complete my statement. But if that mining company should sell it to a corporation or an individual or a company somewhere else, then, I think, it is perfectly proper that their ownership of that kind of a concern ought to be limited, because then there would be a profit added by this middleman, this middle concern; and if that is the purpose of the bill, it is all right; but I am very sure the language of the bill does not express that purpose.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, the gentleman states that, in his judgment, it would be entirely proper to permit a producing company to organize another corporation whose business would be the selling of the coal of the producing company. But in that event it is entirely clear that that corporation, organized by the lessee, would not be amenable in any way to the provisions of this law, while if the company itself established an office and itself conducted a transaction, then, whatever it did, they would be subject to the provisions of the law. While we all have the greatest admiration for the ability of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING], I do think that he has an incorrect construction of the use of the term "agency" in this connection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 25. That any permit, lease, occupation, or use permitted under this act shall reserve to the Secretary of the Interior the right to permit for joint or several use such easements or rights of way upon, through, or in the lands leased, occupied, or used as may be necessary or appropriate to the working of the same, or of other lands containing the deposits described in this act, and the treatment and shipment of the products thereof by or under authority of the Government, its lessees, or permittees, and for other public purposes: *Provided*, That said Secretary, in his discretion, in making any lease under this act may reserve to the United States the right to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of the surface of the lands embraced within such lease under existing law or laws hereafter enacted, in so far as said surface is not necessary for use of the lessee in extracting and removing the deposits therein: *Provided further*, That if such reservation is made it shall be so determined before the offering of such lease. That the said Secretary, during the life of the lease, is authorized to issue such permits for easements herein provided to be reserved.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Line 14, page 23, strike out "25" and insert "24."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk proceeded to read the next paragraph of the bill.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. NORTON. I wanted to make some suggestions with regard to the last paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The last paragraph, I will say to the gentleman, has been concluded.

Mr. NORTON. I was on my feet, but did not ask for recognition. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will return to paragraph 24.

Mr. NORTON. I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if there is any good reason why in lines 23, 24, and 25 there is not reserved to the Secretary the discretion to lease or otherwise dispose of the surface rights of the land during the period for which the permit is issued?

Mr. FERRIS. Now, there is a proviso down below on page 24, beginning with line 4, which provides that if any such reservation is made it must be made before the lease is entered into. I think that answers the question.

Mr. NORTON. No; there is no provision there made for reserving to the Secretary of the Interior the right to sell or lease the land during the time for which the permit is made.

Mr. FERRIS. In case the lessee has to go out and borrow money and capitalize his concern and make a going company of it, we thought, in the interest of good development for coal, as well as other development, where large expenditure is likely after they start in, we ought to give them some fixed, definite tenure during that time; and it was therefore up to the Secretary to make such reservations of surface right or other rights that were necessary before beginning the lease, so that the leasehold might not be tampered with during its lifetime.

Mr. NORTON. I offer the following amendment:

On page 23, line 24, after the word "any," insert the words "permit or."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 24, after the word "any," insert the words "permit or."

So that the line will read:

In making any permit or lease under this act—

And so forth.

Mr. NORTON. By the adoption of the amendment I have offered this would be effected: During the two-year period for which the permit for prospecting is issued the surface right to the land could be leased or otherwise disposed of. Entries for agricultural purposes could then be made upon the land the same as is now provided can be made during the time for which the lease is made.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman other amendments to go with it?

Mr. NORTON. Yes; I have other amendments to offer to the paragraph to supplement the one I am now offering to perfect that. I believe this reservation should be made.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. What is the purpose of the gentleman in permitting the Secretary to lease or otherwise dispose of the land that a man may be seeking to get a permit upon?

Mr. NORTON. My purpose in that is just the same as the gentleman's purpose in giving to the Secretary of the Interior the right to lease or otherwise dispose of the surface of the land during the time for which the mining lease is given. Can you tell me any good reason why the surface right to the land should not be disposed of for agricultural purposes during the permit period?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I think so.

Mr. NORTON. Why? Any more than during the lease period?

Mr. RAKER. Yes. There could not be any permanent agricultural work upon the land pending the two years except the mere fact of permitting it to be used for grazing purposes. Here, for example, is a man having 640 acres of land that he is going to prospect upon. You would not let Tom, Dick, and Harry go in there and use that land and occupy it and interfere with the permittee, would you?

Mr. MANN. Right there, will the gentleman from North Dakota permit me to ask a question of the gentleman from California?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Under the law as it now stands we do lease for grazing purposes a large amount of the public domain, do we not?

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. MANN. None of it in the forest reserves?

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. MANN. We do not make any leases there?

Mr. RAKER. No; we do not permit any leases in the forest reserves or anywhere else.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman mean that the Government does not permit leases in the forest reserves?

Mr. RAKER. I do. They grant permits.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is simply dodging. He is not frank, and I will not ask him any further question if he does not want to be frank.

Mr. RAKER. I was frank. I answered "no" and "yes." There is no question about it. There is no leasing permitted. That is the policy. But the Department of Agriculture permits four or five men to inclose a part of the territory in a forest reserve so that they may use it for the purpose of rounding up their cattle in the fall or spring, and not otherwise, except that a bill was passed last year permitting small tracts to be leased to people who desired to build summer homes temporarily in the forest reserves—leases for 20 years, I think. But there is no leasing of the lands, as leasing, in the forest reserves or elsewhere, so far as I am able to find. That is my candid answer.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is candid. He may be correct, but that is not my understanding of the situation. I was going to ask him another question but will not, because it is dependent on the answer to the first.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I propose to offer amendments to perfect this section, so that if a man secures a permit for two years for exploring the land for purposes of securing oil, during that time homestead entries for agricultural purposes may be made upon the surface rights. It seems to me that if this law is not safeguarded in this way, then any man may go out upon the public domain and secure a permit on 2,560 acres of land for two years with the main idea in view of having the free use of that land for grazing purposes for two years. I believe that that possible abuse should be guarded against.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. NORTON. I ask unanimous consent to continue for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to say to the gentleman that that would be impossible under the provision of section 9, which provides for a due measure of diligence, and the Secretary is authorized to cancel the lease upon any breach of the conditions.

Mr. NORTON. Yes; and in such proceedings it will likely take two years to cancel it.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of 10 minutes, 5 minutes of which shall be used by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] and 5 by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], all debate on this section and amendments thereto be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, after the consideration of this amendment, if it is adopted by the committee, I shall offer other amendments to the paragraph, to make the paragraph read so that when the bill becomes a law it will not be possible for anyone to go on the public domain and under the guise of securing a permit for exploring for oil or gas or phosphates to use the surface of the land for some other purpose.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, going back to the colloquy with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], relative to the matter of leasing, as I understand the law to-day there are no leases authorized on the public domain. The public domain does not refer to the forest withdrawals.

In the Forest Service last year for the first time the Secretary of Agriculture was permitted to lease certain tracts of land—my impression is not over 5 acres, although it may be 2 acres—for the purpose of summer homes, the leases not extending beyond 20 years. As a lease I know of no other provision.

I have been looking that up carefully, and I feel that that is the general position as it stands to-day. The permit author-

ized by the Department of Agriculture is such that on the great majority of forest reserves men are permitted to turn out their stock at so much per head. The time is fixed, commencing in the early spring or late spring, and running until the early fall or late fall, and the price is fixed according to the time the reserves are used. There are some larger tracts and some smaller ones given to parties under a permit to use the land for their stock. Sometimes a half dozen, by paying so much per year, may have permits to use a particular tract of land, and, in a few instances, where it relates to a tract where they may use a meadow or a spring, which is a good place for gathering up and rounding up their stock in the summer or fall, a permit is granted sometimes to one and sometimes to a dozen or 15 stockmen, so that they may have the feed in the field when the round-up occurs. That is my understanding generally, that those are permits and are not considered to be leases.

I have tried to answer the gentleman from Illinois. Getting back now to the amendment, I think the committee considered that general feature in this bill, permitting the leasing, selling, and other disposition after the man had leased, or at the time he leased, that he then knew exactly what he was going to do and could prepare his house accordingly.

Mr. FERRIS. Is there not a good deal in what the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] says, and is it not barely possible that cattlemen could go out and secure a permit when in truth and fact they wanted to do grazing on the land?

Mr. NORTON. I have especially in mind the probability of the passage of the 640-acre grazing law that is now before the Congress; and if you leave this provision as it stands in this section it means the withdrawal, under a permit, of 2,560 acres for two years.

Mr. RAKER. Getting back to the point, the permit is given to the man for the purpose of prospecting, for the purpose of investigation, for the purpose of determining in advance, before he makes a lease, whether or not there are minerals in the ground which are of the character referred to in the bill. He determines this by the investigations that he makes in good faith, untrammeled by the department. The Secretary of the Interior is given power to see that he complies with that permit and works diligently for the purpose, and the only purpose for which the permit is granted; and I ask the members of the committee now, when a man is willing to go upon the public domain a long distance from civilization, where hardships are encountered at every turn, whether he should be hampered by others using the same land that he is attempting to use?

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment is exhausted. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 26. That no lease issued under the authority of this act shall be assigned or sublet, except with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior. The lessee may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, be permitted at any time to make written relinquishment of all rights under such a lease, and upon acceptance thereof be thereby relieved of all future obligations under said lease. Each lease shall contain provisions for the purpose of insuring the exercise of reasonable diligence, skill, and care in the operation of said property; a provision that such rules for the safety and welfare of the miners and for the prevention of undue waste as may be prescribed by said Secretary shall be observed, including a restriction of the workday to not exceeding eight hours in any one day for underground workers except in cases of emergency, provisions securing the workmen complete freedom of purchase, requiring the payment of wages at least twice a month in lawful money of the United States, and providing proper rules and regulations to insure the fair and just weighing or measurement of the coal mined by each miner, and such other provisions as he may deem necessary for the protection of the interests of the United States, for the prevention of monopoly, and for the safeguarding of the public welfare.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 24, line 9, strike out "26" and insert "25."

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 25, line 6, insert the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That none of such provisions shall be in conflict with the laws of the State in which the leased property is situated."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EMERSON:

Page 24, line 11, after the word "Interior," insert the words "but no such assignment shall be made unless to citizens of the United States or associations of such citizens."

Page 25, line 8, after the word "situated," add "except as to the provisions as to citizens referred to in this section."

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, these two amendments go together. They either fall or stand together.

Section 1 of this bill provides, among other things, in line 7—

Shall be subject to disposition in the form and manner provided by this act to citizens of the United States.

Then comes section 26, new section 25, that no lease issued under the authority of this act shall be assigned or sublet except with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior.

I presume my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] will say that this is entirely up to the Secretary of the Interior to determine to whom these assignments shall be made, and it is, under this bill; but I am rather inclined to agree with my friend from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] that perhaps we might have some Secretary of the Interior whom we would not desire to have pass upon these matters. Besides, the object and purpose of the bill is to limit it to citizens of the United States. Now, he might say that the Secretary of the Interior would not permit others than citizens of the United States to receive such assignments, but it is absolutely within the province of the Secretary of the Interior to determine to whom these assignments shall be made. And if we are to carry out that particular section, limiting the use of these lands to citizens of the United States, this section should be so amended that it shall be limited to citizens of the United States or associations of citizens of the United States. I think that protection should be thrown around this section. At least it can do no harm, and it may do some good.

After I sat here yesterday and listened to the gentleman from the Philippines [Mr. QUEZON] assert on the floor of this House that he had used force and arms against the authority of the United States, and was applauded as he was applauded yesterday, I came to the conclusion that it is time for somebody to stand up in defense of the citizens of this country. My first act when I arose this morning was to look out of my window and see whether the Capitol was still here. If proceedings such as happened yesterday continue we may expect before Congress adjourns to hear the national hymns of other countries sung on the floor of this House.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to close debate on this section in four minutes, three minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in four minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment appeals to a man from California, where we have been pioneers in the attempt to save our part of the country from oriental invasion. It was a matter of deep regret that the alien-land act passed by my State did not exclude all aliens from land ownership and all corporations having alien stockholders. Now, it seems to me that the time has come to put a crimp in this sort of legislation and provide that these acts that grant privileges shall be granted solely to the people of our own country, to those who are responsible for the management of our institutions and for responsibly operating a democracy. I thoroughly agree with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to differ with my friend from California, and also with my friend from Ohio. This is what we do. We first provide that only citizens of the United States can lease these lands at all, and we then say that the lessee can not sell them unless the Secretary of the Interior gives him permission to do it. We ought not to go any further, it seems to me. It is not a matter that I am concerned deeply about. But we can not settle the Japanese question and the immigration question in this bill.

Mr. EMERSON. Would the gentleman object to the amendment going in?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; I do not think it is necessary. I doubt, also, the wisdom of it. We can not cure all the ills in this one bill. This is a public-land bill. Let us not load it up so much.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico asks unanimous consent to address the committee for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands to a very important point in this bill. My State is very much interested in this bill and I am in favor of it. I notice all through the bill it empowers the Secretary of the Interior to do certain things. My understanding is that a great part of this bill refers to land within the national forest reserves which are under

the Department of Agriculture, administered by the Bureau of Forestry. Now, we all understand that, as far as the minerals are concerned, they are under the authority of the Department of the Interior and under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior and its various bureaus. But what about the surface?

Mr. FERRIS. We do not meddle with the surface of it. Not only that, but the bill provides that the land can only be leased for minerals when it is determined that it will not be harmful for the purposes for which it is set aside.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. It does not affect the surface of the land?

Mr. FERRIS. No; they could not proceed until there is a finding by the Secretary of Agriculture that this proceeding would not interfere with operations on the surface for which the land was withdrawn.

Mr. LENROOT. Is the gentleman correct, that that provision is in this bill?

Mr. FERRIS. I think so. I think the provision is in both bills.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to address the committee for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to voice the thought conveyed by my colleague from California [Mr. KENT] on the question of alien ownership of this mineral contained in the land, particularly as to the leasing. I took it up with the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Mines when we inserted the provision in section 1, lines 10 and 11, which read as follows:

Shall be subject to disposition in the form and manner provided by this act to citizens of the United States, or to any association of such persons, or to any corporation organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State or Territory thereof.

That ought to have been and should have contained the proviso that these corporations should be composed of citizens of the United States, or that the stock should not be owned by aliens over and above a certain number or percentage. Otherwise, under the provisions of this bill, while we are trying to legislate in behalf of the citizens, native and naturalized, of this country, nevertheless the corporation might be organized by two-thirds of the aliens, or the stock may be transferred to aliens. In practically all of the provisions contained in the bill they could be held by aliens in this country—Japanese, Chinese, and others—without any restriction. As a matter of fact, the matter was discussed in committee, and it was the idea to make effective the provision that was left out in the California Legislature, that the ownership of land should be prohibited to corporations as well as to aliens if those corporations were composed of aliens who were not citizens of the country. We are trying, under the general mining laws, to make them applicable to citizens alone. So far as this applies to corporations, the corporation may, of course, be controlled by the directorate, who are citizens, but so far as the holding of stock is concerned, 95 per cent of it may be held by those who are neither citizens of the United States or who have not declared their intention to become so. In other words, there may be aliens to the extent of 90 per cent, if not all, of the stock.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. We have already closed debate on this section three times.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I sympathize with the efforts of gentlemen to see to it that all of the developments in this country shall be made through the aid of home capital. If it had not been for capital from abroad there would have been no such development in the country as has taken place. We possibly and probably have reached a state now where we are not so much in need of foreign capital, but at the same time we have reached the point where we are now seeking investment of our capital in foreign countries, and we ought to be using a large share of our resources in the development of Central and South America. We ought to own a great many of their enterprises. We ought to put our money into the development of the great natural resources which they have. I question very much whether it will aid us any when we go down there with our capital and seek a chance to develop, to be told "You will not let anybody in your country do this, and now since you are a little richer, why do you come here?" It is bad policy, and we ought not to do it.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. KENT. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he would like to repeal the clause in the homestead laws that calls for citizenship?

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; because in the very nature of things it is different. A man who goes on a homestead is supposed to be a permanent resident of the United States. I prefer to make him a citizen of the United States, although some of our laws which the gentleman is seeking to change permit a woman, if she is married to a foreigner, to lose her citizenship.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. KENT. I would like to ask the gentleman whether there is so much difference between homestead tenure and a 99-year lease tenure?

Mr. MANN. I should say there was a great deal of difference between a homesteader cultivating the soil on a small piece of ground and a man borrowing money to put millions of dollars into a great hydroelectric plant or something of that kind or to develop a railroad. Our railroads never would been built across the continent if it had not been for the aid of foreign capital. If it had not been for foreign capital, California would not be on the map to-day.

Mr. KENT. It would be yellow, if the gentleman's ideas were carried out.

Mr. MANN. The greatest benefit we have ever had from California was because she had so much that was yellow in her.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The question is on the adoption of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken.

Mr. EMERSON. I demand a division.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the amendments may be again reported. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendments.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 12, noes 25.

So the amendments were rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 27. That any lease issued under the provisions of this act may be forfeited and canceled by an appropriate proceeding in a court of competent jurisdiction whenever the lessee fails to comply with any of the provisions of this act, of the lease, or of the general regulations promulgated under this act and in force at the date of the lease; and the lease may provide for resort to appropriate methods for the settlement of disputes or for remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof.

The committee amendments were read, as follows:

Page 25, line 9, strike out "27" and insert "26."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to move an amendment to the following amendment. All through the bill we have been amending it by adding, after the word "States," the word "district," and I move, on page 25, line 12, after the word "States," to insert the word "district" to make it conform.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, line 12, page 25, by inserting after the word "States" the word "district."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 11, strike out the words "a court of competent jurisdiction" and insert "the United States district court of the district in which the property, or some part thereof, is located."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of section 26 the following:

"The court in adjudging a forfeiture may, as compensation to the lessee or others interested, decree a lien upon any land permanently improved by the lessee in a sum not exceeding the value added to the land by such improvement, such lien to be paid when the land is again sold or leased under the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That if when the land is again sold or leased such improvement shall have depreciated in value since such forfeiture, the lien may on application to such court be reduced accordingly: *Provided further*, That the court may deny compensation in whole or in part to anyone guilty of bad faith in securing the lease or in carrying out its provisions or the provisions of this act."

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, without any desire to cut the gentleman off, I move that the committee do now rise, and we will leave the matter standing and the gentleman can debate it to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to,

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CULLOP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 406, and had directed him to report they had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Speaker laid before the House a message from the President of the United States (H. Doc. No. 576), which was read, as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in relation to claims presented by the Governments of Austria-Hungary, Greece, and Turkey on account of injuries inflicted on their nationals during riots which occurred in South Omaha, Nebr., on February 21, 1909, and I recommend that, as an act of grace and without reference to the question of the liability of the United States, an appropriation be made to effect a settlement of these claims in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 14, 1916.

The SPEAKER. The message is referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, together with the accompanying documents.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] is detained in a hearing over in his committee room, and he requested me to make this request: I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], on next Monday morning, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the business from the Speaker's table is disposed of, be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, have not we already made a date for somebody on Monday?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] has already been granted an hour.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt the gentleman from Florida would be perfectly agreeable to a transfer. I do not think I would ask for it to-night under the circumstances. Nobody over here will object to Mr. KITCHIN coming in Monday.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the request was slightly different in the case of Mr. KITCHIN. The consent granted to Mr. CLARK was after the ordinary business of the day had been disposed of, whereas the request of Mr. KITCHIN was immediately after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. MANN. Well, if they do not conflict, I have no objection. I think the gentleman from North Carolina is entitled to it, and I hope that courtesy will be extended to me if I ever ask for it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 320. An act to authorize the county of Bonner, Idaho, to construct a bridge across Pend Oreille River; and

H. R. 775. An act granting the consent of Congress to J. P. Jones and others to construct one or more bridges across the Chattahoochee River between the counties of Coweta and Carroll, in the State of Georgia.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by inserting a speech delivered by Hon. JAMES A. REED, United States Senator from Missouri, at Milwaukee recently upon the subject of "Violations of international law and American neutrality by the belligerent nations."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by Senator JAMES A. REED, of Missouri, at Milwaukee recently upon the subject of "Violations of international law by the present belligerents in Europe, Asia, and Africa." Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Saturday, January 15, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 571); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of Agriculture submitting an estimate of an appropriation for inclusion in the urgent deficiency bill to meet the emergency caused by the infectious nature and spread of the citrus canker (H. Doc. No. 574); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a further estimate of the deficiency in the appropriation for printing and binding for the Patent Office for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 575); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. DILLON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3032) authorizing the county of St. Louis to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between Minnesota and Wisconsin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 42), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PADGETT, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (H. J. Res. 98) making part of the appropriation "Construction and machinery, increase of the Navy," in the naval act approved March 3, 1915, available for the extension of building ways and equipment at the navy yards at New York and Mare Island, Cal., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 40), which said resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. PADGETT, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (H. J. Res. 95) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy, at Annapolis, Mr. Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán, a citizen of Cuba, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 41), which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5383) granting a pension to Julia M. Connolly; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6165) granting a pension to Mary Carroll; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 9043) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Albemarle, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 9044) to amend the white-slave traffic act, approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 9045) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to certify to the Secretary of the Interior, for restoration to the public domain, lands in the State of Louisiana not needed for naval purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9046) providing for the erection of four Government munition factories between the Allegheny and the Rocky Mountains; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DECKER: A bill (H. R. 9047) to promote the safety of employees and travelers on railroads, by requiring common carriers engaged in interstate commerce by railroad to afford a safe and sufficient clearance between structures located on their roadways and locomotives and cars passing over their lines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NORTH: A bill (H. R. 9048) to provide for the erection of a public building at Kittanning, in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: A bill (H. R. 9049) making appropriation for emergency levee building on the Mississippi River below New Orleans; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 9050) amending section 1 of the act of June 19, 1912, limiting the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 9051) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 9052) to exempt from cancellation certain desert-land entries in Riverside County, Cal.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SUMNERS: A bill (H. R. 9053) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a farm-produce exchange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOFT: A bill (H. R. 9054) to amend section 5 of the act making appropriations for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses, approved March 3, 1893, as amended by section 7 of the act approved March 15, 1898; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. OLIVER: A bill (H. R. 9055) to make pensions to Mexican War survivors payable from date of approval of pension act of May 11, 1912; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 9056) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate condemned cannon and cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 10) for the protection of American citizens in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEFLIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 103) authorizing and directing the Director of the Census to collect and publish additional statistics; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. KAHN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 104) granting permission to the Woman's Titanic Memorial Association to erect a memorial on public ground in the city of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 9057) for the relief of Frank Pullman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 9058) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 9059) granting a pension to David A. Nelligan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9060) granting an increase of pension to Elisha P. Maconaughey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9061) granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Steringer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 9062) granting an increase of pension to John Merriweather; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9063) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose Parish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9064) granting an increase of pension to James Irwine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9065) granting an increase of pension to George W. East; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9066) granting an increase of pension to William A. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9067) granting an increase of pension to Louis R. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9068) granting an increase of pension to Preston Lett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9069) granting an increase of pension to Richard Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9070) granting an increase of pension to James M. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9071) granting an increase of pension to Simeon L. Miles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9072) granting a pension to Ella Moffatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 9073) granting an increase of pension to Louis C. T. Kramer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 9074) to correct the military record of James P. Collins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 9075) granting a pension to Henry F. Clement; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 9076) for the relief of Alfred Sjostrom; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9077) for the relief of F. X. C. Boucher; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 9078) granting an increase of pension to Peleg B. Washburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9079) granting an increase of pension to Cordelia E. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 9080) granting an increase of pension to David Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9081) granting a pension to Addie D. Garvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9082) for the relief of Frank P. Sammons; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 9083) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Lowd; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 9084) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Case; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 9085) providing for the retirement of Col. David L. Brainard, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 9086) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9087) granting an increase of pension to Henry Fleisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KREIDER: A bill (H. R. 9088) granting an increase of pension to Henry Peiffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 9089) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Ulmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9090) granting a pension to Carleton E. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9091) to remove the charge of desertion against Harold Holst; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 9092) granting an increase of pension to Warren D. M. Coon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 9093) granting a pension to Walter L. Jewell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9094) granting a pension to G. F. Hudson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 9095) for the relief of I. C. Johnson, jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9096) granting a pension to Joseph Daley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9097) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Piernas, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OAKEY: A bill (H. R. 9098) granting an increase of pension to Robert Liddell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9099) granting a pension to Michael D. Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 9100) for the relief of the estate of James L. Waugh; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 9101) granting a pension to Bev Baker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 9102) granting a pension to Charles J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 9103) granting a pension to Mary E. Roseberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9104) granting a pension to Henrietta Yarnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9105) granting an increase of pension to Richard C. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9106) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Kessinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 9107) granting an increase of pension to Rufus C. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9108) granting a pension to Will Morgan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9109) granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Bresnahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 9110) granting a pension to Adeline L. Powers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9111) granting a pension to Robert McLemore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9112) making an appropriation to pay the legal heirs of the estate of Daniel H. Hoge, deceased, late of the State of Virginia, in full of any claim for salary and allowance made by reason of the election of the said Daniel H. Hoge to the Thirty-ninth Congress and his services therein; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9113) for the relief of the estate of William T. Edmunds, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9114) for the relief of the heirs of A. R. Edmonds; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9115) granting a pension to Mrs. M. Lightner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 9116) granting an increase of pension to Mina C. Balzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9117) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Woolaston; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 9118) granting a pension to Mathew Grubb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9119) granting a pension to Vance Walden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9120) granting a pension to J. R. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9121) granting a pension to T. J. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9122) granting a pension to John Haney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9123) granting a pension to Abe McBroom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 9124) for the relief of Frank Ferrin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 9125) granting a pension to Burton Erwin; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial urging passage of legislation for the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also (by request), memorial of Central Trades Union of St. Louis, Mo., urging that report of International Relations Committee be printed; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Kansas, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of W. J. Appleman and 262 other citizens of Mansfield, Ohio, against an increase of the tax on beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 6119, for special relief for George L. Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: Petitions of Berkely Woollen Mills, of Martinsburg, and citizens of West Virginia, favoring passage of a bill to protect the manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Memorial of Columbus Chamber of Commerce, favoring increase of compensation allowed the railroads for carrying the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CURRY: Resolution by the City Council of Richmond, Cal., asking for appropriation for the construction of an inner harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of Mississippi River Levee Association, favoring national legislation for prevention of floods; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ESCH: Papers to accompany House bill 7803, granting an increase of pension to Abram Towson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of Pennsylvania Arbitration Peace Society, relative to the war in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of American Federation of Labor, opposing the repeal of the seamen's law or any changes in the same; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of William H. Hubbell Camp, No. 4, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, urging adoption of legislation granting pensions to widows and orphans of men who served in the late Spanish-American War, Philippine insurrection, and Boxer relief expedition in China; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of knitting manufacturers of the central West, urging Congress to take steps to prevent foreign products being sold in this country at less than their market price prevailing in the country of their origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of New York Post Office Laborers' Benevolent Association, Branch No. 1, favoring a bill for classification of post-office laborers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of women of 76 chapters Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of New York Post Office Laborers' Benevolent Association, Branch No. 1, favoring passage of bill for classification of post-office laborers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FREEMAN: Memorial of National Machine Tool Builders Association, favoring adequate compensation to railroads for carrying the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Talcott Bros., of Talcottville; Russell Manufacturing Co. and I. E. Palmer Co., of Middletown; Brainerd & Armstrong Co., of New London, all in the State of Connecticut, favoring bill for protection of dyestuffs in United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Westbrook and Clinton, Conn., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Traffic Club of New York, favoring repeal of the seamen's act; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of joint advisory board of the Cigar Makers' Union, favoring a permanent tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition signed by Robert Montgomery and 97 other citizens of Cuyahoga County, Ohio, protesting against any additional taxes upon the beer and liquor industries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Petition of H. C. Bradford Co., of Bennington, Vt., favoring bill for protection of manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Memorial of Philadelphia Bourse, favoring repeal of the seamen's act; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway-mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Traffic Club of New York, favoring the repeal of the seamen's act; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of Ratcliffe Bros., of Shelton, Conn., and Lees Manufacturing Co., of West Point, Conn., favoring bill for protection of manufacturers of American dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Davis Hosiery Mills, of Chattanooga, Tenn., and Sidney Blumenthal & Co., of Shelton, Conn., favoring passage of bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of D. F. Woodbury, of Stamford, Conn., favoring passage of House bill 702, for protection of manufacturers of American dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Papers to accompany House bill 8978, granting a pension to William Butts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 8979, to remove the charge of desertion from Orrin F. Strickland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of California State Rural Letter Carriers' Association, relative to reinstatement of carriers dropped from the rolls where motor-vehicle service is substituted; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HINDS: Petitions of Haskell Silk Co., of Westbrook, and North Berwick Co., of North Berwick, Me., favoring protection for manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of Capt. Gunther Muir and all other officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of Company D, First Infantry, National Guard of Missouri, urging adoption of the militia pay bill as the only salvation to save the National Guard from dissolution, and for other reasons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of citizens of Outagamie County, Wis., favoring the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of St. Cloud, Brainerd, and Little Falls, Minn., favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKELLAR: Petition of sundry citizens of Memphis, Tenn., opposing Chamberlain standing army bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Petition of voters of Edgerton and St. Joe Township, protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of women of Edgerton, Ohio, protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9001, granting an increase of pension to William H. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9002, granting an increase of pension to Orrin P. Gay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9003, granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Fronefield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9000, granting an increase of pension to David W. Bogard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON: Petition of Davis Hosiery Mills, of Chattanooga, Tenn., and Textile Woolen Co., of Sweetwater, Tenn., favoring bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of Shepard Norwell Co., of Boston, Mass., favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEELY: Petitions of 200 business men of Mannington, Wheeling, Fairmont, Clarksburg, Grafton, Janelew, Salem, Weston, McMechen, Elm Grove, New Cumberland, Fairview, Monongah, Shinnston, Worthington, Littleton, Cameron, New Martinsville, Moundsville, Follansbee, Weirton, Chester, Wellsburg, and Lumberport, W. Va., urging favorable consideration of House bill 270; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 4413, for the relief of Oliver C. Stringer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OAKEY: Memorial of William McKinley Camp, No. 9, of Norwalk, Conn., indorsing a program of preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of the Huguet Silk Co., of Hornell, N. Y., urging the passage of House bill 702, a bill to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rev. H. Kaufman, of Cohocton, N. Y., favoring an embargo on munitions of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of Edwin B. Loughlin, of Cohoes, N. Y., favoring passage of bill for protection of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SELLS: Petition of Tennessee Line & Twine Co., favoring bill to protect the manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Papers in the pension case of Mary A. Tilton—House bill 5593; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in the pension case of Henry P. Bliss—House bill 8898; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: Memorial of Herkimer County (N. Y.) Historical Association, favoring passage of House bill 6033, for national park at Oriskany (N. Y.) battle field; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of McCleary, Wallin & Crouse, the Morris Mills, and Shuttleworth Bros. Co., of Amsterdam; New York Mills Co., Utica Dyeing Co., Gilbert Knitting Co., Utica Chamber of Commerce; and Kathaway & Reynolds, of Oriskany Falls, all of the State of New York, favoring protection for manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the thirtieth New York district, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STINESS: Petitions of Atlantic Mills, Compton Co., and Continental Worsted Co., all of Providence, R. I., and Hamilton Web Co., of Hamilton, R. I., favoring passage of bill for protection of manufacturers of American dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of merchants and business men of New Hampshire, favoring legislation taxing persons, corporations, and firms doing an interstate mail-order business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Belknap Mills Corporation, of Laconia, N. H., favoring a bill for protection for manufacturers of dyestuffs in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEBB: Petitions of employees of Robin Manufacturing Co., of Lincolton; Sivur Cotton Mills Co., Kings Mountain; Lowell (N. C.) Cotton Mills; Defiance Sock Mills, of Charlotte; Cleveland Mill & Power Co., of Lawndale; Ella Manufacturing Co., of Shelby; Phoenix Manufacturing Co., of Kings Mountain; Flint Manufacturing Co., of Gastonia; and Spencer Mountain Mills, of Lowell, N. C., protesting against the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of citizens of the ninth congressional district of North Carolina, favoring passage of a bill for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Henry Dreyer and 100 voters of Willow City, N. Dak., favoring an embargo on arms and ammunition; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *January 15, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, infinite and eternal Spirit, that though we forget Thee and wander far from the paths of rectitude and duty Thou dost not forget us, but are ever constant in Thy ministrations to our needs. Forgive our forgetfulness and our sins, quicken our conscience, and make us profoundly sensible of the sinfulness of sin, that the trend of our lives may be Godward through the sublime example and eternal precepts of the Master. Amen.

CALL OF THE HOUSE.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point there is no quorum here this morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota makes the point there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move the call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ashbrook	Eagle	Holland	Padgett
Bacharach	Edmonds	Howell	Paige, Mass.
Barchfeld	Estopinal	Hughes	Patten
Beales	Fairchild	Hulbert	Peters
Bennet	Farley	Husted	Phelan
Brown, W. Va.	Fess	Hutchinson	Porter
Browning	Flynn	Johnson, S. Dak.	Reilly
Bruckner	Gallagher	Jones	Riordan
Butler	Gallivan	Kahn	Roberts, Mass.
Caldwell	Gardner	Keister	Rowe
Cannon	Glass	Kelley	Sabath
Capstick	Gould	Kiess, Pa.	Scott, Pa.
Carew	Graham	Kreider	Scully
Carter, Mass.	Gray, Ala.	Lewis	Small
Casey	Gray, N. J.	Lieb	Smith, N. Y.
Chiperfield	Gregg	Linthicum	Sparkman
Costello	Griest	Loft	Stephens, Tex.
Cox	Griffin	McCulloch	Stout
Cramton	Guernsey	McLemore	Swift
Dale, N. Y.	Hamill	Madden	Taggart
Darrow	Hamlin	Maher	Tague
Davenport	Hart	Mays	Talbott
Dempsey	Haskell	Mooney	Tinkham
Dewalt	Hastings	Morin	Vare
Dooling	Hayes	Murray	Walker
Driscoll	Heaton	Nicholls, S. C.	Ward
Dupré	Heflin	Nichols, Mich.	Watson, Pa.
Dyer	Hernandez	Olney	Whaley
Eagan	Hilliard	O'Shaunessy	Winslow

The SPEAKER. On this call 314 Members, a quorum, have answered to their names.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] moves to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

APPROVAL OF JOURNAL.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. PLATT and Mr. FERRIS rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] rise?

Mr. PLATT. To request leave of absence indefinitely for my colleague, Mr. ROWE, who is ill and in bed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks leave of absence for his colleague [Mr. ROWE] indefinitely. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COAL AND OIL LEASES.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 406.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 406) to authorize exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium, with Mr. CULLOP in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 406, and the Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 406) to authorize exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending, offered last evening by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD]. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the amendment to the section reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of section 26 the following:

"The court in adjudging a forfeiture may, as compensation to the lessee or others interested, decree a lien upon any land permanently improved by the lessee in a sum not exceeding the value added to the land by such improvement, such lien to be paid when the land is again sold or leased under the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That if when the land is again sold or leased such improvement shall have depreciated in value since such forfeiture, the lien may on application to such court be reduced accordingly: *Provided further*, That the court may deny compensation in whole or in part to anyone guilty of bad faith in securing the lease or in carrying out its provisions or the provisions of this act."

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, this bill contains a good many provisions designed to protect the Government and the consumers of the various mineral products that may be mined under its provisions; but it has occurred to me that it is very doubtful whether any operation is likely to occur under the leases which it provides for, except perhaps by men who are rich and can afford to take chances, knowing that they have the means to carry out the provisions of a lease.

It seems to me clear that this bill provides for an ordinary lease that would be subject to the laws applicable to leases generally. If anybody should fail to carry out the provisions of such a lease, or of this act, the lessee would lose whatever he had put into the land as a permanent improvement of it.

I had some experience in trying to frame lease laws of this kind while a member of the Committee on the Public Lands. In the hearings we had we were told that in many instances it cost hundreds and thousands of dollars before a mine can be developed so as to secure any proceeds from the operation. Take the case of the person who attempts in good faith to open up a mine and fails. Has he no equity that is entitled to protection?

It is true that a court would go as far as it could in protecting him; but this bill in effect directs, that the court shall declare a forfeiture. When that forfeiture is declared the ordinary common-law rule would apply; not only would he lose the lease but it would carry with it all that he had invested, except a few things that might be removed.

Now, there are a great many things that he could not remove, and it is doubtful whether he would have a right to remove much of anything, as nearly all fixtures would be of a permanent character, placed there to stay, under a lease the term of which is indefinite. Take, for instance, a tunnel. That could not be removed. A shaft could not be removed.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. In providing for allowing the court to decree a lien on the premises, in whose favor do you ask that the decree be made?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. As compensation to the lessee and others interested. That is the provision of the amendment.

Mr. RAKER. In other words, your intention is that the man who violates his lease shall have a lien decreed upon the public domain that is leased, to remain there, and that the subsequent lessee shall pay for this lien for the benefit of the man who has violated the law? Is that the purpose?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. My idea is that if a man adds anything of permanent value to Government land he should not forfeit it, except as a punishment for bad faith. The amendment provides that the court may punish bad faith by refusing compensation.

Mr. RAKER. If a man has violated the rules and violated the regulations imposed——

Mr. VOLSTEAD. He may be compelled by reason of circumstances to violate the conditions of a lease. Let me call attention to another aspect of this matter. The lessee is not the only one to be considered. There is the party who invests his money and takes a mortgage upon the land; without him there will be but little development. That party has no power to protect himself if the lease is forfeited. It seems to me the court should be given the power to protect the mortgagee—the man who has put the money into the transaction.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman again yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield again to the gentleman from California?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I do.

Mr. RAKER. Does not the mortgagee, who has foreclosed his mortgage under the bill, stand in the bill in the position of the original lessee?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. When he has foreclosed his mortgage he may, but until then he only has a lien that would be lost when the lease is forfeited.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to cut the gentleman off, but I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of 10 minutes, 5 minutes of which shall be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] and 5 minutes by the committee, all debate on this paragraph and amendment thereto be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that at the expiration of 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota and 5 by the chairman of the committee, all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object, Mr. Chairman. This is a most important amendment, prepared by a gentleman who was formerly a member of the Committee on the Public Lands. I do not think it is right to abridge this discussion, with only 10 minutes allowed for debate on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] objects. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I called attention a moment ago to the fact that a great many improvements that are made under a lease of this kind could not be removed. In case of the forfeiture of a lease, not only would the shafts and tunnels but other fixtures necessarily placed upon the land be forfeited.

It is a rule of the common law that where a lease is forfeited and there are trade fixtures upon the land when the forfeiture takes place, they go to the landlord. The lessee can not remove them if he has suffered a forfeiture during his term. Take the roads that have been built, the houses that have been erected, the timber supporting the roof of the mine, and the protection in tunnels and shafts, all will be subject to forfeiture. I am sure the lease will require that all those things must remain

upon the land, to be lost in case the lease is forfeited. I have put at the end of this amendment a provision giving power to the courts to punish in case there is a lack of good faith in the lessee. It seems to me with that provision the court can amply punish the one whom my friend from California [Mr. RAKER] is so anxious to rob. Barring those who act in bad faith, it seems to me we ought to be willing to give to the people who honestly invest their money in these leases full protection for whatever they do to add value to Government lands; I do not understand why this bill should be considered so sacred that we can not dot an "i" or cross a "t." That seems to be the attitude of the committee. In the public interest they ought to be willing to concede anything and everything that is fair.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TOWNER. Is it not also true that as a mere matter of policy, if these gentlemen desire investments in these interests that they have out there, if it shall be known to the investor that perhaps an unintentional violation of the law will work a forfeiture of all of the property that he has, no ordinarily careful and prudent man would invest a dollar in these enterprises?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Why, certainly; and besides that, remember this, that the lessee has the power to ruin absolutely the man who puts money into the enterprise in the shape of a mortgage. He may conspire with his competitors to do so. It may even pay him to do so if the lessee is a corporation. Under this bill, if it becomes a law, the mortgagee has no way to protect himself. There is nothing here that gives the court the power to protect him. It seems to me you ought not to say to the man who is going to put in his money, "You have got to put it in on the credit and the honesty of the lessee. You can not put it on the strength of the security at all." That is the way you leave it, and it is not fair. You will never get any development under such circumstances. This provision can not do any harm. It only asks compensation for permanent improvements, and only to the extent that such improvements increase the value of the land. Why should not the Government be willing to be honest? Why should it not be willing to pay for what its citizens may add in value to its property? I think the Government ought to be as honest as any citizen. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the amendment may be reported again. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, is there any arrangement for time?

Mr. FERRIS. No; but I hope there may be one. Can we not find out how much time is desired, and give gentlemen the time they desire, and then close the debate on the paragraph?

Mr. STAFFORD. Let it run a little while.

Mr. FERRIS. I am afraid it will go too far.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no; it will not.

Mr. FERRIS. I withdraw the request.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, when this provision was under consideration in the other bill, I called the attention of those who had charge of the bill to this provision, which, in my judgment, was both unwise as a question of justice and certainly unwise as a question of policy from the standpoint of the proponents of this bill. However, they did not seem to take that view of the case. I am entirely in accord with the idea suggested in this amendment and shall support it. In my judgment it is a very important amendment and ought to be adopted by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, the provision in the bill is that a proceeding may be commenced in a court of the United States for the cancellation of these leases whenever—and this is the exact language of the section—

> Whenever the lessee fails to comply with any of the provisions of this act, of the lease, or of the general regulations promulgated under this act and in force at the date of the lease.

It will be observed by gentlemen of the committee that this places every lessee under this act subject to three conditions: First, the provisions of this act. Granted that they may be complied with, perhaps without difficulty. Second, the provisions of the lease. Mr. Chairman, it is not only possible but probable that no lessee will ever enter upon one of these leases who will not at some time, for some reason, under some circumstances, be unable to comply with the terms of the lease. Under these circumstances this provision allows a proceeding to be begun against him for the forfeiture of his lease. Now, grant that the proceeding may be tried in a court of equity. Grant that the court may consider that an unintentional violation is not sufficient to work a forfeiture of the lease——

Mr. VOLSTEAD. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. TOWNER. In a moment. Still, Mr. Chairman, there is no provision in the section that would not compel the court under its terms to declare a forfeiture if there had been even a small violation of the lease inconsequential in character. Now, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Is it not true that for a forfeiture of a lease an action may be brought in ejectment as well as in equity, and that it depends entirely upon the local statutes of the State in which the land may be situated?

Mr. TOWNER. I think the gentleman is correct. I am not absolutely certain with regard to that. Usually, of course, when a forfeiture is to be declared in a court of justice, it is an appeal to the equity jurisdiction of the court. I am not at all sure, however, but that the gentleman may be correct in his suggestion, and if that is the case, it certainly makes it more necessary that we should be careful.

But granting all those things, granting that the court will do everything it can to protect the interests of the lessees, still there is absolutely no provision in this section, or in this bill, which provides for a disposition of the property that may be placed upon the land under this lease, in case a forfeiture is declared. I suggest to gentlemen that there is no State in the Union that does not provide, in case of occupancy of land upon which improvements may be made, for an equitable disposition of those improvements at the expiration or upon the cancellation of the lease. Yet there is not in this bill which we are here considering any suggestion of that kind. Mr. Chairman, will not this say to an intending investor, who may desire to invest his money in such an enterprise to the advantage of all who desire the passage of this act and the improvement of this property, "You can not afford to invest $10,000 or $100,000 or $1,000,000 in property where there is absolutely no protection against the danger of such forfeiture?"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, as I say, will it not have that effect when there is absolutely no provision in the law that will compensate him for his property or by which any arrangement can be made for its disposition in case he shall be put off the property. I suggest that the adoption of such a provision will result in no improvements being made on these properties. It will defeat the very object and purpose of the act. For, above everything else, I judge it is a bill that will result in its operation for the benefit of the West rather than a restriction on the development of their resources.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think that the provision in the bill providing that "the lease may provide for resort to appropriate methods for the settlement of disputes or for remedies for breach of specified conditions" would cover the case?

Mr. TOWNER. I hardly think so, for the reason that here is a specific section of the bill devoted to the consideration of questions of violation of the terms of the lease, and providing a method by which, and only by which, they can be terminated.

Mr. MANN. But it is not a forfeiture in itself; it requires a court proceedings to make a forfeiture that is based on the lease. It may contain remedies for breach of any specified condition or provision for settlement of any dispute between the Government and the lessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Iowa be extended three minutes. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. So, apparently, the lessee has the right when he makes the lease to insist upon conditions which I had supposed would permit him to make provision for the settlement of any dispute between him and the Government and would be a better protection to him than it would to have us insert a specific provision applicable to all cases which would be binding on the courts.

Mr. TOWNER. I am not at all sure but that the gentleman from Illinois is entirely right. It may be that the other provisions of the bill are entirely adequate for the settlement of disputes during the continuance of the lease. I am only calling attention to the danger of this section that may follow its expiration by a declared forfeiture.

Mr. MANN. The provision I refer to is in this section.

Mr. TOWNER. If the gentleman is correct about it, it would appear antagonistic to other sections.

Mr. MANN. I do not think so. Here is a provision of the lease that it may be forfeited for violation of a condition, the violation of a statute or regulation, but the same section contains a provision authorizing the Government and the lessee to make a special agreement on this subject as to what shall happen if a forfeiture takes place. I do not say that that covers the case, but I had supposed that it would.

Mr. TOWNER. Let me suggest to the gentleman. This clause reads:

And the lease may provide for resort to appropriate methods for the settlement of disputes or for remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof.

I think, perhaps, that if the lease contained a provision for the settlement of specific instances then it would be adequate, but unless it did contain a provision for every particular requirement it would not. That, in any event, would not meet the case that might result in forfeiture without the fault of the lessee and with no intent on his part to violate the terms of the lease. A lessee might, because of unfair competition, be unable to pay his rent and the court be required to declare a forfeiture. In such a case it would be manifestly unfair to confiscate his improvements, made in good faith, by declaring a forfeiture, without any provision for the disposition of his property.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of 20 minutes all debate on this section and amendments thereto be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and amendments thereto be closed in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to urge, in perfect good humor, that the House proceed a little more rapidly with this bill. The bill passed the last House practically by unanimous consent, after the most extended consideration of every paragraph, and it seems to me that we have spent more time than we ought to on a bill that we had previously passed with such full and complete consideration.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] offers an amendment which is more far-reaching than any provision that I have yet heard of. But, to debate his amendment, I want to state what section 26 does. The section is more liberal to the lessee as it stands than the leasing laws of any foreign countries that have Federal leasing laws, for they usually provide for involuntary forfeiture. This section provides that when conditions are broken, when the lessee fails to keep faith with the Government, when he fails to keep the lease contract, when he fails and refuses to do the things he agrees to do, then he may go into court and have a trial on every one of the issues to determine whether or not he has broken them at all. But the section does more than that; the last part of the section provides for arbitration, an amicable settlement between the lessee and the Government, and what language more beneficial than that could be inserted for the lessee?

Now, I have a profound respect for the opinion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] and also for the gentleman from Iowa, Judge TOWNER, and I am sure that the reading of this section in conjunction with section 30, which gives the Secretary every power to work out rules and regulations to make this effective, is liberal enough for the lessee.

My own notion is, we need not be so solicitous about these big coal and oil companies. They usually have high-priced attorneys to look after their interests, both at the start and at the close.

But let me call attention to the Government side of it. If you adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD], in my opinion you will make it so favorable to the lessee that you never can get rid of the lessee or even be able to regulate him or force him to comply with the lease. And in the event he breaks his conditions under the amendment offered the only thing you can do is to call a halt and pay him for everything he has done. If he wanted to obviate his lease, if he wanted to get rid of it, if he wanted to fail to comply with it, all he would have to do would be to lean on the gentleman's amendment and say, "I demand a lien, and that the court decree a lien on not only property put there but also on the Federal Government as well." Whoever heard of the law giving a tenant of the Government the right to decree a lien against the Government land? That is what the amendment does. Let me read the gentleman's amendment:

The court in adjudging a forfeiture may, as compensation to the lessee or others interested, decree a lien upon any land permanently improved by the lessee in a sum not exceeding the value added to the land by such improvement, such lien to be paid when the land is again sold or leased under the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That if when the land is again sold or leased such improvement shall have depreciated in value since such forfeiture, the lien may on application to such court be reduced accordingly: *Provided further*, That the court may deny compensation in whole or in part to anyone guilty of bad faith in securing the lease or in carrying out its provisions or the provisions of this act.

But I want to get back to the first of it. I again read:

The court in adjudging a forfeiture may, as compensation to the lessee—

Compensation for what? Because he broke the conditions that he himself made—

or others interested, decree a lien upon any land permanently improved by the lessee in a sum not exceeding the value added to the land by such improvement—

And so forth.

Now, along comes the first lessee. He breaks his condition; but if he goes into court he has the right to demand that the court give him a lien on the Government land, the thing that we lease, the property that belongs to the Government, in order that the lessee may be justified, almost, in breaking those conditions. It ties the hands of the court, while the lessee may break the lease with impunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I hope no such amendment as this will be agreed to. I do not believe that the gentleman, after thinking about it and reading section 30, will want it agreed to.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, my attention has been called to the last part of this original section. It is thought by some that that provides sufficient protection to the lessee. I do not believe it does. I do not believe that that is intended to accomplish the purpose of my amendment at all, but only to adjust disputes while the lease is in force and only for the purpose of continuing the lease in force. It reads:

And the lease may provide for resort to appropriate methods for the settlement of disputes or for remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof.

It seems clear to me that that was intended to give power to adjust differences while the lease remains in force.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the lease is not in force until forfeited by a court of competent jurisdiction?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. That is an interesting question. Ordinarily the lease can not be in force when an action is brought. The court should find the fact that a forfeiture has taken place and declare such forfeiture; the forfeiture takes the title, not the decree. Your right must be ripe at the time you bring suit. Under the language of this bill, however, there may be some doubt when the forfeiture actually takes place. But let that be as it may, it does not cut any figure in this matter, as I look at it. Could the Secretary of the Interior make a provision such as I suggest? Could he, after forfeiture, give to the lessee any compensation? From where would the money come? I am clearly of the opinion that he would have no such power and that this language was not intended to give him any such power.

The gentleman from Oklahoma just asked why these men should have protection. He asks if it is because they have violated the lease. No; it is because they have added permanent value to the property by parting with their money in good faith for that purpose. That is what the amendment provides. We ask simply that he be given a lien for the purpose of protecting his interest in that permanent improvement.

Mr. FERRIS. Should a lessee profit by his own wrong?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. He may not have done any wrong. He may have failed because he could not help himself. His competitor may have practically driven him out of the field, and he may not be to blame at all.

Mr. FERRIS. There are provisions covering that.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. The mortgagee has no power under a lease or under any provision of the bill to protect himself. I ask that the man who puts the money into the property shall be protected. I do not ask that the dishonest man should get anything. I have carefully guarded that in the last provision of the amendment.

Mr. FERRIS. Let me inquire, Does the gentleman think that that arbitration provision means nothing? Can the gentleman conceive of the Department of Justice or anyone else who

would institute proceedings against an honest man who in good faith has failed? On the contrary, it is almost impossible to get them to bring suits at all.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. The gentleman is begging the question. This is a provision that only applies when confiscation does take place. It is only in that case that I make provision for the decree. It is where forfeiture is declared. There ought to be some power under the law whereby the interests of innocent parties may be protected. In many instances the forfeiture of leases causes great hardship. Every lawyer knows of cases of leases and of contracts for the purchase of land that have been forfeited where great injustice has been done. The men who are asked to put millions of money into these lands should not be placed in such a position. The public will eventually pay these losses. This bill will only give an opportunity for the rich man to develop. I insist the law should be such that not only will it apply to the rich, but also to the poor. Any man who wants to go to the assistance of his friend and put money into his enterprise should be permitted to do it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa and Mr. RAKER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. How was this time to be divided?

Mr. FERRIS. Nothing was said.

Mr. LENROOT. I desire to ask the Chairman how much time has been consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. Ten minutes; five minutes by the chairman and five minutes by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD].

Mr. STAFFORD. It was understood that 15 minutes was to be used by gentlemen on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. STAFFORD. And I so assured the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], that he and the gentleman from Wisconsin were to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], misconstrues, I think, not only the section itself but the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD]. The provisions of the section, had it been intended, as the gentleman from Oklahoma seems to think, ought to read quite differently from the text as it now stands. Instead of saying that a forfeiture may be declared by the court, it ought to have read to express the intention of the gentleman from Oklahoma, as I understand it, that proceedings to obtain a forfeiture might be instituted in a Federal court. Instead of so saying, we expressly authorize the court to declare a forfeiture. It does not, it is true, require the court should in all instances——

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FERRIS. If the gentleman will pardon me, the gentleman can not assume that the court is going to decree a forfeiture unless suit is brought for the purpose, can he?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman will pardon me if I say that he has entirely misunderstood what I stated. There is a vast difference between giving a court power and jurisdiction over an action and expressly giving it power to adjudicate a certain kind of judgment. The gentleman does not seem to apprehend my point.

Mr. FERRIS. I will hear the gentleman and see how well he understands it. [Laughter.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Now, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota does not provide that the lessee shall receive the expenses that he has incurred, but simply the value which he has added to the property, and even in the event he has added to the value of the property, the court is not required to award him this additional value, but may only do so in case of good faith, and also, we assume, in case that unavoidable casualty or misfortune which has caused him to make some breach of the lease. The remedy provided in the last part of the section is a remedy afforded the lessee and not the lessor. It is for a breach of the provisions or the settlement of some dispute. It affords the lessee no chance of recoupment in this direction.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RAKER. What would become of the land upon which the court gave a lien after a lien has been decreed?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. What would become of it?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; how would you satisfy the lien?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The lessor would proceed, if necessary, in the same way we now proceed to satisfy a lien.

Mr. RAKER. Tell us how. How would the lien be satisfied?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. He would enforce the lien through proper proceedings in court, if necessary, if the amount of the lien was not paid.

Mr. RAKER. What would be the ultimate result—to sell the land?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Ordinarily, however, a subsequent purchaser would take it subject to the lien.

Mr. MANN. The amendment provides for that.

Mr. RAKER. Let us see whether it does or not. That is the reason why I asked the gentleman the question——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will ask the gentleman to state that in his own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa declines to yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, in my judgment, fully provides for these matters.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am very sorry, but I can not yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. RAKER. Thank you.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The amendment is simply in accordance——

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Very well.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Something has been said here about a possible forfeiture for a breach caused by unavoidable casualty. Could not the Government and the lessee make the lease cover a breach caused by unavoidable casualty or by the act of a public enemy or by act of nature, like an earthquake or tornado? Why could not all of these possibilities of which gentlemen speak be provided for by the terms of the lease itself? The language of the bill is that the lease may provide remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will ask the gentleman not to make an argument instead of putting a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid the gentlemen who are advocating this amendment have lost sight of the purpose of this bill of authorizing a court to declare a forfeiture. It is for the purpose, and sole purpose, of securing the performance of the contract that the lessee has entered into with the Government, holding before him the possible penalty, to be declared by a court, of a forfeiture of his rights.

Now, with the amendment that is proposed, that is now pending before the committee, in a great many cases forfeiture might be no penalty at all if he is going to be made good for all that he has put into the property, and the purpose in authorizing a forfeiture entirely disappears. Now, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD], when the water-power bill was up, discussed this with me to some extent, and at that time was of the opinion that a court in a proceeding brought to declare a forfeiture would have no discretion if there was any breach of conditions, but would be compelled to declare a forfeiture. In other words, that if the breach was found to exist a forfeiture must be declared. Of course, if that was the state of the law, it ought not to obtain in this kind of a case, because there ought to be a discretion and a power in the court when a proceeding is brought in equity, and it must be in equity to do equity between the parties. I have examined the question somewhat since that time and I am satisfied now, as I was then, that the purpose of this penalty being to secure the performance of this contract in any proceedings brought in court for a forfeiture the court of equity will take that case, and if there is any way by which equity can be done between the lessee and lessor—in other words, if the lessee can cure his default by any act—the court will not declare a forfeiture. The rule is very well settled by the courts.

I read just a paragraph from Story on Equity Jurisprudence. After stating the general principle of law, he said:

> In every such case the true test generally, if not universally, by which to ascertain whether relief can or can not be had in equity is to consider whether compensation can be made or not. If it can not be made, then courts of equity will not interfere—

In other words, will declare the forfeiture—

> If it can be made, then, if the penalty is to secure the mere payment of money, courts of equity will relieve the party upon paying the principal and interest. If it is to secure the performance of some collateral act or undertaking—

And that is this case—

> then courts of equity will retain the bill and will direct an issue of quantum damnificatus; and when the amount of damages is ascertained by a jury, upon the trial of such an issue, they will grant relief upon the payment of such damages.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if a proceeding is brought under this act to declare a forfeiture, the court will not declare the forfeiture unless the lessee refuses to do that which the court says ought

to be equitably done, and if the lessee refuses to comply with what the court says ought to be done in equity, then he ought to suffer the penalty of the forfeiture of his lease.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Does the gentleman claim that that rule, which he has read from Story, has any application to the forfeiture of lease?

Mr. LENROOT. I do in this case; yes, sir.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Is it not a familiar doctrine that those leases are always canceled for failure to perform? The condition in the contract is that it shall be forfeited.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes, exactly; but it is not true always. In the payment of rent, even though there is a condition that it shall be forfeited in case of nonpayment, it has been held that a court of equity will relieve in that particular case; but generally in leases where the court will declare a forfeiture, or, in other words, not relieve against it, the parties themselves have declared there shall be a forfeiture. But in this case we do not declare a forfeiture; we simply declare the court may have the right to declare the forfeiture, and if the lessee refuses to do that which the court says in equity ought to be done he ought not to be indemnified for the money that he put into the property.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 39, noes 55.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. VOLSTEAD and Mr. FERRIS took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 56, noes 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 28. That all statements, representations, or reports required by the Secretary of the Interior under this act shall be upon oath, unless otherwise specified, and in such form and upon such blanks as the Secretary of the Interior may require.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 25, line 20, strike out the figures "28" and insert "27."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 29. That the provisions of this act shall apply to all lands of the United States which may have been or may be disposed of under laws reserving to the United States the coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium, with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same, subject to such conditions as to the use and occupancy of the surface as are or may hereafter be provided by law.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 26, line 1, strike out "29" and insert "28."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 26, line 1, after the word "shall," insert the word "also."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 26, line 2, after the word "all," insert the words "deposits of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium in the."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Also, the following committee amendment was read:

Page 26, line 5, after the word "States," strike out the words "the coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium" and insert "such deposits."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Also, the following committee amendment was read:

Page 26, line 7, after the word "conditions," strike out the words "as to the use and occupancy of the surface."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 30. That all moneys received from royalties and rentals under the provisions of this act, excepting those from Alaska, shall be paid into, reserved, and appropriated as a part of the reclamation fund created by the act of Congress approved June 17, 1902, known as the reclamation act, but after use thereof in the construction of reclamation works and upon return to the reclamation fund of any such moneys in the manner provided by the reclamation act and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, 50 per cent of the amounts derived from such royalties and rentals so utilized in and returned to the reclamation fund shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury after the expiration of each fiscal year to the State within the boundaries of which the leased lands or deposits are or were located, said moneys to be used by such State for the support of public schools or other educational institutions, as the legislature of the State may direct: *Provided*, That any moneys which may accrue to the United States under the provisions of this act from lands within the naval petroleum reserves shall be deposited in the Treasury as "Miscellaneous receipts."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, line 10, strike out the figures "30" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "29."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, line 25, after the word "State," insert the words "or subdivisions thereof for the construction and maintenance of public roads or."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to that amendment. I would like to inquire whether this is in the happiest phraseology as to "subdivisions thereof." I assume that the purpose is that the moneys may be used by these subdivisions. In reading the bill I thought perhaps the language was used rather awkwardly, "to be used by such State or subdivisions thereof."

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I will say in reply to the gentleman that some of the States have cooperative roads, operating between the counties and the States, where the legislature treats the county as an entity, and in such cases the legislature might want to appropriate part of the funds to the county as a county. If the gentleman has any suggestion about the language, we shall be glad to hear it, but I think this will cover it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, that is well enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 2, after the word "other," insert the word "public."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN] offered an amendment. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCLAUGHLIN:

"Page 26, line 11, after the word 'act,' strike out all the remainder of the section and insert the following language: 'shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.'"

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment with the idea of having legislation enacted in the proper way and a proper disposition made of public receipts and the revenues of public property.

It may be remembered that a few days ago, when we were considering the bill to provide for the development of water power on the public lands, I offered an amendment which, if adopted, would have provided for the depositing in the Treasury of the United States of money received as charges or rentals for use of land within the national forests, to be used as are other receipts of the national forests. That amendment was not agreed to. It may be, as some gentleman here has suggested, that this bill is air-tight, and that no amendments can be made except such as are presented by the committee itself. But I offer this amendment with the idea that the plan proposed by the bill is not proper. Money received from public property, all public receipts, ought to be turned into the Public Treasury, so that Congress may know the amount of them and the source of them, and that it may always be within the power of Congress to make appropriations of money, to know what use is to be made of it, how much of it is to be used for each and every particular purpose.

I venture to say there is not a gentleman on this floor who knows what the receipts available for the Reclamation Service have been up to this time, nor is there one who knows the amount of money already expended on reclamation projects.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, right there, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Nor how much money will be needed, according to the estimates of any official, to complete what is known as the reclamation projects. Now I yield.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman is correct in his last statement, but in the others he is entirely in error. His last statement as to how much is to be expended is true, but as to the proposition that no one knows how much has been expended he is in error. I have the figures right here.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Well, it is possible the gentleman from Oklahoma, the chairman of this committee, has those figures, but I doubt whether other gentlemen on the floor have any idea of how much money has been used on the projects, how much money is available, or how much money will be necessary to complete the projects.

When I presented my amendment a few days ago my colleague from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] made a statement as to the amount that had been used in reclamation projects and gave something of the history of those projects; and it appeared that the projects were started with the idea that they were to cost a comparatively small amount of money. We had the estimates of distinguished engineers. The money devoted to the purpose was all expended, and it was found that the projects had just been begun, and that immense sums of money running up, as I remember, to $75,000,000, in addition to all that had up to that time been appropriated or expended, would be or might be necessary to complete the projects. I think those figures came as a surprise to the membership of this House. The Members had no idea of such expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. FERRIS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, is any more time desired on that side of the question?

Mr. MONDELL. How much time is the gentleman going to reserve?

Mr. FERRIS. I thought of reserving five minutes for the members of the committee.

Mr. MONDELL. I suggest that the gentleman reserve 10 minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the debate be allowed to run on for a little time. This is an important matter, the subject of receipts.

Mr. FERRIS. I did not intend to close debate on the section, but on the amendment. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that at the expiration of 15 minutes, debate on the amendment be closed.

Mr. MONDELL. I may want two or three minutes.

Mr. LEVER. And I would like to have a little time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment be closed in 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be used by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], who now has the floor, 5 minutes to be used by the committee, and 5 minutes by some one else who desires to speak in favor of the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. No, Mr. Chairman; the remaining five minutes is to be divided between the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the remaining five minutes to be divided between the gentleman from Wyoming and the gentleman from South Carolina. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, ought not the committee to have some time, too?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; I think the committee ought to have a few minutes. Say 10 minutes to be divided between the gentleman from Wyoming and the gentleman from South Carolina and myself. Is that satisfactory?

The CHAIRMAN. And 10 minutes to be divided between the gentleman from Wyoming, the gentleman from South Carolina, and the chairman of the committee. Is that it?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know the purpose of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] in presenting the figures and making the statement he did. Possibly it was because of a feeling of opposition to the reclamation projects; but I am not speaking with any feeling of opposition to those projects, or to the use of reasonable amounts of money to carry them out. I am simply insisting that the proper way to carry on legislative business is to have the money turned into the Treasury of the United States, and that Congress shall appropriate money for each and every several project, so that Congress may at all times know just what it is doing.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I am afraid I shall not have time, Mr. Chairman, I prefer to go on now and yield later if I have time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The plan proposed by the bill is a vicious and altogether improper way of carrying on public business. When I spoke the other day, I spoke partly on behalf of the Forest Service, because land within the national forests is to be used for the erection of dams, or dams are to be erected upon forest land, and are to be used in developing hydroelectric power. And my idea was that the rents and charges collected by the Government for the use of lands within the national forests ought to go into the Treasury of the United States, just as other receipts of the national forests go into the Treasury, to be used just as other receipts of the forests are used. That appears to me proper and just.

I know and appreciate the strenuous opposition on the part of some Members of the House to the entire national-forest policy. They oppose the policy, and fight almost every proposition relating to national forests incorporated in measures that come before the House. They would, if they could, wipe out all law for protecting our forest reserves. They wish to have all those forest lands, in fact, all of the public lands in the western part of the country, turned over to the States, to be used just as they please, that the Government shall part with its title and give up the idea of controlling its lands in any manner or respect whatever.

We know what has been the result of the Government being without laws, or of ineffective laws, for the protection or disposition of its property. The result has been that private interests have acquired the resources of this country; and I venture to say that if the public lands of the United States, including the forest lands, were turned over to the States, or if the laws relating to the forest reserves were repealed, within 48 hours the entire body of these lands would be in private ownership, monopolized as almost every acre of land available for purchase has been monopolized in the past.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I am afraid I have not the time. I will if I have further time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Now, I have no feeling whatever of opposition to the Reclamation Service; but we started out to use about $48,000,000, and without authority of Congress the officials in charge of the work spent, or obligated the Government to spend, about $73,000,000, if I remember the amounts correctly; and after these immense sums had been used, or obligations incurred, these same officials, supported by their very "efficient" engineers, called on Congress for money to complete the projects, telling us that a still further sum of $75,000,000 would be necessary. Now, that may have been a good use of money. The work may have been done properly. It may be a proper policy to continue; but the money to be realized under the law we are now making, the amount of which no human being can tell, ought to be first paid into the Treasury of the United States and appropriated from time to time, as Congress shall determine, so that Congress can keep track of the work and keep track of public money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope there is no gentleman, at least on this side, who has the views of certain things which have been expressed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN]. He is evidently agonizing because the farmers of Illinois own all of what was formerly the property of the Government in that State. He is sorrowful because the farmers of Michigan own all its broad and beautiful acres, which were once the property of the Government. He is thoroughly discouraged because the farmers of Iowa and Missouri have made those great Commonwealths by being able to secure title to what was once Government property.

Of course, the proposition offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] will not be adopted. It should not have a single vote, not even that of the gentleman from Michigan. I am of the opinion it would not, if he would stop to think about it. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan would not want to have all of the resources of Michigan laid under a 10, 15, or 20 per cent annual tax on the production and have the money go into the Treasury of the United States. We think that at least 50 per cent of this money should be paid to the States and the communities to compensate them for the taxes they will lose under this system; but the committee have pro-

posed that it shall go into the reclamation fund, a perfectly proper, legitimate public service; and in this connection I want to say to my good friend from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], as I said to my other good friend from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] the other day when he discussed the Reclamation Service, that I hope before he again discusses what has been done under the reclamation law he will better inform himself on the subject. [Applause.]

Mr. FERRIS. Does the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] desire to be heard?

Mr. LEVER. No; I thank the gentleman; I do not.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] does not care to use his time, and I should like to be recognized for seven minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] is recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] comes in, and in a wholesale way proposes to take every cent of these royalties and put them into the Treasury of the United States. That is his side of it. A certain group of gentlemen here believe in doing that very thing. In a few moments the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], or probably some other gentleman who lives in the far West, will come in with an amendment proposing to deliver it all eo instanti direct to the States. Now, what have the committee done? The committee have done the thing that is reasonable, the thing that ought to be done, and have put the proceeds into the Reclamation Service. Let us then see if we are justified in doing that.

In 1902 Congress said, in the enactment of the Reclamation Service law, that every penny of the proceeds of the sale of the public lands should go into the Reclamation Service. What for? To build up and create a great service in the West, converting the bald, naked prairie into habitable homes. Since that time the department have been going along with irrigation as best they could. The receipts from this source have dwindled down from $9,000,000 in 1908 to $3,000,000 in 1915. Now, if it was right in 1902 to put the proceeds of the sale of the public lands into the Reclamation Service, the fee passing into the States for taxing purposes, surely it is right to put the proceeds of these royalties into the Reclamation Service, and keep the Reclamation Service going.

I can speak without any selfish interest on this proposition, because while my State is one of the semiarid States and while we have put into the fund six and a half million dollars we have never had a single acre irrigated. So my defense of the irrigation fund is without any selfish motive. But looking further than the individual rights of my State, I am not one that wants to strike down that great service in this country. In 1892 it was thought wise to begin this service, and every year it has been thought wise to maintain it, and only two or three years ago Congress was called upon and responded with an appropriation of $20,000,000 to keep the service going. Under the leases we do not provide that the lands shall be patented, so they will yield taxes, and so we ought to at least give them royalties, so that the irrigation fund may be kept going and so that it will not wither and die.

Let me call attention to the fact that about $85,000,000 has been expended for irrigation. A part of it was a $20,000,000 loan and the rest are the proceeds of the public lands. Some of it has been wasted, I have no doubt, not intentionally, but in experiments as to what they could do with water on worthless land. But for the $85,000,000 expended we have a lien or mortgage on the land irrigated, and that money is to be paid back.

Let us see what we are doing for rivers and harbors. The Federal Government has at one time and another expended over $800,000,000 for river and harbor improvements. This is not to be returned or even promised to be returned.

Now, I am not against river and harbor improvement. I have voted for it every year because I believe that it is a great national development and that it ought to be done. Perhaps mistakes are made there. The $850,000,000 is not to be paid back to the Government at all; while, on the other hand, these expenditures are to be paid back—the homesteaders who are trying to settle up the arid States in the West promise to pay back—whether they do it or not, they promise to pay it back.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. As a matter of fact, they are paying it back; why does the gentleman emphasize "promise"?

Mr. FERRIS. I think that is true—they are paying it back.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. How much money is to be realized under the leases you are providing for in this bill?

Mr. FERRIS. No one knows. You can judge something from the speeches that have been made here. The gentleman from Oregon said that it would take $20,000,000 out of the West, and a gentleman later on said that no lease would ever be executed under it, and therefore there would be no royalty.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Did not he say that it would take $20,000,000 out of one State?

Mr. FERRIS. No; not if I understood the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The statement was that if the water possibilities could be realized to the full capacity, it would take $20,000,000 out of one State.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Can the gentleman from Oklahoma give us any estimate as to the amount that would be realized under this bill?

Mr. FERRIS. No; no one knows.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Does that not support what I said—that we are providing for turning possibly untold millions of dollars into this fund?

Mr. FERRIS. I hope that is true. I hope that thing will happen, for if it does the House will place the stamp of approval on the work that the Public Lands Committee has been doing, and the fact that it has brought a razor in here that will shave. The standing indictment against this bill has been that it would not do anything—that no one would ever work under it.

Now, I am only giving you my own opinion, but I think that from oil and water power we shall get some pretty good returns. I doubt if we ever get much from coal for a long time. The fact is we have 450,000,000,000 tons of coal, roughly estimated, belonging to the Government, and there are 150,000,000,000 tons in private ownership. My opinion is that the Government coal is so far from the railroad, so far from the central market, that it will be a long time before anything is realized under it from coal. But as to the oil and water power, my opinion is that receipts will enrich the irrigation fund. You will get a good return, and it will build up the irrigation fund in the West; it will make States that have only 100,000 population now have double that amount. I believe it will develop things in the West generally. I think the bills we are passing will accomplish what is claimed for them. They have had careful consideration here on the floor, extended and patriotic consideration by the Committee on the Public Lands. The Secretary of the Interior has personally given unstinted and patriotic work on them. All of the departments have. I am personally proud of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired, and all time has expired, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the section and insert the following:

"That one-half of the royalties and rentals received under the provisions of this act shall be paid to the State within which the leased lands or deposits are located, to be used by such State or the subdivisions thereof for the construction and maintenance of roads and for the support of schools, as the legislature of the State shall direct, and one-half shall be paid into the reclamation fund.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take up the time of the committee for any considerable period, even if opportunity is given me in the discussion of this amendment, for I discussed it at some length in general debate, and I discussed a similar provision in the water-power bill when that bill was under consideration.

The section as it stands provides that the royalty and rentals shall flow into the irrigation fund. My amendment provides for a division, one half going to the State and one half to the reclamation fund. It will be remembered that this is a radical departure from past legislation. Heretofore we have disposed of the public lands and in due course of time they have passed into private ownership and become taxable, with all their values. We are now proposing to retain permanently from private ownership and taxation this valuable property of land and minerals.

It is our opinion that one-half of the receipts from royalties and rentals will not more than recompense us for the actual loss in revenues through our inability to tax values retained in the hands of the Federal Government. If it were a matter of selling lands at a nominal price and then turning the money into the Federal Treasury, that would be one thing, because the land sold would become taxable and we would have an opportunity to support the institutions of government by taxing the lands. When, however, we retain the lands permanently in the hands of the Federal landlord and exact a heavy rental, to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior, surely there can be no one who has considered the matter carefully, not even my

friend from Michigan, who believes that under such conditions these great rentals and royalties, running on forever, covering a large portion of the lands and resources of a State or of a community, should all be taken out of the community, out of the State, even for so splendid a purpose as the reclamation of arid lands.

It is perhaps proper that half the funds should go into the reclamation fund; but surely these communities are entitled to compensation for the loss that they must sustain to their revenues under this system; and, more than that, if there be any real, sound argument for the establishment for a public leasing system, its strongest pillar and support is the claim, the hope, the expectation that through such a system, with all of its annoyances, with all of its liability to check development, the community may secure larger benefits as time passes than would be secured under a system of private ownership. That is one of the strongest arguments in favor of a public leasing system. That argument goes for naught if the revenues thus received from the depletion of the resources of a State are taken beyond its borders and its people receive no benefit. The cost of the maintenance of government goes on. Roads must be built, schools must be maintained, while the revenues flowing from these enormous resources are going out of the community beyond the borders of the States, to be used for other purposes, the people left without funds or opportunity to develop their country. It seems to me this is a very fair provision. As a matter of fact, these States and communities should have all of these moneys. No other theory is consistent with our idea of government, and it is only because the reclamation fund is one contributing to the upbuilding of this same western country that we approve or agree to the proposition of half of it going into the reclamation fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. It is true there is a provision in this section under which, after the money has been paid into the reclamation fund and then paid back, half of it shall go to the State for the purposes contemplated by my amendment. The difficulty with that is that it will be 20 or 25 or 30 years before these moneys are returned. It will be impossible to identify them, in any event, when they are returned; and if anyone objects, no dollar could ever come back to the States under that provision. Worse than that, these communities for 20 years, longer than the life of an ordinary oil field, as long as the life of an ordinary coal mine, must be deprived of this source of income, must build their roads, must educate their children, and the only satisfaction they would have is a hope deferred that at some time in the distant future some other generation may perhaps get some benefit.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan because I have always been of the belief that all moneys received by the Government ought to be paid into the Treasury, to be at the disposition of Congress in its wisdom. Its wisdom may not always be as great as the wisdom of a former Congress, and yet during my experience here I have not seen that the Congress of 20 years ago was any wiser than the Congress now, or that the Congress before my friend from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] came into it knew any more than it has since he came. I am inclined to think that the wisdom increases gradually rather than retrogrades.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. For a question.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the gentleman understand by this provision that this money would not go into the General Treasury?

Mr. MANN. No; but it goes into the General Treasury as a pledged fund. It is kept apart on the books of the Treasury. The gentleman knew, and I knew, perfectly well about that. I would be almost inclined, however, to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] were it not for one thing, because I can not conceive of any reason why we should pay half of this money to the States eventually and not pay it to them from the start. If the States are entitled to half of the money, then those who live at the time the money is contributed are better entitled to it than are their descendants. But the reason I shall not vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming is very briefly stated. I do not think these reclamation projects ever intend to pay back the money to the Government. In the last Congress we put off the time for any payments for five years, gave them the money without interest.

Mr. MONDELL. Not on all of them.

Mr. MANN. On all of them except the preliminary payments, even those in the past as well as those in the future, and we extended the time of payment for the balance—the annual payments—for 20 years. But if we provide that half of the money when it is repaid shall go into the State treasuries, then we are sure to get the money back.

The gentleman from Wyoming says there is no way of distinguishing where this money goes to. I think he is incorrect. The books of the Treasury will show these funds kept separately, and they will show what projects received money out of this fund, and the Treasury Department and the Reclamation Service will at all times know just to a dollar, to a cent, how much of this money is in any particular reclamation project, and when the money is to be paid back the balance of the State which has received half the money that comes in will insist that the money be paid back so that the whole State may have the benefit of it, in spite of a few gentlemen who have gone into some place and reaped the special benefit of a special reclamation project. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to insert in the RECORD right here a table contained in the Fourteenth Annual Report of the Reclamation Service, 1914–15, which would answer all of the questions propounded by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN]. Secondly, on page 470 a table marked "14," in order to answer the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], which shows that there have been $15,359,956.59 already paid by these reclamation projects, and that we hope and expect and believe, and no western man ever had an idea different or contrary to that fact, that the Government would be repaid for every dollar expended on reclamation projects.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield.

Mr. MANN. I have not yet examined that table, but I do not believe upon examination it will show any $15,000,000 has been paid back on reclamation projects.

Mr. RAKER. I did not say that.

Mr. MANN. That is what the gentleman tried to lead us to believe.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. MANN. I understood——

Mr. RAKER. What the gentleman understood and what the gentleman from California stated are entirely different things.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Not for the moment. I made a statement direct and positive to the fact, and irrespective of what the gentleman from Illinois might think or might believe and the unkind statements that he made are entirely two different things.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. No; I do not yield for the moment. A man gets up here and reads a record, and the gentleman makes an unkind comment here, just as he did last night. I realize the fact, and I realize the gentleman's astuteness, and I realize that he has a great body of men on the other side behind him and can always demand anything he wants; but, notwithstanding, such a statement of a gentleman of his ability becomes improper at this time, when one reads the record before the House to the end that information may be had.

I read exactly what is here. I gave the page showing the kind and character of receipts that have been collected from the reclamation fund, not only from rentals but temporary water rentals, transportation refunds, forfeitures by bidders and contractors, power and light, water-right construction charges, water-right operation and maintenance charges, overdisbursements, and miscellaneous, as well as the miscellaneous service, coming to the full amount, and showing that these people in the West have already paid into the reclamation fund this amount of money; and the persistent statement before the House that these people are trying to avoid their contracts by trying to get out of payment, or trying to defeat this Government in carrying out these most beneficial projects, is clearly uncalled for and ought not to be made, because no one has ever attempted to defeat the Government. The idea is these projects may be completed, and that as soon as they are completed and other projects—land lying in the same condition as these present projects before being started—might be used in making fertile, valuable, and useful the desert lands of the West.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from California will accord me another virtue—that of patience. It is one of the peculiarities of politics that when the Democrats are short of other things, they abuse the Republican leader. That is always safe. It never takes either acumen, intelligence, or any other attribute which naturally belongs to a Member of

Congress, or properly. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] a moment ago stated that there had been paid back to the reclamation fund $15,000,000, and he had the record before him. There the gentleman stopped. Now, I have examined the reclamation-fund reports every year. I have not yet seen them this year, but I knew that statement was not correct; and out of kindliness of heart, because I wished to excuse the many inaccuracies the gentleman from California unintentionally perpetrates upon the House, I challenged the statement so that he might correct it. Thereupon he says there has been paid into the reclamation fund from a great many different sources a large amount of money—not paid back to the reclamation fund. Now, the gentleman will not state how much has been paid back to the reclamation fund.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will not the gentleman from Illinois state how much has been paid from the settlers last year?

Mr. MANN. I do not know. I just stated I have not seen that.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It is shown by the last report of the Reclamation Service, page 31, that during the last fiscal year there was paid back $644,544.54 from water-right charges.

Mr. MANN. That is, in the last year. The gentleman from California told the House that in the few years that it has been running there have been $15,000,000 paid back, and last year should have been by long odds the largest amount that was paid in.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman from Illinois allow me?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly. I am willing to receive information.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH], wanting to be exceedingly fair, only referred to water-right repayment—that is, repayment of the building charge. There was another item of $1,764,962.48 in the last year, a very large proportion of which is water rental.

Mr. MANN. That is for the operation.

Mr. MONDELL. That is for operation and rental.

Mr. MANN. That is not paid back into the reclamation fund, and the gentleman from Wyoming, with all his acumen, ought not to attempt to mislead me on the subject.

Mr. MONDELL. I am not attempting to mislead the gentleman. I could not if I would, and I would not if I could. The money, in the first instance, is paid out for a certain purpose and paid back with a profit. In other words, they paid back the cost of maintenance and some more, and nearly three-quarters of a million on the building charges.

Mr. MANN. Why, Mr. Chairman, we have reached that point where our friends from the West in their zeal compliment themselves that they even pay the operating expenses of these water-power and reclamation projects. I have no doubt that they will continue to do that during this generation, or, it may be, if my friend from Wyoming remains in the House long enough he will want the General Government to pay the operating expenses as well as the original cost.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. I want to make this suggestion. I have made it to him before, but I hope this time he will remember it. The only difficulty we have had in the West with regard to repayments; that is, the only arguments that have been made by the farmers at any time against repayments have been by quoting Members on the floor of the House, among others my friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN], to the effect that they did not expect the money would ever be paid back. And every time a statement of that kind is made it goes out into our country. And, of course, there are some people everywhere who would like to escape their debts, which makes it more difficult to make these collections. I hope we will not hear any more of it.

Mr. MANN. If I make it more difficult to make collections the gentleman ought to get busy, then.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment, and to discuss for a few moments the difficulties which result where the income from resources on Federal domain in the far Western States is taken into the United States Treasury, there to be held for a time and then a portion of it to be returned to some other Federal activity.

In the amendment now under consideration it is proposed to place in the Federal Treasury all of the moneys received from long-term leases of mining land. Do this, and how may the Western States hope for any return from resources within their own boundaries? True, these resources belong to the Federal Government, and we so acknowledged in accepting our enabling acts, but we have felt that the United States Government meant "to have and to hold" them only until we became of age, and that ultimately we might come into our own. But under a 50-year renewable leasing system we never shall. And now the amendment just offered proposes to take all of the proceeds from the leases away from the States. Could anything be more unfair?

These debates as to where the lease money for water-power sites on the nonnavigable streams, and for coal lands, and for mining generally, will be read with much interest by the people of the State that I have the honor in part to represent. We have had some experience with the pay-back-the-money scheme. We receive 25 per cent of the sales of timber in the Federal forest reserves. That per cent comes back to the particular counties which have area in the particular forest reserve from which the timber has been sold.

That seems simple; but, so far as I can learn, there has always been a misunderstanding among the people of Washington about it. Many think that all of the 25 per cent from all the reserves in the State of Washington is divided among all the counties which have territory in the reserves. But this is not the case. A sale of timber in Jefferson County in no way benefits Okanogan County. No part of the return from that sale goes to any county except the three other counties which, along with Jefferson, have area in the great Olympic Forest Reserve, which itself comprises 1,652,000 acres. The 25 per cent of that Jefferson County sale goes to Clallam, Jefferson, Mason, and Grays Harbor Counties, in proportion to their area in that reserve, which is as follows:

County.	Acres.	Per cent of area.
Jefferson	709,575	48.75
Clallam	442,410	30.40
Mason	172,497	10.53
Grays Harbor	172,454	10.32

Mr. Chairman, in the State of Washington there are 11 forest reserves. One runs over into Idaho and one runs into Oregon. According to the statement I hold in my hand there has been returned to the forest reserve counties of the State of Washington for eight years ending June 30, 1915, the sum of $215,744.12. This is an average of $26,968 per year. There are 25 forest reserve counties in the State of Washington. If that $26,968 had been divided equally among them, each forest reserve county would have received $1,000 a year. But the fund is not divided that way. Olympic National Forest sales provide a 25 per cent return to Olympic National Forest counties. For instance, Mason County in 1913 received as its share of the 25 per cent the great sum of $24.65. Think of it, $24.65—for what? To quote the words of the act of Congress, February 1, 1905, "for benefit of the public schools and public roads." The total sum returned to the State that year as 25 per cent was $33,109.69.

Mr. Chairman, I have stated as clearly as I could the distribution of the 25 per cent fund. For lack of time I have not discussed the additional 10 per cent which the Forest Service receives for a road and trail fund, to use as it pleases in any forest reserve in the State. For the present, let me say that to date none of that 10 per cent has been used in the Olympic reserve. Now, let me state the distribution in other words by reading the exact language of this paper, signed by C. B. Kegley, master of the Washington State Grange, and by F. W. Lewis, secretary. The introduction says:

STATEMENT OF FOREST RESERVE FUNDS.

An act of Congress, approved February 1, 1905, reads as follows: "That hereafter 25 per cent of all money received from each forest reserve during any fiscal year, including the year ending June 30, 1908, shall be paid at the end thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State or Territory in which said reserve is situated, to be expended for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which the forest reserve is situated."

As a result of this act there has been paid to the State of Washington 25 per cent of receipts from national forest reserve, as follows:

Fiscal year:	
1908	$13,855.31
1909	16,017.56
1910	23,671.89
1911	24,111.36
1912	31,895.21
1913	33,109.69
1914	35,637.54
1915	37,445.56
Total for 8 years	215,744.12

The Agricultural appropriation act for 1913 authorized the setting aside of the road and trail fund, 10 per cent of receipts, for the fiscal year 1912:

"That an additional 10 per cent of all moneys received from the national forests during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, shall be available at the end thereof, to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture for the construction and maintenance of roads and trails within the national forests in the States from which such proceeds are derived; but the Secretary of Agriculture may, whenever practi-

cable, in the construction and maintenance of such roads, secure the cooperation or aid of the proper State or Territorial authorities in the furtherance of any system of highways of which such roads may become a part."

The appropriation act for 1914 contained a similar provision and continued it to subsequent years.

The road and trail fund, 10 per cent, for Washington is as follows:

Fiscal year:	
1912	$12,759.08
1913	13,243.88
1914	14,255.02
1915	14,978.23
Total	55,236.21

The fund derived under this provision of law is not distributed among the forests according to collection, but is regarded as a State fund, to be expended on the forests where it appears it will be of most advantage to the State in general.

Then follows a long dash, and the following:

Congressman ALBERT JOHNSON proposes in a bill recently introduced to build a part of the Olympic highway along the western side of the Olympic Peninsula by a loan to the State of Washington from the National Government, the total sum to be repaid through a reduction of the school and road moneys paid the State by the Forest Service.

The forest reserves in Washington are located in 25 counties, each receiving its share of the 25 per cent forest reserve fund for public schools and public roads. The counties reached by this proposed highway would be three—Clallam, Jefferson, and Grays Harbor (formerly Chehalis). Twenty-two counties are to be asked to yield their share of school and road funds in order that three may have this highway.

Note again carefully the provisions for use of road and trail fund, which does not revert to counties but may be used where it appears it will be of most advantage to the State in general.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, just four counties would be called on to pay back—Clallam, Jefferson, Grays Harbor, and Mason—after five years, at a rate of 15 per cent of the 25 per cent they received from forest-reserve sales. The statement of the grange continues as follows:

Why should Okanogan County, receiving in 1915 $12,121.90 for schools and roads, be asked to build a highway on the Olympic Peninsula? Why should Ferry, Chelan, Stevens, and Pend Oreille yield their school and road funds for an Olympic Highway?

And, indeed, why should they? It is not proposed that they should. If the forest-reserve counties of the State received as 25 per cent in 1915 the sum of $37,445.56 and Okanogan County received $12,121.90, it is very plain that the Okanogan reserve had large sales, while the 10 other reserves had small sales. In fact, the four counties in the Olympic reserve received in 1915 a total of only $4,494.75. They got nothing from the Okanogan sales, and if there shall be big sales in 1916 Okanogan will receive no part of their 25 per cent.

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, we come to the resolutions, of which what I have read seem to be a sort of argument and introduction. I quote:

Whereas Congress has appropriated 25 per cent of receipts from national forest resources to the counties of our State in which forest reserves are located, to be used for public schools and public roads within said counties; and

Whereas these counties, 25 in all, need every dollar they can get for the development of schools and roads within their borders; and

Whereas Congressman JOHNSON proposes by a bill introduced in Congress to secure a loan from the National Government to construct a section of Olympic Highway through Clallam, Jefferson, and Grays Harbor Counties, the same to be repaid by deductions from the 25 per cent forest reserve fund appropriated for use of schools and roads in each county; and

Whereas this would deprive the people of 22 counties not benefited by said highway of their just share of funds for schools and roads for a number of years; and

Whereas Congress has further provided that 10 per cent of forest resources be used for roads and trails, to be expended on the forests where it will be of most advantage to the State in general, thus providing a fund for such highway, if it is deemed advisable: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we are opposed to diverting any moneys from the schools and roads of the respective counties for a highway fund such as proposed in Congressman JOHNSON'S bill.

Adopted by the Washington State Grange executive committee, in session this 6th day of January, 1916.

C. B. KIGLEY, *Master.*
F. W. LEWIS, *Secretary.*

Now, you see, Mr. Chairman and Members, the State grange, an important organization in my State, has the impression that the funds returned to the Olympic Forest Reserve counties are scattered among 25 forest reserve counties, where, as a matter of fact, all except four of the counties participate in other forest reserve funds. That is what we get into when we take money away from a State and attempt to parcel it back in dabs and driblets.

I am glad the grange has called attention to the bill for building roads in and adjacent to the forest reserves. It will result in good discussion and better understanding.

How are we going to get roads into, around, or through these great areas?

The States should not be asked to build them.

The 25 per cent return is not enough to build them.

The additional 10 per cent is handled by the Forest Service in its own way.

The United States Treasury gets and keeps 65 per cent of our forest sales. We want to borrow it without interest, the counties benefited to pay it back by letting the Government withhold 10 per cent of the 25 per cent after five years. We propose to use the first available $100,000 for the Olympic National Forest, the next $100,000 for the Columbia National Forest, the third $100,000 for Rainier or some other of the 11 great reserves in our State—any one—I do not care which, if we can get started. Then the grange and other organizations will be among the first to indorse this rational plan for Government aid for roads into or adjacent to Government property.

No; I am not afraid that these western organizations will continue to oppose this measure, but I am afraid that eastern Congressmen, who do not understand the difficulties of long-range Federal control—3,200 miles in this case—will oppose, and will go on passing bills to hang us up, blight our prospects, and take away the income from the resources within our boundaries.

It will not be very many years before just such problems as now confront the Forest Service will confront the department handling this leasing scheme. The Forest Service says that it must have money to build some trunk-line roads through forest reserves, and the only way they can see that they can get it is from the money which comes in through the sales of forest-reserve timber.

Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks by inserting a copy of House bill 6867.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the bill referred to by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The bill referred to is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6867) to advance to the State of Washington the sum of $100,000 for the construction of a road within and adjacent to the Olympic National Forest.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized to expend from moneys received during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, from the national forests in the State of Washington, exclusive of the 25 per cent of receipts now paid to the State for the benefit of public schools and public roads under the act of May 23, 1908 (34 Stat., p. 251), and the 10 per cent of receipts expended under the act of May 10, 1912 (37 Stats., p. 269), in the construction of roads and trails, not exceeding $100,000 for the construction of a road approximately 60 miles in length between Quinianlt, Grays Harbor County, and Forks, Clallam County, within and adjacent to the Olympic National Forest, in the State of Washington, said road to be a continuation of the State road known as the Olympic Highway.

SEC. 2. That, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, in lieu of the 25 per cent to be granted the State of Washington under the act of May 23, 1908, out of receipts from the Olympic National Forest, there shall be granted the State of Washington 10 per cent of the gross receipts until such time as is provided for in section 3 of this act for the benefit of the public schools and public roads in the counties in which the aforesaid national forest is situated.

SEC. 3. That when the Secretary of Agriculture shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury that the 15 per cent of the gross receipts from the Olympic National Forest which is withheld under section 2 of this act amounts to $100,000 the reduction hereby made in the percentage to be paid to the State of Washington under the act of May 23, 1908, shall no longer apply.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairmain, I am not sure whether or not I got consent to insert them, or whether it was in my statement that the tables referred to by me under this report, Document No. 58, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, would be inserted in the RECORD. I made a statement based upon them, and I ask unanimous consent that the tables be inserted in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to insert certain tables in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following are the tables referred to:

COLLECTIONS.

The two tables below give information as to collections that have been made under the reclamation operations. Table 14 gives an analysis of the sources of all cash collections to June 30, 1915, while Table 15 gives, by projects, the amount collected for water-right charges.

TABLE 14.—*Analysis of cash collections by fiscal years to June 30, 1915.*

Sources.	Fiscal years 1903–1914.	Fiscal year 1915	Total.
Miscellaneous sales	$1,343,272.12	$383,342.20	$1,726,614.32
Miscellaneous services	3,552,106.38	585,691.08	4,137,797.46
Temporary water rentals	2,204,723.43	502,805.65	2,707,529.08
Transportation refunds	260,464.86	31,215.59	291,680.45
Forfeitures by bidders and contractors	78,588.71	100.00	78,688.71
Power and light	499,104.01	260,614.45	759,718.46
Water-right construction charges	3,102,331.59	473,137.31	3,575,468.90
Water-right operation and maintenance charges	1,895,847.84	171,407.23	2,067,255.07
Overdisbursements	34,030.63	1,193.51	35,224.14
Total	12,970,469.57	2,409,507.02	15,379,976.59

TABLE 15.—*Collection of water-right charges by projects to June 30, 1915.*

State and project.	Construction charges.		Operation and maintenance charges.		Total.	
	Fiscal year 1915.	To June 30, 1915.	Fiscal year 1915.	To June 30, 1915.	Fiscal year 1915.	To June 30 1915.
Arizona: Salt River		$100,000.00				$100,000.00
Arizona-California: Yuma	$72,479.43	215,901.69		$44,345.55	$72,479.43	260,247.24
Idaho: Minidoka	23,657.48	398,456.51	$24,728.95	259,209.60	48,386.43	657,666.11
Kansas: Garden City		142.50		104.50		247.00
Montana:						
Huntley	14,819.45	255,681.82	14,122.84	95,736.22	28,942.29	351,418.04
Sun River	17,791.60	110,166.95	2,648.25	36,851.16	20,439.85	147,018.11
Montana-North Dakota: Lower Yellowstone	1,117.52	34,948.07	353.05	36,144.49	1,470.57	71,092.56
Nebraska-Wyoming: North Platte	53,526.51	237,121.61	22,706.13	274,142.49	76,232.64	511,264.10
Nevada: Truckee-Carson	29,044.63	264,335.17	21,431.40	157,653.14	50,476.03	421,988.31
New Mexico: Carlsbad	8,552.81	119,332.11	11,734.58	124,334.47	20,287.39	243,666.58
North Dakota: North Dakota Pumping	1,165.39	7,847.52	340.35	13,307.15	1,505.74	21,154.67
Oregon: Umatilla	8,725.10	196,112.26	6,364.16	65,096.61	15,089.26	261,208.87
Oregon-California: Klamath	11,014.88	277,705.88	1,679.02	110,624.25	12,693.90	388,330.13
South Dakota: Belle Fourche	25,508.64	133,622.50	15,733.19	106,837.06	41,241.83	240,459.56
Washington:						
Okanogan	77.63	24,549.33		35,492.62	77.63	60,041.95
Yakima storage	100,000.00	100,000.00			100,000.00	100,000.00
Sunnyside	41,195.76	633,530.91	34,961.69	477,296.88	76,157.45	1,110,827.79
Tieton	34,395.06	225,484.81	1,445.89	124,939.68	35,840.95	350,424.49
Wyoming: Shoshone	30,065.42	240,529.26	13,157.73	105,119.20	43,223.15	345,648.46
Total	473,137.31	3,575,468.90	171,407.23	2,067,255.07	644,544.54	5,642,723.97

State and project.	Refunds.						Net collection of water-right charges to June 30, 1915.
	Construction charges.		Operation and maintenance charges.		Total.		
	Fiscal year 1915.	To June 30, 1915.	Fiscal year 1915.	To June 30, 1915.	Fiscal year 1915.	To June 30, 1915.	
Arizona: Salt River							$100,000.00
Arizona-California: Yuma							260,247.24
Idaho: Minidoka		$234.10		$18.00		$252.10	657,414.01
Kansas: Garden City		142.50		104.50		247.00	
Montana:							
Huntley	$268.50	603.39	$30.00	96.97	$298.50	700.36	350,737.68
Sun River		755.85		125.97		881.82	146,136.29
Montana-North Dakota: Lower Yellowstone							71,092.56
Nebraska-Wyoming: North Platte	107.60	229.60		24.40	107.60	254.00	511,010.10
Nevada: Truckee-Carson		210.00		42.00		252.00	421,736.31
New Mexico: Carlsbad							243,666.58
North Dakota: North Dakota Pumping		129.20		23.80		153.00	21,001.67
Oregon: Umatilla		63.00		9.55		72.55	261,136.32
Oregon-California: Klamath		186.00		18.00		204.00	388,126.13
South Dakota: Belle Fourche	260.00	260.00	5.87	5.87	265.87	265.87	240,193.69
Washington:							
Okanogan				52.50		52.50	59,989.45
Yakima storage							100,000.00
Sunnyside		1,874.60		542.45		2,417.05	1,108,410.74
Tieton		762.60				762.60	349,661.89
Wyoming: Shoshone		1,187.52		257.02		1,444.54	344,203.92
Total	636.10	6,638.36	35.87	1,321.03	671.97	7,959.39	5,634,764.58

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, if the chairman of the committee will permit me, I wish to say that in discussing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD]——

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that at the expiration of six minutes, five minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] and one minute by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TIMBERLAKE], the debate close on this section and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, in reply to a question asked me by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], through inadvertently leaving out several words my remarks were susceptible to a construction that I did not at all intend, and doubtless they seemed quite discourteous to the gentleman from Oklahoma. If the gentleman from Oklahoma failed to apprehend the point I was endeavoring to make, it was undoubtedly entirely my fault and not his.

I wish to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that nothing was further from my intention than to reflect in the least upon his ability or upon his fitness to manage the bill which is now before the House.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. FERRIS. I can assure the gentleman that I took no offense at what he said. I knew the gentleman was trying to accomplish something that he believed was meritorious, and I had no feeling about it. In fact I had forgotten what the gentleman said.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am very glad to hear it. Mr. Chairman, and the statement I make is not necessary in behalf of the gentleman from Oklahoma, whose ability is well known by the Members of this House and whose courtesy is always uniform toward all Members. But I thought it was due to this House and to myself also to make this statement.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], but I do not desire at this time further to enter into a discussion of the merits of that amendment.

I want to enter my protest against the general provisions of this bill, which are felt so keenly by my State, and I desire at this time to join the ranks of such Members of this House as have from time to time quoted Scripture in justification or explanation of their position. I refer you to the fourth Psalm and second verse, where you will find this language:

> O ye sons of men, how long will ye turn my glory into shame?
> How long will ye love vanity and seek after leasing? Selah.

[Laughter.]

Now, gentlemen, the proponents of this measure may find their faith shaken in their present course in the fifth Psalm and sixth verse:

> Thou shalt utterly destroy them that speak leasing.

[Laughter.]

Gentlemen, I have warned you. Take due notice and govern yourselves accordingly. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 31. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe necessary and proper rules and regulations and to do any and all things necessary to carry out and accomplish the purposes of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 8, strike out the figures "31" and insert the figures "30."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 11, add a proviso, as follows:
"*Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed or held to confer or limit the rights of the States or other local authority from exercising any rights which they may have to levy and collect taxes upon improvements, output of mines, or other rights, property, or assets of any lessee."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the language here is that "nothing in this act shall be construed or held to confer or limit," and so forth. If it neither confers nor limits, what does it do? What is the use of putting a thing in that shows on its face it neither goes forward nor backward?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, may I reply to the gentleman just a word?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. My notion is very much like the gentleman's as to this language. A letter came from the Acting Director of the Reclamation Service which purported to hold and to say that the improvements on reclamation projects could not be taxed, and——

Mr. MANN. I understand the point of that. If the language of the bill should be that "nothing should be construed or held to limit the rights of a State," that would be intelligible; but if you say "shall not confer"——

Mr. FERRIS. I do not believe in conferring any additional rights on the State to tax Government property. Of course, I am not in favor of taking any rights away.

Mr. MANN. This is not a right to tax Government property. It seems to me the use of the language in the bill may be inimical to the purposes for which it is used. The purpose, as I understand, of this provision is not to interfere by any action with the rights of the States to levy taxes against this property.

Mr. FERRIS. We wanted to completely hurdle that question.

Mr. MANN. But when you say nothing in the act shall confer a right, you may thereby be denying the right of the States.

Mr. FERRIS. We did not intend to do that. Personally, I may say, I would like to see the language go out, but there are some members of the committee who feel keenly about it and desire to have it retained. However, in my opinion, it does not amount to anything. There is a wide difference of opinion about the queston of taxation, not only in the committee but in the department. I personally think we ought not to confer any more rights than the States have, or take any away. This is primarily a leasing bill, and we did not want to legislate on the subject at all. We can not cure all the ills in this bill and we wanted to leave it absolutely alone.

Mr. MANN. I suppose we are all agreed that if the lessee puts up a plant under the terms of this act, his plant is subject to State taxation?

Mr. FERRIS. I think there is no doubt about that, and I have brief here to show it.

Mr. MANN. I suppose we all agree about that, and it was not the design at all to prevent the State from taxing the improvements on the plant of the lessee. While it could not tax the land to the extent that it could sell the land for taxes and take away the Government title, it could tax it as to anything else.

Mr. FERRIS. And that ought to be so.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will say that I am probably responsible for having this language inserted here. I did not like the word "confer" in there, but the committee insisted upon that. As stated by the chairman of the committee, there was a decision issued and published in the regular December number of the Reclamation Record, by the chief counsel of the Reclamation Service (Mr. King), holding that the States or counties had no authority to tax improvements upon any of the homesteads under reclamation projects until final proof, and he said he believed not until patent issued.

Mr. MANN. I understand. I was not objecting to that part of the language.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Just a moment. My thought about the matter was that that to a certain extent unsettled the subject out there, and we did not want Congress to be legislating in any way that might be construed as an acquiescence in that construction.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] makes a suggestion which may be proper, to strike out the language "confer or limit" and insert the word "affect," so that it would read:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed or held to affect the rights of the States—

And so forth.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think that would be a very proper amendment.

Mr. FERRIS. I think the suggestion is good, and we would be glad to adopt the gentleman's language. I would be glad if the gentleman would offer that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois offer an amendment?

Mr. MANN. I move to amend the amendment by striking out, in line 12, the words "confer or limit" and inserting the word "affect."

Mr. FERRIS. That is undoubtedly better.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. You will have to follow that by striking out the words "from exercising" and inserting the words "to exercise."

Mr. MANN. That will come in as a separate amendment later.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment on page 27, line 12, by striking out the words "confer or limit" and inserting the word "affect."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman from Wisconsin has an amendment.

Mr. MANN. It is to strike out the words "from exercising," in line 13, and inserting the words "to exercise."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 13, strike out the words "from exercising" and insert the words "to exercise."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the record should stand quite as it would stand with the statement of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] as to the opinion that he refers to. I understood him to say that it was a decision of the department with reference to this question of the right of taxation. The fact is that it was a voluntary letter written by a lawyer in the Reclamation Service. It is not an official decision of the department, and I think I am safe in saying that the department has not in any way ratified that opinion.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin that that is correct. I wrote to the Secretary of the Interior and asked whether or not the Interior Department approved of that decision by Mr. King, and I have just to-day received a letter, signed by Secretary Lane, in which he says that the Interior Department does not approve of it, and he inclosed me a copy of a lengthy brief on the subject. But, nevertheless, that has gone out as an official opinion, and has had a tendency to disturb things throughout the reclamation projects. Secretary Lane's letter to me is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, January 12, 1916.

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TAYLOR: I am in receipt of your letter of December 30, 1915, calling attention to a letter addressed by the chief counsel of the Reclamation Service to Mr. Samuel L. McGee, of Pomona, Cal., copy of which letter is printed in the Reclamation Record for the month of December, 1915. The letter expressed the opinion that certain improvements upon lands within reclamation projects, the title to which remains in the United States, are not taxable by the States.

As I understand it, this letter simply represents the individual opinion of the writer, and is not a decision of this department, nor does it involve a matter in which it has jurisdiction. As you will perceive, it can be nothing but an opinion, because ultimately the question of whether the improvements upon homesteads, mining, or other claims, the legal title to which still remains in the United States, may be taxed must be determined by the courts, should the parties interested resist payment of the taxes. A memorandum prepared for me by one of the attorneys in this department, copy attached, appears to support the right of the State to tax improvements, citing numerous decisions of the Federal and State courts in support of this view.

It is a fact that for many years various Western States have recognized the right of taxation over improvements upon public lands included in pending claims, the legal title to which has not passed from the United States, and authorities, including those cited in the attached memorandum, indicate that this right has been sustained by the State and Federal courts in numerous instances.

Cordially, yours, FRANKLIN K. LANE.

Mr. FERRIS. I have the letter and a copy of the brief referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], and think it would be well to let them go into the RECORD. Unless there be objection, I will insert them in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that certain documents referred to by him may be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The documents referred to are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, January 6, 1916.

Hon. SCOTT FERRIS,
Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. FERRIS: My attention has been recently called to a letter addressed by the chief counsel of the Reclamation Service to Mr. Samuel L. McGee, of Pomona, Cal., a copy of which is printed in the Reclamation Record for the month of December, 1915, the letter expressing the opinion that improvements upon lands within reclamation projects, the title to which remains in the United States, are not taxable by the State in which situate.

As I understand it, this letter simply represents the individual opinion of the writer, and is not a decision of this department in the broad sense, nor does it involve a matter over which this department has jurisdiction. As you will readily perceive, it can be nothing but an opinion, because ultimately the question of whether improvements upon homesteads, mining, or other claims, the legal title to which still remains in the United States, may be taxed must be determined by the courts, should persons taxed resist payment thereof. I have had the general subject investigated, however, by one of the attorneys in this department, and attach a memorandum citing various authorities, which would seem to support the right of the States to tax such improvements, among the cases cited being that of Forbes *v.* Gracey (94 U. S., 762), which held that not only the mineral output but the value of the possessory right might be made the subject of taxation. See also case of Elder *v.* Wood (208 U. S., 226) and other cases cited in the memorandum.

The fact is that for many years the various Western States have exercised the right of taxation over improvements upon public lands included in claims, the legal title to which has not passed from the United States, and the authorities, including those cited in the attached memorandum, indicate that this right has been sustained by both State and Federal courts in numerous instances.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE.

MEMORANDUM.

The water-power bill, considered by Congress at the last session and proposed to be reintroduced at the coming session of Congress, contemplates the granting of the right to use public lands for the generation, development, and transmission of hydroelectric power for periods of 50 years, the right to be at the expiration of the period named, and at the option of the United States, renewed to the original permittee or lessee, or taken over by the United States upon payment to the original permittee of the fair value of all property other than public lands or rights, or the granting of a similar permit to a third party, on condition that he pay for the properties. The bill also provides for the payment of a charge or rental for the lands permitted to be used, which may be measured by the power developed and sold. The so-called general leasing bill contemplates the leasing of the fuel and fertilizer minerals, coal, gas, oil, phosphate, and nitrates upon a royalty basis, the proceeds to be divided between the States and the reclamation fund. In connection with these measures some question has arisen as to whether the exaction of a Government rental or charge will prevent the States wherein the lands are situate from taxing the improvements, rights, and interests or products of the permittees or lessees.

TAXING POWER OF STATES.

The taxing power of a State is one of its attributes of sovereignty. And where there has been no compact with the Federal Government or cession of jurisdiction for the purposes specified in the Constitution, this power reaches all the property and business within the State which are not properly denominated the means of the General Government, and as laid down by this court it may be exercised at the discretion of the State. (Nathan *v.* Louisiana, 8 How., 73; 17 U. S., 505.)

It being the policy of the law to tax all property not expressly exempted, it is incumbent on one claiming an exemption to find and point out an express constitutional or statutory exemption. (State *v.* Holcomb, Cudahy Packing Co., intervenor, 106 Pac., 1030; Kans.)

PUBLIC LANDS AND FEDERAL AGENCIES NOT TAXABLE.

Lands belonging to the United States can not be taxed by a State (United States *v.* Southern Oregon Co., 196 Fed., 423); and lands allotted to Indians, but held in trust by the United States, as well as personal property purchased for and furnished to the Indians with money of the Government are not taxable (United States *v.* Rickert, 188 U. S., 432); nor can a Federal instrumentality acting under congressional authority be subjected to an occupation or privilege tax by a State (Choctaw, Oklahoma & Gulf R. R. Co. *v.* Harrison, 235 U. S., 292).

The franchise of a corporation of the United States is not subject to taxation by a State. (Central Pacific Railroad Co. *v.* California, 162 U. S., 91.)

PROPERTY AND POSSESSORY RIGHTS TAXABLE.

But the property of agencies of the United States, of companies holding franchises from the United States, and rights and interests in or to public lands, superable and assessable separate and apart from such lands, are subject to taxation. (Id.)

Possessory rights in public lands are a kind of property recognized as such since the earliest days of this Government. (Lamb *v.* Davenport, 18 Wall., 307.)

In the case of Forbes *v.* Gracey (94 U. S., 762), involving the taxation not only of the mineral output, but of the value of the possessory right of the Consolidated Virginia Mining Co. in the Comstock lode, the Supreme Court of the United States said:

"As we construe the statutes of the United States and the recognized rule of the Government on this subject, the moment this ore becomes detached from the soil in which it is embedded it becomes personal property, the ownership of which is in the man whose labor, capital, and skill has discovered and developed the mine and extracted the ore or other mineral product. It is then free from any lien, claim, or title of the United States and is rightfully subject to taxation by the State as any other personal property is."

In the same case, speaking of possessory rights in and to mining claims, the court said:

"Those claims are the subject of bargain and sale and constitute very largely the wealth of the Pacific Coast States. They are property in the fullest sense of the word. * * * Why may it not also be made subject to a lien for taxes, and the claim, such as it is, recognized by statute, be sold to enforce the lien? We see nothing in principle or in any interest which the United States has in the land to prevent it."

In the case of Elder *v.* Wood (208 U. S., 226), involving an interest in a mining claim in Nevada which had been sold for taxes, the Supreme Court of the United States, speaking of the opinion of the State court, said:

"That court held what was assessed was not the land on which the mining claim was located, but the claim itself; that is to say, the right of possession of the land for mining purposes. It is agreed that the Comstock lode was a 'valid subsisting mining location,' and at the time of the assessment of the tax Wilhelmina Gude was the owner of the undivided interest in it which is in controversy here. Such an interest from early times has been held to be property distinct from the land itself, vendible, inheritable, and taxable. (Forbes *v.* Gracey, 94 U. S., 762; Bell *v.* Meagher, 104 U. S., 279, 283; Manuel *v.* Wulff, 152 U. S., 505, 510; St. Louis Mining Co. *v.* Montana Mining Co., 171 U. S., 650, 655; 1 Lindley on Mines, secs. 535–542, inclusive.) The State therefore had the power to tax this interest in the mining claim and enforce the collection of the tax by sale. The tax deed conveyed merely the right of possession and affected no interest of the United States."

See also Goldfield Consolidated Co. *v.* State of Nevada (127 Pac., 77); Nephi P. & M. Co. *v.* Juab County (93 Pac., 53, Utah).

TAXATION OF IMPROVEMENTS ON SURFACE OF UNPATENTED MINING CLAIMS.

In the case of Cobban *v.* Meagher (113 Pac., 290) the Supreme Court of Montana held:

"We can distinguish no difference between the use of the surface ground of a patented claim for other than mining purposes and that of an unpatented claim, and we therefore hold that the surface ground of an unpatented mining claim when used for other than mining purposes is subject to taxation in this State when it has a separate and independent value for such other purposes."

WATER RIGHTS TAXABLE.

Water rights held separate and apart from land are treated as separate property and taxable by the States. (Wyoming Central Irrigation Co. *v.* Farlow, 114 Pac., 635, Wyoming; Murray *v.* Montrose County, 65 Pac., 26, Colorado; Helena Water Works *v.* Settles, 95 Pac., 838, Montana; California Water Co. *v.* Los Angeles County, 101 Pac., 547.)

FRANCHISES GIVEN BY UNITED STATES NOT TAXABLE, BUT PROPERTY OF CORPORATION HOLDING FRANCHISE IS TAXABLE.

In the case of Central Pacific Railroad Co. *v.* California (162 U. S., 125), the Supreme Court said, referring to the previous decision of the court, reported in One hundred and twenty-seventh United States, pages 1, 38, 40:

"Thus it was reaffirmed that the property of a corporation of the United States might be taxed, though its franchises, as, for instance, its corporate capacity, and its power to transact its appropriate business and charge therefor, could not be. It may be regarded as firmly settled that although corporations may be agents of the United States, their property is not the property of the United States, but the property of the agents, and that a State may tax the property of the agents, subject to the limitations pointed out in Railroad against Peniston."

In the latter case (18 Wall., 5) the Supreme Court said, in substance, that the exemption of agencies of the United States Government from taxation by the State is dependent upon the question of whether or not the tax would deprive them of the power to serve the Government, and that a tax upon their property, having no such effect, and leaving them free to discharge the duties they have undertaken to perform, may be rightfully laid by the States.

PROPERTY NOT EXEMPT FROM TAXATION BECAUSE ON LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES.

The fact that under the right or permission accorded by the Revised Statutes of the United States a telegraph company occupies with its line post roads of the United States does not operate to exempt its property from taxation by a State, the Supreme Court holding in the case of Western Telegraph Co. *v.* Massachusetts (125 U. S., 530):

"The tax in the present case, though nominally upon the shares of the capital stock of the company is in effect a tax upon that organization on account of the property owned and used by it in the State of Massachusetts, and the proportion of the length of its lines in that State to their entire length throughout the whole country is made the basis for ascertaining the value of the property. We do not think that such a tax is forbidden by the acceptance, on the part of the telegraph company, of the rights conferred by No. 5263 of the Revised Statutes nor by the commerce clause of the Constitution."

Personal property upon Indian reservations is subject to taxation, the Supreme Court holding, in substance, that an act of the Legislature of Oklahoma Territory making cattle grazing on Indian reservations subject to taxation was legal and constitutional (Thomas *v.* Gay, 169 U. S., 264); and in the case of Maricopa & Phoenix Railroad *v.* Arizona (156 U. S., 347), holding that the property of a railroad company within an Indian reservation was subject to taxation by the Territorial government of Arizona:

"It is wholly immaterial whether the rights vested in the corporation by the act of Congress were rights of ownership or merely those which result from the granting of the easement. Whatever they were, they were taken out of the reservation by virtue of the grant and came, to the extent of their withdrawal, under the jurisdiction of the Territorial authority. The fact that Congress reserved the power to alter, amend, or repeal the statute in no way affected the authority of the Territory over the rights granted, although the duration of that authority may depend on the exercise by Congress of the rights reserved. The method

of assessing railroads provided for in the statute was to treat each road as a unit embracing the sum of its franchises, property, and rights. The division of the total amount of the one assessment of the property of the road into certain sums per mile was a mere method of stating the assessment and did not change the real unit forming the basis of taxation, the railroad in its entirety comprising every element entering therein which could be made assessable. This being the case, it was clearly lawful for the taxing authorities of the Territory to consider the rights granted by the act of Congress and enjoyed by the railroad in making up the sum of the assessment upon its total property."

See also Utah & Northern *v.* Fisher (116 U. S., 28); also Rice *v.* Hammonds (91 Pac., 698), holding personal property on a military reservation subject to taxation.

CONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS UNDER DIRECTION AND AUTHORITY OF CONGRESS DOES NOT IN ITSELF EXEMPT THEM FROM TAXATION.

In the case of Thomson *v.* Pacific Railroad (9 Wall., 579) it was contended that the railroad having been constructed under the direction and authority of Congress for uses and purposes of the United States, and being a part of a system of roads so constructed, was exempt from taxation under State authority. The Supreme Court, in overruling this contention, held:

"No one questions that the power to tax all property, business, and persons within their respective limits is original in the States and has never been surrendered. It can not be so used, indeed, as to defeat or hinder the operations of the National Government, but it will be safe to conclude in general, with reference to persons and State corporations employed in Government service, that when Congress has not interposed to protect their property from State taxation such taxation is not obnoxious to that objection."

See also Lane County *v.* Oregon (7 Wall., 77); National Bank *v.* Commonwealth (9 Wall., 353).

INTANGIBLE PROPERTY IS SUBJECT TO TAXATION.

In the case of Adams Express Co. *v.* Ohio (166 U. S., 185), the Supreme Court held, according to the syllabus of the case:

In the complex civilization of to-day a large portion of the wealth of a community consists of intangible property, and there is nothing in the nature of things or in the limitations of the Federal Constitution which restrains a State from taxing such intangible property at its real value. Whenever separate articles of intangible property are joined together, not simply by a community of ownership but in a community of use, there is not infrequently developed a property, intangible though it may be, which in value exceeds the aggregate of the value of the separate pieces of tangible property. Whatever property is worth for the purpose of income and sale it is worth for the purposes of taxation, and if the State comprehends all property in its scheme of taxation, then the good will of an organized and established industry must be recognized as a thing of value and taxable.

"COAL AND OTHER MINERALS ARE SUBJECT TO TAXATION BY THE STATES WHEN SEVERED FROM THE SOIL, WHETHER THEY BE ON PATENTED LAND, PUBLIC LANDS, OR LEASED LANDS.

"But it is insisted that the statute, rightly understood, prescribes only an ad valorem imposition on the personal property owned by appellant—the coal at the pit's mouth—which is permissible according to many opinions of this court." (Choctaw & Gulf Railroad Co. *v.* Harrison, 235 U. S., 298; Kansas Natural Gas Co. *v.* Commissioners, 89 Pac., 750; Kansas; Forbes *v.* Gracey, supra.)

LEASEHOLDS TAXABLE.

In the case of Trimble *v.* Seattle (231 U. S., 683), involving property leased by the State, the Supreme Court said:

"If these leaseholds are not taxable, they are a favored class of property, for ordinary leaseholds are taxed, even if they are lumped and included in the value of the fee. When an interest in land, whether freehold or for years, is severed from the public domain and put into private hands the natural implication is that it goes there with the ordinary incidents of private property and therefore is subject to being taxed. See New York ex rel. Metropolitan Street Railway Co. *v.* New York State Board of Tax Commissioners (199 U. S., 1, 38.)"

FACT THAT TITLE IS REVERTIBLE DOES NOT EXEMPT FROM TAXATION.

In the case of Baltimore Shipbuilding Co. *v.* Baltimore (195 U. S., 375), there was a State tax levied upon a dry dock which was subject to certain duties to the United States. The title of the land on which the dry dock was built was a defeasible one, to revert to the United States on breach of the condition subsequent if the owner failed to discharge duties to the United States for a specified period. As this was an incomplete title, subject to reversion in case of default, the dry-dock company claimed it was exempt from State taxes. Speaking of the State's power of taxation, the court held:

"It may tax a life estate to one and a remainder to another and sell only the interest of the party making default. With regard to what the State of Maryland has done and what are the purport and attempted effect of the tax in this case we follow the court of appeals. That court treated the tax and the lien as going only to the dock company's interest in the land, although probably by an oversight it neglected to modify the judgment according to its own suggestion so as to show the fact. That only the company's interest was taxed is shown by the reduction of the assessment on account of the condition. * * *

"In the next place, as to the interest of the United States in the land. This is a mere condition subsequent. There is no easement or present right in rem. The obligation to keep up the dock and to allow the United States to use it carries active duties and is purely personal. The property is subject to forfeiture, it is true, if the obligation is not fulfilled. But it is only by forfeiture that the rights of the United States can be enforced against the res. It would be a very harsh doctrine that would deny the right of the States to tax lands because of a mere possibility that they might lapse to the United States. The contrary is the law. The condition can not be extinguished by the State, but the fee is in the dock company, and that can be taxed and, if necessary, sold, subject to the condition. See Northern Pacific Railway *v.* Myers (172 U. S., 589, 598); Maish *v.* Arizona (104 U. S., 589, 607–609); Central Pacific Railroad *v.* Nevada (182 U. S., 512, 525). The title of the dock company was not alienable, as that of the railroad was held to be in Northern Pacific Railway *v.* Townsend (190 U. S., 267).

HARMONIOUS EXERCISE OF RESPECTIVE RIGHTS OF THE STATES AND OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

In the State of Kentucky a tax was levied on the product of a distiller, whose produce lay in a bonded warehouse awaiting payment of the revenue tax to the United States. The State law made the warehouseman liable for the State tax whenever the spirits were removed from bond and the United States tax paid. The State tax was resisted by the warehouseman after he had permitted the spirits to be withdrawn on the ground that the taxing power of the Federal Government, being paramount, was exclusive. The court refused to recognize this contention and held (Thompson *v.* Kentucky, 209 U. S., 340):

"There is no conflict between the State and Federal purpose. There is no question of the supremacy of the latter and its complete fulfillment. 'The State does not propose,' the court of appeals said, 'to collect the taxes so long as the spirits are in the custody or under the lien of the Federal Government.' There is actual accommodation, therefore, of the power of the State to the rights of the Federal Government, and a harmonious exercise of the respective sovereignties of each, preserving to each necessary power. * * *"

RIGHT OF TAXATION AS ESTABLISHED BY DECISIONS.

The foregoing decisions of the courts and others which might be cited seem clearly to establish the right of the several States to tax whatever may be held and regarded as rights or property, and this without respect to whether or not the right, easement, personal property, or other form of holding is or is not upon unpatented public lands of the United States or reservations.

APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLES LAID DOWN TO THE WATER-POWER AND GENERAL LEASING BILLS.

The water-power bill, as previously stated, contemplates the grant of the right to use public lands. The water right is to be obtained from the State. The dams, canals, pipe lines, and other conduits, power houses, the machinery therein, transmission lines, transformers, and other parts, and appurtenances of a complete power plant must be provided by the permittee and will be his property, so recognized in the proposed law, which stipulates that in the event of the taking over he must be compensated therefor. The output of energy or the profits and proceeds therefrom also constitutes another form of property, which, under the decisions, is clearly taxable. The general leasing bill provides for the leasing of the deposits hereinbefore enumerated on a royalty basis, and it is clear, under the foregoing decisions, that the buildings, machinery, railroads, tramways, pipe lines, and other parts of a complete mining plant are property which may be taxed by the States; also that the mineral, when severed, is, without question, subject to taxation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 32. That the deposits of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, and sodium, herein referred to, shall be subject to disposition only in the form and manner provided in this act, and all laws or portions of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed, except as to valid claims existent at date of the passage of this act and thereafter maintained in compliance with the laws under which initiated.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, in line 17, page 27, I ask unanimous consent to change the section number from 32 to 31.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment to the section.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 27, in line 18, by inserting after the word "to" the words "in lands valuable for such minerals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

In line 20, after the word "act," strike out the words "and all laws or portions of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, is the chairman of the committee sure that this is a perfectly safe saving clause as amended? As it stood without the amendment, it seems to me, it might have been a safe saving clause, though not without question, but I am not so sure about it, as it will stand with the amendment, the language being—

That the deposits of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, and sodium, herein referred to, in lands valuable for such minerals shall be subject to disposition only in the form and manner provided in this act, except as to valid claims existent at date of the passage of this act and thereafter maintained in compliance with the laws under which initiated.

Now, the intent is that valid claims may be perfected under present laws, but that is so only as a sort of an inference, leaving a question as to what is to happen to valid claims now existent. It seems to me we must add something like this at the end of the paragraph:

Which claims may be perfected in accordance with the laws under which they were initiated—

If you are to strike out the words contained in the committee amendment, which I assume you have stricken out for some other reason than as affecting the saving clause. And at the end add:

May be perfected under such laws.

Referring back to the laws under which they were initiated, then you would have a perfectly good saving clause. Otherwise you are leaving it as a matter of inference how these claims may be perfected.

Mr. LENROOT. May I suggest to the gentleman that, with the expressly repealing language stricken out, there is an implied repeal of all laws that are inconsistent with the terms of this act.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, any existing valid claims are not counted within the terms of the act, and there is no repeal of those existing laws so far as such claims are concerned.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; but there is no statement of that fact. It is all left to inference. It seems to me there ought to be a definite statement in the saving clause.

Mr. MANN. Here is the meaning of it plainly: They first had in a repealing provision that would repeal laws under which these existing claims have now been made.

Mr. MONDELL. Except as to these certain claims.

Mr. MANN. No; it would repeal all laws, because they are in conflict with this law. Now they leave that out and say that this law shall apply to the disposition of deposits, except where claims are now made. The old laws still stand as to those claims which have now been made, because they are specifically repealed and because they do not conflict with this act, which does not apply to these claims at all.

Mr. MONDELL. I think that is a fair interpretation, but so much is left to inference.

Mr. MANN. But if the original provision about repeal had been in effect, then there would be nothing for these claimants to go on at all, because these laws would be repealed.

Mr. MONDELL. I think, as the section stood, the repeal would not have affected these claims at all, because they are excepted.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman makes the exception apply to the repeal, but I think it applies to the deposits.

Mr. MONDELL. I think the exception applies to the repeal.

Mr. MANN. I do not think that was the construction.

Mr. LENROOT. If the language remained in, the criticism might be that the section applied to the repeal, and that we had taken from the operation of the law the very deposit as to which there were valid existing claims.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin or the gentleman from Oklahoma a question about the amendment in line 18—the language "in lands valuable for such mineral."

The CHAIRMAN. That amendment has been adopted.

Mr. FERRIS. The committee inserted the language referred to for the reason that we did not want to require in the future everyone who took title to agricultural land to take out a limited patent. We took it up with the department, and they thought that it might have that effect, and so when lands only known to have some valuable mineral deposit are taken up will they have to have a limited patent.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But suppose land contains a deposit of oil, gas, potassium, or sodium, or coal, and a man wishing to patent it should go to the Secretary and say, "This contains little deposits, but not large enough to be 'valuable.'" The Secretary could give him a patent under the general law.

Mr. FERRIS. They do that now.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does not that open up an opportunity for fraud?

Mr. FERRIS. No; I do not think so. The surveyor goes on the land and declares it to be or not to be mineral land. The applicant later on has to prove whether it is valuable for mineral or not.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It does seem to me that this is not apt language to put into a law of this kind.

Mr. RAKER. There are many laws of that kind containing that language.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I care not how many laws there may be on the subject containing the same language. There are some laws that have permitted gross frauds on the Government. The question here now may be whether we should continue that sort of manipulation.

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, no.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Here is land, for instance, that is known to have a deposit of one of these minerals. A man goes to the office of the Secretary of the Interior and says, "This land contains deposits of such a mineral, but I do not think they are valuable." He might get a patent under the general land law. It seems to me that it opens up an opportunity for gross fraud.

Mr. FERRIS. Still, if you adopt the gentleman's view of it, it would carry it too far. You would make every patent in the future a limited patent. In other words, no one could get a complete title to his land. I have no doubt what the gentleman says is true in a measure, that some lands may have oil or coal on them, although I think the Geological Survey knows where those deposits lie pretty accurately.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is not the point. There can be a deposit on the land which the Geological Survey has pointed out, but the executive officer in the department might say, although there is a deposit there, it is not valuable, and give an applicant a patent under the old land laws. It is a question of whether you wish to run the risk of having patents issued under the general land laws on any land in which there is known to be valuable deposits of oil, potassium, sodium, gas, and so forth.

Mr. FERRIS. I answer frankly that I do not; but still, if there was a little deposit of asphalt or a little lignite, I would not want to prevent a man's getting a patent and make him take out a limited patent.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the question raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] is a fair and interesting one. Unless I am mistaken it is practically taken care of in the bill. My understanding is that the term "land valuable for certain minerals" is a term in use in the department, and has a well-defined meaning, and also in the statutes in relation to reservations. I understand that, without this language in the bill, if some one takes a homestead and eventually should find there a large or small amount of these deposits after obtaining a patent on it, he would not hold the title to it. Nobody could go on the land, because that would be a case where the Government had passed title to the surface. I do not know who would own the deposits. But the language "land valuable for such deposits" has a well-defined meaning, although otherwise it might be considered as loosely used.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is entirely correct. The Land Department, instead of referring to a certain tract as being coal or oil land, has for a great many years used the term "valuable for coal" and "valuable for oil."

Mr. MANN. And we have used it in the statute.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, many times.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the period at the end of line 24, page 27, and insert:
"Which claims may be perfected under such law."

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, we will accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CULLOP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 406) to authorize the exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium, and had instructed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? [After a pause.] There being none, the question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FERRIS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS.

Mr. FERRIS rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Oklahoma rise?

Mr. FERRIS. I rise to call up a privileged bill, H. R. 407, to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, and I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether this bill was presented through the basket or as a privileged bill from the floor. I take it, if it was not presented as a privileged bill, it can not be considered as a privileged bill; that is, if it were presented through the basket. Of course I have no objection to the consideration of the bill, but I do not

believe it has a privileged status if the bill was not presented as a privileged bill in the House. I believe there are precedents to sustain that position.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not inform the gentleman. What does the gentleman from Oklahoma say?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I did not report it. I am informed that it went through the basket.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the point.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, it has been held several times that it is not necessary to report a bill from the floor in order to preserve its privilege.

The SPEAKER. There being no point of order made, the Chair is not going to rule upon it or listen to anyone talk about it. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 407.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 407, with Mr. Cox in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. One moment. I ask for recognition, if no member of the committee wishes to take the floor, to discuss the bill in a general way.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will ask the gentleman from Wisconsin whether he wants to have general debate before we commence the reading of the bill for amendment?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not know whether any time is desired on this side. My colleague informs me that no time is desired, but I think there should be some general debate in explanation of the bill, rather than rushing pell-mell into the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado reported the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, by authority of the Public Lands Committee I have reported to the House this stock-raising 640-acre homestead bill. My printed report, containing some 18 pages, gives, I think, a very complete statement of the contents as well as the objects and purposes of the bill.

This bill has been before Congress for two years. This is almost an exact copy of the bill on this subject which passed this House a year ago next Tuesday, January 18, 1915. There has been a growing demand for this kind of a law for several years, and some of us have been diligently working upon and advocating this measure for two or three years. In fact, I introduced this bill in the Sixty-third Congress and the present bill, H. R. 407, is the same as my H. R. 15, introduced the first day of this session. So that the question of the advisability of providing for stock-raising homesteads is not a new subject before Congress. As stated by the First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Jones, this measure has been in practical operation in the western third of Nebraska for nearly 12 years, and has been wonderfully successful and beneficial in the settlement and development of that former barren and sand-hill country.

The 320-acre enlarged-homestead act of February 19, 1909, has also been in practical operation for about seven years, and has brought about the settlement of hundreds of thousands of acres of land and made homes for tens of thousands of people and built up many hundreds of rich and prosperous communities through the dry farming of the land, which would be utterly barren to-day if it were not for the enactment of that law. So that for the past several years there has been a growing sentiment throughout the country and a very firm conviction in the public-land States of the West that the only possible way to bring about the settlement of a very large per cent of the remaining public domain is to provide a law whereby a settler can obtain a sufficient quantity of that character of land upon which to make a living for himself and family.

The 275,000,000 acres of public land unreserved and still open to settlement is fully 90 per cent arid and incapable of irrigation, and is, moreover, broken and very rough in character, and after an exhaustive investigation by agents of the Interior Department and thorough consideration of the subject by the people of the West it has became practically a unanimous sentiment that if certain portions of that land can be opened to entry under a 640-acre stock-raising homestead law containing reasonable provisions, with which an entryman can comply, that a very large per cent of that remaining public domain can and will ultimately be settled in that manner and furnish homes thereon to many thousands of deserving people.

This matter was taken up and exhaustively considered by the Public Lands Committee of the House in the Sixty-third Congress. Hearings extending over several weeks and covering several hundred printed pages were held, and a large number of people made statements before the committee and introduced a large amount of documentary evidence. The bill is the result of the joint efforts of the committee and the Interior Department. Several of the western members of the committee have for two or three years been especially active in support of this measure. Congressman Fergusson, of New Mexico (since deceased), was at that time the author of the bill that was considered by the committee. He devoted an immense amount of time, energy, and painstaking service to the hearings and preparation of the data in support of this bill. His whole heart was in the measure, and when this bill is enacted into law the entire West will owe a debt of gratitude to Harvey B. Fergusson. He reported the bill out for the committee May 6, 1914, his report thereon being No. 626 of the Sixty-third Congress, second session. That report contains the reports of the Secretary of the Interior and other valuable data upon this subject. That bill was considered by the House and passed unanimously January 18, 1915. As stated by the commissioner, it was favorably reported by the Senate Public Lands Committee, but owing to the long debate upon the shipping bill, and there being a large number of other important measures upon the Senate Calendar ahead of it, the bill failed of passage.

The present bill as introduced is an identical copy of the bill as it passed the House during the last Congress. Copies of this same bill have also been introduced in this Congress by several other Members, and one or two Members also had the same or similar bills in the Sixty-third Congress. This bill is necessarily a compromise measure, as all important legislative matters of this kind must be. And while it may not be entirely satisfactory to the extreme eastern or western sentiment, it is a splendid, practicable, and workable measure.

This bill represents a natural evolution or adaptation of the homestead laws to conditions existing in the public-land States. It seems to be thoroughly well settled that there are many million acres of the public domain to which none of the existing public-land laws are adapted, and that the time has come when a new form of homestead law should be enacted to make the settlement of those vast areas possible.

This bill will apply to large portions of arid mesas and mountain sides, as well as gulches and rough broken land where, by the modern dry-farming methods, and by the use of crops that are suitable to the arid regions, a settler can by acquiring a few head of stock maintain a home and support himself and family.

There have been some objections to the measure before the committee by some representatives of large cattle and sheep growers, upon the ground that the bill may interfere with their use of the open public range. On the other hand, a few people have also objected to the measure upon the ground that they fear the land, after being entered by homesteaders, may be acquired by the large stockmen.

In answer to the first objection, your committee is of the opinion that the general welfare of the country demands that every acre of agricultural land be utilized, and that no better use can be made of the public lands than for the maintenance of homes for the people, and that wherever lands in quantities of 640 acres or less will provide a home for a family that the law should expressly allow nothing to interfere with the entry and use of that land for that purpose. What the West needs is more people, more homes, and more property on the tax rolls. Moreover, it is conclusively demonstrated that the settlement of the former large cattle ranges throughout every State in the Union has not only afforded homes and made the land at least a hundred times more valuable than it was in its former native state, and populated regions with prosperous people and built large cities upon tracts that were formerly cattle ranges, but that the settlement of the country has actually increased the number of cattle, and that the cattle are of a better grade than under the old public large range system. Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, and all of the other former large cattle-range States prove this result beyond any question. So that purely from the standpoint of increasing the number of cattle in the country and enhancing the supply of beef for the consumers of this country this measure will prove wonderfully beneficial.

In answer to the second objection, the investigations of the committee and all the experiences and tendencies of the country

thoroughly and conclusively demonstrate that homesteads are nowhere being purchased and being put into cattle ranges. There is not the slightest danger or possibility of any appreciable number of homesteaders, after complying with all the requirements of the homestead law and regulations as now administered regarding residence and improvements, will ever sell their lands at any figure that would permit large cattlemen to buy them for stock-range purposes. Instead of the present tendency being toward selling private improved lands for cattle or sheep ranges, the tendency is all in the opposite direction. The large holdings, generally speaking, everywhere are being subdivided and sold in small tracts. In fact, the large farms all over the country are with few exceptions being subdivided and sold into smaller tracts. The tendency is toward the small farm and individual stock raising and the improvement of the breeds and the better care of stock.

In the Assistant Secretary's report, herein quoted, this situation is shown, and the judgment of the West, generally speaking, is unquestionably in accordance with that report. This bill is directly carrying out the time-honored policy of this Government to use the public domain as far as possible to furnish homes for the citizens of our country. As was stated in the report of this committee on this bill in the Sixty-third Congress:

> It takes homes to insure permanent taxpayers; it takes homes to bring schools and churches; it takes homes to build cities and towns that attract and support labor and mechanics; population invites railroads, which in turn bring more immigration and capital to develop the barely touched resources of this great semiarid West.

Lands all over the West that were looked upon as utterly worthless 10, and even only 5, years ago are to-day good homes. Former Secretary of Agriculture Wilson once stated in a public address that every acre of land or rock in the West would be put to some practical use some time. No one now has the knowledge or foresight to classify that land. The time may some time come when homesteading will practically cease, and there will undoubtedly ultimately be some large bodies of land that can not be used for homes. But that time has not yet come. In fact, it is a long way off.

This law will mean the settlement of at least one-fourth of all the remaining public domain outside of the forest reserves, and will add thousands of homes to each of the Western States and put several million acres of land that now appear almost worthless into a productive condition and onto the tax rolls of each of those States.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do.

Mr. BORLAND. I would like to ask the gentleman [Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado] in charge of the bill whether there is any of this land that could be taken up under the 640-acre homestead except such as has access to some watercourse?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, yes.

Mr. BORLAND. What would be the supply of water; how would the homesteader get his supply of water?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. By digging a well.

Mr. BORLAND. Unless he had access to a watercourse——

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, yes; settlers can either dig a well or make a reservoir. They do that now. They also use windmills and cisterns, and sometimes they open up a little spring.

Mr. BORLAND. Is it not possible that if a 640-acre homestead be located along a watercourse it will destroy the entire value of the land lying back of it either to the Government or anybody else?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If the gentleman will read section 11 he will find that that matter is specifically and very carefully covered; that water holes are reserved from entry.

Mr. BORLAND. That has been inserted as a committee amendment?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes, sir; and they can not take them up at all if they control the only available water supply for a large region.

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire at this time to take up any more of the time of the committee, but I would be glad to answer any questions anyone may desire to ask about any feature of the bill. The bill is really self-explanatory. The report of the Interior Department, by Assistant Secretary Jones, is very full and complete. I think it is one of the best reports we have ever had on any bill since I have been in Congress during the last seven years. The Interior Department during the past year has made special investigation upon this measure, and they give in this report the result of such investigation, and the department is enthusiastically and earnestly in favor of the expeditions passage of this bill.

I will now reserve the balance of my time and yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC]

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the first words I can utter on the floor of this great body shall be in behalf of the man without a home.

Hanging in my office is a picture of a ranch scene in Texas which was taken on the last day that I worked on that ranch. Underneath this photograph, lying on my desk, there is another picture of the same land, only it is in a different form, it being a map furnished by the United States Geological Survey showing that section, which was at one time the Mecca of the cattleman, has been cut up into small farms and later developed by the oil and gas men into one of the largest fields in that State.

In western Oklahoma, where I live, I can remember 14 years ago when there were those who said that this country should not be taken away from the cattleman; that there would not be sufficient rainfall to make this country suitable for agricultural purposes; that it would only be a few years before those who had come there to have the benefit of their homestead rights would be forced to abandon the same and give up in despair.

Let us see how true their predictions were. One county in that section in 1914 produced some 40,000 bales of cotton. Land in another county is now selling as high as $100 per acre. Thousands of carloads of wheat and other small grain have been marketed in practically every county in that section this year, and I dare say there is not another congressional district in the United States that produces as many tons of broom corn as the one that I have the honor to represent. Not only this, but the settling up of this country by the homesteaders in the early days has resulted in bringing to that part of the State many new industries, and to-day gypsum and cement mills, granite works, flour mills, cheese factories, and many other enterprises are keeping pace in the development of that section of my State.

Statistics show that more than 50 per cent of the farmers living in my State do not own their homes, and I venture the assertion that this same condition exists in many States of the Nation. I know there are thousands who are eagerly waiting and watching for an opportunity to better the conditions of themselves and families, and if there is any class that our Government should help it is those who have not been fortunate enough to provide for themselves a little domicile which they could call "home."

The 640-acre homestead bill holds out to this class a helping hand, and when enacted into law will mean the development of thousands of acres that have been lying idle for years and retarding the progress of many States. The existing homestead laws will only permit a man to file on 160 acres of agricultural land or 320 acres of nonmineral and nonirrigable land. This is sufficient in sections of the country that are developed for agricultural purposes, but in the West, where the big cattleman has had control over the Government domain, it has been impossible for the little fellow to take up 160 acres and to make a successful start in the stock-raising business.

The records of our country are full of instances where those who have fenced off certain tracts of land on which to erect homes have been browbeaten and intimidated and have been forced to give up in despair. This is the same old story, the mighty will crush the weak, and because of this condition that has prevailed for years and years a large amount of our public domain has been undeveloped and has not been bringing in any revenue to the States within whose borders these lands are located, and has been rendering to our Nation very little good. The 640-acre homestead act will hold out a real hope to the modest man of but small means and who has little money with which to start in the stock-raising business. It will afford him an opportunity to be cooperating with many others who are eager and willing to have this chance. It will place thousands of acres of these lands on the tax rolls. It will cause the undeveloped natural resources to be thoroughly investigated, and I prophesy that in 14 years from now there will be many sections in the United States as productive as the seventh congressional district of Oklahoma, which was dominated by the cattle king before this section was opened for homestead entry.

Some years ago, in what was formerly called "No Man's Land," now in the western part of Oklahoma, it was my pleasure and privilege to make a homestead entry on 160 acres of Government land. I have seen herds of antelope on the prairies, and I saw the last band of wild horses as they were driven to captivity.

I know something of the hardships that are often undergone by the pioneers, and if there is any class of men that is entitled to praise it is those who blaze the way for civilization. At this time the entire country was under the control of the cattlemen, who had by manipulation secured rights to certain property, thereby enabling them to keep thousands of head of cattle on this range, with resultant big profits, and at the same time retarding the progress and development of that section. Visit

those counties to-day and see what has happened since that country has been opened up for homestead entry. One would think in making a comparison that a miracle had been brought about. Growing towns, State educational institutions, and splendid agricultural farms are now located on lands which a few years ago were wholly under the domination of the cattle kings.

If this Congress will pass the 640-acre homestead bill, it will be only a few years until many sections of our Western States will be turned from a barren desert into happy homes and thriving, prosperous communities. It will be made to support thousands of sturdy, energetic, patriotic, and loyal citizens, who will give their time and energy in advancing the interests of such sections, so that they will produce revenue and compare favorably with every other country that has undergone similar changes.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members of this body will realize the importance of this measure, and that they will unanimously give this bill their hearty support, so that the homeless men of our Nation may have the opportunity to secure homes and at the same time have a chance more easily to provide a livelihood for themselves and families.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. HERNANDEZ].

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have introduced in the House a bill similar to the one now under consideration. It is a measure that has been presented to the Congress of the United States for several years. My predecessor in office had a measure similar to this, and I venture to say that there is not a State in the Union that has as much interest in this measure as the State of New Mexico or that has as much land of the character described in this bill as it has. Therefore if we follow the injunction and the quotations that some gentlemen have made of the Holy Book here, this will come to the rescue of the humble and the lowly in a more effective manner than by legislating against the trusts or octopuses or anything of that sort.

We have a lot of land in New Mexico that is not suitable for any other purpose than for stock-raising homesteads. This bill is intended to promote colonization of those States in the West where dry-farming processes are being experimented with. In a few minutes I will have some data here that will show the amount of land in New Mexico that would be available under this act. Still, statistics are rather a dry subject anyway, and I will make only a few remarks now and ask permission to have the statistics go in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

This legislation will induce a good many people to go and settle these lands. Four counties in the eastern part of my State bordering on the western part of Texas and Oklahoma are partly settled now by good and thrifty farmers. They find themselves, however, in the position that part of the people of New Mexico find themselves in the older settled regions, where they have seen the grazing lands taken away from them through one process or another; that is, by grants made to the States and by private land grants.

New Mexico is one of the two babies that came into the Union in 1910. We are going through the process, Mr. Chairman, that all States go through when they are first admitted into the Union. We imagined that we were rich and that we could legislate so as to create a large number of offices and incur a good deal of expense. We find ourselves now meeting and footing the bills. We discover that we have obligations to meet which we were not looking for. In order to meet these expenses we have to invite people down to our States so that they can help us develop the resources and get these lands in shape so that they will become taxable.

In a good many communities in the northern part of the State where I live the poorer people, for whom I now speak—the native element—that live on what was supposed to be land grants owned by them, because that was the intention of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, should have the large tract for their own benefit, but when you read the history of the land grants, when you go back to the facts, you find that these lands have gone out of their hands and possession and have been in a good many instances gobbled up by some land shark or landowner, and they have been left in their little communities with their little strips of land along the streams as the only thing they have now on which to subsist. They are trying to get out into the public domain, and are doing so in a great many instances. This measure will help them in that way.

But they have to take some stock. Now, 640 acres may look very large to a man that is not acquainted with conditions in New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, or Oklahoma, but when you come to consider that, according to the best estimates that have been made, such lands as this bill provides for can only keep one cow to every 10 acres, you will know that there is short picking there.

New Mexico ranges fourth in size in the United States, with an area of 122,580 square miles, or approximately 78,500,000 acres. She is practically the center of the arid section of the United States. We have some very excellent land. As I say, these newcomers—for instance, take the County of Roosevelt, in the extreme eastern part of my State, which takes in practically all of what used to be called the Staked Plains—follow this dry-farming process. Fifty of our energetic population in that county went down to our State fair, held last October in the city of Albuquerque, and took, in the general exhibits, the first prize in that fair. [Applause.] And we want to invite more of that class of people. We want people that will have the courage and the energy to make out of the Staked Plains a garden spot, such as Roosevelt County is now; and we have the counties of Curry, Quay, and Union, all of the same character.

The element of water in our State is a very precious one. There is not a department of the Government that is doing more to develop the West and that will do more than the Reclamation Service; and it pained me to hear one gentleman here suggest that they take away from us the royalties provided by the bill that we just passed—away from this community, away from the Reclamation Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. I wish about five minutes more.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes further time.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. I will not take up the time of this committee with any more of my remarks. Only I want to introduce certain data that I have prepared and I want to be put on record as saying that notwithstanding this is not my bill it practically is the same thing. I am heartily in favor of it. There have been some amendments made by the committee and there will probably be some amendments offered; but in general, Mr. Chairman, the people of my State are in favor of just such a measure.

There is very little land remaining in my State that would be valuable if taken up under any other act than this one. The stock-raising homestead would be just such ranges, or farms as you may call them, as they have in the State of Texas, where a man may accumulate, say, 1,200 acres or more, and he could keep a bunch of, say, 50 or 60 cows, or something like that, or where he could keep 400 or 500 head of sheep.

In one word, this is a measure that would invite emigration down to those States, and we need it. It would also put all these lands on our assessment rolls as taxable property.

I have some figures here that are interesting. For instance, we have in my State as forest reservations 9,881,660 acres. When we went what we call in the West "conservation mad" there was a large area segregated in the public domain into what is now known as forest, which in time I know will be, and I hope to see, taken up under stock-raising homesteads.

Some will ask, perhaps, how we are going to do that. We are going to do it because I know that a good deal of this area now included in national forests will come under the head of arid land, as it is nothing else. The State has now also 9,760,000 acres of State lands. Indian reservations in my State take in 4,080,800 acres. That leaves only of unappropriated lands 30,344,843 acres out of the 78,485,760 acres.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the privilege of having inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the following. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. HERNANDEZ] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. The following are the statistics to which I have referred:

New Mexico ranges fourth in size in the United States, being as large as the New England States, excepting Maine. It has an area of 122,580 square miles, or approximately 78,500,000 acres.

Of course on account of New Mexico being practically in the center of the arid section of the United States a very small portion of these lands can be utilized for agricultural purposes. Only that part which can be irrigated, or that part in the extreme east, and portions between the mountains where a fairly large amount of rainfall is had can be brought into any kind of cultivation, and then only with a great deal of care and the harboring of the waters.

Out of this large acreage only about 3,500,000 acres are susceptible to irrigation, and I believe about 10,000,000 acres are claimed to be adaptable as dry farming crops.

At the present time about 800,000 acres are cultivated under irrigation and about 300,000 under dry farming methods, and there are remaining about 13,500,000 acres which could possibly be brought under cultivation.

We can only expect, with a certain degree of safety, to utilize for horticultural purposes something like the number of acres mentioned above—about 3,500,000 acres—as it is not safe to expect continuous satisfactory results from horticultural crops except from land which can be irrigated.

The Indian reservations and Pueblo Indian land grants in New Mexico absorb 4,518,758 acres of our best lands within nine different counties, the largest of these being within the counties of McKinley and San Juan, from which over 2,500,000 acres have been taken.

Private-land grants absorb 9,152,312 acres of agricultural, grazing, and forest lands.

There are 200,000 acres of mining lands—sold, unsold, leased, and open to lease.

There are 30,104,843 acres of unappropriated lands in New Mexico, mostly grazing and mountainous, with very little agricultural lands among them.

There are 58,088,412 acres of nontaxable lands consisting of—

Forest reservations	9,881,660
Lands belonging to State	9,760,000
Indian reservations	4,080,800
National monuments	21,109
Pueblos, military reservations	4,000,000
Unappropriated lands	30,344,843
Total United States, State, and nontaxable lands within the State	58,088,412

There are taxable lands to the number of 20,397,348 acres. This includes lots in cities and villages, rights of way, church and school property, and property escaping taxation.

Recapitulation of the above lands are as follows:

Nontaxable lands in New Mexico	58,088,412
Taxable lands	20,397,348
Total	78,485,760

Of all lands in the State there were approximately 21,561,265 acres of land unsurveyed on June 30, 1915, and 56,840,655 acres of surveyed lands, which includes 14,397 acres of resurveyed lands during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

In conclusion I desire to say that the granting of the 640 acres to the farmer and the stockman, instead of 160 acres, will be the greatest boon to all who live in the arid West.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] intend to yield any more time on his side?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON].

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, the people of my district and of my State are altogether very much in favor of legislation of this character. At the outset I wish to compliment the members of the Committee on the Public Lands for bringing out this bill for consideration so early in the session, and also for the splendid work they have already done in bringing before the House the bills providing for the leasing of coal and oil lands and water-power sites.

There are some provisions of this bill that I desire to see changed, and which I shall call to the attention of the committee. The bill provides in the beginning that any qualified homestead entryman may make entry on 640 acres of land designated by the Secretary of the Interior as stock-grazing lands; that proof may be made on this land by the entryman residing on it for three years, and, in lieu of the cultivation required now under the homestead laws, the entryman must make improvements on the land which will increase the value of the land for stock-raising purposes at least $1.25 an acre.

Those who are allowed to make an entry of this kind are citizens over the age of 21 years, or heads of families, who have never used their homestead rights, and those who have made entry on public lands under the homestead laws and have not perfected their entries, or who have perfected their homestead entries and still own and occupy the land.

Those who have never exhausted any of their homestead rights may make entry under the provisions of this bill as it now stands for 640 acres of grazing land, all of the land to be in compact form. In other cases entry may be made for lands contiguous to the original homestead entry of the entryman. The additional entry may be for such land as will not with the land embraced in the original homestead entry exceed 640 acres.

Now, there does not seem to me to be any good reason why a man should not be included in the privileges afforded by this law who has gone out in the West during the last two or three decades and made entry and proof upon public lands under the homestead laws, and has, through the misfortune of poor crops and climatic conditions out there, lost the ownership and title to his land. I believe that this bill should provide that any man, whether he has made entry heretofore under the homestead laws or not, who has perfected his entry, should have the right to make entry for one of these grazing homesteads.

In my State there is to-day nearly 500,000 acres of unappropriated public lands. This bill, if enacted into law, will result in the settling up of practically all of that land.

Now as to the character of settler that is desired out there or the character of settler that is desired in any of the public-land States: We want on these lands men who will make their homes there, men who will live with us and actually engage in farming and in stock raising. From my own observation and experience I know this to be the fact, that among the most desirable class of men to have go upon these lands are to be found those who some years ago made settlements and homestead entries upon public lands and lost their land through mortgage-foreclosure proceedings or some other misfortune. These men, many of them who are now tenants or day laborers, will desire to make entries under a law of this kind. These men should have the right to make entry for these grazing homesteads, and I trust that when this bill is considered section by section in the committee amendments will be agreed to which will give them such right.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly; I shall be pleased to.

Mr. RAKER. I catch the gentleman's idea, I think, that anyone who has exercised his right to homestead entry and received patent and who has disposed of the land and is out in that country now pioneering and working and wants to take up one of these 640-acre tracts shall be given that opportunity.

Mr. NORTON. Yes; I think so. I do not see any good reason why that opportunity or privilege should not be given. We have many such men in my State and in adjoining States. To-day some of our very best citizens, who have in the past exhausted their homestead rights, are working as tenants. Numbers of them will be desirous of securing a grazing homestead. If this bill is enacted into law as now drawn, they would not have a right to make entry for one of these grazing homesteads.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. BOOHER. Would you give a man of the character you describe the entire 640 acres, or would you take from him the land he has entered and proved up on and gotten patent to and lost?

Mr. NORTON. Well, if it were left to me, I would give him the right to take the entire tract of 640 acres. I will say this, that in giving him that right I would have the fullest confidence that these men would improve this land and hold fast to it as their permanent homes. They would prize these homesteads more and improve them far better than any other class of men you could find in the country.

Mr. BOOHER. Just another question.

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. BOOHER. Why would you give a man who has proved up and lost his claim any more than the man who had not quite proved up, but would let him go ahead and take out just enough to make 640 acres? Why not let the second man take up more of this land?

Mr. NORTON. The man who has not proved up now?

Mr. BOOHER. And lost his land.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question right there?

Mr. NORTON. I will say in reply to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] this: I would allow the man who has lost his land in the past, recognizing conditions that are well known to everyone who has lived in the public-land States, to make entry for the full 640 acres. I would do this, recognizing the fact that in making his original entry and final proof he had sacrificed a great deal of time, a great deal of effort, and a great deal of money, and has contributed a great deal to the upbuilding and improvement of the particular section of the State where he first made settlement.

Mr. BOOHER. No more of that than the man who has not yet proven up. Would it not be fairer to all classes to give the man who has lost his land sufficient to make his 640 acres, the same as the other man?

Mr. NORTON. There is some reason, of course, in the argument to give the man who now has an unperfected homestead entry the same rights as the man who has lost ownership to his first homestead entry.

Mr. BOOHER. I just wanted to get the gentleman's idea of the cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Colorado use some time?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CHURCH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. CHURCH] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for a stock-raising homestead of 640 acres, and if passed will be of untold benefit to the West.

I am in favor of any bill that takes people away from the cities into the great outdoors to build for themselves homes. In the country home nearer than in any other place we find content. Our cities are filled with perplexities and unrest; the grind of the machinery, the noise of the factory, and the shriek of the locomotive keeps the nerves of the city man strung to the key of G. His life passes like a tale that is told. Regardless of the amount he earns, his bank account is generally depicted on the first of every month. A toll master stands at every city gate. Paying house rent, the water bill, the gas account, for electric lights, the morning paper, the evening news, the grocery and department store, for vegetables, milk, bread, butter, wood, and meat, a little here and a little there, a dime or two for church and Sunday school; "Bill, loan me $5, I am a little short;" "No, I haven't it to spare," are the monthly woes of the average city man.

This bill is calculated to take people out into the foothills where can be produced almost all that is consumed; out where a person can sleep at night, where children are happy and on horseback ride to school, where father works the farm and mother trades the eggs for groceries at the store, where brother learns to hunt, fish, and swim, and sister sews and sings and entertains her beau, and where taxes are paid once a year.

Mr. Chairman, I look back to-day to the green hills of California, to the homestead of my father, the old Circle Spring Ranch, as the dearest spot on earth; away from the strife and din of the city, where the flowers nodded and the meadow lark sang, where the quail whistled, the ground squirrel scolded, and the sad dove moaned; to the landscape and to the trees that were all numbered and named.

My life has been crowded with blessings too numerous even for me to recall—health, friendships, bodily strength, and an optimistic mind—but my chief benefactor has always been that old country farm. There I received my first impression of music from the night winds and the waterfalls; my first knowledge that life was a struggle from 4 miles of trail through brush and rocks to school; my first idea of purity from the soft sweet water of the mountain spring; my first impression of the sublime from the great heights that rose abruptly just outside the door; and I received there, from the great mountain, moon, and stars, my first impression of God.

At first this country gave to the home seekers 160-acre farms, and under this law the best of all the land was taken. That law transformed the face of this country from a wild, prairie and woodland, undergrown by brush and bramble, into a land the most rich and beautiful of all the world. That law caused our valleys to teem with industry and our cheerless mountains to glow with the friendly fires of home. It made wild places, where before no sound was heard save the great owl's hoot at night and the coyote's cry, resound with children's voices and the sacred sounds of contentment. It has transformed the South into cotton and tobacco fields, the North into cereal farms, and the West into orchards and vineyards, the fruits from which astonish the world.

That 160-acre homestead law has changed the San Joaquin Valley in California, that I represent, from a desert, bleak and bare, into one of the garden spots of the West. Last year in this valley, where sagebrush once grew and where owls and snakes and horned toads once lived in solitude, we produced 120,000 tons of raisins, valued at $9,000,000; 5,000 tons of prunes, valued at $400,000; 1,500,000 boxes of oranges, valued at $3,200,000; 1,000,000 pounds of nuts, valued at $125,000; 6,000,000 pounds of apples, 4,000 tons of dried apricots, 8,000 tons of figs, 75,000 boxes of lemons, 1,200 tons of olives, 28 tons of dried peaches, 5,000 tons of table peaches, 50,000 tons of table grapes, 3,000,000 gallons of wine, 2,000,000 gallons of brandy, 2,000,000 boxes of berries, 7,000,000 centals of wheat, oats, and barley, 600,000 centals of corn, 500,000 pounds of beans, and twelve hundred thousand tons of hay. During this same year, in this valley and on its adjacent hills, grazed fifteen hundred and eighty thousand head of cattle, sheep, hogs, horses, and mules.

I may properly say right here that nearly half of the land claimed under the 160-acre homestead law in this valley is not yet under cultivation on account of the great expense of getting water onto the plains; but we are looking forward to Government aid, and now especially have we reasons to hope, owing to the fact that the reclamation fund is soon to be materially replenished by the royalties received from the Government for leasing power sites in our nearby mountains, as well as from the royalties received by the leasing of oil lands located on the border of the plains. I expect to file a bill in the near future asking assistance from the Federal Government, to the end that the waste water of our mountains may be brought in touch with the waste lands of the plains; and when this assistance comes and this 640-acre homestead bill becomes a law my country in California will come into its own. Then all the unreserved public land of the mountains will be taken, and the dry, uncultivated land of the plains will yield an annual bounty, and this western valley will become the pride of the Nation.

I have mentioned the marvelous development of the San Joaquin Valley under the 160-acre homestead law as a fitting illustration of what has been done, in a greater or less degree, in all parts of this country; but already we have passed beyond the usefulness of the 160-acre homestead law as an agency for the finder of homes, and on the 19th day of February, 1909, Congress passed what is known as the enlarged-homestead law, which provides that 320 acres of land could be embraced in a single entry or enough added to the original entry to make, in all, 320 acres. Under this law hundreds of thousands of acres of the western land has been claimed by settlers, and through this law many homes established, but we have now outgrown the 320-acre law, most of the land suitable for a home of this size having been taken, so we have reached the time when the acreage again should be increased, thus giving people who are tired of living in cities and working for others another chance to go out and gather the fragments of the Government domain.

Mr. Chairman, I predict much for this bill when it becomes a law. It will place thousands of acres of land upon the tax rolls of our counties and States. It will provide homes for many homeless people in the West. It will kindle fires on many hearthstones now unknown. It will bring happiness to many downcast heads and saddened hearts. It will create memories for the future of the dearest place on earth—home, sweet home. It will cause hundreds who now feel they have made a failure in life to leave the cities and go out into the everlasting hills and start life anew. It will bring color to faded cheeks, merriment to many a cheerless tenement child, and place a new star in the dark life of many hopeless men.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield five minutes to my colleague from Colorado [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the passage of this bill. I believe it will be of very great benefit to the people of the public-land States, and I am confident its provisions have been so carefully safeguarded that the public interests are not endangered.

In my congressional district—the third district of Colorado—we have witnessed a tremendous settlement within the last year or two under the provisions of the 320-acre homestead law. It may be of interest to the Members of this House to know that out there in southeastern Colorado, where it has been the general impression that all of the land has been taken up, we have within the last year had more homestead filings than ever before in the same district in the history of the public-land laws of this country.

Six or eight thousand settlers have come into my congressional district alone and have filed upon homesteads, so that at present practically all of the land which is of a character to enable a family to live on 320 acres has been taken up, and there remains a very considerable area where more than 320 acres are required. I would hesitate to advocate the granting of 640 acres of land to an individual if the grant were not necessary to enable a man to earn a living for his family and so circumscribed as to safeguard the public interests. But under this bill and under the present administration of the General Land Office, I believe it is well-nigh impossible to perpetrate extensive frauds. We are, therefore, assured that if the bill is enacted the benefits will accrue to men who are seeking to make homes on the public domain and not to land-grabbing corporations.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make some reference to the treatment accorded settlers under the present administration as compared with former administrations. When Woodrow Wilson entered the White House on the 4th of March, 1913, the man who sought to make his home on the public domain was regarded as a criminal who was seeking to get something away from the National Government, and the people of the West, without regard to party and without regard to locality, felt a just indignation against the manner in which the public-land laws were being administered. But under the administration of the present Secretary of the Interior, Franklin K. Lane, and his Commissioner of the General Land Office, Clay Tallman, the

man who in good faith has sought to make his home on the public domain has been given every possible encouragement. One of the direct results of that reversal of policy has been such a settlement of the West as has never been witnessed before in the history of that section of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I consider it a very great misfortune that Franklin K. Lane was born on the northern side of the boundary line between this country and Canada. If he had been born on the southern side I would here and now, on behalf of the grateful people of the West, launch a presidential boom for him for 1920. [Applause.] So far as 1916 is concerned, of course no Democrat thinks of any other standard bearer than Wilson. There is no man in the recent history of the United States who has contributed in greater measure to the development of the West than has Franklin K. Lane. As an administrator he is without a peer in public life and his ability is made manifest in every branch of the great department of which he is the head.

This measure which we have before us to-day is recommended to the consideration of Congress by Secretary Lane. He assures us that the public interests are protected in it and that the interests of the settlers will be advanced by it, and he stands so well with men of all parties in this House that I take it his recommendation will be accepted. [Applause.]

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman use some of his time?

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman any further speeches on his side?

Mr. FERRIS. I think not. I think we will reserve them for the reading of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have had an understanding with the gentleman from Oklahoma, the chairman of the committee [Mr. FERRIS], that we would not take up the bill under the five-minute rule to-night, but would conclude the general debate. I do not care to project myself into the debate at this late hour. I had intended speaking for 15 minutes on the bill, but I shall defer that out of consideration for Members and will withhold my remarks until the five-minute rule.

Mr. MANN. Let the Clerk read the first section of the bill.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; let the Clerk read the first section of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act it shall be lawful for any person qualified to make entry under the homestead laws of the United States to make a stock-raising homestead entry for not exceeding 640 acres of unappropriated unreserved public land in reasonably compact form: *Provided, however*, That the land so entered shall theretofore have been designated by the Secretary of the Interior as "stock-raising lands."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Cox, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 407) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after this bill has been disposed of H. R. 7617, the road bill, be taken up for consideration.

Mr. MANN. I take it that what the gentleman wants is to make it in order to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the road bill, subject to the Unanimous Consent Calendar, special orders which have already been made about speeches, appropriation bills, and Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It is not to interfere with this bill.

Mr. MANN. The request is for the bill to be made privileged after this bill is disposed of.

The SPEAKER. What is the number of the bill?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. H. R. 7617.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that after the pending bill is disposed of the bill H. R. 7617, the good-roads bill, shall be given a privileged status, not to interfere with appropriation bills, Calendar Wednesday, the Unanimous Consent Calendar, or any of the special orders heretofore made. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 7611. An act authorizing the Seaboard Air Line Railway Co., a corporation, to construct and operate a bridge, and approaches thereto, across what is known as "Back River," a part of the Savannah River, at a point between Jasper County, S. C., and Chatham County, Ga.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until Monday, January 17, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of legislation to increase the cost of a central heating, lighting, and power plant to serve buildings owned or occupied by the United States Government (H. Doc. No. 577); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of Elizabeth River, N. J. (H. Doc. No. 578); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of White River, at Duvall Bluff, Ark. (H. Doc. No. 579); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of Oregon Slough, Oreg. (H. Doc. No. 580); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Hudson River at Troy, N. Y., with a view to the removal of Adams Island (H. Doc. No. 581); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain officers and enlisted men who lost personal property in the hurricane at Galveston and Texas City, Tex., in August, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 582); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, submitting an amendment to urgent estimates of deficiencies in appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, changing the item of $33,000 for public printing and binding to $30,000 for public printing and binding and $3,000 miscellaneous expenses, Bureau of Labor Statistics (H. Doc. No. 583); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting draft of a bill authorizing the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to collect and publish statistics of leaf tobacco (H. Doc. No. 584); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of expenditures on account of appropriation for contingent expenses of the War Department, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 585); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1916 (S. Doc. No. 244); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HOUSTON, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 65) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to certain gas, electric light and power, telephone, railroad, and street-railway companies and franchises in the Territory of Hawaii, and amending the laws relating thereto, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 43), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 931) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Gould; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3153) granting a pension to Friedericke Potter; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3206) granting a pension to Harriet L. Busick; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6334) granting a pension to John Delaney; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9126) providing for a survey of Town Creek, in Brunswick County, N. C., with the view to making same navigable; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PARK: A bill (H. R. 9127) making an appropriation for the improvement of Flint River, Ga.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9128) making appropriation for the treatment and eradication of lungworm disease in hogs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 9129) to establish a fish-cultural station near Rye, Colo.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9130) to provide for a Government munitions plant and supply depot at or near Pueblo, Colo.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 9131) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California," approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 9132) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 9133) to amend an act entitled "An act to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes," approved January 17, 1914; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 9134) to repeal certain sections and part of section of an act entitled "An act to provide for recognizing the services of certain officers of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service for their services in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal, to extend to certain of such officers the thanks of Congress, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1915; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRITT: A bill (H. R. 9135) to reduce the rate of postage on first-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 9136) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal public building at Bishop, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9137) to survey and locate a military and post road from St. Louis, Mo., to Olympia, Wash.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 9138) for the relief of the counties of Marion and Monongalia, in the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 9139) for the relief of the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9140) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 9141) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COX: Resolution (H. Res. 93) asking for the appointment of five Members to investigate the Yucatan Sisal Trust; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 9142) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Peak; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9143) granting a pension to Mary F. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9144) granting an increase of pension to John Irvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 9145) granting an increase of pension to Harriet J. Sargent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: A bill (H. R. 9146) granting a pension to Anna de Rochemont; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 9147) granting a pension to Maggie Little; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURGESS: A bill (H. R. 9148) for the relief of the estate of John R. Tally; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 9149) to permit the Denison Coal Co. to relinquish certain lands embraced in its Choctaw and Chickasaw coal lease, and to include within said lease other lands within the segregated coal area; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 9150) granting an increase of pension to Arvilla N. Stocker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 9151) granting an increase of pension to Christian B. Old; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: A bill (H. R. 9152) granting an honorable discharge to Joseph L. Galle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 9153) granting an increase of pension to James A. Dicus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9154) granting a pension to Charles W. Kester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9155) granting a pension to Henry Langley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 9156) granting an honorable discharge to Albert Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 9157) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Champion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 9158) granting a pension to Andrew Conley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 9159) granting an increase of pension to Janet T. Packard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9160) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9161) granting a pension to Elmira Goshen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 9162) granting an increase of pension to Fox Glass; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 9163) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Swartz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 9164) to restore pension to Juanita Rine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9165) granting a pension to Martha E. Gibbons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 9166) to correct the military record of E. D. Judkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9167) granting an increase of pension to Malcolm J. McNeill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9168) for the relief of Peter McKay; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 9169) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Bushnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9170) granting a pension to Franklin Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 9171) for the relief of Arthur J. Burdick; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9172) for the relief of the M. Kondo Fisheries Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9173) for the relief of Union Oil Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9174) for the relief of John F. Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAZARO: A bill (H. R. 9175) for the relief of the heirs of Victor T. Landry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 9176) granting a pension to George H. Cope; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9177) granting an increase of pension to William H. Eoute; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 9178) granting an increase of pension to Rosa Matheny; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9179) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Frantz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9180) granting an increase of pension to Woodford W. Keeney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 9181) for the relief of the heirs of James R. Tolbert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 9182) granting an increase of pension to Washington H. Switzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGEE: A bill (H. R. 9183) granting a pension to John F. O'Donnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OAKEY: A bill (H. R. 9184) granting an increase of pension to Alice A. Deming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9185) granting a pension to Martha A. Knapp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9186) for the relief of George W. Davis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 9187) for the relief of Franklin E. Emery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 9188) granting a pension to Laura A. Botts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9189) granting an increase of pension to John T. Ferrie; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9190) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Leary; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 9191) granting a pension to Addie Davidson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9192) granting an increase of pension to David Cornelison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9193) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9194) granting an increase of pension to John W. Wilkerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9195) granting an increase of pension to George L. Clonts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. A bill (H. R. 9196) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Lamons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 9197) providing for the payment of the findings reported by the Court of Claims in favor of certain engineers, firemen, mechanics, and laborers for extra time; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 9198) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide Wagner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 9199) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 9200) granting an increase of pension to Fanny Wickliffe Throckmorton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 9201) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Charles H. Whipple; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 9202) for the relief of Joshua Banks Nicholson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 9203) granting an increase of pension to Homer E. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9204) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Amberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9205) granting a pension to George De Merritt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 9206) granting an increase of pension to Adelia C. Augur; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9207) granting an increase of pension to Mina C. Balzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 9208) to remove the charge of desertion against William H. Mounce; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: Petition of sundry citizens of Columbus, Ga., protesting against the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of Ohio Stogie Manufacturers' Association, relative to distribution of taxes on cigars, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Business Men's Club of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring more pay to railroads carrying mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 8254, for special relief of Amos Lynne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of sundry citizens of Wichita, Kans., favoring Federal censorship of moving pictures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. BURKE (by request): Petitions of 114 citizens of the second congressional district of Wisconsin, favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petitions of Stephen Sanford's Sons, of Amsterdam, and sundry citizens of the thirtieth congressional district of New York, favoring bill for protection of manufacturers of American dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of Cooper Underwear Co., of Kenosha, Wis., favoring protection for manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAGO: Petition of Pennsylvania Association of Union Volunteer Officers of the Civil War, favoring volunteer retired-list bill, H. R. 386; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Memorial of Women of Chapter 76, Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of the Mississippi River Levee Association, favoring appropriation for completing the levee system; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FREEMAN: Petitions of Plainfield Woolen Co., of Central Village, and Max Pollack & Co., of Willamantic, Conn., favoring passage of bill to protect manufacturers of American dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Papers to accompany a bill granting an increase of pension to Ellen Champion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Division 241, Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees of America, favoring nonpartisan tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARD: Petitions from R. I. Miller, of College Corner, and other merchants resident of Eaton, Farmersville, Middletown, Trenton, Hamilton, Lewisburg, Eldorado, West Manchester, Brookville, Oxford, Seven Mile, and Camden, all in the State of Ohio, favoring bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Petition of William Broadhead & Sons, Broadhead Worsted Mills, of Jamestown, N. Y., favoring protection for manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Evidence in support of House bill 5150, for pension for P. L. Dawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 5170, for pension for Charlotte J. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES: Memorial of Marquette (Mich.) Commercial Club, favoring increase in Army and Navy as prepared by the General Staff of the same; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions of Coronet Worsted Co., of Providence, and Glengarry Mills, of Oakland, R. I., favoring bill for protection of manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rhode Island Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, protesting against passage of House bill 743, for building for Department of Justice in Washington; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petitions of citizens of Randall, Gray Eagle, Burtrum, Swanville, Freeport, and New Munich, Minn., favoring bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of John Finger, sr., and 22 others, of Prescott, Mich., favoring taking from Congress power to declare war and placing that power in the hands of the people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of Syracuse Rug Works and others, of Skaneateles Falls, N. Y., favoring protection for manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial of Portland (Oreg.) Chamber of Commerce, asking that the duty on imported shingles be restored; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: Petition of Knox Woolen Co., Camden, Me., in favor of House bill 702, "A bill to provide reve-

nue for the Government and establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of C. N. Cook & Son, of Alexandria Bay, N. Y., protesting against the reenactment of the war-revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Delaware: Petition of Glen Hosiery Co., of Wilmington, Del., favoring bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs in United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NOLAN: Protest of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, the Building Trade Employers' Association, the Simonds Manufacturing Co., and sundry other corporations and individuals of San Francisco, Oakland, Sacramento, and San Jose, against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the employment of efficiency methods on Government work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the German-American Alliance of San Diego, Cal., relative to embargo on shipment of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a memorial of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, favoring the matter of railway mail pay being placed under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. OAKEY: Petition of J. R. Montgomery Co., of Windsor Locks, Conn., favoring protection for manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Fitchburg (Mass.) Woman's Club, favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9014, for the relief of John O. Kinney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9015, granting an increase of pension to John E. Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of James R. Reid, of Elmira, N. Y., asking that a paragraph including Regular Army officers be placed in the Townsend bill, which favors a retired list for the volunteer commissioned officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio: Petition of German Baptist Mutual Insurance Co., of Miami County, Ohio, protesting against motor vehicles along rural routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SELLS: Petitions of sundry business men of the first congressional district of Tennessee, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISSON: Petition of Eupora (Miss.) Christian Temperance Union, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petitions of citizens of the fourteenth congressional district of Texas, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Rhode Island Chapter of American Institute of Architects, protesting against the passage of House bill 743, relative to building for the Department of Justice; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of Great Falls Woolen Co., of Somersworth, N. H., favoring protection for manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of Susie Sprague Chite and other citizens of Holyoke, Colo., against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *January 17, 1916.*

Rev. Lauritz Larsen, pastor of the Zion Norwegian Lutheran Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. Eternal and Almighty God, Thou Author and Giver of all good things, we thank Thee for Thy manifold blessings to us. We pray Thee that Thou wilt be our guide, and that through the example of Thy divine Son, our Master, we may be guided in all things; that we may be given wisdom in all the matters that Thou hast given us to attend to; that we may be true to Him who hath given us the Divine Word of service, saying, "Whosoever would be great among you let him be your servant." Help us, bless us, and guide us, we ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 406. An act to authorize exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium; and

H. R. 8493. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 320. An act to authorize the county of Bonner, Idaho, to construct a bridge across Pend Oreille River;

H. R. 775. An act granting the consent of Congress to J. P. Jones and others to construct one or more bridges across the Chattahoochee River between the counties of Coweta and Carroll, in the State of Georgia; and

H. R. 7611. An act authorizing the Seaboard Air Line Railway Co., a corporation, to construct and operate a bridge, and approaches thereto, across what is known as "Back River," a part of the Savannah River, at a point between Jasper County, S. C., and Chatham County, Ga.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PHELAN. I present a telegram from the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, in opposition to a suggested invasion of Mexico and in favor of an enlarged Army and Navy, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CAL., *January 15, 1916.*

Hon. JAMES D. PHELAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Suggested invasion of Mexico by American troops most objectionable to our people. We advise enlarged Army and Navy to protect our border, our coast, and harbors. Hope you will use every influence to this end, for Pacific coast interests demand protection rather than invasion.

LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
ROBT. N. BULLA, *President.*

Mr. FLETCHER presented a petition of the members of Company H, Second Infantry, National Guard of Florida, of Tampa, Fla., praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of H. N. Wood & Co., of Lakeport, N. H., and a petition of the Tilton Woolen Mills, of Tilton, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Martha S. Kimball, of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Navy League of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for a prohibitive tax on intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented telegrams in the nature of memorials from sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the regents of the University of Minnesota, St. Anthonys Park, Minn., praying that an appropriation be made for the building of a high dam to provide water power for the citizens of St. Paul and Minneapolis, in that State, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WARREN presented petitions of the Sweetwater County Federated Trades and Labor Council, of Rock Springs; of Local Union No. 2742, United Mine Workers of America, of Carneyville; and of Local Union No. 2055, United Mine Workers of America, of New Acme, all in the State of Wyoming, praying for the printing of the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations as a public document, which were referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 2055, United Mine Workers of America, of New Acme, Wyo., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York, praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CUMMINS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hespers, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to fix a standard price for trade-marked and patented articles, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. POMERENE presented a petition of the Mitchell Manufacturing Co., of Portsmouth, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHIELDS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Chattanooga, Tenn., and a petition of sundry citizens of Knoxville, Tenn., praying for an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented memorials of Local Union No. 1289, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, of Ivy Hill; of Local Union No. 1685, National Farmers' Union, of Elizabethton; and of sundry citizens of Summertown, all in the State of Tennessee, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Knox County Rural Letter Carriers' Association, of Knoxville, Tenn., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the postal laws relating to the transfer of rural letter carriers, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maryville and Huntingdon, in the State of Tennessee, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Nashville, Tenn., praying for an increase in the compensation of railroads for transporting the mails, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Automobile Club of Nashville, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the highways of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Commerce of Knoxville, Tenn., praying that an appropriation be made for the purchase of additional lands for forest reserves, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Association of Chattanooga, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation to relieve the congested condition of freight on the eastern seaboard, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented a memorial of Local Union No. 204, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, of New Braunfels, Tex., and a memorial of sundry citizens of League City, Tex., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Pennsylvania Association of Union Volunteer Officers, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called volunteer officers' retirement bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Philadelphia Bourse, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the repeal of the so-called seamen's law, and also for the enactment of legislation to develop the merchant marine, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. NORRIS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Nebraska, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minden, Nebr., praying for the placing of an embargo on the exportation of munitions of war, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of Local Union No. 430, Brotherhood of Post Office Employees, of Norwich, Conn., and a petition of Local Branch No. 35, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, of New Haven, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to civil-service employees, which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of Local Branch No. 22, United States Civil Service Employees, of Newburgh, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented a petition of the H. B. Claflin Corporation, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Watertown, N. Y., and a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Utica, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to relieve the congested condition of freight on the eastern seaboard, which were referred to the Committe on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Utica, N. Y., praying for an increase in the compensation of railroads for transporting the mails, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of the Admore Woolen Mills Co., of Yantic, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROTECTION OF GAME IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 3205) to amend "An act to protect the birds and animals in Yellowstone National Park, and to punish crimes in said park, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1894, reported it without amendment.

FEDERAL JUDGES.

Mr. CUMMINS. From the Committee on the Judiciary I present a favorable unanimous report on Senate resolution 66 directing the Judiciary Committee of the Senate to make inquiry and report the number of Federal judges now holding office who are unable to discharge substantially the duties of a judge, and so forth, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 66, submitted by Mr. CUMMINS on the 11th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Judiciary Committee of the Senate be directed to make inquiry and report: First, as to the number of Federal judges now holding office who are unable to discharge substantially the duties of a judge; second, whether, under the Constitution, such judges, if any, can be removed from office; third, if they can be so removed, what is the proper procedure?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, we have a bill pending here which has been reported and takes precedence of the resolution. I think the resolution should go to the calendar ordinarily.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go to the calendar.

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT (S. DOC. NO. 246).

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I ask that the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, Sixty-second Congress, second session, submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] on the power of the Government over the development and use of water power within the respective States, be printed as a Senate document. It is a very short report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SHIELDS. I also ask that the views presented by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], members of the Committee on the Judiciary, be printed to accompany the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3554) providing for the leasing of arid lands which are irrigable, belonging to Indian allottees, and fixing the maximum time for which such leases may run; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3555) to provide for the securing of deposits in postal savings banks in cities and towns of less than 15,000

inhabitants by bonds of bonding companies, when such deposits shall be deposited in national or State banks located in such cities or towns; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 3556) to establish a military academy at or near Fort Douglas, Utah; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3557) to fix the price for gas in the District of Columbia and prescribing punishment for its violation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 3558) granting an increase of pension to Louis Miller (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 3559) to provide for the erection of a public building at Columbia, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 3560) to validate certain titles wherein the purchase money has been paid on sales by order of the United States circuit or district court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 3561) to correct the military record of Robert D. Magill;

A bill (S. 3562) to correct the military record of Joseph R. Berg;

A bill (S. 3563) to grant an honorable discharge to John W. Jester; and

A bill (S. 3564) to correct the military record of John L. McGregor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3565) granting a pension to Erastus J. Bierbower;

A bill (S. 3566) granting a pension to Edward J. Hart;

A bill (S. 3567) granting an increase of pension to Philip Smathers;

A bill (S. 3568) granting a pension to Alfred L. Jackson;

A bill (S. 3569) granting a pension to Mary P. McCarty;

A bill (S. 3570) granting an increase of pension to John Stouffer;

A bill (S. 3571) granting a pension to Mary Rauch;

A bill (S. 3572) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Pennington (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3573) granting a pension to Moses P. Osborn;

A bill (S. 3574) granting a pension to Ellwood C. Dixon;

A bill (S. 3575) granting a pension to Bernard Closkey;

A bill (S. 3576) granting an increase of pension to Peter Sheplar;

A bill (S. 3577) granting an increase of pension to Cerelle Shattuck;

A bill (S. 3578) granting an increase of pension to A. Y. Whitmoyer; and

A bill (S. 3579) granting a pension to Sarah A. Spriggle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 3580) releasing the claim of the United States Goverument to lot No. 306 in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; and

A bill (S. 3581) releasing the claim of the United States Government to that portion of land, being a fractional block, bounded on the north and east by Bayou Cadet, on the west by Cevallos Street, and on the south by Intendencia Street, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLIS:

A bill (S. 3582) prohibiting the interment of the body of any person in the cemetery known as the Cemetery of the White's Tabernacle, No. 39, of the Ancient United Order of Sons and Daughters, Brethren and Sisters of Moses, in the District of Columbia (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. BURLEIGH):

A bill (S. 3583) granting an increase of pension to Edward P. Carman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3584) making an appropriation for the construction of a dry dock at the Puget Sound Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 3585) providing for the disposal of certain lands in block 32, in the city of Port Angeles, State of Washington; and

A bill (S. 3586) for the relief of settlers on Northern Pacific Railroad lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3587) providing for the survey and commencement of construction of a road in the Olympic Forest Reserve; and

A bill (S. 3588) appropriating $100,000 to be used by the Forest Service in constructing a road from the town of Glacier to Mount Baker in the Mount Baker Forest Reserve; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 3589) setting aside certain lands in the District of Columbia as a site for memorials to women; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 3590) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Bates (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3591) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural roads; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 3592) to remodel the old post-office building at Austin, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 3593) authorizing the issuance of land patents to religious organizations in certain cases, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3594) to grant to the various States the lands owned by the United States within the limits thereof; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 3595) for the relief of Milton C. Conners and George G. Conners, doing business under the firm name of Conners Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 3596) granting to certain employees of the United States the right to receive from it compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment; and

A bill (S. 3597) to amend an act entitled "An act to further regulate interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting the transportation therein for immoral purposes of women and girls, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 3598) to suppress the sale of pistols, revolvers, and other firearms of like form, size, and description, commonly used in the commission of felonious homicides and assaults, and to provide punishment for violation of the provisions of the same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 3599) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Johnson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 3600) granting a pension to Robert Howlett (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3601) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Young (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN: A bill (S. 3602) granting an increase of pension to Kate M. White (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 3603) granting a pension to Margaret J. Berry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 3604) regulating the use of the mails relative to loans, etc.; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 3605) authorizing the President to appoint Archibald Grymes Hutchinson a first lieutenant of Infantry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3606) for the relief of the contributors of the Ellen M. Stone ransom fund; and

A bill (S. 3607) for the relief of Nelson D. Dillon, executor of Harriet A. Dillon, deceased, widow of Robert Dillon (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 3608) granting a pension to Thomas J. Wilson;

A bill (S. 3609) granting a pension to Anna E. Newbury;

A bill (S. 3610) granting a pension to William G. Neeley;

A bill (S. 3611) granting a pension to Hiram B. Kelly; and

A bill (S. 3612) granting an increase of pension to Henry Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 3613) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lewisburg, W. Va. (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 3614) authorizing the President to regulate matters of sanitation, quarantine, taxation, and police in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO.

Mr. GORE. I introduce a joint resolution and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 79) authorizing and directing the President to enter into an agreement with the recognized head of the Mexican Government, under which order shall be restored and life rendered secure in that portion of Mexico adjacent to the United States, was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized, and, in case the prevailing disorder in Mexico is not brought under control by the de facto government thereof before the approval of this act, the President is directed to enter into negotiations with the recognized head of said government with a view to the establishment of a neutral zone along the northern border of Mexico to be jointly policed by the Governments of Mexico and the United States until such time as order may be restored and the lives and property of American citizens rendered secure under the law, at which time the forces of the United States shall be withdrawn from Mexican territory.

2. That in order to carry into effect the terms of any agreement entered into in pursuance of this resolution the President is empowered to employ such part of the naval and military forces of the United States as may be necessary to that end.

3. That this act shall take effect from and after its approval.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. SMOOT submitted an amendment providing for an appropriation from the several appropriations for protection, improvement, and management, etc., of the various national parks, including the Hot Springs Reservation, as well as from the revenues from privileges, etc., in the national parks and the Hot Springs Reservation, such sum or sums as the Secretary of the Interior, in his judgment may deem necessary, to be expended in employment of competent persons in the District of Columbia and in the field, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHIELDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3331) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3393) amending an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes," which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections and ordered to be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. ASHURST submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 69), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had on the pending Senate concurrent resolution No. 4, such stenographer to be paid at a rate not exceeding $1 per printed page, and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. OVERMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 70), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it hereby is, authorized, during the Sixty-fourth Congress, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to employ a stenographer at a cost not to exceed $1 per printed page to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee at any time, and to have such hearings printed for the use of the committee; that the expenses of such hearings be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of a subcommittee; and that the said committee and all subcommittees thereof may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

SAN FRANCISCO WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, an editorial appeared in the New York Times entitled "The Hetch Hetchy fraud," and I made a reply thereto respecting legislation on the subject of the Hetch Hetchy grant passed by Congress. For the information of the Senate I think the matter should be printed.

Furthermore, as an addition to the argument, I desire to state that in pursuance of the requirements of the grant the city of San Francisco last week let a contract for $1,500,000 for the construction of a railway to carry the material into the Hetch Hetchy Valley for the construction of dams. This shows further the good faith of the city, which has been disputed by the New York Times.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Editorial from New York Times, Jan. 9, 1916.]

THE HETCH HETCHY FRAUD.

The Hetch Hetchy Valley, as beautiful as the Yosemite, 30 miles away, was given over to use as a reservoir; a great national wonder place that was a priceless, and should have been a precious, possession of the American people forever, was ruined so that San Francisco might have a water supply. Save us or we perish of thirst, cried the clever tongues that robbed the United States of that paradise. Vainly the friends of park preservation proved that San Francisco had other and adequate sources of water supply. Vain was the campaign against the spoliation. Congress passed, President Wilson signed, the bill.

The Times and many public-spirited associations of men and women were not listened to. The lie about San Francisco's necessity was believed. It is now impudently admitted. Speaking of certain plans of the mayor of San Francisco, the Chronicle, of that city, says:

"It is not proposed to bring the Hetch Hetchy waters to the city at all. Some 'future generation' may do so, but those now alive have no means of knowing what future generations may do. At any rate the Hetch Hetchy as a source of water supply is to be dismissed from consideration."

In short, the mayor proposes to build a power plant in the Sierras for a municipal railway with $15,000,000 of Hetch Hetchy bonds voted and issued to provide for perishing San Francisco's water supply.

Thus in its nakedness is the fraud upon the United States exposed to every eye. It is no consolation to those of us who tried to save the Hetch Hetchy Valley that our predictions come true.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 13, 1916.]

SENATOR PHELAN ON THE HETCH HETCHY PLANS—SAN FRANCISCO'S INTENTION TO DEVELOP THE GREAT FEDERAL GRANT FOR BOTH WATER AND POWER—THE LOCAL ISSUES INVOLVED.

(By JAMES D. PHELAN, United States Senator from California.)

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, January 11, 1916.

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I read in your edition of January 9 an editorial entitled "The Hetch Hetchy Fraud," in which you stated on the authority of the San Francisco Chronicle that "it is not proposed to bring the Hetch Hetchy waters to the City (San Francisco) at all—some future generation may do so," etc.

Of course, if this were true you would have some justification for your caption and comment, but it is not true. The San Francisco Chronicle is engaged in a local political controversy with the mayor. The facts are as follows:

San Francisco, some time since, voted $46,000,000 to bring in water from Hetch Hetchy Valley, and the work is being diligently prosecuted. I personally visited the valley last summer and know of my own knowledge that a broad wagon road has been constructed to the heretofore inaccessible Hetch Hetchy, and that hundreds of men are employed building a diverting tunnel, about completed, to carry the Tuolumne River water by the dam site, while the work of the construction of the dam is under way, a necessary preliminary. Therefore it is the present policy of San Francisco to construct a dam for the impounding of water, and, unless it does so with diligence, under section 5 of the law passed by Congress (H. R. 7207), the Secretary of the Interior may declare forfeited all the rights of the grantee.

The mayor of San Francisco desired to purchase the existing water plant of the Spring Valley Water Co., operating it as a municipal utility, which would be more than self-supporting, and to use its distributing system so acquired for the Hetch Hetchy water when it was brought down to the city's gate. He held that as a distributing system had to be acquired, either by purchase, condemnation, or new construction, and that reservoir sites were necessary, it was not antagonistic to the Hetch Hetchy project to acquire the existing company's properties. As the Hetch Hetchy water could not be brought in for seven years and as there was a most pressing and absolute need for more water, caused by the rapidly growing population and the extension of the suburbs, he proposed to develop certain near-by sources as a temporary expedient. He submitted the proposition to the people, and the San Francisco Chronicle took the ground that such action, if taken, would defeat the completion of the Hetch Hetchy.

The people were so impressed with the idea that the makeshift would delay the completion of the Hetch Hetchy as a permanent and ample source that they voted down the mayor's proposal, which had in it many elements of practical business advantage to the municipality. It was intended to free the city from the hampering policies of the private water company and immediately secure an increased supply for the city; and it was calculated that the profits of the business would meet the cost of the new construction. But, as I stated, the people were suspicious of it, and in their zeal to bring in the Hetch Hetchy they voted it down. This certainly is evidence of good faith, and yet if the mayor's proposal prevailed it would simply have emphasized the desire of the people to get water quickly from any near-by source, although inadequate and exposed.

The city has spent $1,500,000 already upon the Hetch Hetchy project. There is an intimation that the real purpose of the city was not to secure more water, but to acquire a hydroelectric power plant. I am again personally familiar with this phase of the subject, and desire to inform you that no thought of power development was entertained until in January, 1912. At the hearing in Washington before Hon. Walter Fischer, then Secretary of the Interior, Mayor Rolph was asked, in my presence, if the city intended to develop power. He told the Secretary, in answer to his question, that no consideration had been given to the subject, whereupon the Secretary told him that he had better consider it at once, because if the city had no intention of developing hydroelectric energy, the Department of the Interior would not permit it to lie fallow, but that the power grant would be given to some one else. The mayor asked for 24 hours to consider it, and at a conference held that night by the California delegation it was determined to assure the Secretary that with the development of water the city of San Francisco would also undertake the development of electricity for the supply of the city and the irrigation districts, which was finally included in the bill. The bill makes it incumbent upon the city to develop such power within a limited period of time, and if the city does not comply with this condition "the Secretary of the Interior may take possession of and lease to such person or persons as he may designate such portion" of the property "acquired or constructed by the grantee hereunder as

may be necessary for the development, transmission, use, and sale of such power."

This seems to be a complete refutation of any hidden or sinister purpose on the part of the city of San Francisco, and shows that the congressional act makes it incumbent for the city to develop both water and power within a limited period of time. The rents which the act requires the city to pay run from $15,000 to $30,000 a year and begin five years after the passage of the act.

I may state that the criticism of the act at home is that it has imposed too many onerous conditions upon the city. As to the wisdom of the passage of the act, permit me to recall an interesting episode. The press of the East was united in its opposition on the ground that it disfigured the face of nature, and in answer to that the testimony San Francisco offered was that the conversion of a meadow into a lake was not a disfigurement; that the dam site is so narrow that it will never be observed, and that the reservoir will give it the appearance of a mountain lake. There was a well-grounded suspicion that much of the opposition, however, came from the hydroelectric power trust.

The President signed the bill—Congress had passed it by large majorities—in face of this opposition. Dr. George Harvey, editor of the North American Review, and no friendly critic of the President, in an editorial, February, 1913, stated that never had a measure received such universal condemnation from the eastern press, and on that account he examined it as an original proposition, studying the testimony, and he came to the conclusion that the President could have done nothing else than to sign the bill, and he commended the President for what he considered an act of the highest courage.

I regret to see a recrudescence of this opposition, even though it now be vain, and I beg to assure the Times that the conduct of the people of San Francisco and their representatives in this matter has always been dictated by no other consideration than the public weal. There shall be no disfigurement of nature, and beauty places of the Sierra will by this act be made more accessible; and the great populations which shall grow upon the Bay of San Francisco, when served with cheap water and cheap power, shall bless the President and Congress for having, in the face of opposition, wisely provided a necessity of life without in any measure impairing the enjoyment of the aesthetic.

JAMES D. PHELAN.

SEIZURES OF COTTON AND FOODSTUFFS BY GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that following the routine morning business on Thursday, January 20, I shall address the Senate upon the illegality of the order of Great Britain making cotton contraband, and illegal seizures by Great Britain of foodstuffs and cotton belonging to neutrals.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his clerks, announced that the President had, on the 17th instant, approved and signed the following act:

S. 2409. An act to authorize the Ohio-West Virginia Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at the city of Steubenville, Jefferson County, Ohio.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 406. An act to authorize exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 8493. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

INCREASE OF WAGES IN WOOLEN MILLS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have a matter which I desire to present to the Senate before taking up the calendar, and if not out of place, and with the consent of the Senate, I should like to present it at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is a question for the Senate to decide. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, as I have said, I have a matter to present which I feel is of infinite importance to the Senate of the United States, and is particularly of importance to the Senators from Rhode Island. It is also a matter which vitally affects the interests of our whole country, and it seems to me it is but fitting and proper that the public should know the situation to which I refer.

I hold in my hand a copy of the New York Herald, which has an article headed "Six woolen mills raise wages," which reads as follows:

WOONSOCKET, R. I., *Monday.*

Six mills in this city, engaged in woolen and worsted weaving and employing 2,000 operatives, to-day announced a 5 per cent increase in wages, effective January 3.

I am happy to say, and the Senator from Rhode Island should be flattered to learn, that these are the Lippitt mill, the Montrose woolen, the Dunn, the Perseverance mill, and some others. This splendid intelligence conveyed from that portion of New England is most delightful to the average American to hear; but let not you Democrats on this side of the Chamber smile and "lay the flattering unction to your souls" that you are the authors of this condition through your legislation, for you are not. We have been told that we are the wreckers of mills, the cause of the bankruptcy of institutions, and the general bedevilment of the country. You are not the authors of this prosperity. Well, Mr. President, who is or who are the authors of this prosperity? Let me read from their own statement. They say that this increase of wages is not because of prosperity. No; God forbid! Prosperity did not prompt them to make this increase, but that which occasioned it——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I do.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will the Senator from New Jersey object to the creation of a neutral zone about the center aisle of the Senate Chamber? [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I hope I am not dealing death and vengeance to Senators on the other side of the Chamber. I know that which I am to say is not exceedingly pleasant—and I say it regretfully—to the Senators from Massachusetts or to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The mill owners would have it distinctly understood, according to this article, that they did not raise wages because of Democratic prosperity or because of Democratic legislation; that was not at all the cause, they say, but it was due to the fact that they could not find labor. Great God, what has become of the idle men who were walking the streets, of whom the Senator told us? What has become of the idle men in Pennsylvania and the idle men in Rhode Island? They could not find labor.

I am reminded of a condition that prevailed in New Jersey during the time of the McKinley administration. We had a great many idle men in New Jersey during that administration. A meeting was held to decide just what was the cause of the idleness and just what could be done with the idle labor. Very many men were invited to come before the meeting to give their testimony and to express their judgment. Among those who came was a stalwart, broad, sturdy philosopher of an Irishman named Billy Mulligan. He was asked what he had to say, and Billy said, "I will tell you what I find, sirs. I have always found when there are two Pats hunting one job, then times is poor and wages is low, but when I find two jobs hunting one Pat, then wages is high and times are good." That seems to be the condition at Woodsocket, R. I.—two jobs hunting one Pat; hence times are good and wages are high.

Now, I appeal to Senators on the other side to be honest with themselves and to be honest with the country at large, to tell the world that times are good, that we have been blessed beyond parallel with wealth pouring into our coffers, and that in the goodness of your heart you have chosen to raise wages in Woonsocket, R. I.

Of course, the whole trouble about this condition, Mr. President, is that it happens at an unseemly time; it happens under a Democratic administration. If it had happened under a Republican administration the stentorian voice of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], as well as that of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, would ring the changes on the glorious prosperity which the beneficent legislation of the Republican Party had brought.

Now, I have here not only from Woonsocket, but from Massachusetts and the country over, notices of unparalleled prosperity. I have here a report from my little State, from one of the oldest banking institutions in New Jersey, the National Banking Co., of Newark, N. J. They are busy; and when I say "busy" some of these gentlemen say, "Oh, say it quietly, for it is only war busy." No; it is not war busy entirely, though some of that business also may come to us. Is a sewing machine an engine of war? No; but we are multiplying sewing machines and sending them abroad by the thousands and tens of thousands from New Jersey.

Then again, is jewelry an engine of war? We manufacture much jewelry in New Jersey, and particularly in Newark, N. J. That is literally and entirely an article of luxury. We are manufacturing jewelry by the millions of dollars worth, and we have had the same trouble that you have. We could not find men enough in the jewelry trade there, the manufacturers of jewelry could not find men enough to move the wheels and make things go.

Prosperity is the rule this land over; and I say it is unfair, it is ungenerous, and, unknowingly to you, I say it is untrue that conditions are stagnant and dull. The hives of industry this land over to-day are busy. The shafts and spindles and pulleys of the mills throughout our Commonwealth and yours are hissing and growing hot with the busy whir of industry; the anvils are ringing out in clarion note of industry this land over.

Let us be frank with the country. If this condition has come in the unfortunate time of a Democratic administration, never-

theless as American citizens you gentlemen must reap your rich share of recompense. Cease your grudge, admit the truth, deal fairly, deal liberally with the administration that is in power. All mankind will wear a happier and a broader face in consequence of general prosperity, and you, proclaiming justice and truth and not pressing the narrowness of simple selfishness, will live longer and, thank God, die happier.

Mr. LIPPITT and Mr. GALLINGER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I am a little in doubt whether the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, in the remarks which he has made, is trying to pay me a compliment or to utter a political and partisan criticism.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Oh, no; far from it.

Mr. LIPPITT. As a matter of fact, the mills to which he refers in Woonsocket as bearing the name of the Lippitt Woolen Co., unfortunately I am not connected with, and, so far as I know, there is no person of the name of Lippitt who owns any stock or is interested in the management of the concern in any way. Nevertheless I am delighted to know that they are raising wages.

The Senator from New Jersey in his usual polite and emphatic manner has called upon his patron saint, "Good God," to justify the remarks which he has been making.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I suppose the Senator will appeal to the same benign influence, of course. I do not claim a monopoly on that. God knows I trust His blessings may spread over all. [Laughter.]

Mr. LIPPITT. Well, I thought the Senator from New Jersey was going to claim a monopoly upon that, because he seems to be claiming a monopoly on every other influence that causes good times and prosperity in this country.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Ah, far from it.

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator from New Jersey wants the Republicans to be generous with him and admit that the prosperity which is now prevalent in the country is due to some Democratic cause, and probably having in mind the fact that the Republicans were at one time accused of stating that good crops were the result of the protective tariff he is now apparently trying to assert that present industrial conditions instead of being the result of war are the result of the Democratic tariff policy. The Senator from New Jersey knows as well as I do, when he asks us to be generous, that the cause of the present prosperity in this country is due to the fact that there is the most absolute protective tariff in force that this country has ever seen. He knows that there is a protective tariff that is defending the industries of this country, and that it is so strong that it not only defends our markets but that it defends all the neutral markets of the world against the products of Germany and of Belgium and of France and of England, because they are not able on account of the lack of laborers to continue to so great an extent as formerly in the field of production or to export such articles as they are able to produce.

Now, I want to say to the Senator from New Jersey that up to the date of August 1, 1914, in the State of Rhode Island neither the Lippitt Woolen Co. nor any other manufactory of any kind was considering the question of raising wages. The fact is that those factories were running on half time; that there were two "Pats" seeking jobs all over the State of Rhode Island and in every part of New England. I will say, also, to the Senator from New Jersey that the result of Democratic tariff policies in the State of Rhode Island was that for the first six months of the year 1914 the laborers of Rhode Island were receiving at the rate of more than $2,000,000 less wages than they had been receiving under the Republican administration.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. And in the meantime——

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator now comes and asks us here to be generous to him. I ask the Senator to be generous and fair and admit the fact that until the European war intervened the effect of the policies of his party was to cause disaster all over the United States.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I ask no generosity toward myself; I only ask that you shall be generous and true to yourself.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I did not know the Senator from Rhode Island had concluded, and I wanted to interrupt him. I want to put in the RECORD for the information of my good friend from New Jersey a few figures. I have looked up the facts, and find that in the last year of peace we sold to Europe woolen goods to the value of $4,753,000, while in the first year of the war we sold to Europe woolen goods to the value of $32,057,000, a gain of 574 per cent. Now, Mr. President, I hope the Senator will take those figures home with him——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am not willing, nor will I——

Mr. GALLINGER. I have not yielded to the Senator. I say I hope the Senator will take these figures home with him and ask himself seriously the question whether the present prosperity in the woolen industry is not directly due to the war. The same thing exists in reference to the boot and shoe industry of New England.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. How is it with the jewelry industry?

Mr. GALLINGER. Of jewelry Germany is a great producer, and Germany can not send any kind of jewelry out into the markets of the world to-day, so that for the time being New Jersey is finding a market for jewelry, but it will not last.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. If there were no prosperity in this country, the people of this country would not be able to buy jewelry.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think they probably could afford to buy the kind of jewelry made in New Jersey under any circumstances. [Laughter on the floor and in the galleries.]

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. How is it with sewing machines?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. The Chair, under a rule of the Senate, is compelled to admonish the galleries that they must not manifest their approval. The Chair does not object, but the Senate seems to object.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey is always entertaining; the Senator from New Jersey always takes us unawares——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well——

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, Mr. President, if the Senator will just restrain his impetuosity for a moment—the Senator gets hold of some Democratic newspaper——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Is the New York Herald Democratic?

Mr. GALLINGER. Such as the New York World or the New York Herald or some Democratic newspaper in New Jersey when we are unprepared for him, and bursts forth in a torrent of invective against the Republican Party and tries to make us believe——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have been flattering myself——

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, now, there—— [Laughter in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will be compelled to clear the galleries if order is not maintained.

Mr. GALLINGER. I had occasion to say, Mr. President, during the last session of Congress that the Senator from New Jersey approached me in a threatening attitude. [Laughter.] I do not want him to repeat that action to-day, and, if the Senator will just keep his seat and content himself for a moment, he will have an opportunity to show that the 574 per cent increase in woolen goods sent to Europe during the first year of the war, as compared with the last year of peace, had nothing to do with the prosperity of the woolen industry in this country. Of course it has had, and the same thing is true of the boot and shoe industry of New England.

The boot and shoe industry in my State—and it is a very large industry—was practically on the verge of collapse when the war commenced. The first order that was received by one New Hampshire concern was for 2,000,000 shoes from Russia, and other large orders are coming regularly from abroad. All the great shoe shops of New England are to-day prosperous, and they are prosperous because of the demand that has been made upon that industry and other industries because of this horrible war and not at all because of the Democratic tariff policy, which the Senator so vehemently defends on all occasions.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I know, Mr. President, and regretfully, too, that the portrayal of these facts is not comfortable, but, great heavens, I do not know how I am to help it; the facts are published in the daily newspapers of the country. It is unpleasant for our friends to hear that in Democratic times properous conditions exist.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. We have been hearing much about idle men stalking the streets; we have heard about soup houses. I think in stentorian tones the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], in a glorious burst of eloquence in the Senate, told us about the idle men the country over; and now, my heavens, instead of feeling bitter at me, Senators on the other side, as true patriotic Americans, should be proud of the fact that the newspapers of the country are heralding abroad

the news that these men are busy to-day and are not stalking the streets in idleness.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, Mr. President, the Senator——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. One moment. As an evidence that your Republican legislation does not bring all that prosperity that you would have us believe, I cited the McKinley tariff. I remember full well the first bread line I ever saw in my life. I saw it standing at the corner of Tenth Street and Broadway, at Fleischmann's. Fleischmann was giving out bread under the Republican régime of a high protective tariff and under the McKinley administration. I never before knew what a bread line was nor a soup house. But they stood there, as I think I stated once before, on a cold, shivering night, with shrugged shoulders and chattering teeth, waiting for their bread at 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning, and the bells in Grace Church spire were ringing out the gleeful tale, "Praise God, from whom all blessings flow."

This was under a Republican administration, and yet these poor devils were seeking bread. This came about under the guardian angel of the Republican protective policy, and you have not helped the conditions one whit. We had idle men under your so-called protective policy, and idle men will come again under your protective policy.

I am willing to admit that a portion of the present prosperity has been due to the war—this unfortunate, sad, hateful war. I hate the thought, and I hate to recur to it, but I say that it is not all due to the war. I say that the country is stepping on into a revival of prosperity.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I want to congratulate him upon his gradual progress in intellectual achievement. He is now gradually coming around to the point where he is admitting part of the Republican contention. If he will only listen to the debate long enough, I have no doubt that he will get so that he will agree to the whole of it.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It will take a good long while.

Mr. LIPPITT. It is hard work to educate some people.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will say, Mr. President, after listening to the eloquent arguments presented by the Senator from Rhode Island, that it would take a good long while before I would be willing to admit——

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. This is all very interesting, but I ask for the regular order of business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is the consideration of bills on the calendar under Rule VIII.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I submit to that; but I will only say, digest the facts as published.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Philippine bill, Senate bill 381.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, pending that motion I desire to say that during the last year of peace we exported $9,000,000 worth of boots and shoes to foreign countries. During the first year of war we exported $22,000,000 worth of boots and shoes, or an increase of 254 per cent. And yet the Senator from New Jersey calls that Democratic prosperity. It has been well called in another place "Battle-field prosperity."

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska, and that must be disposed of.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, may I not say a word on that motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is decided without debate, always—the question as to whether the Senate will or will not take up a bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the While, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I want to say that while under the rule I was not permitted to object to the motion I do not believe that course ought to be pursued. There are bills on the calendar here, and I think from the close of morning business until 2 o'clock we ought to devote the time of the Senate to the calendar, at least every other day. I think that when a bill is the unfinished business and it is debated from 2 o'clock to 5, that is plenty of time. Now, of course the motion has been carried; but I hope to-morrow, at least, we may be permitted to do something with the calendar.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, on February 5, 1908, I presented to the Senate a joint resolution, which I now send to the desk and ask the Secretary to read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The SECRETARY. From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 5, 1908, page 1575. Mr. STONE introduced a joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas by virtue of the treaty between the United States and Spain, December 10, 1898, the United States established its control over the Philippine Islands; and

Whereas as a step toward their ultimate independence there was first established by acts of the Philippine Commission in 1901 and thereafter a scheme of provincial and municipal governments, which governments in the hands of the Filipinos themselves under an elective system have achieved and maintained order and stability; and

Whereas as a further step in the same direction, and two years after a proclamation of the complete pacification of the islands, the United States provided for an election of a Philippine Assembly, which assembly, inaugurated last October, is now, as appears from the reports of the Secretary of War, in full and satisfactory operation; and

Whereas the steps heretofore successfully taken have demonstrated and are demonstrating the justice of the claim of the Filipinos for speedy independence and their capacity for self-government; and

Whereas it is frequently urged, as a reason for refusing independence to the Philippine Islands, that some other nation would seize the islands if the United States abandoned them; and

Whereas this danger can be removed by an agreement between the United States and the great nations of Europe and Asia whereby the independence of the Philippine Islands shall be assured, and they shall be regarded as neutral territory, not open to the occupation of any other nation, as the independence of Switzerland has long been secured in Europe; and

Whereas fidelity to the fundamental principles of the American Government requires that said Government should aim to secure and safeguard the independence of said islands: Therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the President is requested on the 10th day of December, 1913—that is to say, 15 years after the date of the Treaty of Paris—to deliver the control and possession of said islands to the authorities representing the people thereof, including also all government property therein pertaining to the administration of such government, and withdraw therefrom immediately thereafter the Army and Navy of the United States: *Provided, however*, That the United States shall retain on such date and thereafter such suitable coaling and naval stations as in the judgment of the President may seem necessary, and that the delivery of said islands to such native government shall in itself imply the assumption by it of the obligations then existing and incumbent upon the Government of the United States and consequent upon the granting of any franchise as well as the assumption of all outstanding obligations of the Government at that time existing in said islands; and be it further

Resolved, That the President is requested to open negotiations with other nations for the purpose of securing an agreement with them for the neutralization of the Philippine Islands and the recognition of their independence whenever the same shall be granted by the United States.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, on the policy outlined in that resolution I addressed the Senate at different times, pressing my views with such force as I could. While there was a strong sentiment in the Senate favorable to that policy, I was not able to secure action on the resolution, although it was kept before the Senate through two Congresses.

Since this pending bill has been before the Senate I have conferred with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], who is in charge of the measure, as to whether a declaration in substance like that embodied in the resolution I have had read should be added to the preamble of the bill as a declaration of the policy and purpose of the United States. I told him I did not wish to embarrass or interfere with his plans and would take no step without his approval, especially as I favor the bill as it is, since the bill as it is would grant a larger measure of liberty and autonomy to the Philippine people. I preferred, therefore, to leave the suggestions in his hands.

A few days ago the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] proposed an amendment to the bill before the Senate, which I will ask at this point to insert in my remarks without reading, as I presume Senators are generally familiar with it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SEC. —. The President is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippines, and he shall on behalf of the United States fully recognize the independence of the said Philippines as a separate and self-governing nation and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the government instituted by the people thereof. This transfer of possession, sovereignty, and governmental control shall be completed and become absolute within two years from the date of the approval of this act, under the terms and in the manner hereinafter prescribed. For the purpose of a complete and prompt compliance with this direction, the President is hereby invested with full power and authority to make such orders and regulations and to enter into such negotiations with the authorities of said Philippines or others as may be necessary to finally settle and adjust all property rights and other relations as between the United States and the said Philippines, and to cause to be acknowledged, respected, and safeguarded all of the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States resident or engaged in business in said Philippines or having property interests therein. In any such settlement or adjustment so made in respect to the rights and property of the United States as against the said Philippines the President shall

reserve or acquire such lands and rights and privileges appurtenant thereto as may, in his judgment, be required by the United States for naval bases and coaling stations within the territory of said Philippines.

Immediately after the passage of this act, the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located, for the purpose and to the end that the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves, in the form of a treaty or other binding agreement, to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines, and also to mutually obligate themselves, equally and not one primarily nor to any greater extent than another, to maintain as against external force the sovereignty of said Philippines for the period of five years from the taking effect of such treaty or agreement. If any of the nations so invited to join the United States in such undertaking shall decline to do so, then the President shall include as parties to such convention or agreement such nations as may be willing to join therein and to assume such obligations; and if none are willing to so unite therein, then the President is authorized to give such guaranty on behalf of the United States alone.

Mr. STONE. The same general idea runs through the joint resolution I proposed in 1908 and the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas. I think the plan proposed by the Senator from Arkansas for getting at this matter is better than the suggestion I made to the Senator from Nebraska, since the Senator by his amendment to the text of the bill seeks now, by a quick and direct method, to embody the idea of separation and neutralization into an absolute statutory enactment. That would be more effective and conclusive than a mere declaration of policy in the preamble. Unless the Senator from Nebraska and his committee colleagues are of the opinion that this amendment of the Senator from Arkansas would endanger the passage of the bill we are considering, I need hardly say that I will support the amendment, even in its present form, although it has some limitations I do not approve. I am certainly in favor of the general idea embodied in this amendment.

I wish now to address myself with respect to the idea covered by the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas—I mean especially with respect to the idea of neutralizing the Philippine Archipelago. I have in former years so fully stated my views on this subject that I shall not take much time in expressing what I have in mind to say to-day.

Mr. President, there are at least three schools of thought, three classifications of policy, prevailing in this country with respect to the Philippines: First, there are those who are unwilling to surrender the islands to their own people, withdrawing our sovereignty, at any time. The policy of those holding to this view—that is, the permanent occupation of the islands—was well expressed by the late Senator Elkins, of West Virginia, during a debate in the Senate several years ago, when he said: "The Philippine Islands constitute a part or portion of the territory of the United States," and that they would "furnish a base for operations in the East, where we must extend our commerce and protect American interests," and that they would "prove of great advantage to the United States." "Give them up!" he exclaimed, "surrender them to whom, how, when, and for what? * * * It does not belong to Anglo-Saxon blood to give up land under any circumstances." Then he added that whatever the Democratic Party might do, "the Republicans would declare and say they will never surrender our possessions and give them up for nothing—possessions that have cost us money and blood." That is one view.

Akin to this view is that maintained by those who say that at some indefinite and remote period the United States should grant independence to the Philippines. Former President Taft is a distinguished exponent of this view. He thinks that it is out of the question to talk about Philippine independence for many years to come, certainly not during this generation, and he thinks that it is both idle and vicious to even discuss the question of independence at this time. The first of these of whom I have spoken—that is, of the type of Mr. Elkins, bodly announce, with a straightforwardness of purpose we can easily understand, that they have no intention of ever surrendering our sovereignty and control over the islands; while the other class, of the type of Mr. Taft, sugar coat the bitter pill they offer the Filipinos—breathing a promise to the ear, which they must know is broken in advance to the hope.

Secondly, there is another school of thought, represented by another class of publicists, who go to the other extreme and declare that the United States should at once and forthwith, without any reservations or conditions, abandon the Philippines and turn them over to the native people there, admonishing them to take care of themselves in accordance with the old adage "Root hog or die."

This view has been expressed here in the Senate during this session, notably in the very charming and interesting speech delivered the other day by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Thirdly, there is another class of men who think that we ought speedily to grant political independence to the Filipinos, but that we should not run away and leave them at the mercy of any powerful nation that might conclude to ravish them. The general idea of those who hold to this view is, in general terms, expressed in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] to the pending bill. It is to this last view of the question that I wish to address myself. The difference between those who favor permanency in our occupation of the islands and myself is so radical that there can be no hope of agreement between us, so I will pass that up. But as to those who really wish to confer the boon of liberty and independence upon the people of this archipelago, but who wish to do this at once and without any conditions, and without any provision whatever looking to their future safety, I think there is good reason why we should discuss this matter between us, with the hope of composing our differences.

Mr. President, it has been often said that we made a grave mistake when we took the Philippines under our jurisdiction and guardianship, making them either absolutely or qualifiedly a part of our national domain. It has been said that after the naval battle in Manila Bay, and after the Spanish authority over the islands had been overthrown through the joint efforts of our soldiery and that of the Philippines themselves fighting for their liberty, we should have sailed away and abandoned the islands to the native population, leaving them to work out their own destiny. That may be true; I will not stop to discuss that now. It is too late to discuss that. The fact is that instead of leaving the islands we took them over and put them under our sovereignty, and did this against the will of the natives. We shook loose the hand of Spanish sovereignty and thrust in our own. For more than 17 years this Government of ours has maintained a sovereign jurisdiction over the islands. And here I wish to say that during this long occupancy the work done by our people in the islands, taken as a whole, has been highly beneficial to the native population, at least in many important respects. We have aided them by teaching them the art and science of government, and have impressed upon them the great importance of order and integrity in the administration of public affairs. We have helped them enormously in educational work, and in the development of agriculture and industries of various kinds. We have taught them self-reliance and the value of a national equipoise. I have no doubt that these people have been benefited immeasurably by our work among them and for them, and I am sure that they are better equipped for self-government than they were before our advent. At the same time I think it is also true that mistakes have been made, and that the people there have been the victims of misconduct on the part of American representatives and American exploiters. Our presence there has not been a thing of unmixed blessing, but taken as a whole the Philippines, in a material way, have been far more benefited than injured. Nevertheless, in the hearts of the Filipino people there has always been an inextinguishable flame burning for liberty and independence. They are a good people, a Christian people, who love their homes and country. While they recognize and admit that the conduct of their affairs under American administration has been infinitely better than when administered under Spanish jurisdiction, they still resent and protest against a foreign and alien supremacy over them. I have always sympathized with their hopes and aspirations in this behalf. Moreover, looking down through the years to come I can not escape the conviction that it would be unspeakably better for us, whether considered from a moral or material point of view, if we should sever our connection with and responsibility for the government of these people. I would rather have these people grateful to us for giving them their liberty and independence, thereby making them our fast and firm friends, than to hold them in subjection by superior force. Mr. President, I think in this direction lies the path of wisdom and safety for us.

But, Mr. President, wisely or unwisely, we have exercised power and guardianship over these people for 17 or 18 years. Wisely or unwisely, we have assumed responsibilities and obligations with respect to them which would not have attached to us if we had left them at the close of the Spanish War. As I see it, the duty we now owe is more than the mere duty of giving them independence. We are so related to them and to their history that we can not now with honor send them adrift and leave them at the mercy of any great marauding power that might appropriate them and misuse them. The whole world would look upon an act of that kind with amazement, and we would fall under the just condemnation of mankind.

What, then, should we do? We should do something along the line suggested in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas. I have no doubt that upon the initiative of the United States a joint treaty could be made between what we call the Great Powers—or between such of them as would be necessary

to make the agreement effective—to neutralize these islands, so as to protect them against the danger of invasion and appropriation by any foreign power. Of course, this could not be done now while Europe is rent by war, but it can be done when normal conditions are restored in the world. This ought to be done and, I am sure, can be done. We owe it to these people to do this if it is possible. If we are willing to give up this great, fertile, opulent land and voluntarily withdraw our sovereignty over this important field in the Orient, how could any other nation refuse to join us in a solemn agreement to leave these people free and to protect them against outside interference with their liberty and independence? I would not limit this agreement for neutralization to a fixed period, and certainly not to any brief period like five years. That is my objection to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas—the provision which would limit the period of neutralization to five years. I do not think it is at all likely that any foreign power would seek to overrun and appropriate these islands within five years from the date of our grant of independence to them. That would be too raw, too bold, too insolent, and insulting to us. I see no good reason for placing a limit of that kind at all, and certainly not for a period less than a generation—or at least not less than for 20 years.

Mr. President, I said in the beginning that I did not wish to elaborate my views in this behalf. The extent of my wish has been only to restate with as much brevity as possible the views I have heretofore amplified on this subject. If the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and his colleagues having charge of the bill approve of the general idea and think they could safely incorporate it in this bill, I would be very glad indeed to have that done. In any event, why should not a provision of this character be inserted in the bill by the Senate? If the Senator from Nebraska should afterwards find that it was antagonized elsewhere, he could exercise his judgment as to whether he would insist upon it or recede from it. Is it not worth while, at least, to make the issue now and put it to a test?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me, I wish to make an observation in the Senator's time. The Committee on the Philippines did not consider the provision referred to because they thought it was a matter which ought to be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I myself introduced a joint resolution asking the President to enter into negotiations with other leading nations of the world for the purpose of coming to some kind of agreement with relation to the neutralization of the Philippines; and I expected to appear before that committee after this bill was disposed of. I heartily agree with the Senator from Missouri that a provision of that kind would be very proper in this bill, and if it can be inserted by an amendment I have no objection to it whatever.

I agree, too, with the Senator that five years is too short a time. It ought to be of an indefinite nature. I believe there should be a limit of five years, if there is no agreement between the nations of the world and the guaranty of neutrality is made only by our Nation; but if an international agreement is made, I feel that it would be better to have unlimited time.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WADSWORTH in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to ask the Senator whether he has made any estimate or survey of what our obligations, either legal or moral, in a financial way would be in case we should sever within a reasonable time our relations with the Philippines. We have issued, or authorized the issuance of, a considerable amount of bonds there for the improvement of cities and the construction of railroads and other public works. It seems to me that our relation to those obligation would be one either of legal or moral responsibility. Has the Senator made any estimate of that?

Mr. STONE. Has the Senator read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I have read it, but I do not recall it very fully.

Mr. STONE. That amendment makes provisions for a settlement of the question the Senator suggests as between the United States and the Philippines when the United States withdraws its sovereignty or jurisdiction over them. I assume that that can be settled as between the Philippines and this Government. I think the Philippine Government or people would assume the whole of the liabilities in cases where the Senator thinks there might be some kind of responsibility resting on us. It ought to assume responsibility for its part. All those questions would have to be settled as a part of the arrangement under which we would withdraw.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I am inclined, as the Senator from Missouri is, to support some proposal for the severance of our relations with the Philippines as soon as it can be done consistently with the interests of the Filipino people; but it seems to me before we can act intelligently upon such an amendment as has been presented by the Senator from Arkansas it is necessary for us to have some statement from the committee having jurisdiction as to the nature and extent of these obligations, either legal or moral, for I assume that a moral obligation would be as strong as a legal one, as far as the United States is concerned.

There is another question that disturbs me, and that is as to when the Filipino people will so acquire a common language as to enable them to communicate with each other. I can not understand that any scheme of independence or of self-government will be successful unless the people of those islands can communicate their ideas to each other on such important matters as those that relate to government. When this subject was up for consideration some 8 or 10 years ago I urged in that view that it was essential that we should by direct appropriation of the United States Government aid the Filipino people in acquiring a common language. The evidence that has been presented to us indicates that to-day little less than one-half of the Filipino people are in school, and in order to educate 500,000 more, assuming that 1 teacher would be required to every 50 pupils, we would require a great many teachers. I imagine that the annual expense merely for teachers' salaries alone would aggregate a sum half as great as the entire insular revenue at present. It is very evident that they could not stand that burden, and if we wish to prepare them for self-government it will be necessary for us to assume it. It would be a matter of economy to do so.

I imagine that the maintenance of our government in the Philippine Islands, self-sustaining as they are in all domestic matters, must cost the United States in matters of military and naval defense $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 annually.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state to the Senator that the House committee, having investigated the matter, found that the cost to which he refers was $26,000,000 a year.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Assuming that we shall desire to sever our relations with those people in 10 years, during that time we shall have incurred an expenditure of $260,000,000 simply in the defense of the islands or in the preparation for their defense. As a matter of dollars and cents, it would be a great deal cheaper to appropriate five or ten million dollars annually for the purpose of instructing the Filipino people in a common language during that period of 10 years, involving a total expense of between fifty and one hundred million dollars, rather than to prolong our departure for 10 years longer at an expense during that additional period of $260,000,000.

It seems to me that we ought to have some definite information upon these two important questions: First, what will it cost to give the Filipino people a common language in the shortest possible period of time in which it could be accomplished; and, second, what will be the extent of our legal and moral obligations in those islands when we cease our relations? It seems to me that the committee having charge of this matter might furnish us with that information whilst this debate is going on.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, what the Senator from Nevada has just said and the questions that were raised at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] indicate what seems to me to be the inconsistency of this bill. I have heard all of the debate upon this question, but no explanation of what the obligation of the United States rests upon, if there is such an obligation, that we should go on for an indefinite number of years expending millions of dollars annually in order to give the Filipino people a common language, with the expectation that after we have given them the common language we would abandon our investment there and unsettle the entire form of government as well as their relations between their own country and the United States.

It seems to be the idea—this is a little bit out of the order in which I expected to discuss it, and I am not going into it fully—that there is a moral obligation, to say nothing of a legal or international obligation, for the United States of America to go cruising around the world to find a people we think need a common language, who we think ought to have their country put in a sanitary or hygienic condition, who we think

are not capable of governing themselves, and to do that work for them and to teach them how to govern themselves and then abandon them. Such an obligation does not grow out of any ordinary attributes of international relations or of sovereignty of nations. The United States of America has never undertaken it in any case in its past history, except where it grew out of the incidents of a war in which we had become engaged.

Mr. President, I would have hesitated to say anything about this bill except for the fact that I, in part, represent a State and represent, in part, a section of the country which are particularly interested in the question, lying, as they do, approximately near to the Philippine Islands, being only separated from them by the easy avenue of the Pacific Ocean, which needs no dredging and which is an open channel for our ships. That section has built up a considerable intercourse with those people; some of our citizens have located there; and I could not sit in entire silence without expressing some of the feelings with which I should witness the accomplishment of what is proposed by this measure. A great number of our young men enlisted in the volunteer forces of the United States which went to the Philippines; some of them gave their lives, many of them gave their blood, in bringing about the acquisition of these islands and the restoration of peace and order there.

What has been accomplished there since that time has been described by many of the advocates of this bill. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] in a very graphic way, with a wave of his hand, said that, unarmed, the traveler could pass from the northernmost point of the island of Luzon through the Philippine Archipelago to the Sulu group in peace and safety; that these people were happy and comparatively prosperous. That has been the result, Mr. President, of the American occupation, of the sacrifices of our soldiers who fell there, of the expenditure of vast sums of our treasure which have been stated by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and others.

Mr. President, in the practice of the law, as is familiar to every lawyer, there is a plea known as the plea of confession and avoidance; there is a plea of res adjudicata; there is a plea of the statute of limitations or prescription. We can apply, Mr. President, in the argument upon this matter of State, the principles on which these pleas are based in the formal pleadings in a lawsuit. An analogous answer would be applicable to the proposition here now—to the proposal to unsettle a question which has been settled for 17 years, on which rights have been adjusted, upon which people have builded their lives and adjusted their habits for the period of almost a generation. I want to discuss that feature of the matter a little later, in view of the insistence which has been placed in this debate upon the proposition that some promise has been given to the Philippine Islands which would bind the United States, after a long course of years of effort and expenditure there, to sever our relations with them and give up our sovereignty.

I can understand, Mr. President, the basis of the argument of those who insist that, in accordance with the fundamental principles of the American Government, we are not adapted to hold colonies, or to administer them, and that accordingly we ought to leave these islands. I can understand the argument of those, on the contrary, who say that these possessions having come under the jurisdiction and sovereignty of the United States as one of the unexpected incidents of an unexpected war, and we having become committed to their tenure and having made a success of their administration from our own standpoint and from that of the welfare of the Philippine people, we ought not to discuss the question of the abandonment of sovereign jurisdiction over them; but I can not understand the preamble of this bill or any policy which would justify it; that we should not abandon them; and, on the other hand, that we should not let the matter rest where it has rested for many years; but that we should continue to expend our lives and millions and hundreds of millions of dollars for an indefinite period in the future without hope of benefit to the American people, and when these expenditures have borne rich fruits to leave them all in the end. And, if you follow the argument of the advocates of the bill, it would also be without the possibility of benefit to the Philippine people, for it has been said time and time again that these people can not learn the principles of self-government so long as they are under our tutelage. Yet it is proposed to keep them under our tutelage for an indefinite period and then to relinquish our jurisdiction over them. That is the principal objection which I have to the measure. The preamble is more important than the enacting sections.

I should dislike very much, Mr. President, to be misunderstood as to my position toward the people of the Philippine Islands. I do not think there is anyone who would go further than I am willing to go in giving them self-government. I do not know that I would have any objection to that portion of this bill which deals with the internal administration of their government; but, for the very reason that I want to see these people led up and on toward the full fruition of self-government, I am opposed to the unsettlement of their international relations and of the tie which binds them to the United States, because I believe that it would defeat the purpose and the object of self-government. That is one of the reasons why I am opposed to the preamble of this measure.

Suppose we were to abandon them to-day, Mr. President, and absolutely sever this intangible tie by which the sovereignty of this great Republic attaches itself to them. I think there are some Senators here who believe that they would have self-government. I am aware of the fact that it is said by many that it is none of our business what they would do after we sever our relations, and that is quite logical. It is not, however, the position of the preamble of the bill. But, nevertheless, even though there are Senators who say that it is none of our business, it is an important phase of this matter which ought to be considered. My opinion is that it is our business, and the very Senators who say that it is none of our business refute their own argument when they talk about going on year after year and spending millions of dollars to give them, among other things, and only one among other things, a common language. If it is none of our business what condition those people should be in and will be in when the protection of the United States is withdrawn, why should we go on for a single day? Why should we negotiate treaties with foreign powers to neutralize the islands? What business is it of ours? That is what Senators say. Oh, Mr. President, it is some of our business; and I am impelled to say so, notwithstanding my belief that there are in the Philippine Islands a large number of people who are more cultured in many respects than we are. They have better manners than we have and are more polite, and that is a great thing. I think it was Montesquieu who said, "Commerce goes to those nations whose people are polite." It is a national asset—their culture, their education, their refinement of manner; but is that the Philippine people?

There has been some discussion here as to the meaning of self-government. I mean by self-government, Mr. President, that kind of government which was described by Webster and formulated by Lincoln as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Now, the Philippine people, as a people, will never have, in my judgment, that kind of a government when the United States pulls down its flag, which is the token of its sovereignty there, and takes away its restraining influence. The great interest which I have in the condition of the Philippine people is the same interest I have in the people of this country—not of a favored few, who in every country exist and can take care of themselves, but in the condition of the masses of their population. If American sovereignty were withdrawn from the Philippine Islands, civil war would break out. Between the so-called non-Christian peoples and the Christian peoples, between the wild tribes, so called, and the civilized tribes, there is undying unfriendliness. Time after time the Moros have boasted that, given the opportunity, taking away the obstruction of the United States, they would conquer the Filipino people.

This order which is described, and which exists, this peace, this security of person and life and property in the Philippine Islands, was not wrought out by themselves; but it was established there in the first place—as is almost always the case wherever a government has established order and security—by force of arms, then by the knowledge and the capacity of self-government existing in the United States backed up by military force. That is how they obtained it.

Pictures have been drawn of massacres and of horrors that attended the suppression of the Philippine insurrection. One Senator said that a number of Filipinos had congregated in a crater, and men, women, and children were massacred. I do not know what the purpose was in dragging that incident, whatever the circumstances may have been, into this debate. It was an incident, if it ever occurred, of the ordeal through which this country and the Philippines went when we undertook to establish peace and order there. But having established it, having paid that price for this result, does it follow that because it cost us that price, because horrors were attendant upon their acquisition, after they have been forgotten, after these people—a large portion of them, at least—have come to realize the material benefits, at least, which come from the government and sovereignty of the United States, we are to undo all of that?

Mr. President, there were two occasions when the question of the relation of the Government of the United States to the Philippine people might, under a wise policy, have been determined. One of them was when the question was presented of going to

war with Spain. All of these problems grow out of the War with Spain; they are the aftermath of that war; they are burdens and responsibilities which, perhaps, were foreseen by President McKinley and which caused him to refrain, in the face of the insistent and passionate demand of the American people, from plunging this country into that war. But having gone into the war, this question, the Cuban question, and many other problems with which we have been burdened since, and the responsibilities of which we have borne with credit to ourselves, I am glad to say, became fixed upon us.

There was another time when we sensibly could have determined the question of our relations to the Philippines, and that was when the Spanish fleet had been destroyed in Manila Bay by Admiral Dewey. I heard some Senator describing inconversation the regret of Senator Hale, I think, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, when there was submitted to the council of officials of this Government the telegram to Admiral Dewey to proceed from Hongkong to Manila and destroy the Spanish Fleet, that he did not think of adding four words to the telegram—"and return to Hongkong." He expressed the opinion that if the suggestion had been adopted, and that course pursued, we would not have acquired the Philippines; and consequently we would not now—17 years afterwards—after the horrors which have been described, and the billions of dollars that have been expended—I think that is an exaggeration, but taking the estimates of Senators, probably a billion dollars, according to the estimates of some of them, first and last, directly and indirectly—we would not now, here in the Senate of the United States, be talking about undoing it all, abandoning it, and putting the Filipino people and the United States of America back where they were when the War with Spain was declared, or at least where they were when the insurrection began in those islands. And that reminds me——

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

Mr. POINDEXTER. In just one moment I will yield to the Senator. That reminds me that many Senators discuss this question as though we had imposed an arbitrary sovereignty upon a free people. Why, that is not the case. That is not borne out by history. We substituted the sovereignty of this free Republic for the oppressive Government of Spain in those islands. We have taken nothing of self-government away from the Philippine people, but we have given them more than they ever would have gained if they had never heard of the United States.

I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. I was simply going to add something to the historical value, perhaps, of the incident to which the Senator refers. Senator Hale told the incident partially to illustrate how easy it is for men of experience, temporarily vested with the control of things, to make a mistake. The Senator was always very bitterly opposed to the acquisition of over-sea territory, and the incident has some value in view of the fact that there it was, at least from his viewpoint, in the power of a man who was opposed to something to secure the adoption of a certain course of action, instead of which he failed at a critical moment to take advantage of the opportunity along the line of his own inclinations, for Senator Hale stated that if he had added the four additional words he did not think a member of the party would have objected to it. There it was in the power of the man to do something along the line of his inclinations, and yet at that moment he forgot to interpose and to add the words.

Mr. POINDEXTER. And yet, if I am not mistaken, Senator Hale subsequently, after the matter had become fixed and had taken on a new phase, voted against the evacuation of the islands by the United States.

Mr. CLAPP. Oh, certainly. While the question of our supremacy was involved he was in favor of establishing the supremacy of the American arms.

Mr. POINDEXTER. But the statement which he made, and which has been so clearly described by the Senator from Minnesota, illustrates the distinction which Senator Hale made between the decision of the question before we had committed ourselves to the policy of occupying the islands and its decision after we had occupied them and had governed our course of action upon that occupation.

Mr. President, I suppose the best form of government which a people can have, eliminating from consideration abuses of administration, is that form of government to which they are accustomed. It is sometimes said that the sweetest word in the English language is "home," and I have reflected somewhat as to why that is. Many homes that we see are not more attractive than others around them, perhaps not nearly so attractive. A wanderer upon the face of the earth may be amid beauties of every kind of nature and of art, and yet we commiserate him as the most miserable of mortals because he is a wanderer. The pleasure and the attractions of home are based upon the familiarity of its occupant with his surroundings. It is because he is used to it. Man is like other animals in that respect. A dog or a cat or a horse will return from long distances and after long periods of time to the place to which it is accustomed, not because it is better than other places, but because the sensibilities of nature and of human nature yield to contact with their environment and they are easy and comfortable in the place and under the conditions to which they are accustomed.

I venture to say that the people of the Philippine Islands, after 17 years of American occupation, are becoming accustomed to that occupation. I venture to say that if it were possible to get the real sentiment of the great masses of the people of those islands and search the innermost recesses of their souls they would say, with all the impulses of their nature, that this occupation has been a blessing to them. If it should be submitted to the people of those islands in the proper sense, referring to the great masses of the people, I do not believe they would want to change that relation. They have experienced its benefits. They are looking forward to greater benefits which are to come; and while they may not know it, we know, or we ought to know from the teachings of the founders of our Republic, that it is unwise to unsettle the governmental relations of people. It is set forth in the Declaration of Independence. Men will bear the ills they have rather than fly to those they know not of.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield for a question.

Mr. SIMMONS. Before the Senator altogether leaves the phase of this question which he was discussing just before he was interrupted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], and which is very interesting to me, I wish to ask him a question with respect to his views upon an aspect of that subject.

The Senator had just stated—and stated truthfully, I think—that during our occupation of the Philippines we have taken nothing from those people, but that we have given them much of great value. We have, at large expense to ourselves, helped to initiate them into the methods of self-government. At large expense to ourselves we have helped them to establish schools, and with our help they have made very great progress in the direction of the education of the masses of the people. We have helped them in matters of sanitation at considerable expense to ourselves. We have helped them in road building, and in other directions we have broadened the development of their natural resources.

Do I understand the Senator, in making these comments upon our gratuities to the people of those islands, to suggest that in withdrawing, if we should withdraw, as provided by the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], we shall withdraw without any suggestion to them or any demand upon them or any requirement upon them of any sort of financial indemnity to the United States for the large sums of money that it has spent there for the purpose of their betterment politically, socially, industrially, and economically?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, there is nothing of that kind provided in this bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. There is nothing of that sort provided in the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. I was desiring to elicit the views of the Senator from Washington as to whether, in case we do withdraw, we should do so unconditionally or whether we should require them to make us some sort of indemnity for the expenditures we have incurred for benefits to them which are permanent and perpetual.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Withdrawal, to be perfectly frank with the Senator from North Carolina, from the Philippine Islands now, whatever might have been right and wise 10 years ago, seems to me a stupendous mistake from every possible standpoint, and it is difficult for me to address myself to a consideration of the question which the Senator from North Carolina has stated. It is not agreeable to me to contemplate a business dicker with those poor people for a return to the Government of the United States of the vast sums of money which it is stated—as I said before, I think it is exaggerated—we have invested there. I do not know what the views of the Senator from North Carolina might be as to the means by which we could collect the returns for this great investment.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me——

Mr. POINDEXTER. My opinion is that it would be extremely difficult to the Filipino people ever to pay the United States for the money we have invested there, and they could never pay us for the lives which have been sacrificed or for the labor which has been expended by Americans in building up the government which they now have.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me, I have not expressed any opinion with respect to the matter that I brought to the attention of the Senator. I could not say that I have any well-formulated opinion upon the subject. The Senator was discussing the subject of the expenditure on the part of the United States for their benefit, and I wanted to inquire of the Senator if, in discussing it, he had in view the idea that in case we did withdraw, as provided in the amendment to which I understand he is addressing himself, we should demand compensation.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is not only the amendment, Mr. President, to which I am addressing myself, but it is the bill itself, which is far more important in its prologue, as some dramas are said to be, than is the drama itself. This proposition, which involves the destiny of 8,000,000 people and the interest of all the people of the United States, is the adjustment of the relations between those islands and this country.

It was both those propositions to which I was addressing myself, and the reason why I suggested the amount which has been expended in the Philippine Islands was to call to the attention of the Senate that this was only one of the conditions which had become fixed and which had grown out of our occupancy of the islands, which rendered an evacuation now unreasonable, made it difficult to readjust to these conditions, and that we should have determined the question earlier. I shall point out in a moment that we did determine it earlier, and that it should not now be questioned after these sums have been expended—and I regard the funds which have been expended as the least which we have given to those islands. We have given our genius, we have given our knowledge of building roads, we have given the ability of our physicians to establish sanitary conditions, we have reduced the death rate, we have reduced the illiteracy of those islands. That grew in part out of the expenditure of this money. It grew also in part, and in far greater part, out of the knowledge, the capacity, the devotion, and the self-sacrifice of the people of the United States.

I want, Mr. President, in the discussion of this question to depart from that policy which seems of late years to have governed so many of our foreign relations, as in the Panama Canal, for instance, and to consider not only the welfare of foreign people but to consider as a part of the equation which is to be solved the interests of our own people.

Now, Mr. President, should we come to the proposition of abandoning the islands—pulling down our flag? I have no objection to pulling down the flag if it represents the policy which is to be adopted, but if we are to adopt that policy there are many questions, not only the one which the Senator from North Carolina suggests; there is the question of coaling stations for the use of the Navy, the question of making treaties with foreign countries for the neutralization of those islands, and a question which perhaps the Senator from North Carolina has not thought of, because he says he has not come to a conclusion upon the one which he mentioned—and which I doubt has been thought of by any of the advocates of that policy—and that is, when we have made neutralization treaties for the Philippine Islands are we prepared when we sever our relations with them to plunge into international war to maintain the treaties which we have signed? That is a question which will have to be answered, and if not answered now it will have to be answered hereafter.

One of the great responsibilities of legislation in this great tribunal is that what we do every day not only affects the interests of ourselves and of this generation, but in the laws which we pass we affect the woe or the welfare of generations that are to come. Are we going to saddle upon the next generation the responsibility of plunging this country into a great war or else of dishonoring itself by abandoning its treaty obligations because we have entered into a treaty with foreign countries for the neutralization of the Philippine Islands?

I should like Senators to give me their views about that. I know that there is an element which would say that we would arbitrate it, but suppose the other fellow would not arbitrate it, as has been said by quite a noted American on another occasion. I heard a great American speak in my State last summer, in which he said that if modern naval vessels and transports with armed troops came to invade this country we would go out to meet them and say, "We have the lives of 100,000,000 people to protect and priceless ideals to preserve for the benefit of mankind." He seemed to be of the opinion that, when we said that, that would settle it, and the fleet would turn back and the transports would return to the country from which they came. But that is not in accordance with common sense. That is ideally beautiful; it is theoretically perhaps defensible upon some high plane of brotherly love; but we all know that international relations are not, in our time at least, and, so far as I can see, will be at no time in the near future, determined by principles of brotherly love.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. POINDEXTER. In just one moment. Whether we would like it or not, whether we would like to put it upon that basis, however much our virtue might be in evidence, if it should be, our great rivals do not, as a matter of fact, adjust their foreign relations upon any such high principles. On the contrary, it can not be denied that matters of self-interest govern. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Washington has very sagaciously called our attention to the real significance and possible consequence of a treaty by which the neutralization of the Philippine Islands would be guaranteed. Is not the same obligation and the same responsibility involved in the suggestion lately made of a treaty of alliance offensive and defensive with the Republics of America?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It might be, Mr. President, unless it was guarded against by some proviso in the treaty. I do not know that that proposal has been worked out to any definite form. It does not follow, if the Senator proposes to make that the basis of removing the difficulty of a Philippine treaty for the neutralization of the Philippine Islands, which I mentioned, that it can be used for that purpose at all. I do not know, so far as I am concerned, that a treaty of offense or defense with a great number of any foreign countries in the Western or Eastern Hemisphere would be wise.

Mr. WALSH. There is one other suggestion which has been repeatedly offered as a solution for war trouble, that the nations of the earth ought to band themselves together and agree jointly to use coercive measures with respect to any single nation that might engage in war. Such an engagement would likewise involve us in the same kind of responsibility and obligation as a treaty of neutralization.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The only difference is, Mr. President, that it is more extensive. There would be more opportunities for trouble. There would be more consequences involved in it.

Mr. WALSH. I merely desired to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that there is a general principle involved in any obligation of the Government with respect to the future.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is very true, but while there are general principles involved the neutralization of any country is not necessarily one of them; and even though it were, and if it were true, as the Senator seemed to intimate, that such treaties might furnish a cause for war, it does not follow that we should add to that difficulty by assuming a protectorate through neutralization treaties or otherwise over the Philippine Islands. I think one of the most illogical features, and there are many of them, of any of the proposals which have been made in regard to the Philippine Islands is that we should absolutely surrender our sovereignty and yet guarantee their independence. Three or four different times the National Democratic Party in its platform has proposed it. It is not proposed in this bill; it is not said by Senators defending the bill what the plans or purposes of their party are in regard to that, but of course, in view of the rigid adherence to other planks of their platform, they will abide by this one.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield further to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. Such a treaty of neutralization would impose no heavier obligation upon the United States to engage in war in case of its violation than it would upon any other signatory power?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It might not. That would not help us very much.

Mr. LIPPITT. I would like to ask the Senator if he does not think, under the peculiar circumstances of our connection with the Philippines, a treaty negotiated by us of the neutralization of those islands would involve us in some additional responsibility in case of a violation as compared with other nations of the world. There certainly would be a moral obligation on our part—considering the relations we have already assumed with those islands and considering the fact that such a treaty, if it was signed, would have been through negotiations of ours—to defend, to protect, and to take armed measures in case of a violation of it. It would seem to me that that would be involved.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Why should we assume that burden? If we are to sever our relations with the Philippine Islands why should we bother ourselves and sacrifice our people's lives and pay out the taxes which have been ground out of them to protect the Filipinos? Why not go and protect the Chinese?

Mr. LIPPITT. If I may be allowed a word further, I do not for a minute assume that that could be a desirable course for us to pursue, but the Senator from Montana suggested that it would involve some more responsibility on our part than it would on the part of any other signatory power. It seems to me that it would.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that the Philippine question being our question, we being the proponents of the proposed treaty, and we being in the attitude of plaintiff, so to speak, and the other parties defendants, the treaty being formed with the idea that we were not going to interfere with the independence of the Philippines, because we would be giving it up, and the treaties being framed to prevent some other country from interfering with their independence, that much greater burdens and responsibilities would be placed upon us than upon the other parties to the treaty.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield further to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has been very kind in yielding. Let me ask him if this is not the situation, exactly: If we retained possession of the Philippines and any nation attempted to take them we would of necessity be involved in war with that nation without being able to call upon any other nation to assist us. If we surrender the possession and enter into a treaty with all the nations of the earth for the neutralization of the islands it may be, and undoubtedly would be, our duty to defend them by force of arms, but we could then call upon all the other signatory powers to help us. In other words, we lessen, do we not, the burden of the obligation?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It would be as hopeless as the prophets of Baal calling on the Lord to send down fire from heaven. The help would not come.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. All I was going to say is that just now there is not much dependence to be placed upon treaties.

Mr. WALSH. That is the unfortunate situation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. POINDEXTER. For a question.

Mr. SIMMONS. I should like, with the permission of the Senator from Washington, to ask the Senator from Montana a question with reference to the observation he has just made.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If it does not take the Senator from Montana too long to answer it I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. SIMMONS. It will not take me long to ask it and I am sure that it will not take the Senator long to answer it. The Senator said it would probably be easier for us to defend the neutrality of the islands with the assistance of the other nations to the agreement of neutrality than it would be to defend them during our occupancy against invasion. That is probably true, but I notice in the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, which we are now discussing, there is a provision that we invite other nations to join us in this work of guaranteeing the neutrality of the islands, but in case no nation will join us in that guaranty there is a provision that the United States shall guarantee the neutrality of the islands after we have retired. I will ask the Senator, if it should come to that, if we should evacuate the islands and become the sole guarantor of neutrality, would we not then be in a much worse position in order to defend that country against invasion than we are now while we are in the occupation of the islands?

Mr. WALSH. I should say obviously we would. I would not be able to give my assent to the amendment for that reason.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President——

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will yield in a moment to the Senator from Rhode Island. If the argument which has been made with so much eloquence by Senators in favor of this bill and this preamble, or of the amendment which the Senator from Arkansas introduced, is based upon the inalienable rights of people to manage their own affairs, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana and the Senator from North Carolina why we should make any treaty of neutralization for them?

Mr. WALSH. Why we should?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes. I was assuming that if the argument of the proponents of this measure and the amendment is correct, that it is one of the inalienable rights of people to manage their own affairs, and if superimposed sovereignty by a greater power can not benefit them in any way at all, why we should impose ourselves upon them to the extent of making a neutralization treaty?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Montana has not been sponsor of that provision.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand he is not in favor of it, and I do not want to press the Senator; I am just anxious to have his view about that.

Mr. WALSH. I think we should make an agreement if we can.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course the Senator need not answer unless he desires, but I will ask him out of what duty would such an act on our part grow? Why should we make such a treaty?

Mr. WALSH. I would like to relieve, so far as we possibly can, the Philippine people and any other people on earth from the evils of war. We have had such an example within the last year. It is my opinion that they would be very much less likely to be made the subject of foreign aggression if the whole world were leagued to preserve their independence. I should think it altogether unlikely under those circumstances that any nation would attempt to fight them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator would be a long ways from the doctrines of George Washington, also of Thomas Jefferson and many of the leaders of the old Democratic Party to go so far afield as that and entangle ourselves in international agreements, out of which he admits war might come.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. COLT. If I may be permitted to ask the Senator from Montana a question, it would be in this line: Whether at the present time, when most of the great nations who are interested in the Far East are suffering from the delirium of war, the Senate of the United States should pass the Clarke amendment, which calls upon the President to enter into an agreement, pledging the independence of the Philippines, and whether he thinks these nations at this time would be willing to enter into any such guaranty?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I cheerfully answer the question of the Senator from Rhode Island. My opinion about the matter is that the present is an inopportune time to engage in any negotiations looking to a treaty of that character.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish just a moment.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will yield in a moment to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish merely to say a word.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire simply to say to the Senator from Washington, that if he is laboring under the impression that I have committed myself to this amendment in that way he is laboring under an erroneous impression. I have not committed myself to it. I am listening to the argument. I am studying the question. I do believe and always have believed——

Mr. POINDEXTER. I hope the Senator will not commit himself to it.

Mr. SIMMONS. I beg pardon; I did not catch his remark.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I say I hope the Senator from North Carolina will not commit himself to the proposition of guaranteeing the independence of the islands and entering into treaties for that purpose.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was going to add to what I have said that I have always believed that as soon as it was wise and just to ourselves and to the Filipinos we ought to retire from the islands and give them an opportunity to govern themselves. I still feel that way about it. I believe when we do retire it would be a wise thing for us to provide for some international system of guaranteeing the sovereignty of those people, because I very much fear unless it be done that as soon as we get out of the way they will be the prey of some designing powers of the earth. But while I feel that way about it, I am not at all prepared to give my assent to this amendment. I am considering and studying the matter, listening to the discussion; but at this time I am not prepared to give my assent to the provision.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am encouraged to know that, Mr. President, because I think the counsel of the Senator from North Carolina on the other side will have great weight. My own opinion is that while the Senator says he is not in favor of entering into treaties, his subsequent remark that he is in favor of entering into some sort of international arrangement

guaranteeing independence amounts to the same thing, and that undoubtedly it would lead us to a continuous series of difficulties and to war if we adopted it, owing to the responsibility which we would necessarily assume, regardless of the form which the agreement took, because the Senator is correct in saying that other nations would look upon the islands with covetous eyes. Other nations need them. Some nations need the undeveloped rice fields of the Philippine Islands to support their overcrowded population. Now, if we undertake to guarantee independence, we have got to meet that contingency.

Mr. President, if we propose to commit ourselves to the proposition of abandoning the Philippine Islands we ought to do it to-day; we ought to get out of the islands as soon as it is physically possible for us to get out of them. I can quote the argument of a dozen Senators on the other side to prove that we are under no obligation to remain there a day longer to educate them or to preserve their independence or for any other purpose. We ought either to be there or not to be there. If we are there, we ought to give them self-government, a good government, and we ought to exercise such sovereignty and jurisdiction over them as will enable us to do that; else we should leave at once.

However, Mr. President, should we pursue such a policy, within a very few months the people of the islands would be engaged in civil war. Instead of being a Philippine republic or a Philippine monarchy, there would be a large number of Philippine nations. Every local leader who chafed at the restraint of some national regulation which interfered with his interest would defy that restraint, and there would be independent governments set up in every island of any importance and perhaps in different portions of the larger islands of the archipelago.

Self-government reduced to its ultimate analysis means the capacity of the individual to submit to law; and the reason why so many of the Latin American colonies—not all of them, but many of them—have been in a constant state of disorder and violence is the lack of that individual quality on the part of their people.

A rule by violence, a medieval system—

> Let him take who has the power,
> And let him keep who can—

would soon be established in the archipelago. So far from having freedom or individual liberty or self-government, a state of virtual slavery, a condition of gradually increasing peonage, would oppress the masses of the people of those islands, just as it has for generations ground down in pitiful bondage the masses of the people of Mexico. They would be the subject of exploitation of the so-called politicos. They have no knowledge, if one is to believe the statements of disinterested and well-informed and competent observers, of what independence means. There is no desire upon the part of their leaders to educate the masses, but, on the contrary, the policy is much like that of Spain—to keep them in a state of ignorance, in order to keep them in a state of subjection.

There can be independence, Mr. President, without self-government, and, in my judgment, independence in this case would make self-government impossible. On the other hand, there can be self-government without independence; and there are many concrete illustrations of both those propositions. When the great war between the British Empire and the Boers was on—if the Senate will pardon a personal reference, my sympathies were very strongly with the Boers. I looked upon them as a people who had been imposed upon, as a brave and courageous people, capable of self-government, who were being oppressed; but that question was settled the other way.

The power of Great Britain, not by conquering their armed soldiers in the field—for they did not do that—but by overrunning their country and concentrating their women and children in camps, threatening the entire race with extermination, imposed the superior might of its Government upon them by military force. To-day, Mr. President, after the lapse of years, just as there have been the changes of years in the case of the Philippine Islands—I have no feeling that the former Boer Republics are being oppressed or that they are being deprived of self-government. When I witness the advance that has taken place there, when I read of men who had committed an offense punishable with death—treason to the Empire—surrendered to their former compatriots to be dealt with as they saw fit, and, after a brief incarceration, given their liberty, I realize, as never before, that, while they may not have independence, and the tie of sovereignty to the British Empire is not released, they have self-government in the fullest and best sense of the word.

It is so, Mr. President, with our great and magnificent neighbor on the north, the self-governing Dominion of Canada; it is so with Australia, bound to the British Empire not by laws that oppress and compel their support but rendering in this time of the need of their mother country their full measure of men and means through the love which they bear to a country which gives them security, international peace, and individual liberty.

On the other hand, Mr. President—and this is the question which is involved in the preamble of this resolution—I see a country to the south of us which has independence. The so-called Republic of Mexico is a sovereign Republic, and yet the priceless privileges of self-government, a word which has been used so often in the course of this debate, and something which Senators are so eagerly seeking to give to the Filipinos, as though they did not have it in great extent now, is unknown in Mexico.

I witnessed the other day a Senator put into the RECORD the constitution that had been prepared under the Aguinaldo government, and he eulogized it as a beautiful expression of the principles of self-government and a proof of the ability of those people to understand and adopt it. Why, Mr. President, you can read in the laws of Mexico a constitution that is freer than that of the United States; but it is not the documents which a few men, sincere or insincere, in their drawing-rooms can frame and publish that is to determine whether a people are capable of self-government or whether they possess it; it is the use which they make of their opportunities. The proof is in the administration of the law. While Mexico is a free Republic on paper, it has for a generation been a military dictatorship in fact. For some five or six years it has been a hotbed of lawlessness, violence, and anarchy, of disregard for the rights of personal liberty, of life, and of property of their own people, as well as of the citizens of other countries who had been invited there on lawful missions of peace.

Mr. President, we know that we may give to the people of the Philippine Islands—and I mean no affront to them; I know the differences between those people and the Mexican people; they are an entirely different people—the same measure of independence which Mexico had; and, in a few years, although there will be many earnest souls there who will ardently desire it, they will have no more individual security and no more government of, by, and for the people than has Mexico.

Mr. President, if the object of this bill is, through the mistaken means of independence, to give self-government to these people, I agree that there can be no higher object. I know that the Magna Charta is as great a document, in the long course by which we won the blessings of liberty, as the Declaration of Independence; I know that the security of person, the dignity and self-respect which come from the guaranties of that instrument, which won a large measure of self-government in the island of Britain, are, in fact the ultimate objects which the patriots of our war for independence had in severing our relations with England; but unless they had had a capacity to establish on these shores those same individual privileges and rights which English subjects enjoyed in the mother country, they would never have framed nor ever have adopted a Declaration of Independence, because it would have been a fruitless labor.

I should like Senators to reflect, while they may talk about the fundamental principles of government and the inalienable rights of man, of which Rousseau and Tom Paine spoke, that there are some practical circumstances to be considered here and to be put ahead of academic reasoning and of abstract ideals and impossible theories, namely, the plain middle-of-the-day facts and conditions with which we are dealing. After we build up a government in the Philippine Islands and those people have adjusted themselves to it during a course of years, and laws have been made and enforced and the people have become accustomed to them, can you imagine anything more without reason or any foundation of solid judgment than to say we must now go back and examine Rousseau and Tom Paine and see what they said and find out whether or not the principles enunciated by them are in force in the Philippine Islands? If we are to found a government, Mr. President, we desire all the inalienable rights of man that are consistent with peace and order and good government to be embedded in its law; but when that government is founded, we must proceed with such means as may be adapted to the conditions which exist.

For one, I would not have acquired the Philippine Islands. Having some sense of the complex problems that would grow out of the War with Spain—and this is one of them, though I do not claim to have foreseen this identical question, except that in a vague way I apprehended similar problems—I felt that we ought not to have gone into that war; but after we had gone into the islands, I confess that when the question arose in 1900 of whether we should abandon them, I thought that, having expended our blood and treasure for them, we ought to keep them.

Mr. President, we might have considered then the fundamental rights of man and the fundamental principles which ought to be incorporated in the constitution of a State, but the time is very different now. These people are happy and contented; peace and order prevail; they have the growing blessings of education and increasing opportunities in business and for bettering their condition and relieving themselves from the servitude of absolute poverty. Under such conditions, to say that, because there is a doctrine that no man shall be governed without his consent, government ought to be overthrown, if applied in this country, would result immediately in disorder and rebellion even in the United States.

Why, Mr. President, when one of the Senators who is advocating the abandonment of all these great results of our occupation of the Philippines was a small boy—I do not think he was old enough to take part in the struggle—his father and relatives—and I may say my father—were engaged in one of the greatest struggles that mankind ever engaged in for the independence of Mississippi and Virginia, as a part of the Confederacy, from the Federal Union. No people could have given more for the faith that was in them than they gave. I am as fully aware as is the Senator from Mississippi, and understand just as well their devotion to that cause. The feelings it aroused still occasionally flare up after all these years. For four years they carried on that war, until they were exhausted in men, in treasure, prostrate before a superior power, resentful, hostile in their feelings toward the Federal Government; but now years have gone on, conditions have evolved from that state of chaos in which the South was left at the close of the war, and I do not think I make a mistake when I say that if you searched the innermost consciousness of the Senator from Mississippi and had him answer upon it he would not change to-day the relations which exist between his State and this great Republic; that he would not, if it were given to him to choose, have that independence for which his fathers fought.

So, Mr. President, after we have fought, after we have expended our genius and our time in the government of the Philippine Islands in building up there a self-governing dependency, the mass of the Filipinos would not go back to the conditions that existed before we went there.

I do not think any excuse can be given for such a provision as is incorporatd in this bill under which, though we stay there, at some unknown time in the future, under conditions which no man can foresee as to the Filipinos or as to ourselves, we shall find ourselves bound by a solemn legislative promise that we will come away and sever our relations with them. If that is statesmanship, then the great statesmen of the world have been misrepresented.

Now, it is said, Mr. President—and I want briefly to discuss another phase of the question—that we can not take up this matter ab initio, because binding promises have been given to the Philippine people which raised certain expectations among them which it would now be immoral to disappoint. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] has already discussed, I think, very conclusively the facts as to whether any such promises were given by any of our administrative executive officers. I do not think anything was said by them which, upon reasonable interpretation, could have been held to guarantee that we would evacuate the islands, whatever might have been said by them as to an autonomous form of government, which is rather a vague form.

I am in favor of an autonomous form of government as rapidly as it can be developed, so far as their internal affairs are concerned, and their internal affairs, mind you, are the same as their national affairs; if they get independence it covers the entire archipelago. I am willing for them to govern those things, and it may be that some of the expressions of American officials led them to expect that would be evolved. But, Mr. President, regardless of whether or not the expressions justified that interpretation, is it to be contended here that the American people have been deprived of the essential power over their government to determine this question for themselves through their Representatives in Congress? No. Is there any sophistry of argument by which it could be held that Mr. Taft or Mr. Francis Burton Harrison or anybody else who may have assumed such powers of government in the Philippine Islands have fixed their status by some individual declaration they may have made? Of course not, Mr. President. The proposition is absolutely absurd. They had no right to do so. The intelligent Filipino people knew they had no right to bind this Government; that it was a matter of congressional action. No belief that the question was precluded or concluded in any way could legitimately have arisen from those declarations, whatever they may have been, even though they went further than the Senator from Rhode Island has shown.

Mr. President, the fact of the case is that, so far from having bound ourselves to sever our relations with the islands and give them complete independence, and so far as it was possible for any past administration to bind this Government upon the question at all, we have informed the Filipino people by our action upon the question of independence that we proposed to retain the ultimate sovereignty over the islands. That is a statement of fact, and I want to briefly demonstrate that it is correct.

I mentioned a moment ago that in 1900 one of Mr. Bryan's issues—I think the "paramount issue," as he expressed it in that campaign—the Senator from Colorado will know if I am correct—was the Philippine question, or imperialism, as it was called.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I think that was regarded by Mr. Bryan as the paramount issue in that campaign.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator will allow me, it was not only regarded personally by Mr. Bryan as the paramount issue in that campaign, but it was distinctly so stated in the platform adopted by the Democratic convention of that year.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is certainly true, Mr. President, and I was going to call attention to the fact that it was submitted for decision to the highest tribunal known to our form of government for the settlement of general policies of this kind, namely the American people. This platform of the Democratic Party declared in 1900:

> We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to give the Filipinos, first, a stable form of government; second, independence; and third, protection from outside interference.

If that platform is to be carried out in this bill, not satisfied with the burdens that we have assumed under the Monroe doctrine in the Americas, we will establish something analogous to it in Asia, among people who are so alien to our system of government that the Senator from Mississippi says we can never reconcile them to it.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will yield in just a moment. I was just going to state, to complete the sentence, that the Democratic issue which was submitted to the American people by the Democratic platform of that year—and I am going to call attention to some other features of it a little later—made the rather Quixotic proposal that we should have no interest in the Philippine Islands; that we should abandon our sovereignty over them, and yet we should not allow any other nation to go in there at all; it would be our business in case we abandoned them to prevent any other nation from going there.

Mr. GALLINGER. And to fight to prevent them going there.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I wanted to call the Senator's attention to the fact—although the Senator has referred to it already—that the effect of the Democratic platform was equivalent to this, "We will give you independence with an American protectorate."

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. NELSON. It was proposed that we should continue there as their protector, as their guardian.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Exactly.

Mr. NELSON. They were to have independence under those conditions.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That was exactly what was proposed, a proposal which, as I have said, would extend something analogous to the Monroe doctrine, which was supposed to be confined to the Western Hemisphere, into the Orient, and undertake to say to other countries—at least to this extent it was analogous to the Monroe doctrine—"you shall not colonize in the Philippine Islands or acquire territory there without their consent." Inevitably, Mr. President, that would have involved us in war, if we had undertaken to maintain it, and would have done so before now had independence been granted.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the Senator if he took the Democratic platform seriously? It seems to me he is wasting time, because nobody else took it in that way, not even the Democrats.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Except for the purposes of debate. That seems to be about the only use that is made of it. There are various reasons given for not living up to it—as in the case of the abandonment of their platform on the Panama Canal tolls question, that when the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] read the platform there was so much noise in the convention hall that the delegates could not hear it. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, in reference to the question as to the paramount issue in 1900, is it not also admitted by the Senator that while Mr. Bryan desired to make that the paramount issue, the New York papers would not let him, and that they claimed that he was in favor of free silver and thereby turned a great number of people in the East against him?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think that is true, Mr. President. Not only the New York papers would not let him, but the American people by a plurality of 849,790 would not let him. It was submitted to them and was decided against him. Of course the Senator's explanation in regard to the claim that Mr. Bryan was in favor of free silver is a good deal like the excuse I mentioned a moment ago about the Democratic platform at Baltimore. I know that there were other issues involved besides imperialism, but I do claim that was the paramount one, and, if our elections mean anything at all, if a public policy—and every national platform contains more than one question—can ever be determined in a general national election, this question was determined in that election, and the Philippine people knew it and took notice of it, or should have done so, any statement any executive officer made there to the contrary notwithstanding.

Practically the same proposition was again submitted very persistently in 1904. In that year the Democratic platform declared:

> We insist that we ought to do for the Filipinos what we have done already for the Cubans, and it is our duty to make that promise now, and, upon suitable guarantees of protection to citizens of our own and other countries resident there at the time of our withdrawal, set the Filipino people upon their feet, free and independent to work out their own destiny.

I can personally vouch for the fact that that issue was carried before the people upon the hustings and the decision of the people was 2,545,515 plurality against the proposition; and the Filipino people knew of that.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator has read the platform of the Democratic Party for one year upon the Philippine question, and says that question was necessarily submitted to the people and the people decided against it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is right upon that. The people, when they decide against a party, are supposed to decide against the principles which the party avows and upon which it nominates its candidate for President. But in 1912 the Democratic Party again made a declaration with reference to the Philippines.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I can give the Senator the decision on that. The plurality of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Taft over Mr. Wilson in that election was 1,311,444.

Mr. SIMMONS. Still, President Wilson was elected according to the Constitution of the United States, and both Houses of Congress were elected according to the Constitution of the United States, and they are now all Democratic.

The declaration of the party in 1912 was to this effect:

> We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers.

The Senator from Minnesota was therefore mistaken when he said that the Democratic Party proposed to exercise suzerainty over the islands. The declaration of the last platform, the platform upon which we came into power, the platform upon which we have a Democrtic Senate and a Democratic House and a Democratic President, does not provide for any suzerainty over the Philippines. It simply provides that we will guarantee their independence, the independence of their government, until the neutralization of the islands can be secured.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like, with the permission of the Senator from North Carolina, to ask him whether he considers that there is anything in the bill now before the Senate that carries out the provisions of the platform as expressed by the convention of 1912?

Mr. SIMMONS. I think there is a declaration in the preamble of the bill.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to the fact that the platform specifies that independence is to be given when a stable government can be established, while the bill which is now under discussion specifies that independence shall be given when in the opinion of the United States it is for the permanent interest of the Filipino people. The proviso which constitutes the limitation on the bill and the limitation that is in the platform have no relation to each other in any way. In fact, if I may be allowed to say so, the bill is itself as foreign from the conditions on which the platform was based as many of the other methods and policies that the Democratic Party have adopted are different from their other platform utterances.

Mr. SIMMONS. The declaration in the preamble of the bill—that they shall be given their independence as soon as the well-being of the Philippine people will justify it—I think in itself implies that it is to be given when there is a stable government; because until there is a stable government, or until the people have reached such a stage of development and intelligence and education that they can establish a government in their own interest, to be operated for their own welfare, I do not think they are probably in a condition to establish a stable government. When they do, in that condition they have all the elements necessary to the establishment of a stable government. They can not establish a stable government——

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator from North Carolina is entirely——

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator will not permit me to finish a sentence. They can not establish a stable government in the Philippines until they are given an opportunity to establish a stable government. We are exercising such control and dominion over there as does not permit them either to establish for themselves a stable government or to demonstrate their ability to establish a stable government; but when they have reached that condition of intelligence, that condition of education, where it is reasonable to suppose that if permitted to establish a stable government they are in a condition and will be able to do it, then they have reached the requirements of the declaration in the Democratic platform.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I am very glad to hear the Senator make the last statement that he made, because he points out what is evident to any thoughtful person—that the Democratic platform as it was adopted by their convention and as it establishes the condition for independence of the Philippines is an absolutely illogical and impossible condition to conform to under any circumstances. It is manifestly true, as the Senator from North Carolina says, that it would be impossible for the Filipino people to demonstrate their ability to establish or to carry on a stable government so long as the United States continued to exercise its sovereignty over them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not care to interrupt the Senator's speech.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I simply wanted to inquire if the Senator expected to go on at any considerable length?

Mr. LIPPITT. I am very much obliged to the Senator for allowing me to interrupt him.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I agree with the point the Senator is making; and that, in my opinion, is one of the chief objections to this bill. The advocates of it argue, on the one hand, that we must give the Filipinos independence before they can fit themselves for self-government, and upon the other hand say that they will not give them independence until they are fitted for self-government. That is the inconsistency of the bill. The Senator from North Carolina is also wrong, I think, in regard to the platform of 1912 not committing the Democratic Party to guarantee the independence of the islands.

Mr. SIMMONS. I did not say that. I said the platform of 1912 expressly committed the Democratic Party to guarantee the independence of the government of the islands, and that that was not a suzerainty; that it did not propose, as the Senator from Minnesota suggests, that this Government would continue to exercise suzerainty over them, but that it would continue to guarantee their independence against any nation seeking to overthrow their government.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the question whether or not guaranteeing their independence amounts to a suzerainty depends upon the definition of the word "suzerainty." I think, myself, that it does.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me, have not nearly all the nations or great powers of the world guaranteed the integrity of the territory and the Government of China? As the result of the Boxer troubles there, all the great nations intervened; and after that trouble was overcome, and order was restored in China, they then withdrew and gave an international guaranty of the integrity of the territory and independence of the Government of China. Does the Senator contend that that was a suzerainty that the great nations of the earth set up over the territory of China and the Government of China?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not think the Senator has stated accurately the language of the international agreement relative to China; but assuming that it was in substance as the Senator says, it would be, in my judgment, a form of suzerainty by the nations making the guaranty for the protection of China as against any other nation not a party to the agreement or against any one of them attempting to violate it. I think it would come within the meaning of "suzerainty," and might, of course, lead up to conflict between the nations so agreeing in case of its violation by one of them.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to ask the Senator whether it is contended, either by him or by the Senator from North Carolina, that there is anything in this bill that provides that our Government shall guarantee the independence of the Philippines after it is once established until the neutralization of the islands is secured by treaty with other powers, as stated in the Democratic platform of 1912?

Mr. SIMMONS. I will state to the Senator that while I have not examined the bill very carefully, I do not understand that in this particular bill there is any language providing for the guaranty of the independence of the government of the islands. There is in the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. SIMMONS. The bill, as I understand, contents itself with a declaration that so soon as an independent government is thought by this Government to be in the interest of the Philippines it is proposed to allow them that degree of liberty.

Mr. NORRIS. It is not claimed, then, as I understand, by the Senator from North Carolina or anyone else, that this bill is a full compliance with the declaration of the Democratic platform of 1912?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not think the bill assumes that the time for granting independence has arrived. I am speaking now of the bill itself, independently of the amendment. The bill does not assume that the time has arrived when the United States should retire from the islands and accord independence to the Filipinos. The amendment does assume that the time has arrived.

Mr. NORRIS. That being true, if the Senator from Washington will permit a further interruption, is it, then, the intention of the Senator from North Carolina that when independence is brought about there shall be coupled with it a proposition that the Government of the United States shall guarantee the independence of the islands until a treaty with the powers can be agreed upon regarding their independence?

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not a member of the Committee on the Philippines, and I speak only as an individual Senator; but it would be my desire that whenever this Government shall accord independence to the Filipinos, it shall at the same time guarantee them the independence of their government until their country can be properly neutralized and have the support of the powers of the world. That is the position I occupy with reference to this question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I should like very much to proceed, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is entitled to the floor.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will yield in just a moment. As particular attention has been directed to the Democratic platform of 1912, it may be well to point out this fact: I suppose the party who made the platform are back of this bill. It is reasonable to hold them responsible for it; and as the Senator has just said, the bill does not assume that the time has arrived to make a declaration in favor of Filipino independence. The Democratic convention, however, did assume that the time had arrived, and declared in favor of an immediate declaration.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the Senator fails to differentiate between a declaration favoring the immediate passage of legislation giving them independence and an immediate declaration that they should at some future time, when certain conditions have transpired, be awarded their independence. The platform declaration is not that the Democrats shall immediately accord to the Philippines independence of the United States. That is not the platform declaration. That seems to be the idea the Senator has in his mind, however.

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; that is not my idea.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator seems to think the platform provides that we shall immediately accord to the Filipinos their independence. The language of the platform is as follows:

> We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands—

When?—

> as soon as a stable government can be established.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the bill attaches an entirely different condition. It leaves it entirely in the discretion of the United States—

> when, in the judgment of the United States, it will be to the permanent interest of the people of the Philippine Islands—

An entirely different condition from anything that could be interpreted out of the platform.

Now, Mr. President, on this question of whether or not the Philippine people had any reason to feel that we had bound ourselves as a nation to grant them entire independence, I want very briefly to put in the RECORD the language of the Democratic platform of 1908, in which this declaration was contained:

> We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us as we guarantee the independence of Cuba, until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers.

That issue was submitted to the people, and was decided against the Democratic Party by a plurality of 1,269,804 for Mr. Taft.

Those, however, were not the only occasions on which the American Nation committed itself upon this policy. The question was decided a number of times by a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate of the United States. When the treaty with Spain was presented to the Senate, Mr. Vest offered an amendment to it, as follows:

> The United States, desiring that the people of the archipelago shall be enabled to establish a form of free government suitable to their condition and securing the rights of life, liberty, and property and the preservation of order and equal rights therein, assumes for the time being and to the end aforesaid the control of the archipelago so far as such control shall be needful for the purposes above stated, and will provide that the privileges accorded to Spain by Article IV and V of this treaty shall be enjoyed.

That was decided in the negative by a vote of 53 to 30 in the Senate of the United States on the 6th day of February, 1899.

Everybody remembers the diligence with which the identical discussion that has been carried on upon this bill was carried on throughout the country on the so-called issue of "imperialism" immediately after we had made the treaty with Spain. I remember the prominent part that Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, took in it. There was a gentleman named Edward Atkinson, a statistician, who was very prominent among the anti-imperialists. They were able men. All of this is like raking up bones from a sepulcher of dead issues. They have been decided and determined time and time again. Even though it should have been well at that time, as I have said, to decide against so-called imperialism, an entirely different question is presented now, after the lapse of years.

On the 6th day of February, 1899, Mr. Hoar moved to amend the joint resolution which was pending with regard to the Philippines by inserting after the word "islands," where it appeared the third time—that is, after the words "to make such disposition of said islands as will best promote the interests of the citizens of the United States and the inhabitants of the said islands"—the words "with the consent of the people thereof"—that is, with the consent of the people of the Philippine Islands—thus raising this identical question. It was submitted to a record vote on the motion of Mr. Aldrich to lay it on the table, which motion to lay it on the table prevailed by a vote of 45 against 34.

The issue was very persistently made in the Senate; and in view of the insistence with which the argument has been made here now that we have promised to give them independence, I am taking the time to put in the RECORD the proof that we not only have not promised to give independence but we have put ourselves officially on record in the only way we have ever taken any official action on this question—and this was official action, because it was a matter officially determined by the Senate in the exercise of its powers and jurisdiction—against the proposition of absolute independence, saving all the time, at least so far as I am concerned, the matter of self-government, for which I

shall vote, and which I hope to see developed for the people of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. Hoar again moved to amend the resolution by inserting, after the words "United States," where they appeared the second time, the words "or to force a government on them against their will." Where the declaration in the resolution said:

Nor is it intended to permanently annex said islands as an integral part of the territory of the United States—

He moved to amend by inserting the words "or to force a government on them against their will." On a motion to lay that amendment on the table, the motion to lay on the table prevailed by a vote of 46 against 30.

Mr. Bacon, of Georgia, one of the leading Senators of this body at that time, and at one time chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, moved to amend the resolution by inserting at the end the following:

Resolved further, That the United States hereby disclaim any disposition or intention to exercise permanent sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said islands—

The same identical question which is now before the Senate—

and assert their determination, when a stable and independent government shall have been erected therein entitled, in the judgment of the Government of the United States, to recognition as such, to transfer to said government, upon terms which shall be reasonable and just, all rights secured under the cession by Spain, and to thereupon leave the government and control of the islands to their people.

There, Mr. President, was a statesmanlike proposition, supposing the policy of getting out was to be followed. He proposed to get out, not to get out, and at the same time to stay in—a logical impossibility. He proposed to leave the government and the control of the islands to their people. That question was voted on, and on the direct question of the passage of the resolution the yeas were 29 and the nays were 29. There was a tie vote in the Senate upon that resolution, which contains almost the same language as the preamble of this bill and attaches the same condition as to when their independence should be actually granted, and the Vice President cast the deciding vote against the resolution, thereby again officially declaring the policy of the United States on that issue.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. I simply wanted to ask whether that vote was a vote on the Bacon amendment or on the bill itself?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It was upon the adoption of the Bacon resolution.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If these votes in the Senate are so important as the Senator from Washington seems to think them, what would he say as to the vote which was taken in the House of Representatives last year, in the Sixty-third Congress, the Members of which were elected at the time of the election of 1912, when President Wilson was elected? The bill declaring in favor of Philippine independence as soon as a stable government could be established was passed in the House of Representatives by a vote of 3½ to 1, there not being even a party division upon it.

If these votes in the Senate are to bind the American people, does not the Senator think the vote of the direct representatives of the people, elected under the platform which was expressed in the Democratic convention, would have some binding force to show that those representatives understood that the people meant to give the Filipinos independence?

Mr. POINDEXTER. On the contrary, Mr. President, strange as it may seem, it shows just the opposite. I think it did not have any binding force, because the Senate many years before, in its official capacity, declared just the opposite, and the House of Representatives did not consider it had any binding force. So you have to apply the same rule to the action taken by the House of Representatives. I am not contending that this action of the Senate had a binding force, because it has always been my contention that we not only ought not to undertake to bind the future of the United States in this matter, but that we had no power to do so. That has been the argument of the advocates of the bill, based upon the declarations of administrative officers. I have attempted to refute it by showing that it has been declared to the opposite effect, and those declarations are entitled to more weight in the consideration of this question than are the others.

One or two other phases of the question——

Mr. SHAFROTH. Right there, if the Senator will allow me——

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not understand that anyone in this debate has taken the position that binding promises have been made, because nothing but an act of the Congress of the United States can absolutely bind. But the position they take is that the Governor General and the President of the United States have said certain things with relation to the independence of the Philippines, and the statement is here made, and it is contended upon our side that those promises are morally binding, because they represent high officials of the Government and that the world takes them as governmental promises. Now, I want to call the Senator's attention to one.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I hope the Senator will not go on at great length.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like the Senator's opinion as to this which I am going to read.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If it is not too long and does not take too much space.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will read just that and then yield. I want to read it, and I want to ask the Senator whether he thinks it ought to be considered as a governmental promise.

The President of the United States has charged me to deliver to you the following message on behalf of the Government of our country:

That was Gov. Gen. Harrison talking to the Philippine General Assembly.

We regard ourselves as trustees, acting not for the advantage of the United States but for the benefit of the people of the Philippine Islands. Every step we take will be taken with a view to the ultimate independence of the islands and as a preparation for that independence; and we hope to move toward that end as rapidly as the safety and the permanent interests of the islands will permit. After each step taken experience will guide us to the next.

When a man sent to the Philippine Islands as the Governor General of the islands, addressing in their General Assembly representatives of the Philippine people, says "The President of the United States has charged me to deliver to you this message of independence," can it be possible to say there is no moral obligation there? I should like to have the Senator say whether he thinks that would imply a moral obligation?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think that it is impossible, Mr. President, for Mr. Burton Harrison to fix such an obligation upon the United States. I do not say that with any reflection upon Mr. Harrison. I know that he is a very honorable gentleman. I served in the House of Representatives with him and have a very high personal regard for him. But I say that in the nature of things, even though Governor General of the Philippine Islands, he could not deprive the people of the United States of the right to settle this question for themselves, and if he could fix a moral obligation upon them that is as binding as any other obligation, of course the result would be that it did deprive them of the right to settle it for themselves.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to his colleague?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. JONES. I merely wanted to ask my colleague if he thought Gov. Gen. Harrison even assumed to do that? He says he is charged by the President. That was the message he was told to deliver to those people by the President himself. Does my colleague think that the President even could impose a moral obligation upon the people of the Philippines?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Undoubtedly not, Mr. President. The President of the United States knows perfectly well that he had no right to impose any sort of an obligation upon the people. He might have been in a general way representing his party. He is representing his own views about the matter, and of course his own views were entitled to great weight, but it did not constitute any obligation, moral or legal or otherwise, upon the people of the United States to carry it out. If it did, it would handicap them and deprive them of the free agency in this matter which, of course, they have.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I agree with the Senator from Washington that any utterance by the Governor General could not be taken at this time as imposing a moral obligation upon the people of the United States to do anything, but I want to ask the Senator if there has not been an implied promise? Has there not been an understanding from the day the American flag was planted on the Philippine Islands that independence would ultimately be given to those people?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Answering that question with the utmost frankness, Mr. President, and having been at a place where this question was quite near to us, on the Pacific Coast, and where public questions are probably as actively discussed as they are in any part of the country, my impression was that the opposite proposition had been established as a policy of the Government. I should like to say why. I am impressed with the memory of the issue of imperialism that was thrashed out before the country, and with the division of public sentiment upon that question, and with the fact that it was decided against those who wanted to withdraw from the Philippine Islands, or to make any declaration of withdrawal. The general impression, the public impression, in my vicinity, and I think it represented the general public impression of the country, was that we were to remain in the Philippine Islands, to give them self-government; that after the difficulties and bloodshed of restoring order and setting up a competent government all would be well, and the Philippine people themselves would be thoroughly satisfied.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Was not this the impression upon the Senator's mind, that to the argument of imperialism the answer was made that we made a mistake when we went there, but having gotten into the islands, having taken control of them, it was not fair to the Filipino, it was not fair to the people who have made investments there, to leave at this time, waiting until under the tutelage of the American Government the Filipinos might be qualified to maintain a government of their own?

I have heard, I think, for the first time any Senator or any student of this question announce that it was the purpose of the United States to hold those islands permanently. As a matter of fact, we have always contended that we were not going to hold them. We knew they were not fit for citizenship in this Republic. We did not desire that the Philippine Islands become States, because we did not want any more of that colored virus injected into the body politic, and we were only holding them there until such time as they might be qualified under the control of the United States Government to maintain a government of their own. Not such a Government as ours, but a government for themselves.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, we are under no responsibility to do that. The Senator can not point out in any principle, even of generosity and philanthropy toward a weaker people, any duty on the part of the United States to go to the other side of the world to maintain order and in a foreign country to put their country in good condition, to establish free government for a people knowing in advance that we were to retain no permanent interest there.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I beg the Senator's pardon. Do not make a mistake. I have never thought that we had the moral right to hold those people. I have never had any sort of respect for the argument made in favor of holding them as long as we have done, but my understanding has always been that the advocates of holding the islands have only believed that we should hold them for such time as those people might be qualified under American instruction for self-government.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, that time never would arrive, according to the argument of the Senator from Mississippi, because I have heard the junior Senator from Mississippi very eloquently express the view that no people, being supported and guided by another government, would ever develop the capacity to take care of themselves. So you are looking for the gold in the rainbow. You are looking for something that is visionary.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I am not looking to that, but I was just taking the argument those gentleman have made who insisted on holding the islands. I do not think they were qualified.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator agrees with me at least to that extent. I think the most unreasonable proposition in this whole issue is the proposition to go on there after we have made up our minds to get out. If we have made up our minds to get out, as I said before, the sooner we do it the better.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If the Senator will pardon me, I think the time has arrived when we ought to get out, and I shall vote for such an amendment to the bill. I wish we could have gotten out yesterday.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The other day one of the Senators here—I think it was the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH]—asked if the Argentine Republic is not capable of self-government, if Chile is not capable of self-government. I think the Senator from Colorado would agree that neither the Argentine Republic nor the Republic of Chile would have had an opportunity for self-government but for the protection of the United States. I do not say that, Mr. President, with the intention of reflecting in any way upon the character or capacity of the people of those marvelous Republics of South America, any more than I would reflect upon the American people if I were to say that, in my judgment, we should never have gained our independence but for the assistance of France at a critical time in our Revolutionary War. Something was said here the other day about the President being a man who had visions. There was a time when we were not so strong materially but much stronger spiritually as a nation than we are to-day when by a statesman who had vision indeed a great doctrine was promulgated which involved the safety of our own Republic and the integrity of every Latin American Republic on the hemisphere.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. POINDEXTER. Now, to apply it to the Philippine Islands. If you withdraw, unless you do the illogical thing of giving them independence according to the Democratic platform, and yet protecting them, while you have no control over their action, their situation, if left alone, will not be comparable to that of Chile and Argentina under the protecting ægis of the Monroe doctrine during all their growth. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, when I asked the question as to whether the people of Argentina are capable of self-government I was discussing the question as to their ability for self-government by their own officers, and I referred to the fact that their illiteracy was fully as great as that of the Philippine Islands, that Brazil's was a great deal more, and that Chile's was about the same as that of the Philippine Islands. As to whether or not there should be a protectorate, or whether they would maintain their independence, failing to be subjugated by some other country, is an entirely different question. The proposition whether those people are capable of self-government or would become capable of self-government is for them to settle; it is not for us to settle; and on that account the fact that we had the Monroe doctrine in South America has nothing to do with their ability to maintain a government of their own or self-government except to the extent of interference from outside.

The Philippine people do not care for a suzerainty or a protectorate over them by the American Government. They say that no other nation that has ever attained its independence has ever asked for a protectorate of any kind or character, and that usually there is more danger from a protectorate on account of the iron-hand policy that might be invoked at some time than there is danger of being subjugated by some other country. Consequently the question which I was discussing was as to whether Argentina, Brazil, and Chile were capable of self-government by the passage of laws and the administration of laws within their own country. The question as to whether there should be a protectorate is an entirely different question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is a different question, Mr. President, but it is the same question which is involved in this bill. This bill proposes the absolute independence of the Philippine Islands, and not only self-government in their internal affairs. I think I said in the beginning of my remarks that I would vote for a large degree of local self-government. That matter can be adjusted, even though mistakes are made in the trial of it. I am in favor of it. I should like to see the experiment.

The Senator says that is a different question from the question in Argentina and Chile, but the objection which we have to this bill is the preamble which proposes to give independence.

Since the Senator cited Chile and Argentina as a comparison, if we give the Philippines independence and do not assume a protectorate over them, there will be no such opportunity there as Chile and Argentina have had, either for maintaining independence or for developing self-government. Some foreign country—and I have heard it admitted this afternoon by Senators on the other side—would occupy the land. Many of the leading Filipinos have expressed the opinion that if the United States should withdraw its protection Europe would divide up the islands. It might not be Europe; it might be some Asiatic power. I think inevitably that that would take place.

In whatever way we undertake it, whatever the form of the treaty, whether a protectorate or by treaty of neutralization, the United States would still have the burden and responsibility, even though war should result. If it were known that we would not go to war to protect it, such a policy would be but a scrap of paper and as worthless as a dead leaf blown by the wind.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does not the Senator recognize that there are a good many small governments in the world that have maintained their independence for hundreds of years and have never had any war over it at all? Does he not recognize that Switzerland has been a republic for 500 years right in the midst of hostile nations? Siam has been an independent government. There is Holland that has been independent and Sweden and Norway have been independent governments. Italy and Greece have maintained independent governments. It is a

question, however, it seems to me, that you put to the people as to whether they want a protectorate or not, and they are the ones, if we would be willing, who should determine that question. If the Philippine people are willing to take their independence without a protectorate it seems to me we ought not to raise an objection on our part.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I do not care to protract this dialectic process of reasoning indefinitely. I am very glad to yield to the Senator as long as he expresses his opinion. If I can just call attention to it, that is what I desire to do. He is not considering the interests of the United States or the expense or the responsibility so much as he is considering the desire of the Philippine people. I would reverse it myself. I have great regard for the Filipino people; I should like to see them happy and prosperous, but I have a greater regard for the interests of our own people.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Do you not think, Mr. President——

Mr. POINDEXTER. And I would not put upon the United States the great burden of protecting the Philippine Archipelago at the discretion of the Philippine people. I would reserve the decision of that question for our own Government and make the decision ourselves. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does not the Senator believe, if he is acting in the interest of the United States, and I have no doubt he would so act, it would be better for the United States to recognize the independence of those people than attempt to hold them under a protectorate?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think it would be much better, Mr. President, to give them their independence absolutely and unconditionally than it would be to give them their independence and then guarantee to protect them. I think that would be the height of unwisdom.

Mr. SHAFROTH. There is nothing whatever in this bill that speaks of a protectorate.

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; but the Senator from Colorado talked about it a great deal; and the Democratic platform, which I suppose has presumptive force, at least declares in favor of it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think that the last Democratic platform was to the effect that a neutralizing agreement should be made with the leading nations of the world.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes. Now, are you going to back up your neutralization agreement when you make it, or allow it to be flouted and defied?

Mr. SHAFROTH. There is no responsibility in that, compared with the responsibility of holding suzerainty over the people.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator, it seems to me, does not believe in the traditional policy of his country to keep out of entangling alliances and treaties with foreign countries and confine ourselves to our own affairs and let Asia and Europe alone. I think myself that we cut off a pretty big slice of the world's affairs when we undertake to be a leader in the Western Hemisphere, without going into Asia and undertaking to say to the countries there what they shall do about the Philippine Islands. The retention of the Philippine Islands is a condition that has existed for 17 years. I have attempted to argue that it is not now open for argument any more than a law case that has been tried and submitted and finally determined. There ought to be an end to the discussion of this question, a settlement of the governmental policy, just as there is an end to litigation in the interest of repose. There ought to be a statute of limitations against continually reopening the relations of the Philippine Islands to the United States.

What I say is that with the burdens that we already have in America we ought not to go beyond these and undertake the responsibilities of the Philippines without the advantages of control over them. Answering the other part of the Senator's question, I will say I think there are advantages in the retention of the Philippines for the United States. I will very briefly undertake to show why there are.

But the Senator proposes to go beyond that and give up those advantages, if any there are, and retain all the dangers, all the responsibilities, by entering into an agreement as to what the future status of the islands shall be, after surrendering any power of control over their action, and allow them to become embroiled with every nation upon their borders with whom their people come in contact, surrender their finances, turn them over to any possible revolutionary orgy of selfish interest that may get control of the islands, and civil strife, which will inevitably break out, not only between the Moros and between the Christian tribes of the islands but between the different Christian tribes themselves; allow them to violate their contracts with the people of foreign countries, to conduct themselves in the most irresponsible way in which they may be capable of, and then assume the responsibility for the consequences.

That is quite different, Mr. President, from our present status there, maintaining our relations with the islands and keeping a hand upon their affairs to such an extent that security of life and property is preserved and the sanctity of contract is upheld, and the finances are reasonably well managed. Then we can afford to be responsible for their conduct because we can, in a measure, direct the course of their conduct.

But to propose, as is implied by the Senator's question, that we will release this control, the power to protect, and still be answerable to any country that wants to hold us answerable is quite a different proposition. Suppose you pass this bill to-day, Mr. President; suppose you adopt the Clarke amendment, or rather the preamble to the bill pledging this country in an official way by act of Congress that at some unknown indefinite time in the future we will withdraw from the islands, and we should have a war—I am not apprehensive as some of war—suppose that a war about the islands should arise next year or the year thereafter or 10 years from now, does the Senator propose, and whether he proposes or not it is inevitably involved in the preamble of the bill, that unless we dishonor ourselves, if we are to maintain our honor and protect our sovereignty, we shall have to go to war about the Philippine Islands and expend the treasure and the lives of our country, knowing at the time it was all for nothing, that we had pledged ourselves in advance to abandon the islands?

What has the Senator to say about that? It is a contingency which may happen. It may not be probable, but it is just as liable to happen in 10 years or in 5 years as at any other time. That is a contingency which should be considered in promising to give them their independence while yet retaining them.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I do not regard that a promise of independence imposes any obligation upon us whatever after we have established their independence. Until it is established of course we have a responsibility, but we have these hazards right now, and as long as we maintain the present status of the Philippine Islands we will continue to have that hazard. As sure as we have a difficulty with any foreign nation on the face of the globe there is where they are going to attack us. It is generally recognized by military men that they are a source of weakness to us; that there the attack will be; that there it will be impossible for us to defend because we are 7,000 miles from our base of supplies. That being the case, it seems to me if we could get the leading nations of the world to join us in having a neutralization agreement made it will preserve the peace and quiet not only of our own country but of the Philippine people.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I do not understand that the Senator is a military strategist. I respect his opinion, but I claim the same right to form an opinion about the military features of the question as the Senator from Colorado does, and I do not agree with him.

Mr. SHAFROTH. All I know is that every military man whose opinions I have read seems to imply that. President Roosevelt himself said it was a military weakness to us. Prof. Robinson, the lecturer at the War College, not two months ago announced that it would be a tremendous error for the Government of the United States ever to attempt to defend the Philippines. He said nothing but a weak President would ever send our Navy over there; that if the Philippines were attacked the only way to do would be not to defend them, but at the end of the war, as the result of the war, getting them back by reason of whatever treaty might be made.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I know, Mr. President, some military men may have expressed that opinion and many military men have expressed a contrary opinion. It is easy enough for a Senator—and I am not referring to the Senator from Colorado, whose nearest approach to carrying on a military campaign is running a plantation—to settle a question by saying if you put a chessman out in front of the others it will be captured, and, with a wave of the hand, upon that profound analysis of the situation, say that the Philippines are a military weakness.

The Senator quotes former President Roosevelt. I have never seen the statement to which he refers, but whether or not Mr. Roosevelt made such a statement, actions speak louder than words. In one of the crises through which Mr. Roosevelt brought us—a difficult situation with Japan—so far from claiming that we ought not to send our fleet to the Orient, he did that very thing; and he settled the crisis with Japan by so doing. When Mr. McKinley was President of the United States he sent a portion of our fleet to the Orient. When we had war with Spain we did not own the Philippine Islands, but he sent the fleet to

the Philippine Islands, and the greatest naval victory in our modern history was gained in Manila Bay.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will yield to the Senator from Colorado for a question, but I should like to complete my argument.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well; then I shall not interrupt the Senator, if it is at all disagreeable to him.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is not at all disagreeable to me; it is very pleasant to be interrupted; but it occupies so much time; that is the only objection. I yield to the Senator, however, for a question.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will ask the Senator whether it is not a fact that when we declared war against Spain we did not send our forces against Spain in her home territory, because it would have taken ten times the number of men and ten times the number of battleships to have accomplished the same result? Was it not because the Philippines were a source of weakness to Spain, and that it was a point of attack where we would have great advantage, that we attacked her outlying possessions, that were 13,000 miles from her base of supply? And did not that give us an advantage in that war which we would not have had if we had attacked Spain on her home territory?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the Philippine Islands were not so very much farther from Spain than they were from us, so far as miles were concerned. I will listen to the Senator's statement, and then I should like to go on.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the honorable Senator for a moment. He stated that he had not seen the declaration of Mr. Roosevelt to which I referred and which I would like to read to him, because I regard Mr. Roosevelt not only as an able statesman but also as a strong military man. In the January, 1915, number of Everybody's Magazine, President Roosevelt stated:

> If we act so that the natives understand us to have made a definite promise, then we should live up to that promise. The Philippines, from a military standpoint, are a source of weakness to us. The present administration has promised explicitly to let them go and by its action has rendered it difficult to hold them against any serious foreign foe. These being the circumstances, the Islands should at an early moment be given their independence, without any guarantee whatever by us and without our retaining any foothold in them.

I regard the statement of Mr. Roosevelt upon the military situation, that the Philippines were a source of weakness to us, as being in accord with the sentiments that I have read of many military men, to the effect that any possession that is far distant from its base of supplies must of necessity be a source of military weakness to the country to which it belongs.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am very glad to know that the Senator from Colorado is following the opinion of Col. Roosevelt, even in that matter. I do not know the main subject of his remarks, and I am always skeptical of extracts from statements detached from their context and without knowledge of the circumstances under which they were spoken. I have a very great respect for Col. Roosevelt's opinion, but if he ever expressed the view which it is now stated he did, it is one of the few with which I disagree out of the many opinions which he has expressed, on a great many subjects, with which I heartily agree.

It is proposed by everybody in discussing this question to retain a part of the Philippine Islands for a naval station. It would be as difficult for the United States to defend a part of the Philippine Islands as it would be to defend them all.

I used to have a different opinion, and, in fact, I accepted it without giving any thought to the question. I remember seeing a very distinguished man, under whom I had the privilege of studying law, John Randolph Tucker, who served 20 years in Congress, a very brilliant man, make diagrams on the blackboard to prove that the Hawaiian possessions were a source of weakness to the United States, on some sort of mathematical calculation of fulcrums and levers—I do not remember the details of it—and I accepted it as Gospel truth; but upon thinking about the question, for the purpose of determining my vote on this bill, I have come to an entirely different conclusion as to the strategics of the Philippine Islands.

If we maintain a coaling station and naval base in the Philippine Islands, we shall be called on to defend it. The people of the United States would never for an instant submit to having it taken away from us by force of arms by a foreign country. Consequently such an attempt would precipitate a conflict there; it would necessitate a defense of that coaling station. I am told that Corregidor, the island in Manila Bay, is practically impregnable.

Now, I want to say, Mr. President, that however many men Japan—and I only mention Japan by way of illustration—or any other nation might land upon the shores of the Philippine Islands, however great an army it might put there, it could not maintain them there. Such a power could not hold the Philippine Islands unless she had the supremacy of the sea. It is a question which will be determined by the mastery of the sea; and it will be another instance in history of the determining influence of sea power upon the destinies of nations. If Japan——

Mr. LIPPITT rose.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just a second. If Japan should succeed in landing troops in the Philippine Islands—which she could probably do somewhere upon their shores—she could not maintain them except by keeping up a continuous line of communication with Japan; she would have to cross the sea; she could be met there by the fleet of the United States, and there, as well as anywhere upon the ocean, if the issue is ever to be made, it can be determined. If we gain the victory, she must evacuate the islands, because she could not maintain her armies there. If she gained the victory, she is the mistress of the Pacific; she has humbled and humiliated us; she can land her troops not only in the Philippines but in California and Washington, and she can invade the continental territory of this country.

Not only that, Mr. President, but she can deny us the right to sail the high seas of the world if she destroys our fleet; she can dictate to us the terms upon which we shall trade with the Orient. We shall be a humbled and subject power if Japan ever reaches the point where she is able to take and hold the Philippines against the United States, regardless of the question of the Philippines themselves.

I may say, Mr. President, that the same proposition applies on the Atlantic coast; that there, as well as upon the Pacific, we must maintain the mastery of the seas, at least against any naval armament which would be sent against us, or else we shall be cut off from intercourse with Europe and there would ensue a slow process of social, political, economic strangulation and disintegration. We must prevail with our Navy upon the sea, whether we have the Philippines or not, for the protection of our honor, of the right to trade and to travel, for the protection of our people around the world. If we do, the Philippines will fall into our lap as an easy result of that power. Now, I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I simply wanted to say to the Senator from Washington, in confirmation of the position which he has most eloquently and forcefully stated, that within two months one of the most eminent officers of the American Navy during a recent visit of mine to the Naval War College in Newport—this officer was at that time studying strategy—expressed to me almost identically the opinion which the Senator from Washington has expressed, and he did so in as forceful language as the distinguished Senator himself is using.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to that.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to suggest one other thought to the Senator in considering this question of the Philippines in time of war, and that is that the enormous development of the submarine and the flying machine is, of course, something as to the exact extent of which we can not tell. It already has given such promise of further possibilities that it is only reasonable to suppose that it may go a great deal further than it has up to the present time. It is not at all unreasonable, it seems to me, to suppose that the day may come when the possibility of the Philippines as a station for submarines and flying machines may be of very great importance. We are only considering them now as a coaling station for our war vessels, but there are other means of offense and defense now in existence than war vessels. It is not at all unwise, it seems to me, to recognize the possibilities in these other directions.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, there have been some very able men who have visited the Philippine Islands for the express purpose of studying all of these questions on the ground, and the very suggestion that has just been made by the Senator from Rhode Island has been pointed out by Prof. Blayney, of Rice Institute, of Houston, Tex. I took some pains to inquire into the standing of Prof. Blayney, and I ascertained from the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] that Rice Institute is very handsomely endowed with something like $12,000,000 endowment, and that all its faculty are men of the very highest class. Consequently I accept with a great deal of confidence—subject, of course, to correction, as lawyers get in the habit of accepting everything, if any evidence to the contrary is introduced—the statements of Prof. Blayney in calling attention to the anomalous proposition in the preamble of this resolution that at some indefinite, vague, future time we pledge ourselves in advance to abandon those islands, that the vital interests of the United States might depend in the unknown developments of warfare upon their retention, just as the Senator from Rhode Island has said. In passing I want to say——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. What is the article to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am going to read from it in a moment. It is an article entitled "Our administration of the Philippine Islands," in the January, 1916, issue of the Review of Reviews. I will read an extract from it in a moment, because it is very pertinent, in my opinion.

Before passing the question of the advantage of the islands to the United States I want to say that we must accept the opinion of observers of credence if we desire to arrive at the truth on this question of fact. The success of the American Government in the Philippine Islands in the establishment of a government there such as it has established, in the administration of the material interests of the islands, in their sanitation, in the eradication of disease and of cattle pests, and in the restoration and maintenance of order has enhanced the reputation of the United States and of the citizens of the United States in every country of the Orient. By reason of that accomplishment American citizenship is worth more in that part of the world.

We have gained the respect and admiration of the Orient and of those European nations that have the responsibility of governing oriental countries by our work in the Philippines—a work upon an entirely different theory and different basis than that upon which the government of the British and French colonies is conducted. We have given them a greater amount of autonomy in government; we have extended to them privileges of self-government and of personal liberty and of right and security to a much greater extent than has any other country, and, at the same time, what we have done has not been incompatible with law and order. It is regarded as a great object lesson, and, aside from the military value, Mr. President, which I believe the possession of the islands is, the distinction and reputation which the United States has gained from the work we have done there is not only of a moral value but is of a material value to this country.

Why, Mr. President, one Senator said the other day that we ought to get out of those islands notwithstanding the wishes or the opinions of a lot of two-by-four ward politicians. If the men who, through war and the horrors of war, through the intricate problems of dealing in the Tropics with an oriental people ever accomplished the work which observers say they have accomplished, are the kind of two-by-four ward politicians that they have in Mississippi, my idea of that sort of timber would undergo a great change. They are men who have earned the gratitude of their country, if impartial observers are to be believed, by the honest and unselfish and efficient administration of government for 8,000,000 people; and it throws some light upon the amount of information which Senators discussing the question have when they refer as "two-by-four ward politicians" to men who have increased the honor of the country among foreign nations that have observed what they are doing.

I want to read, preliminary to the article of Prof. Blayney, this note by the editor of the Review of Reviews. He says:

In view of much recent and current discussion regarding the present management of public affairs in the Philippine Islands, we are publishing herewith an article by Prof. Thomas Lindsey Blayney, of the William M. Rice Institute, Houston, Tex. Prof. Blayney is a distinguished scholar, a man of great experience, and an admirer and supporter of President Wilson. All the circumstances of his visit to the Philippines, as well as his relationships at home, render it impossible that Prof. Blayney should have been actuated in his inquiries, and in the preparation of this article for the Review, by any other than the highest and most disinterested motives. Prof. Blayney was one of the professors honored by appointment during the past year by the American committee representing the Albert Kahn Foundation of Paris. This foundation sends two American university professors around the world each year, with the special object in view of having them study oriental conditions and ideals. In correspondence with the editor of this magazine, Dr. Blayney made the following remark:

"I have heard so many expressions of dissatisfaction from prominent Americans, both Democrats and Republicans, in various parts of the world, concerning the present policies of the administration at Manila that I determined to go to the Philippines and satisfy myself concerning the situation there.

"I talked with business men, native and foreign, educators, clergymen, Army and Navy officers, editors, American and British, and many Filipinos of undoubted patriotism and intelligence, and I do not hesitate to assure you that the demoralizing tendency of the policies of the present American administration in the islands is deserving of the widest publicity.

"I am an admirer of President Wilson, and do not wish to be considered as making an attack upon his policies. I have no direct or indirect interest in the islands, other than that of any American citizen who has left nothing undone in the brief time allotted to him to form an unprejudiced opinion, and who cherishes a sincere desire for the prosperity, happiness, and future independence of the islands, whether this be within or without the pale of the American Commonwealth."

I now quote from the body of the article:

When historians of the future shall have spoken a dispassionate and final verdict upon the deeds and achievements of the first decade of our occupancy of the Philippine Islands (before some of our less thoughtful politicians and papers at home had begun to make political capital out of the so-called "independence movement" in the islands), no more inspiring chapter in our national history will be found. Nor will there be found elsewhere a finer list of names of men representing the best type of American manhood and idealism than the pages that record the first 12 years of American administration and achievement in the Orient.

The present projection of partisan politics into the administration of the Philippine Islands—the tendency to allow party theories and sentimental notions to supersede the dictates of sound judgment and common sense—must needs be looked upon as an incidental, though regrettable, moment in the development of our over-the-sea policies. Above motives of such a type, our real statesmen of both parties, as contradistinguished from political opportunists, will surely rise. There is no phenomenon of our national life more passing strange than that which inclines many of our good people to accept the statements of paid emissaries of the Filipino political junta, or of some of our new and inexperienced officials at Manila, rather than those of our fellow countrymen of long administrative experience in the islands. Especially is this remarkable in view of the fact that the statements of men of this last-named class could easily be either verified or disproven by appealing not only to the records but also to residents of character. To accuse all former officers of administration of insincerity or narrow bias, and to disqualify the evidence of the best men of our own blood in the islands—whether clergymen, educators, jurists, or students of colonial policies—as being prompted by selfish motives, must of necessity be but a passing phase of party blindness and can not continue as a fundamental defect in our national character.

Mr. President, in order to avoid occupying the time of the Senate, I ask leave to print as part of my remarks such portions of the article as I see fit, or the whole of it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article referred to is as follows:

OUR ADMINISTRATION OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

[By Thomas Lindsey Blayney.]

[In view of much recent and current discussion regarding the present management of public affairs in the Philippine Islands, we are publishing herewith an article by Prof. Thomas Lindsey Blayney, of the William M. Rice Institute, Houston, Tex. Prof. Blayney is a distinguished scholar, a man of great experience, and an admirer and supporter of President Wilson. All the circumstances of his visit to the Philippines, as well as his relationships at home, render it impossible that Prof. Blayney should have been actuated in his inquiries, and in the preparation of this article for the Review, by any other than the highest and most disinterested motives. Prof. Blayney was one of the professors honored by appointment during the past year by the American committee representing the Albert Kahn Foundation of Paris. This foundation sends two American university professors around the world each year, with the special object in view of having them study oriental conditions and ideals. In correspondence with the editor of this magazine, Dr. Blayney made the following remarks:

"I had heard so many expressions of dissatisfaction from prominent Americans, both Democrats and Republicans, in various parts of the world, concerning the present policies of the administration at Manila that I determined to go to the Philippines and satisfy myself concerning the situation there.

"I talked with business men, native and foreign, educators, clergymen, Army and Navy officers, editors, American and British, and many Filipinos of undoubted patriotism and intelligence, and I do not hesitate to assure you that the demoralizing tendency of the policies of the present American administration in the islands is deserving of the widest publicity.

"I am an admirer of President Wilson, and do not wish to be considered as making an attack upon his policies. I have no direct or indirect interest in the islands other than that of any American citizen who has left nothing undone in the brief time allotted to him to form an unprejudiced opinion, and who cherishes a sincere desire for the prosperity, happiness, and future independence of the islands, whether this be within or without the pale of the American Commonwealth."

On arriving at Manila Dr. Blayney was told that it would be impossible to induce representative natives to give their real views upon the situation on account of their fear of the political ring. He was therefore greatly gratified at the marks of confidence shown him by intelligent and independent Filipinos. This may be attributed to experience acquired by extended residence in Latin countries of Europe and to his knowledge of oriental character gathered through an extensive acquaintanceship with orientals in Morocco, India, China, and Japan. Prof. Blayney suggested a well-known personage as qualified to give to the people of the United States an unbiased account of the situation. We have preferred, however, to invite Dr. Blayney to give our readers the results of his sincere effort to get at the real facts of a situation which he describes as "bidding fair to become a national disgrace if we allow politics and sentiment to take the place of reason and justice."—The editor.]

Ruskin has said, "The art of any country is the exponent of its social and political virtues." After one has visited our own and other great colonial dependencies in the Orient, he is tempted to paraphrase Ruskin's statement and to assert that "the colonial undertakings of a country are the surest reflection of its social and political ideals." Nowhere can the best impulses born of national virtues be appreciated more clearly than when seen in perspective as translated into the administrative policies of a great nation in its control of an alien people.

A great nation—a nation whose body politic is sound and whose greatness is measured not merely by its economic prosperity, but by all those dynamic potentialities reflected in varied forms of civic and philanthropic idealism—necessarily projects into the economic, social, and political life of a dependency (the situation being normal) the quintessence of the best aspiration of the race.

Tested by the foregoing, our own country may well be proud of the record made by its administrators in Habana, Porto Rico, Panama, and till recently in the Philippines. Both we ourselves and foreign critics have found weaknesses in our national life. Nevertheless our recent history has amply proven that in the last analysis we are both efficient and idealistic. This has been shown by the varied manifestations of our endeavors as applied to dependent peoples—the reflection of the disinterested idealism and nonpartisan motives of our best lawgivers at home and our experienced administrators abroad.

OUR SPLENDID RECORD.

When historians of the future shall have spoken a dispassionate and final verdict upon the deeds and achievements of the first decade of our

occupancy of the Philippine Islands—before some of our less thoughtful politicians and papers at home had begun to make political capital out of the so-called "independence movement" in the islands—no more inspiring chapter in our national history will be found. Nor will there be found elsewhere a finer list of names of men representing the best type of American manhood and idealism than the pages that record the first 12 years of American administration and achievement in the Orient.

The present projection of partisan politics into the administration of the Philippine Islands—the tendency to allow party theories and sentimental notions to supersede the dictates of sound judgment and common sense—must needs be looked upon as an incidental, though regrettable, moment in the development of our over-the-sea policies. Above motives of such a type our real statesmen of both parties, as contradistinguished from political opportunists, will surely rise. There is no phenomenon of our national life more passing strange than that which inclines many of our good people to accept the statements of paid emissaries of the Filipino political junto, or of some of our new and inexperienced officials at Manila, rather than those of our fellow countrymen of long administrative experience in the islands. Especially is this remarkable in view of the fact that the statements of men of this last-named class could easily be either verified or disproven by appealing not only to the records but also to residents of character. To accuse all former officers of administration of insincerity or narrow bias, and to disqualify the evidence of the best men of our own blood in the islands—whether clergymen, educators, jurists, or students of colonial policies—as being prompted by selfish motives, must of necessity be but a passing phase of party blindness and can not continue as a fundamental defect in our national character.

Undoubtedly the overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress and of the American public, irrespective of party, wants to do the right thing by the Filipinos. Nevertheless there is an unfortunate impression abroad that much that has been written regarding the present administration is prompted by selfish interests. The following observations made in the course of a visit at Manila are therefore submitted as disinterested evidence. These observations deal largely with questions upon which opinions differ at Washington and concerning which it is very difficult in the United States to secure first-hand information. They reflect the consensus of opinion of most representative Americans, as well as of Filipinos and foreigners in the islands, and, for brevity's sake, the opinions and arguments of the writer are allowed to obtrude as little as possible.

THE CHANGE IN SENTIMENT TOWARD AMERICANS.

No greater surprise is in store for the traveler upon his arrival at Manila to-day than the realization that American ideals are now at a discount in the islands. With but one exception practically all Americans, Filipinos, and Englishmen speak of a marked lessening of respect for Americans and things American. (The exception is an American lawyer having business relations with Filipino politicians, and who, the writer understands, has represented Filipino interests at Washington.) This was explained by the fact that the politicians and public have seen courageous administrators, men whom they at heart admired, but under whose efficient administration the "politicos" had chafed and who therefore had been mercilessly attacked by them, replaced under the new administration by inexperienced officials. And when they saw these new arrivals begin to curry favor with the politicians and to call themselves "friends of the Filipinos," they became bewildered. And this bewilderment gave way to a lessening of respect for Americans in general when it was seen that these inexperienced men of the "new régime," by the frequent use of this word "friend," attributed by implication the contrary to the long list of the best administrative officers the American Government in the past had been able to send to them, and whom it seemed now the fashion to consider as little better than "carpet baggers." And when they found some of the most important of these new "friends" at times deficient in statesmanlike judgment and poise and not too careful in their utterances of the dignity of their positions, there could not but result an inevitable slump in their esteem for Americans in general. It is felt that this situation should be remedied at once; that so long as the American flag continues to fly, our administrative officers should not fall below a fixed high standard of attainment, experience, dignity, courage, and vision; and that ample powers should be vested in them for the sake both of administrative efficiency and of the dignity of their offices. The writer concurs in believing that the early actions and pronunciamentos of some of our high officials of the new administration can not be lived down. He regrets also to have to add that the personality and qualifications of two of the important American officials of the new administration are of such an order that he has never seen their names mentioned without a general smile of commiseration being called forth.

CURRYING FAVOR WITH FILIPINO POLITICIANS.

All Americans and foreigners of experience agree in feeling that it is not only a serious mistake studiously to curry favor with disaffected politicians, but that it is a grave error of administrative judgment to hesitate, either at Manila or Washington, in adopting effective measures and policies for fear of wounding the susceptibilities of the Filipinos. The contention seems established that the "mestizo" politician is devoid of any feeling of gratitude toward the United States. That, therefore, discarding any hope of appreciation in return, it should be our single purpose to give to the islands the kind of administration which may command, not the plaudits of the present but rather the approbation of history and the gratitude of future generations. It is felt at Manila that anything short of this does not represent the highest and best form of American idealism; that this is what the great majority of American people want to see practiced abroad, however far at times we may fall short of it at home.

On the other hand, many of the "wild tribes" are considered as having a genuine appreciation for whatever they realize as being done to help them. It is the consensus of opinion of informed persons that the government of these tribes must remain in the hands of the United States and its representatives. The Filipino has never shown, nor is he likely to show, any real concern for their welfare. And yet they are considered to have a future full of promise under the capable and sympathetic hand of men like Mr. Dean C. Worcester. It is felt on all sides that the loss of this experienced administrator has in nowise been replaced, and that the President could do a real service to humanity by seeing to it that men of this type be not eliminated from the service.

A HIGH STANDARD OF CIVIL SERVICE ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY.

And this brings us to the very heart of the question. It is the opinion of all Americans and foreigners that the inviolability of the civil service must be reestablished by Gov. Gen. Harrison or by his successor if the good name of our governmental methods is not to be irrevocably compromised. Also that the mere fact of a Filipino being an aspirant for office should not be a sufficient reason for his appointment, as has been too frequently the case under the present administration. The claim is made by the administration that such charges are not in keeping with the facts, and that only Filipinos of unquestionable qualifications have been allowed to supersede American officials. The following incident, the facts of which were received first hand by the writer, will, however, illustrate the "careful" way in which under the new era Filipinos have been appointed to offices of trust:

The post of assistant director of the Bureau of Agriculture was to be filled. Without even consulting the American director of the bureau, the Governor General promised the post, at the i quest of the speaker of the assembly, to a henchman of the latter, the then governor of the Province of Pampanga. Shortly before the appointment was to be made public Gov. Gen. Harrison at a dinner party casually informed the director that he had "found an assistant director" for him. Now, it so happened that the Filipino governor selected for the post by the "ring" and accepted by the Governor General had been one of the most recalcitrant of the native governors toward carrying out the hygienic orders issued by the bureau for the prevention of the spread of rinderpest, and a man who had caused the bureau in the past endless trouble. And yet here he was being placed by the administration in a position to enforce in an executive capacity the very regulations which he had insistently ignored. The director endeavored to impress the Governor General with the utter impossibility of the situation, but it was not until after a number of conversations and until the director had threatened his immediate resignation, if a man with such a record were foisted upon him, that the Governor General made what explanations he could to the speaker of the assembly and found another berth for this "excellently recommended" official. It can readily be imagined that such an uncomplacent director of agriculture was not able to continue to serve the "new régime" very long and is now numbered among those who have "resigned."

This incident is cited not to insinuate that the Governor General promised the friends of this Filipino to appoint him, knowing him to be incompetent, but merely to illustrate the "spirit" that now reigns and the happy-go-lucky and reckless manner in which appointments are promised where "politics" and not "efficiency" is the watchword. Such political theories are bad enough in some of our cities at home, but infinitely worse in our distant possessions, where they bring disgrace upon our flag under the very eyes of the efficient colonial administrations of the Dutch and British.

It is believed, furthermore, that to make a financial showing at the expense of efficiency, or to attain this end by stopping expenditures that have heretofore gone for greatly needed public improvements, is neither "making a record" in keeping with American notions of progress nor in accord with what are felt to be the views of the President of the United States as regards governmental efficiency. The loss of men like Gov. Forbes, Mr. Worcester, Dr. Heiser, Capt. Sleeper, Mr. Taylor, and many others who have recently "resigned," is not only a reproach to present-day methods at Manila—a matter of grave local importance—but is looked upon as a distinct setback in the development of better and more stable institutions in the entire Orient in the interest of humanity as a whole.

MORALE OF BUREAU OF SCIENCE VIRTUALLY DESTROYED.

No institution has prospered more under civil service than the Bureau of Science at Manila. This admirable institution had been developed to a point where it had commanded the high respect of scientists in all parts of the world, and especially in the Orient. The ill-advised utterances of the new secretary of the interior upon his arrival, regarding the abolishment of certain departments of research (with the workings of which it was said he had not been familiar and which seemed to him to be "too theoretical"), has created, as might easily have been foreseen, a most unfortunate impression upon the minds of the people. It necessarily has not only lowered the prestige of the bureau and discouraged men from remaining in it or attaching themselves to it but it has reflected upon the sound judgment of American scientists. It is felt that such a thoroughly representative American institution and its corps of experienced scientists should be placed beyond the reach of the vagaries of any individual.

THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PHILIPPINES AT WASHINGTON.

One of the greatest hindrances to a clearer appreciation of the merits of the arguments favoring a more or less immediate independence for the Filipinos consists, strange as it may seem, in the personality of Señor MANUEL QUEZON, Resident Commissioner from the Philippines at Washington. It is felt at Manila to be very unfortunate that Señor QUEZON should have succeeded in establishing himself in the opinion of Washington as a typical representative of his race. After meeting practically all the leading native political leaders, the writer does not hesitate to assert, that in knowledge of America and of American ways, in ability to adopt our mannerisms, to play upon our feelings and prejudices, and to make himself interesting and attractive in society, there is no public man of his race who can begin to measure up to him. It is vital that this be kept in mind when our lawgivers are discussing the question of independence. For it must be remembered that, as high as he stands above his political colleagues in all those attainments calculated to influence the susceptibilities of Americans, an immensely greater and for the present practically impassable gulf separates these colleagues from the great mass of the ignorant populace even in Luzon. A great proportion of the Filipino people have no clearer notion of "independence" than that it is some sort of a tangible or intangible thing that will bring them an era of plenty with little work and no taxes.

FILIPINO POLITICAL MEETINGS NOT ALWAYS REPRESENTATIVE.

Another point to be kept in mind is that meetings organized to further the measures of political leaders do not necessarily represent the feelings of intelligent, independent Filipinos. Native civilians of this latter class informed the writer that the rivalries already existing, and the taste for spoils already whetted by an ever and too rapidly increasing share in the offices of state presage certain revolution as soon as a firm hand is withdrawn; that it will require several generations of peace and prosperity to train an oriental people into a genuine respect for stable institutions.

In this connection it should be noted, further, that one of the serious mistakes made by visitors at Manila is to form an opinion of the intelligence of an audience or delegation in the islands by its general appearance. Gatherings of this kind are exceedingly impressive, especially if large and if the visitor is a recent arrival, owing to the fondness of the men for well-tailored white suits, which give them an outward appearance of prosperity and intelligence out of

keeping with their attainments and with the environment out of which they come.

INDEPENDENCE NOT DESIRED.

Certainly one of the most surprising things to the visitor, if he is fortunate enough to have heart-to-heart talks with representative Filipinos who are not themselves political aspirants, will be to learn that independence is not desired at this time by men of this type. Every one of them gave it as his opinion that revolution would certainly follow the lowering of the flag. Not one of them would name a time now to be foreseen when he thought independence could be safely promised or granted. Each stated, however, that, should his sentiments become known, he would be a marked man and, whether directly or indirectly, would feel the heavy hand of the "politicos."

The writer has been informed from a most unimpeachable source that even one of the two leading Filipino politicians had recently become rather skeptical about early independence, in view of recent events in the Orient. He feared now he had builded better than he thought and that independence might actually be granted, owing to the support of certain Congressmen not entirely in sympathy with the movement, but who, like many of their constituents, were beginning to feel that the present situation is no credit to the United States. He recognized the dangerously increasing impatience of others in Congress and in the public at seeing ourselves invited "to get out" of the islands, and yet in the same breath being requested to permit the Filipino politicians to bury, as it were, the Stars and Stripes at the foot of the flagpole, to be resurrected and run up whenever they got into international complications. His position, however, rendered it very difficult for him to backwater.

CHARACTER AND WORK OF THE PHILIPPINE ASSEMBLY.

Another matter of disillusionment for those of us who have been guided by feelings of sentiment toward the independence movement is to learn, on studying the situation on the ground, that much that we have heard about the excellent work and disinterested patriotism of the Philippine Assembly is not borne out by the facts. Space will not permit even the mention of the many accounts of the inefficiency of the lawgivers. It might be noted, however, that the last assembly—and, by the way, the very one which, as the writer was informed, Gov. Gen. Harrison went to the length of complimenting in a telegram to Washington—occupied, despite the more or less direct protests of the governor, a great part of its time with questions relating to political posts and appointments, and it was with the greatest difficulty induced to discuss the budget. The statements we sometimes hear regarding "the remarkable work of the assembly demonstrating the capacity of the people for self-government," if sincerely made, are considered at Manila as based upon information furnished by parties interested in the successful workings of the theories of the "new era."

FACTS VERSUS THEORIES.

The facts tend to disprove the statements of those who would rapidly "Filipinize" the service. No clearer proof is needed of the grave risks being run for the sake of a theory than the unfortunate results following the "resignation" of Capt. Sleeper as chief of the land office. This efficient officer had built up a remarkable department, and one that had required years of labor to bring to a standard that was considered a model of efficiency. Deaf to the warnings of men of experience, the new administration appointed a Filipino to succeed him. This man was most carefully selected, since it was recognized on all sides as a test of native ability. In a short time the work of years had become but a shadow of its former self, and, however reluctantly, the administration had to remove the new incumbent. Another Filipino was ultimately appointed, but the department was in very bad shape when the writer left the islands.

REGRETTABLE REFLECTIONS ON AMERICAN ADMINISTRATORS.

There is another factor which bodes for many years to come little success to a Filipino administration of the islands. The ingenious lies, innuendoes, and slanderous attacks, under the very shadow of the flag, upon the character and administration of our most highly respected officials in the past, because their rulings ran counter to special interests or prejudices of certain factions, is not considered as auguring well for the conditions that would exist when the flag comes down, granted even that native officials would pretend to attempt to uphold hygienic or other efficient measures against the wishes of the masses. The rapid increase of the rinderpest under the régime of Gov. Gen. Harrison after the control of the situation had been taken from the bureau of agriculture and placed under provincial supervision and certain "economies" of administration has been inaugurated should sober the most enthusiastic advocates of immediate wider autonomy.

CRITICISMS ON PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS.

Filipino politicians, backed by their party papers, have long made the expenditures for the construction of the Benguet Road and its terminus—the splendid health resort of Baguio—a favorite subject of attack in reflecting on the administration of former American commissioners. It is true there was an error of judgment on the part of the engineering expert who reported on the probable cost, but for this the commissioners should not be held responsible. Rather than being a reproach to the executive ability of former administrations, both the road and the resort are now seen to be assets of the highest value, although the road will soon lose its importance, owing to the construction of a safer highway in another part of the mountains. Personally the writer feels, after visiting India and the famous British "Hill Station," Darjeeling in the Himalayas, that Baguio is one of the most creditable and enduring monuments to the foresight and forethought of former commissions. Mr. Harrison and Mr. Denison, possibly for the sake of consistency, spent the past summer in Japan and China, and therefore the government was not transferred to Baguio for the hot months. And yet when the writer visited Baguio it was full of Filipinos from Manila, who now own residences in what only a few years ago was but an uninhabited mountain top. This is conclusive proof that, although always ready to seek out every possible excuse to compromise the administration of American commissioners in the eyes of Congress, they are not slow to profit by the results of the very administrative policies they have so severely criticized.

APPOINTING A PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY.

Since leaving the islands the writer has learned through a copy of the Manila Times that prophecies he had heard made there, and which it was hoped would not be realized, had proven correct, and that the presidency of the University of Manila had been given to a Filipino gentleman "for whom no other post was available, but whose friends insisted that he must be taken care of." This program of Filipinization was too much even for Secretary Denison, who, as a member of the board of control, at first opposed the Filipino, desiring an efficient American educator at the head of this important institution during the first and most important years of its development. His protest, however, was unavailing. This stand represents a radical change in his views as expressed soon after his arrival in the islands in a much-criticized speech, the general tenor of which might be summed up in the since oft-quoted assertion it contained: "Why should we insist upon 'hustling' the East against its will and at its expense if the East itself wishes to lie placid, murmuring mañana?" It is felt that his other no less famous public statement in regard to a letter delayed three weeks in delivery is typical of the sophomoric theories of government entertained by the new administration: "If the Filipino people prefer to have their letters arrive in three weeks and do it themselves, why haven't they the right to do it that way?"

THE PRESIDENT NOT BLAMED.

The majority of Americans and foreigners at Manila do not feel that the President is correctly informed concerning existing conditions, and are therefore unwilling to hold him directly responsible for the present situation. They rather attribute it to the shortsightedness and excess of zeal shown by the administration at Manila in making a "record" such as they might wish to make at home after a political upheaval. Some of these officials seem forgetful of the ignorance of the great mass of Filipinos regarding our traditional treatment of "officeholders" in this country upon a change of administration, and inexcusably forgetful of the supreme importance of maintaining in our over-the-sea dependencies the well-earned reputation of American officials, past or present, and irrespective of party, for disinterested public service. Some of them have compromised the good name and dignity of American institutions abroad by actions and utterance which either reflect upon the sincerity of the intentions of past administrations or else are not in keeping with the views which the American public at Manila believed to be those of the President relative to administrative decorum abroad. To mention but one example:

Only those who have been in Manila and are familiar with the various undercurrents of sentiment and with the personal histories of individuals there can form a conception of the astonishment felt by the audience when, as a number of witnesses told the writer, the distinguished guest of the occasion, a man who incorporates the dignity of American institutions by his exalted position, placed his arm about the shoulders of a Filipino politician and declared that it was "to this man" that he owed his position, and that he would not forget the kindness as long as he lived. The remark was considered, for reasons that can not be touched upon here, not only as lacking excessively in good taste, but also as showing exceedingly poor judgment, in that it magnified the Filipino in the esteem of his countrymen at the expense of the President of the United States, from whom the appointment had come.

HOW THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION IS REGARDED.

Señor QUEZON made the public statement at the Lake Mohonk conference in 1914 that "Gov. Harrison has gained for himself and for the Nation that he represents the confidence and good will of the Filipino people." This statement, according to reliable American evidence and that of intelligent Filipinos, is not in keeping with the facts. Never since the early years of occupation has genuine respect and esteem for America and things American been at so low an ebb, for the reasons mentioned above. Gov. Gen. Harrison and his administration enjoy, quite naturally, a certain kind of popularity with the politicians and factions whose aims he seems to support. But that he has raised his country or his countrymen in the respect of the inhabitants is an altogether different matter. Deep regret was voiced on all sides that at the very outset he had launched himself upon a campaign of "reform" from which, in spite of experience gained, it is very hard for him to turn back.

THE FEELING IN THE ISLANDS ON THE JONES BILL.

The feeling of Americans and foreigners in the islands concerning the Jones bill is somewhat as follows: It is considered impossible to foresee what the next 25 or 50 years may bring in the international situation in the Pacific, nor how essential to us and to the best interests of the Filipinos the new inventions constantly being made in aerial and maritime armament and our commercial interests in the East may render the retention of the islands in whole or in part. Therefore it is believed that, if an unnecessary preamble to such a bill must be formulated, sound statesmanship dictates that it should go no further than declaring it to be "the intention of the United States to grant independence to the Philippine Islands as soon as in the judgment of Congress it is deemed to the best interests of the islands and of the United States to do so." It is further believed that the political element would make at first a bold front of disapproval, but that the great mass of intelligent and peaceful civilians would greet such a statement with sincere satisfaction. A statement of this kind would do more, it is thought, to clear the unhealthful atmosphere of uncertainty and apprehension existing at Manila and to preclude unprofitable discussion than anything that has occurred since the change of administration.

FOREIGN OPINION ON OUR PRESENT PHILIPPINE POLICY.

It is a striking fact that among the many Americans and Britons whom the writer met in India, China, and Japan, and who were more or less familiar with the situation from personal observation, there was not one who did not feel that the almost nervous eagerness of the administration at Manila to conciliate the politicians, even at the cost of some dignity, and the excessive zeal shown in changing the "Filipinizing" the service, had proven a grave error of judgment of more than local importance. That it was destined to render the work of the white man in the uplift of dependent races very difficult in more distant parts of the Orient. It was pointed out by the British that, if, as we claimed, our interest in the islands was purely humanitarian, we should not transfer our political differences of opinion and more or less questionable party theories into the administration of our island dependencies, but rather seek to govern them along recognized lines of administrative efficiency for their own highest welfare, and in the interest of humanity as a whole. That to transfer our own advanced theories of democratic government to an inexperienced people just emerging from a period of almost medieval darkness, many of whom have not the remotest conception of the real meanings of the words "democracy" and "independence," would be little short of criminal.

OUR LEGACY TO THE PHILIPPINES.

The following statement was made to the writer by an intelligent and highly respected Filipino and is submitted as a final résumé of a

situation which can not possibly continue with credit to our Government:

"When the American flag is lowered, whether it be in 1 year or in 10 years or in a hundred years, I feel that the United States will be remembered in our island by three principal contributions to our national life: First, by a splendid system of public instruction; secondly, by an excellent judicial system; and, thirdly, by an all-pervading system of petty Tammany politics, to the fostering of which the present administration has very largely contributed. And I feel that the last of these contributions will far outshadow in effect the results of the other two to the everlasting misfortune of my race."

No words of the writer could possibly add to the simple force of a statement of this character.

Such, in briefest possible form, are the opinions of the overwhelming majority of men of every shade of opinion and nationality in Manila, both native and foreign, whose opinion, the writer feels, the public would care to learn, and by whose judgment it would wish in a measure to be guided in the solemn hour so fast approaching when a courageous, creditable, and unequivocal decision should be reached—a decision free of political bias and sentimental theories, but destined to involve irrevocably the good name of our country, the statesmanship of our lawgivers, and the future welfare of a dependent people.

AMERICAN IDEALS SHOULD PREVAIL IN THE PHILIPPINES.

We are told that the islands are a menace to us; that by their retention we run the risk of grave complications. And yet, these are the very warnings that were directed against our fathers whenever they contemplated moving our frontiers farther toward the Pacific. Thus far in our history we have never recoiled from following our star of destiny because of real or fancied dangers. And it is not believed that we are going to hesitate now, when millions whom we have led toward a brighter day stand sorely in need of our strong helping hand to conduct them over the last and most difficult part of the way.

If we have not the courage of our forefathers, if the splendid work of American achievement, the self-sacrificing labors of countless men of our own race—the scientist, the educator, the administrator, and the soldier—are to be sacrificed to the empty shibboleth "independence," is it not due our good name to leave the islands now? It is the firm belief of the writer that we owe it to ourselves, to the Filipinos, and to humanity to insist, so long as the American flag continues to fly over Manila and over the hundreds of schools, city halls, and courthouses of the archipelago, promising liberty and justice under its stars and stripes, not to a few political aspirants, but to all that just so long American, and not Filipino, ideals of efficiency, administration, and justice should reign at Manila. And this can not be realized unless we cease the present methods of tearing down the laboriously constructed work of years achieved by American administrative officers, not because we feel it to be in the interest of the people, but at the behest of the native office seeker, whose plea, "independence," seems so irresistable to our democratic ears. The individual man is "free" to-day wherever the Stars and Stripes float to the breeze in the islands. That he will not be "free" when the flag comes down is the firm conviction of all men of broad judgment and experience in the Philippines.

Every principle of humanitarianism and of enlightened statesmanship dictates that we should jealously guard this heritage of future generations and hand it down to them in the form of an efficient, model administration unto the day when they, as an enlightened people, and not as a handful of political dictators, tell the people of the United States what they desire. The American people will then gladly give them what they want.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to take only one moment, I should like to add to the extract he has put in the RECORD just a few words which appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. LIPPITT. The quotation is from a statement by Mr. William F. Montavon, who has just been appointed a commercial attaché of the United States and who for many years has been a superintendent of public schools in the Philippine Islands, and who has a very high opinion of the Philippine people. The Senator from Washington a moment ago was talking about the prestige which our administration of the islands has given us in the Orient. Mr. Montavon, after speaking in the very highest terms of the Philippine people, says:

Our prestige as a Nation is bound up intimately with this Philippine business. The world will be richer materially and morally because of the integrity and intelligence manifested by able men in solving the big questions relating to the islands and their inhabitants.

The quotation was so pertinent to what the Senator was saying that I took the liberty of asking to have it put in the RECORD.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The article by Prof. Blayney is an extremely illuminating one, as will be realized by those who will take the pains to read it.

Our people have over $70,000,000 invested in the Philippine Islands. In 1911 they had $70,000,000 invested there, and I am informed, as I said in the debate here the other day, by Gen. McIntyre that it is known that a large amount of capital has been invested there since that time. There are between eight and ten thousand Americans resident in the Philippine Islands. Many of them have established important businesses there. All of this money was invested there, and all of these people went there, of course, relying upon the benefit of American control of the islands. I do not contend that that is a governing factor in the case; I realize the fact that it is a matter of secondary importance to the larger questions that are involved, including in those larger questions our duties toward the Filipino people themselves; but we can not escape the conclusion, Mr. President, that, other things being equal, the obligation to protect, in a proper way, the property and business of our people who have invested and who reside in those islands rests upon this country. I object to their abandonment. There is no proposition advanced in connection with the preamble of this bill that any steps whatever will be taken to give security to the Americans, with their great investments and their great interests in these islands. On the other hand, it is proposed to ignore them, proposed to abandon them; to abandon them just as we have abandoned our citizens in Mexico.

I do not want to irritate that issue, but my opinion is that when the European war is closed, when one or the other of the great powers of Europe will be victorious in that struggle, armed as it never was before, we will be confronted with a real international problem if in the meantime we have not quit this policy of neglect which we have adopted in Mexico.

Now, it is proposed in this bill to adopt the same policy in the Philippine Islands. It is a part of our general foreign policy of surrender and indifference. We have argued many of these questions in detail, and it is not necessary to go into the details again. Our citizens must not travel abroad, for fear they will involve us in trouble with Europe; they must not remain in Mexico, for fear we will be involved in trouble there; we must abandon our right to special rates for the passage of our vessels through the Panama Canal, because of intimate secret issues about which we know nothing; we must pay $25,000,000 to the Republic of Colombia for their good will. I mention these things because they all together show a general course of conduct, a general attitude in our foreign policy which is bringing shame upon us in many quarters of the world; and a proposal to abandon the fruits of the work of 17 years in the Philippine Islands is a consistent part of that general policy of abandonment and of retreat in every direction in which our people have established their interests abroad. The idea seems to be that we must confine ourselves to our continental borders and must not venture beyond them; that we must give up the interests that we have abroad, and that our people, if they go abroad in pursuit of trade or travel, can not depend upon the Government of the United States to protect them. If this bill should pass, and if all that the flag guarantees in the Philippine Islands is to be withdrawn, there ought to be some provision by which a guaranty of security and of life can be given to Americans who are established there.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think it is in order to ask that the Philippine bill be temporarily laid aside. I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

SAN ANTONIO BICENTENNIAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish to ask unanimous consent for the passage by the Senate of Senate joint resolution 72. I would not ask this but for the fact that immediate action is necessary. The resolution authorizes the President to invite the countries of Spanish America to an exposition to be held at the city of San Antonio in 1918. It does not carry an appropriation. The citizens of San Antonio will hold a meeting next week to prepare the invitations. For that reason I should like to have the resolution go through at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas will have to guarantee to the Senate that there will be no appropriation hereafter made or asked for for that purpose or I certainly shall object to its consideration at this time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will say to the Senator that the participation we expect the Government to have in the matter will be through exhibits by the various departments, and not through an appropriation by the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator know about how much the Government will be involved in that respect?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; I can not give any assurance along that line, but I say to the Senator that the extent of the Government's participation will be such exhibits as are usually made by the departments at expositions.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask that the joint resolution be not considered at this time. I must object to its present consideration, but I will talk to the Senator from Texas about it and see just exactly what it proposes. I have not read it at all, but I say to the Senator that if it is the beginning of another exposition and the entering upon of an appropriation by the Government for that purpose at this time I certainly do not think it ought to be done. As I say, however, I have not read the joint resolution, and I will see the Senator about it between now and to-morrow.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is entirely satisfactory to me. I shall be glad to talk to the Senator about it.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Mr. SIMMONS. From the Committee on Finance I report back favorably Senate resolution No. 10, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. It is simply for the pur-

pose of obtaining information with respect to imports and exports for the use of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator if it is the resolution submitted by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] on December 7 last?

Mr. SIMMONS. It is the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish to the Senate information regarding the value of imports, exports, and import duties under the present and the two preceding tariff acts, with a special statement for the period from the enactment of the existing tariff act to the outbreak of the European war, compared with a corresponding period of the previous year; the value of imports, compared with the value of domestic production, and the expenditure for wages in each industry before the outbreak of the European war, and the imports and exports of leading manufacturing countries during recent years.

ADDRESS BY OSCAR T. CROSBY (S. DOC. NO. 245).

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask to have printed as a public document an argument by Oscar T. Crosby, of Washington, D. C., relative to Senate bill 2710, to encourage the establishment of an international peace-keeping tribunal, and pending such establishment to assure the military preparedness of the United States. It is a very short matter, and I do not ask that it be printed in the RECORD, but simply that it be ordered published as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 18, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 17, 1916.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

First Lieut. John L. Holcombe, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from January 14, 1916, vice Capt. Edward P. Nones, who died January 13, 1916.

Second Lieut. Calvin M. Smith, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from December 14, 1915, vice First Lieut. Fredrick E. Kingman, who died December 13, 1915.

Second Lieut. John T. H. O'Rear, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from January 14, 1916, vice First Lieut. John L. Holcombe, promoted.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Civil Engineer Frederic R. Harris, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, in the Department of the Navy, with rank of rear admiral, for a term of four years.

Ensign Hugh McC. Branham to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1915.

Ensign Roy C. Smith, jr., to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1915.

Passed Asst. Paymaster Benjamin H. Brooke to be a paymaster in the Navy from the 22d day of October, 1915.

Professor of Mathematics Paul J. Dashiell, with rank of lieutenant commander, to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy, with rank of commander, from the 12th day of January, 1916.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Clyde A. Rosseter, of Valentine, Nebr., to be register of the land office at Valentine, Nebr., vice Luke M. Bates, term expired.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 17, 1916.

JUDGE OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

George E. Downey to be a judge of the Court of Claims.

MEMBER OF THE CALIFORNIA DÉBRIS COMMISSION.

Capt. Richard Park to be a member of the California Débris Commission.

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION FOR PORTO RICO.

Paul G. Miller to be Commissioner of Education for Porto Rico.

MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF PORTO RICO.

Manuel Camunas to be a member of the Executive Council of Porto Rico.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Civil Engineer Frederic R. Harris to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks with the rank of rear admiral.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

William W. Perry, West Blocton.

CALIFORNIA.

John E. Nolan, Jamestown.

COLORADO.

Elsie E. Da Lee Elliott, Redcliff.
Jerry F. Halloran, Victor.
Stephen Ilgenfritz, Ordway.
Joseph Ray, Aguilar.
Fanny Hamilton Simpson, La Veta.

CONNECTICUT.

Robert D. Burns, Saybrook.

IDAHO.

Jessie Beasley, Wardner.
Josephine Ervin, Mullen.

ILLINOIS.

Charles E. Carlson, Woodhull.
W. T. Clopper, Polo.
H. B. Conover, Orion.
Jacob F. Davis, Minier.
William F. de Frenne, Prairie du Rocher.
J. H. Farquharson, Western Springs.
Max Geisenhoner, East Dubuque.
A. W. Hilbolt, Dongola.
Pearl A. Hollingsworth, Fisher.
J. F. Knight, Sandoval.
Grover C. Lindley, Hutsonville.
Robert A. McFarland, Livingston.
Thomas J. McMahon, Chebanse.
C. D. Miller, Milledgeville.
Edward J. Mulligan, Bradley.
Joseph H. Mulligan, Kewanee.
Frank L. O'Brien, Maple Park.
B. J. Ritson, Farmington.
Emma R. Ritzman, Orangeville.
Albert Schrieber, Red Bud.
W. W. Sloan, Rockton.
Edward Streng, Stewardson.
W. J. Sullivan, Hanover.
Henry Uphaus, Macon.
Louis Wolter, Marissa.

INDIANA.

Herbert P. Carpenter, Elwood.
Maurice L. Cory, Kingman.
John L. Fraley, Anderson.
Frank D. Haimbaugh, Muncie.
Joseph T. Kistler, Royal Center.
Louis H. Kocher, Churubusco.
Guy Longest, English.
William W. Ludtke, Rolling Prairie.
Otto A. Minear, Claypool.
John T. Scott, Valparaiso.
James P. Simons, Monticello.

IOWA.

K. F. Baldridge, Bloomfield.
Edward M. Bratton, Shellsburg.
E. F. Breen, Farley.
Joseph G. Geister, Primghar.
J. J. McMahon, Toledo.
George Ritz, Rockwell City.
S. I. Rutledge, Iowa Falls.
Ira A. Squier, Sutherland.
Albert F. Steffen, Hull.
Peter Wohlenberg, Everly.

KANSAS.

B. M. Palmer, Jewell.
J. H. Rathbun, Downs.
Charles C. Seewir, Lawrence.
Leonard Willems, Lansing.

KENTUCKY.

Tarleton C. Hobbs, Anchorage.
Hubert Hutton, Berry.
Judith W. Montgomery, Greensburg.

MAINE.

Oscar H. Dilworth, Madison.
James L. Foster, Livermore Falls.
Franklin K. Jack, Bowdoinham.
Theodore C. Haley, Rangeley.
Frederick W. Hartnett, Bath.
Edward Lynch, South Berwick.

MISSISSIPPI.

Sheppard Lamar Martin, Wiggins.
Emma L. Whyte, Bond.

MONTANA.

Lawrence C. Porter, Winifred.
Meta W. Shaw, Terry.
George E. Shawler, Geraldine.

NEBRASKA.

O. C. Lamb, Guide Rock.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Edward S. Perkins, Sunapee.
Samuel Runlett, Durham.
Joseph Warren, Rochester.

NEW JERSEY.

Joseph Edward Charles, Wenonah.
Charles G. Hatcher, Smithville.

NEVADA.

E. M. George, Battle Mountain.
Laura Hoegh, Eureka.
George W. Likes, Fallon.
James J. McQuillan, Tonopah.
Thomas D. Rogers, Manhattan.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Abraham T. Anderson, Turtle Lake.
John E. Dick, McVille.
Gilbert M. Eng, Douglas.
Harriet M. Frank, Powers Lake.
H. M. Haakenson, Hatton.
William F. L. Makee, Noonan.

OHIO.

Joel C. Clore, Cincinnati.

OKLAHOMA.

J. L. Buckley, Texhoma.
Thomas B. Dunlap, Ringling.
Charley M. Foil, Jennings.
J. A. Miller, Beaver.

OREGON.

T. J. Anderson, Harrisburg.
James W. Dunn, St. Benedict.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William L. Marshall, Dayton.

RHODE ISLAND.

Sumner Mowry, Peace Dale.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Dana N. Bonesteel, Artesian.
W. F. McGuigan, McIntosh.
J. W. McMahon, Salem.

TEXAS.

W. F. Lancaster, Bowie.
Osceola G. Wilson, Nixon.

VERMONT.

Frank H. Clark, Windsor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *January 17, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We come to Thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, because we believe in Thee as the final cause, the source from whom proceedeth all things, and we most fervently pray that we may be susceptible to the Holy Spirit ever emanating from Thee, that Thy kingdom may come in our hearts and Thy will be done in our lives. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 15, 1916, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER. The credentials of Mr. W. W. VENABLE, the newly elected Member from Mississippi, are on the Speaker's table, signed by the governor and secretary of state in the regular form.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I present Mr. VENABLE and ask that he be sworn in.

Mr. VENABLE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, the father-in-law of my son is dead at my house, and I feel that I ought to ask leave of absence for to-day. I wish to say that there are a number of bills on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent reported from the committee of which I am chairman. The authors and the gentlemen who reported those bills are here and are able to take care of them. I request leave of absence for to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks leave of absence for to-day. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

ANSHE CHESED CONGREGATION, VICKSBURG, MISS.

The first bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 4954) directing the Secretary of War to reconvey a parcel of land to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss.

The Clerk read the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota objects.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman to withhold his objection for a moment.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I shall object to all of these bills to-day on this Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question? I ask unanimous consent to do so.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question. It seems to me the gentleman from Minnesota would determine that, but in any event the Chair will put the request. Is there objection to the gentleman from Texas catechizing the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARNER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he was going to object to all of the bills on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent?

Mr. LINDBERGH. All of these that are here; yes.

Mr. GARNER. Then, I suggest that it is not necessary to call these bills for unanimous consent if the gentleman gives notice now that he intends to object to all of them, unless the Chair is going to recognize Members in charge of bills to suspend the rules and pass them.

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair is going to do.

Mr. COLLIER. Then I will make that motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FERRIS. Has not the gentleman to wait until the bills are called through the calendar?

The SPEAKER. No; the gentleman from Mississippi moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 4954, with committee amendments.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has a perfect right to make that point. Evidently there is not a quorum here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Driscoll	Hulbert	Patten
Bacharach	Drukker	Hutchinson	Porter
Barchfeld	Dupré	Jones	Powers
Beales	Dyer	Keister	Reilly
Bennet	Fairchild	Kent	Riordan
Brown, W. Va.	Farley	Kless, Pa.	Sabath
Bruckner	Flynn	Kitchin	Scott, Pa.
Buchanan, Tex.	Focht	Kreider	Scully
Caldwell	Gallagher	Lafean	Sells
Carew	Gallivan	Lieb	Sherley
Casey	Garland	Liebel	Siegel
Chandler, N. Y.	Graham	Linthicum	Slemp
Chiperfield	Gray, Ala.	Loft	Stedman
Coady	Gray, N. J.	Longworth	Sumners
Cullop	Gregg	McLemore	Tague
Dale, N. Y.	Guernsey	Maher	Talbott
Darrow	Hamill	Mays	Ward
Davenport	Haskell	Miller, Pa.	Whaley
Dempsey	Haugen	Mooney	Williams, W. E.
Dies	Hilliard	Morgan, La.	Winslow
Dooling	Holland	Nolan	Wise
Doremus	Howell	Paige, Mass.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 346 Members, a quorum, responded to their names.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] moved to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 4954) as amended, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4954) directing the Secretary of War to reconvey a parcel of land to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to convey by deed to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss., a small tract of land for cemetery purposes, which land is now part of the Vicksburg National Military Park, and more particularly described by metes and bounds as follows:

Commencing at the southeast corner of a tract of land as described in deed book C C, page 611, in chancery clerk's office, Warren County, Miss.; thence with an astronomical azimuth 100° 40′ 992 feet to a stone post; thence 209° 10′ 509 feet to a stone post; thence 225° 55′ 461 feet to a stone post; thence 220° 50′ 398 feet to a stone post on the south side of the Baldwins Ferry Road; thence 296° 10′ 198 feet; thence 355° 10′ 105 feet; thence 23° 15′ 178 feet to the point of beginning.

Thence with an astronomical azimuth no degrees and 15′ 534 feet; thence 270° 15′ 318½ feet; thence 132° 5′ 251 feet; thence 171° 20′ 259 feet; thence 134° 25′ 143 feet to the point of beginning; containing 1.64 acres, more or less, and being part of section 21, township 16, range 4 east: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States in carrying out the provisions of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimoust consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Mississippi is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois to 20 minutes.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I think I can get through discussing this bill in much less than the 20 minutes of time allotted to me. In fact, the report accompanying the bill states the facts as completely as I could, but to save you the trouble of reading that fine print I will state briefly, for your information, the following:

When the Vicksburg Military Park was established it was found that the Anshe Chesed Congregation Cemetery was stationed near the place where the old fortifications were, and that some of this land was needed to complete the park. In 1900 the congregation gave to the Federal Government 19.5 acres of land——

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What was the name of the cemetery?

Mr. COLLIER. The Anshe Chesed, the Jewish cemetery at the city of Vicksburg. Through their patriotic desire to see that great work perpetuated the congregation gave to the Federal Government 19.5 acres of their cemetery for a nominal consideration. They wanted to give it for nothing, but it was given for a nominal consideration of $1 and the moving of a fence.

It now seems, gentlemen, that they gave more of their cemetery than they should, because they now need more room, and they come and ask the Federal Government to reconvey to them 1.64 acres. There is no objection to this from any source that I have found. The land that is being asked to be reconveyed has no special significance in that it is commemorated by a tablet, memorial, or marker. The chairman of the park commission, Capt. W. T. Rigby, has recommended that this 1.64 acres be conveyed back to that congregation, but the Judge Advocate General has stated—and you will find it in the report—that the War Department has no authority to reconvey that land, but that we will have to come to Congress to get that authority. Judge Crowder states that the War Department will favor any congressional legislation looking to that end, which opinion is concurred in by the Acting Secretary of War.

Now, another point. It might be suggested as to what effect this will have upon the appearance of that park. It will simply be moving a fence down a short distance, and any effect it will have will be that of still more beautifying the park, because they will add more monuments therein.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, except I wish to bring this out, that the committee has made an amendment that this transfer shall be made at no cost to the United States, which amendment was, of course, accepted by the author of the bill and is entirely satisfactory to the congregation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. From what committee did the bill come?

Mr. COLLIER. This bill comes from the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demanded a second in order that the matter might be explained to the House. I have myself no opposition to the bill. If anyone desires a part of my time in opposition to the bill, I will yield to him, otherwise I will yield two minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Washington delegation, Mr. Henry J. Pierce, of Seattle, Wash., will deliver a lecture on "The necessity for water-power development" at the new National Museum, at the foot of Tenth Street NW., on to-morrow evening at 8.30. I have heard this lecture of Mr. Pierce upon this very important proposition. It contains a vast amount of information, and Mr. Pierce is certainly one of the best-posted men on this question in the United States. In addition to his lecture he will show moving pictures of the great nitrogen establishments of Norway and Canada. I call special attention to this as bearing on this question of preparedness. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert this invitation of the Washington delegation in the RECORD, so that Members may see it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to insert the invitation mentioned in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The invitation is as follows:

At the request of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington Mr. Henry J. Pierce, of Seattle, Wash., will deliver his lecture entitled "The Necessity for Water-Power Development" in the auditorium of the new National Museum, B Street, foot of Tenth Street NW., on Tuesday, January 18, 1916, at 8.30 p. m., illustrated by moving pictures.

The Members of Congress and their families and others to whom this is addressed are cordially invited to be present.

This procedure is prompted by the critical importance of this subject at this session of Congress. Among the many important matters which are dependent upon water-power development is the establishment of the nitrogen industry. Nitrogen is necessary to our national defense and to our agricultural welfare. We are now dependent upon foreign sources, which may be cut off in time of need. Among the motion pictures shown by Mr. Pierce are those of the great nitrogen establishments of Norway and Canada. It is believed that a general attendance by Members of Congress will prove exceedingly valuable and timely in connection with the legislative consideration that must be given to a Federal water-power policy at this session of Congress.

WESLEY L. JONES.
MILES POINDEXTER.
W. E. HUMPHREY.
ALBERT JOHNSON.
W. L. LA FOLLETTE.
L. H. HADLEY.
C. C. DILL.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

BIRTHDAY OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this bill pertains to national memorials, which enables me to say the few words I desire to say to the House this morning on a kindred subject.

Mr. Speaker, contemporaneous history does not always record that which is great in our citizenship. We are periodically boastful and are sometimes addicted to hero worship, but that which is truly great in our men and women is too often permitted to pass without that recognition which is the sweetest reward of achievement. The definition of a statesman attributed to Thomas B. Reed, a truly great Speaker of the House of Representatives, will serve best to illustrate the thought in mind. "A statesman," he said, "is a successful politician who is dead."

I am prompted to make these observations this morning because, with the indulgence of the House, I shall speak briefly of Benjamin Franklin, one of the truly great Americans who has come to be recognized the world over as the greatest of our philosophers. To-day is the two hundred and tenth anniversary of the birth of Franklin in the city of Boston. The major part of the 84 years of his life were spent in the district in Philadelphia which I have the honor to represent. When he was not laboring in that district as a practical printer or in working out the many problems which placed him a century ahead of the geniuses of public thought and benefaction he was performing for the American colonists those admirable feats of diplomacy in the courts of Great Britain and France which commanded a respect for American characteristics that in later years we have come to refer to proudly as "American institutions."

It would be idle, however, in the few minutes I am permitted to speak to attempt a eulogy, much less a review, of the life and works of Benjamin Franklin. I have in mind only to say that his mortal remains, now long since turned to dust, lie under a marble slab—provision for which was made by his own will—in old Christ Church burial ground at Fifth and Arch Streets, Philadelphia. It would not be fair to the American people of April 17, 1790, when Benjamin Franklin died, to say that they

did not mourn his loss, for they did. He had asked for a plain funeral, and had designated the maker of the stone and the inscription that should go upon it to mark the last resting place of his wife Deborah and himself; but the people of Philadelphia and such distinguished visitors as could appear at the obsequies turned out in goodly numbers and with much formality to honor the man whom they had come to respect and admire. The greatness of Franklin as a world figure, however, had not then fully dawned upon them. It was perhaps more in the Old World, notably in France, that Franklin's fame was heralded, even as one who had brought a new light into the world. In England he was not only famous, but, if the stories of the suppression of the manuscript of his autobiography, even as Jefferson has referred to it, be true, he was also feared. He had delivered his message to the world, and that message, although not fully printed or understood until long years after his death, left no doubt as to its meaning or of the world influence of the new Republic in the Western Hemisphere.

But now, Mr. Speaker, a full century and sixteen years having elapsed since the mortal life of Franklin was extinguished, we find in every avenue of thought and activity the light of his philosophy, his truth, and his inventions illuminating the world. The greatness of the individual has been recognized in consequences and effects more durable and more beneficent than even the author of them could have ever hoped for. And yet whether it be due to the ingratitude of succeeding generations or, as is more likely, to their thoughtlessness in the press of the activities generated in the philosophy and thought of Franklin there has been no National, State, nor local memorial erected over his last resting place. There under the stone for which he personally made provision, hemmed in by the towering walls of business structures in the heart of the great city, he lies. Across the street is the identical house in which the American flag was first woven into its present form by the deft fingers of Betsy Ross. Within rifle shot is the scene of his courtship and the incident of the penny loaves to which history refers. The scene of his kite-flying, through which he drew electricity from the clouds, is equally near. The home of the American Philosophical Society, of which he was the president, stands intact two blocks away. And there, also, is Independence Hall, in which he signed the Declaration of Independence and in which he labored, as no other man, to perfect in the Constitution of the United States those provisions which gave us a bicameral form of government.

The sites of the homes of Washington and Morris, his great contemporaries in the establishment of the Union of States, are easily traced a short distance from his grave, and Christ Church, in which Washington and the signers of the Declaration of Independence worshiped and by whose walls some of them lie buried, is still breathing forth its message of hope and sympathy to a religious community. Indeed, in the immediate environment of Franklin's grave, with its fast deteriorating cover of stone, paid for by his own estate, historic landmarks and memories cluster in profuse array.

If at last, Mr. Speaker, we have come to recognize that which was truly great in the wonderful Franklin is it not time, for the sake of his teachings and the influence of his philosophy upon the present generation and of the generations to come, that we celebrate in some national way the worth and the patriotism of this many-sided American? [Applause.]

In the city of Philadelphia he is not forgotten. There are memorials yonder which do honor to his name. On this the anniversary of his birth, the Poor Richard Club, which is now looking forward to a convention of the advertising clubs of the world who honor Franklin as the patron of "The Art Preservative," will lay a chaplet on his grave. Elsewhere in the great City of Brotherly Love tributes will be paid to his memory, notably at the University of Pennsylvania, which owes to him its origin.

But it is not alone for a city or a State to honor Franklin; it should be the grateful task of a Nation the honor and integrity of which he successfully sustained in the courts of the world. [Applause.]

Putting on a practical basis the suggestion just made for a national recognition of Franklin in some such memorial as will signalize the pride of the Nation in his character, I have introduced a bill to which the attention of Congress and the Nation is respectfully invited.

I see by the clock, Mr. Speaker, that a few minutes yet remain of the time kindly allotted to me by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and in that brief period I wish to read one or two extracts from the autobiography of Benjamin Franklin which was not published until many years after his death. These extracts will show but feebly the many sides of this truly wonderful man, but they will assure us something of the intense humanity that dominated his every action, not only in things which were political or in the line of statesmanship but in those which pertained to the elevation of mankind generally.

I had, on the whole, abundant reason—

Says Benjamin Franklin—

to be satisfied with my being established in Pennsylvania.

I call attention to this brief specimen of beautiful English, a style that was used by many of the founders of the Republic, and which to a large extent, due to our modern interest and our desire to hit the bull's-eye quicker than our forefathers did, has passed away:

There were, however, two things that I regretted, there being no provision for defense nor for a complete education of youth; no militia, nor any college. I therefore, in 1743, drew up a proposal for establishing an academy; and at that time, thinking the Reverend Mr. Peters, who was out of employ, a fit person to superintendent such an institution, I communicated the project to him; but he, having more profitable views in the service of the proprietaries, which succeeded, declin'd the undertaking; and, not knowing another at that time suitable for such a trust, I let the scheme lie a while dormant. I succeeded better the next year, 1744, in proposing and establishing a Philosophical Society. The paper I wrote for that purpose will be found among my writings when collected.

With respect to defense, Spain having been several years at war against Great Britain, and being at length join'd by France, which brought us into great danger; and the laboured and long-continued endeavour of our governor, Thomas, to prevail with our Quaker Assembly to pass a militia law, and make other provisions for the security of the Province, having proved abortive, I determined to try what might be done by a voluntary association of the people. To promote this, I first wrote and published a pamphlet entitled "Plain Truth," in which I stated our defenseless situation in strong lights, with the necessity of union and discipline for our defense, and promis'd to propose in a few days an association, to be generally signed for that purpose. The pamphlet had a sudden and surprising effect. I was call'd upon for the instrument of association, and having settled the draft of it with a few friends, I appointed a meeting of the citizens in the large building before mentioned. The house was pretty full; I had prepared a number of printed copies, and provided pens and ink dispers'd all over the room. I harangued them a little on the subject, read the paper, and explained it, and then distributed the copies, which were eagerly signed, not the least objection being made.

When the company separated and the papers were collected we found above twelve hundred hands; and, other copies being dispersed in the country, the subscribers amounted at length to upward of ten thousand. These all furnished themselves as soon as they could with arms, formed themselves into companies and regiments, chose their own officers, and met every week to be instructed in the manual exercise and other parts of military discipline. The women, by subscriptions among themselves, provided silk colors, which they presented to the companies, painted with different devices and mottos, which I supplied.

The officers of the companies composing the Philadelphia regiment, being met, chose me for their colonel; but, conceiving myself unfit, I declin'd that station and recommended Mr. Lawrence, a fine person, a man of influence, who was accordingly appointed. I then propos'd a lottery to defray the expense of building a battery below the town and furnishing it with cannon. It filled expeditiously and the battery was soon erected, the merlons being fram'd of logs and fill'd with earth. We bought some old cannon from Boston, but, these not being sufficient, we wrote to England for more, soliciting, at the same time, our proprietaries for some assistance, tho' without much expectation of obtaining it.

Meanwhile Colonel Lawrence, William Allen, Abram Taylor, Esqr., and myself were sent to New York by the associators, commission'd to borrow some cannon of Governor Clinton. He at first refus'd us peremptorily; but at dinner with his council, where there was great drinking of Madeira wine, as the custom of that place then was, he softened by degrees and said he would lend us six. After a few more bumpers he advanc'd to ten, and at length he very good-naturedly conceded eighteen. They were fine cannon, eighteen-pounders, with their carriages, which we soon transported and mounted on our battery, where the associators kept a nightly guard while the war lasted, and among the rest I regularly took my turn of duty there as a common soldier.

There is much more of this to show that they were as intensely human in those days as we are to-day, but that they were even a little more frank about it. [Laughter.]

But having referred to the activities of the Poor Richard Club in celebrating Franklin's birthday, and on this day laying a memorial on his grave, I wish to quote just a few words that Franklin himself said about his creation of the character of Poor Richard:

In 1732 I first publish'd my Almanack, under the name of Richard Saunders; it was continu'd by me about twenty-five years, commonly call'd Poor Richard's Almanack. I endeavor'd to make it both entertaining and useful, and it accordingly came to be in such demand that I reap'd considerable profit from it, vending annually near ten thousand. And observing that it was generally read, scarce any neighborhood in the Province being without it, I consider'd it as a proper vehicle for conveying instruction among the common people, who bought scarcely any other books. I therefore filled all the little spaces that occurred between the remarkable days in the calendar with proverbial sentences, chiefly such as inculcated industry and frugality, as the means of procuring wealth, and thereby securing virtue, it being more difficult for a man in want to act always honestly as, to use here one of these proverbs, It is hard for an empty sack to stand upright.

These proverbs, which contain the wisdom of many ages and nations, I assembled and formed into a connected discourse, prefix'd to the Almanack of 1757, as the harangue of a wise old man to the people attending an auction. The bringing all these scattered counsels thus into a focus enabled them to make greater impression. The piece, being universally approved, was copied in all the newspapers of the continent, reprinted in Britain on a broadside, to be stuck up in houses; two translations were made of it in French, and great numbers bought by the clergy and gentry to distribute gratis among their

poor parishioners and tenants. In Pennsylvania, as it discouraged useless expense in foreign superfluities, some thought it had its share of influence in producing that growing plenty of money which was observable for several years after its publication.

And just here, before closing, Mr. Speaker, it is fair to say that previous to his success in publishing the sayings of Poor Richard, this sturdy American, who attained so great a celebrity as to win the attention of the nations, was as modestly human as the rest of us, as indicated in a humorous prologue to his almanac, published along with the first issue in 1733:

The plain truth of the matter is—

He wrote—

I am excessive poor, and my wife, good woman, is, I tell her, excessive proud; she can not bear, she says, to sit spinning in her shift of tow while I do nothing but gaze at the stars, and has threatened more than once to burn all my books and rattling traps (as she calls my instruments) if I do not make some profitable use of them for my family. The printer has offered me some considerable share of the profits, and I have thus begun to comply with my dame's desire.

So the lady of the house was as much in evidence then as she is now, and in the matter of fashions was impelled by motives of style and taste somewhat similar in degree to those that prevail to-day, and the great Franklin, diplomat and philosopher that he was, was generous enough to admit, like any other good husband who wished to keep up with the times, that he actually "needed the money." [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] is recognized.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to use any more time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill H. R. 3954, with amendments.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

DUPLICATE CHECKS OR WARRANTS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 3636) to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as reenacted and amended by act of February 23, 1909.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3636) to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as reenacted and amended by act of February 23, 1909.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3646 of the Revised Statutes be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3646. That whenever any original check is lost, stolen, or destroyed disbursing officers and agents of the United States are authorized, within three years from the date of such check, to issue a duplicate check, under such regulations in regard to its issue and payment, and upon the execution of such bond, with sureties, to indemnify the United States, and proof of loss of original check, as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That whenever any original check or warrant of the Post Office Department has been lost, stolen, or destroyed the Postmaster General may authorize the issuance of a duplicate thereof, at any time within three years from the date of such original check or warrant, upon the execution by the owner thereof of such bond of indemnity as the Postmaster General may prescribe: *Provided further*, That when such original check or warrant does not exceed in amount the sum of $50 and the payee or owner is, at the date of the application, an officer or employee in the service of the Post Office Department, whether by contract, designation, or appointment, the Postmaster General may, in lieu of an indemnity bond, authorize the issuance of a duplicate check or warrant upon such an affidavit as he may prescribe, to be made before any postmaster by the payee or owner of an original check or warrant."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. LINDBERGH. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Is this bill intended to apply to some particular persons, or is it a bill that applies to conditions generally? It has reference to a good many cases, has it not?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I will say that this bill is a matter of general legislation. In order to explain the general purposes of it, I will say that the people who at the present time I have chiefly in mind are pensioners. In case a pension voucher is lost, either with or without the fault of the pensioner, the Treasury Department can not, without such an authority as this, if the amount is over $50, issue a duplicate within six months. At the present time with these old men six months is a long period. Hence I introduced the bill in order to reach that class. When it was submitted to the Pension Office it was approved, and when submitted to the Treasury Department they suggested a different draft of the bill, in which the Treasury Department is given authority to prescribe regulations such as it deems best, covering all the vouchers of the Treasury Department; and that is the bill that is here pending. It has the approval of that department as well as of the Pension Office. It passed this House in the last Congress, but in the crush of business in the Senate at the close of the session it did not receive action.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 19, on page 2, insert the following:

"*Provided further*, That disbursing officers and agents of the United States are authorized and directed, in the settlement of pensions, to make a monthly payment to all persons borne upon the rolls who can furnish satisfactory proof that they are without an income exceeding $500 over and above the pension now paid to them."

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I make a point of order on that. I do not think it is germane to the bill pending.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. FRANCIS RIVER, MO. AND ARK.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 4716) to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across St. Francis River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at a place known as Browns Ferry, about 4 miles west of Holcomb, Dunklin County, State of Missouri, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "at," near the end of the line, insert the words "or near."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. FRANCIS RIVER, MO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 6448) to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across St. Francis River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the township line between townships 22 and 23, range 8 east, in Dunklin and Butler Counties, in the State of Missouri, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

SALARIES IN THE PATENT OFFICE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 900) amending sections 476, 477, and 440 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, pending a statement from the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. FITZGERALD. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 476 of the Revised Statutes be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 476. There shall be in the Patent Office a Commissioner of Patents, one first assistant commissioner, one assistant commissioner, and five examiners in chief, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The first assistant commissioner and the assistant commissioner shall perform such duties pertaining to the office of commissioner as may be assigned to them, respec-

tively, from time to time by the Commissioner of Patents. All other officers, clerks, and employees authorized by law for the office shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior upon the nomination of the Commissioner of Patents, in accordance with existing law."

SEC. 2. That section 477 of the Revised Statutes be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 477. The salaries of the officers mentioned in the preceding section shall be as follows:

"The Commissioner of Patents, $5,000 a year.
"The First Assistant Commissioners of Patents, $4,500 a year.
"The Assistant Commissioner of Patents, $3,500 a year.
"Five examiners in chief, $3,500 a year each."

SEC. 3. That so much of section 440 of the Revised Statutes as follows the words "In the Patent Office," and refers to said office only, be amended to read as follows:

"One chief clerk, who shall be qualified to act as a principal examiner.
"One librarian, who shall be qualified to act as an assistant examiner.
"Five law examiners.
"One examiner of classification.
"One examiner of interferences.
"One examiner of trade-marks and designs.
"One first assistant examiner of trade-marks and designs.
"Six assistant examiners of trade-marks and designs.
"Forty-three principal examiners.
"Eighty-six first assistant examiners.
"Eighty-six second assistant examiners.
"Eighty-six third assistant examiners.
"Eighty-six fourth assistant examiners; and such other examiners and assistant examiners in the various grades as the Congress shall from time to time provide for."

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I object, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe that this bill should be passed by unanimous consent at this time.

Mr. MANN. May I say to the gentleman from New York that this bill was passed in the last House, I think, by unanimous consent, after it had been amended? I think it was amended somewhat to conform to the views of the gentleman from New York. I am not interested in the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MORRISON] to have the bill passed over, so that it can come up on the next unanimous-consent day. My purpose in doing so is this: The preparation of the legislative bill has just commenced. The gentleman in charge of the bill wanted to have an opportunity to go into this question with the Commissioner of Patents. The bill involves providing additional assistants in the Patent Office. After the examination it may be that the gentlemen may get together.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman had better ask to have it passed over. This bill was agreed upon by everybody in the last Congress and passed both Houses.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know; but bills that pass by unanimous consent do not always have very much substantial argument from that fact in their favor.

Mr. MANN. This was not passed the first time it came up by unanimous consent, by a long shot.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it should be passed over temporarily.

Mr. MORRISON. I have no objection to its being passed over temporarily, provided that it can be called up later during the day.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no. I object to its being brought up to-day. Let it go over and reserve its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] objects, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE TUG FORK OF THE BIG SANDY RIVER, KY.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 306) granting the consent of Congress to William H. Preece, of Inez, Ky., to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River, Ky., at or near Warfield, Ky.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to William H. Preece, of Inez, Ky., and his successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Warfield, Ky., in the County of Martin, in the State of Kentucky, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I object to that. This bill seems to be a purely private bill, and I object to it for the same reason that I objected to the others.

The SPEAKER. It is a bridge bill.

Mr. LINDBERGH. It is a private bill, and I object.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 1773, a bill of like import to the one just read, and substitute it for the House bill, and amend the Senate bill by inserting the words "Warfield, Kentucky, and" in line 9, page 1, after the word "near," and that the title be amended accordingly. I move that we pass the Senate bill as amended and that the House bill lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] moves to suspend the rules and take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1773, and pass the same with an amendment, which the Clerk will read into it. The Clerk will read the entire bill, with the amendment in.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH] makes the point that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-nine Members are present—not a quorum.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does the vote on this call of the House include a vote on my motion?

The SPEAKER. No; this is simply a roll call.

Mr. LANGLEY. I did not quite understand whether we had gone far enough to include a vote on my motion in this call or not.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adamson	Dyer	Igoe	Paige, Mass.
Allen	Fairchild	Jones	Parker, N. Y.
Bacharach	Farley	Keister	Patten
Barchfeld	Fields	Kent	Platt
Beales	Finley	Key, Ohio	Porter
Bennet	Flynn	Kiess, Pa.	Pratt
Brown, W. Va.	Focht	Kitchin	Rauch
Bruckner	Frear	Kreider	Reilly
Brumbaugh	Gallagher	Lafean	Riordan
Caldwell	Gallivan	Lieb	Rowland
Carew	Gardner	Linthicum	Sabath
Casey	Garland	Loft	Scott, Pa.
Chandler, N. Y.	Glass	Longworth	Scully
Chiperfield	Graham	Loud	Sells
Coady	Gray, Ala.	McLemore	Siegel
Cullop	Gray, N. J.	Magee	Slemp
Dale, N. Y.	Gregg	Maher	Snell
Darrow	Guernsey	Mays	Snyder
Davenport	Hamill	Meeker	Sparkman
Dempsey	Hamilton, N. Y.	Miller, Pa.	Stout
Denison	Haskell	Mondell	Sumners
Dies	Haugen	Mooney	Tague
Dill	Hill	Morgan, La.	Treadway
Dooling	Hilliard	Moss, W. Va.	Vare
Doremus	Holland	Mott	Ward
Drukker	Howell	Mudd	Whaley
Dunn	Hulbert	Nolan	Winslow
Dupré	Hutchinson	Olney	Wise

The SPEAKER. On this call 319 Members—a quorum—have answered to their names.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors, a quorum being present. The Clerk will report the bill and read into it the amendments.

The bill (S. 1773) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Warfield, Ky., and Kermit, W. Va., was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That W. H. Preece and associates (or the Interstate Bridge Co., a corporation organized under the laws of Kentucky), their (or its) successors and assigns, are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near Warfield, Ky., and Kermit, W. Va., in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 23, 1906, entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters."

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH] demands a second, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH] has 20 minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual form of bill granting authority for the construction of a bridge across an interstate stream. Gentlemen of the House understand, I take

it, all about the proposition, so that it is not necessary for me to debate it, and I shall not occupy the time to which I am entitled under the rules unless some one else desires to be heard or to interrogate me regarding it. My bill, which has been unanimously reported by the committee and is now on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, was introduced for the purpose of getting authority for some constituents of mine, who are gentlemen of high standing and entirely responsible, to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River. The Senate bill is of slightly different phraseology but its purpose is the same, and in order to expedite the matter I have made the motion to substitute the Senate bill for mine. There is a great deal of development going on along the Tug River, and the point at which it is desired to construct this bridge is becoming quite an important commercial community. The river there is not fordable during a large part of the year, so that a bridge is badly needed. The Senate bill does not describe the location of what I regard as the more important end of the proposed bridge—the Kentucky end—which is to be at or near Warfield, Ky., and the amendment which I have offered is to accomplish that.

I have no desire to take the time of the House myself, but I desire to assure Members that it is a meritorious bill in every respect and I hope it will pass. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LANGLEY. I have yielded to the gentleman from Minnesota, but I will yield later to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LINDBERGH. What does the gentleman mean by this language?—

At a point suitable to the interest of navigation.

Is this bridge in aid of navigation?

Mr. LANGLEY. No; that is the language that is usually put in such bills. It means that the bridge must be constructed subject to the regulations of the War Department, the Tug River being a navigable stream.

Mr. LINDBERGH. What is the bridge to be used for?

Mr. LANGLEY. A highway bridge for ordinary traffic.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Is it to be a toll bridge?

Mr. LANGLEY. I assume that it will be a toll bridge, although I have not been specifically advised as to that. A private corporation is being organized to build it, and, of course, it must be their purpose to make it a toll bridge, unless the local county authorities should decide to purchase it and make it a free bridge, which is sometimes done. However, I know nothing personally about that phase of the matter. I simply know that a bridge is needed there, and I am trying to help pave the way for it.

Mr. LINDBERGH. That is all I wish to ask the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the House whether there is any opposition to this bill in the locality?

Mr. LANGLEY. Oh, none whatever that I have heard of. The bill has been pending for nearly a month and a half. I introduced it the first day of the session, and I have not been advised of the slightest opposition.

I will say further to the gentleman, repeating myself somewhat, that the junior Senator from Kentucky introduced the bill in the Senate and it has passed that body. I introduced a similar bill in the House, which has been unanimously reported by the House committee and is on the calendar. In order to expedite the matter I am asking that the Senate bill be passed and that my bill be laid on the table. That is all the explanation I desire to make.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules, taking this bill from the Speaker's table, and passing it with the amendments which have been read into it.

The question being taken and two-thirds voting in the affirmative, the rules were suspended and the bill passed.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, does that action include amending the title, as suggested by me?

The SPEAKER. The amendment to the title was included in the title as read.

RURAL POST ROADS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall in certain cases aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I had that bill put on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent some days ago, but since that time a different arrangement has been made, and I will ask that it be passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks to pass the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. That it be stricken off this calendar.

Mr. MANN. I object. That will strike it off the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and that takes it off the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

FISH HATCHERY IN OKLAHOMA.

The next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 403) granting to the State of Oklahoma permission to occupy a certain portion of the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla., and to maintain and operate thereon a fish hatchery.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of Oklahoma is hereby granted permission to enter upon and occupy, for the purpose of operating and maintaining thereon a fish hatchery for the propagation of fish for public distribution to the people of said State, and in pursuance thereof to construct ponds, drain the land, plant grass, shrubbery and trees, and otherwise improve and beautify the area to be occupied, the following-described tract of land within the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla., viz.: All that portion of said reservation lying and being within the boundary lines described as beginning at the northeast corner of section 19 in township 3 north, range 12 west, Indian meridian, and extending thence west along the section line a distance of 1,820 feet to a point in the center of Medicine Bluff Creek; thence in a southeasterly direction, following the center line of Medicine Bluff Creek, to a point 200 feet west of the east line and 1,700 feet south of the north line of said section 19; thence 200 feet east of the section line between said section 19 and section 20; thence north on the section line between said sections 19 and 20 a distance of 1,700 feet to the point of beginning, said tract containing an area of 39.5 acres more or less: *Provided*, That the occupation and use of the said land for the aforesaid purpose shall in no manner affect the rights, title, and interest of the United States in and to said lands; nor the Government's rights of passage over and across the lands so occupied: *Provided further*, That the United States shall not be liable for any damages whatsoever that may at any time occur to the improvements of the State of Oklahoma on said lands: *And provided further*, That the exercise of the rights hereby granted and the execution of any work on said lands hereby authorized shall be in accordance with such plans and specifications as may be approved by the Secretary of War and subject to such further stipulations and conditions as he may prescribe.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to the present consideration of this bill, though it is not on the call for to-day. I think it ought to be understood that hereafter the rule in reference to three days on the calendar will, in the main, be enforced.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; but I hope the gentleman will not object to this.

Mr. MANN. I say I shall not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following committee amendment was read:

Page 3, line 3, after the word "prescribe," insert the following:

"*Provided further*, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to revoke the permission herein granted, if in his judgment it is necessary for the use of such military reservation by the War Department."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent to consider it in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to have the gentleman make a brief statement of the bill, so that Members of the House may know what it provides.

Mr. FERRIS. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. MANN. That instead of asking the Government of the United States to maintain a fish hatchery in Oklahoma, as other States have asked the Government to maintain hatcheries within their boundaries, what this bill does is to grant permission to the State of Oklahoma to maintain a hatchery at State expense; an example which other States might well follow.

For several years my district has insisted on my getting a fish hatchery from the Government, but I have never been able to do so. Last year the State appropriated $25,000 and built a fish hatchery, and now they want a little corner of this 56,000-acre military reservation to put a few ponds on, and we ask a revocable permit from the Government to establish on that little corner of this reserve, 7 or 8 miles away, these little ponds.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. I am in harmony with the gentleman's bill, but Oklahoma is not the only State that seeks this privilege.

In fact, many States have already exercised it, and I want to say that Illinois does more work in the line of fish hatching for the streams of Illinois than does the Federal Government.

Mr. FERRIS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. It affords me some gratification, because I was afraid I was alone in failing to secure a Federal appropriation for that purpose.

The War Department drew this bill, and recommends that the bill pass. It only seeks to occupy a remote corner of this large reservation. It is a revocable permit, so that the Government can retake it at any time it sees fit.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What committee reported the bill?

Mr. FERRIS. The Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I want to say that I have had a bill before Congress for some time for a fish hatchery in Texas, but I have not yet been able to secure it. We have only one fish hatchery in the State of Texas, and that is 500 miles from where I live. I hope that we shall soon get a report on that bill.

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman a military reservation in his district?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS TUG FORK, BIG SANDY RIVER.

The SPEAKER. The bill (S. 1773) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River, and so forth, was a Senate bill. The bill H. R. 306, of the same tenor, without objection, will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent will be passed, as it has not been on the calendar the requisite three days. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] is recognized for one hour under a special order.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 11 years I have been a Member of this House and for a goodly portion of that time I have been a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I have served one term as the chairman of that committee and have just entered upon my second term as chairman of that committee.

Mr. Speaker, believing that my experience upon the committee mentioned justifies me, I desire to submit a few remarks to the House and the country on the public-building operations of the United States. It seems to me that the many articles which have appeared in the public press of the country during the past three or four years condemning the committee and holding up the Congress itself to public scorn and ridicule for alleged indulgence in "pork-barrel" legislation demand from some one a plain, simple statement of the real facts, if nothing more.

The storm of ridicule and abuse of the committee and of Congress for what has been designated "pork-barrel" legislation was brought into being by certain sensational metropolitan newspapers and safron-colored magazines and has been so assiduously nurtured by the same agencies that the general public has begun to believe that the chief occupation of the average Member of Congress is the plundering of the Public Treasury for the sole benefit of his particular district. In fact, it has been made to appear that public-building bills have been framed with no regard whatever to the needs of the public service, without reference to the public revenues, with entire disregard of all economic administration, and have been constructed solely upon the idea of giving to every Member of Congress and Senator a slice of the pie.

If these things are true, if Members of Congress are actuated in their legislative conduct by no higher motive than to grab from the Public Treasury all they can get for their own districts, regardless of the merits of the particular proposition, then they are unworthy to be here and should be mercilessly driven by an indignant people from the high places which they dishonor. But, Mr. Speaker, my 11 years of service in this House, my knowledge of its membership during all those years, my close association with the rank and file of this great body, and my fixed, immovable confidence in the integrity of the American House of Representatives all give the lie to these villainous insinuations. [Applause.]

During my humble service here I have seen many men come and go. Some have voluntarily retired from the service, either to private life or to enter upon the duties of some other station; some have gone down in defeat while seeking reelection; and some, answering the last call, "have crossed over the river and now rest under the shade of the trees." Looking back over the Congresses in which I have been permitted to serve, I can truthfully proclaim that nowhere upon the earth can a more upright, honorable, and patriotic body of men be found than is the American House of Representatives. [Applause.] We may and do differ as to the means of reaching the end, but I do believe that in the heart of every Member upon this floor, and uppermost in that heart, is a sincere and honest desire to reach that end which will best conduce to the honor and glory of the United States. We who are native born love the States from which we hail; those of us who were born on foreign shores love the fatherland; but over and above all we love this glorious Republic, an indissoluble Union of indestructible States, over which floats Old Glory, proud emblem of liberty now and forevermore. [Applause.]

Men representing a Government like this, in a country like this, can not be guilty of the petty pilfering laid at our door by these sensational yellow publications, and this I intend to demonstrate in words and figures so plain that "a wayfaring man, though a fool he be, need not err therein." In the first place, Mr. Speaker, let me say that no politics has ever entered into the deliberations of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. It has been a strictly nonpartisan committee, both under Republican and Democratic control. The question of a Member's party affiliation has never been considered in passing on a bill; the merit of the proposition itself was the only thing in each case to which the committee gave thought. No one has ever attempted to make of this a partisan committee, and therefore I was pained a few months ago when a distinguished Republican of the State of Massachusetts, well known to all of us, in an attack on the present Democratic administration, made the astounding statement that if the Democrats would quit squandering so much money on magnificent public buildings in small towns in the South that there would be plenty of money for the legitimate purposes of the Government. I shall not retort by saying that Republican Congresses "squandered" money in public buildings—on the contrary, I expect to show that no Congress, Republican or Democratic, has "squandered" money on public buildings—but I will remind this distinguished gentleman of the fact that the Democrats have not yet passed an omnibus public-building bill, and therefore could not have "squandered" any money on "magnificent public buildings in small towns in the South." The last omnibus public-building bill passed by Congress was approved by President Taft on March 4, 1913, and at that time we had a Republican Senate and a Democratic House. We have had no general public-building bill since the Democrats have been in control of Congress and the Presidency, and, therefore, if there has been any squandering of the public funds on account of public-building legislation it can not be charged to the Democratic Party.

But let us see what the facts are. I intend to appeal from the reckless, sensational statements made by the yellow press, and gleefully repeated by a few alleged statesmen industriously trying to hold onto their jobs by posing as watchdogs of the Treasury in their attacks on public improvements, congressional mileage, a superfluity of janitors, and other like weighty questions of statecraft, to the actual record. [Laughter and applause.]

Congress has been viciously assailed for wasteful extravagance in the matter of the provision for and the construction of public buildings throughout the country. The bills coming from this committee have been referred to as "pork-barrel" bills, and the public has been deceived into believing that in the construction of these general bills it has simply been a matter of "you tickle me and I'll tickle you," without any regard to the merits of the proposition or the needs of the public service whatsoever. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I deny that there has been any appreciable waste of the public money in public-building construction; and, in the second place, I assert without the slightest fear of successful contradiction that if there has been any waste of public money in Federal-building construction, the responsibility therefor can not be laid at the door of Congress. I shall address myself to the latter proposition first, and will recur to the former later on in my remarks. In order to convince the House and the country that Congress is not responsible for any waste of public funds in Federal-building construction, I have only to refer to the law itself. Let it be understood that Congress does not construct public buildings. All we can do is to authorize their construction and furnish the means therefor. Some other governmental agency must attend to the actual construction of the buildings, and Congress, by solemn enactment, has charged the Treasury Department with this duty. In the very nature of things it is utterly impossible

for Congress to determine to the dollar what a public building for each and every city and town in the United States should cost, and therefore a measure of discretion had to be lodged in the executive department charged with their construction.

This being the case, Congress in every item of every general public-building bill has left the cost in the discretion of the Treasury Department. We have never enacted that a specific sum of money should be expended in the construction of a Government building at a particular place, but in each and every case we have fixed the maximum of cost beyond which the Treasury Department could not go. For instance, where we provided for a building at a given place with an authorization of $100,000 we have always expressly fixed that amount as the "limit of cost," and if in such case the department, in its discretion, felt that a $50,000 building would answer the purpose, there has never been anything to hinder the construction of a cheaper building. If, therefore, magnificent, monumental buildings have been constructed in one-horse, crossroads towns, where the business of the Government did not demand it, and thereby the money of the people has been needlessly wasted, the fault lies at the door of the Treasury Department and is not chargeable to us. "Thou can'st not shake thy gory head at us and say, Thou did'st it."

The last public-building bill passed by Congress was approved March 4, 1913, when we had a Democratic House and a Republican President and Senate. The next preceding omnibus public-building bill was approved June 25, 1910, at which time the House, Senate, and President were all Republican. The next preceding general omnibus public-building bill was approved on May 30, 1908, at which time the House, Senate, and President were all Republican. These three bills carried an aggregate authorization in round numbers of some $104,000,000, or an average of about $13,000,000 per annum. From the year 1908, when the first of these omnibus public-building bills was passed, until the present time Congress has passed a number of individual public-building bills; that is to say, bills providing for buildings at particular places. These individual and separate items have amounted in round numbers to some $13,000,000. Upon a calculation it will be shown that about half of the $117,000,000 which has been authorized within the last eight years has been authorized to be expended in cities of 25,000 population and over, and the remaining half has been authorized to be expended in cities under 25,000 population. Adding these miscellaneous and separate acts to the three omnibus bills, it will show an authorization of something over $14,000,000 during the past eight years for public building construction in the United States annually. Thus it will be seen, Mr. Speaker, that practically half of all the money authorized by us in the construction of public buildings in this country for the past eight years has gone to cities of 25,000 and over, while the rural communities, which I venture to say, if it could be correctly arrived at, pay into the Treasury much more than half the taxes of the country, have received the other half. If this calculation should be made upon the basis of cities and towns with more than 10,000 population and those with a population under that figure, it would be found, in my judgment, that the cities of more than 10,000 population have received a much larger proportion of these funds than they are entitled to if measured by the amount paid into the Treasury in the way of taxes. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the Congress has not dealt unjustly, but, on the other hand, has dealt in a very liberal way with the large cities of the country. But, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the facts as disclosed by the record, a certain element of the metropolitan press and a certain class of magazines denounce us as "pork-barrel devotees" or "looters of the Treasury" every time we propose to construct a modest public building in a live, progressive, wide-awake town in the rural districts, but when we propose to expend millions for the erection of a marble palace in one of the great cities of the country we are pictured as broad-minded, progressive, and patriotic statesmen. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department is about five years behind in its work, and there is not the slightest prospect under existing methods of ever catching up. There are to my mind two reasons why that bureau or branch of the service is so far behind. One reason is the fact that some years ago the then Secretary of the Treasury, without authority of law, issued orders to his subordinates that they were only to construct in one year 25 per cent of the buildings provided for in a general public-building bill but recently passed. Thus it will be seen that with one stroke of the pen and in utter contempt for the will of Congress these buildings were thrown three years behind. I want to say right here that this practice of executive departments issuing orders which practically have the effect of nullifying acts of Congress has grown to such proportions and has been so long and persistently practiced until the departmental veto has come to be recognized as a legitimate governmental function. Congress is no longer the supreme power in matters of legislation. We, the chosen representatives of the people, selected by popular vote every two years, charged with the duty of writing into the law of the land the will of the sovereign citizenship of the Republic, sit supinely by while mere appointees of the Executive set aside and declare null and void our most solemn enactments. We have tamely submitted to Executive encroachments for so long, we have for so many years given the world such an example of spineless statesmanship, and have with such unconcerned complacency witnessed the Executive appropriation of practically all our prerogatives that even the janitors and messengers of executive departments no longer have respect for the House of Representatives, but instead appear to have a pitying contempt for what they regard as a harmless aggregation of legislative mollycoddles. [Laughter and applause.] How long shall this condition continue? Shall we assert ourselves and again become the vigorous, virile, powerful legislative force which we once were and which it was intended by the fathers of the Republic we should be, or shall we continue to drag out the miserable existence of a dwarfish, misshapen legislative eunuch? [Laughter and applause.] It is up to us, my friends. Which road shall we travel?

Mr. Speaker, I think we will all agree that from every viewpoint it is desirable to have the Supervising Architect's Office keep abreast of the building operations of the Government. It is neither in the interest of economy nor is it in the interest of good administration to have this or any other branch of the public service five or six years behind in its work. It is better in governmental affairs, as it is better in individual affairs, to drive your work rather than have your work drive you. If it is conceded that it is desirable to catch up and keep up with this important work of the Government, the question How can it be done? naturally arises. Mr. Speaker, I have given a good deal of thought to this question, and I believe that two things are absolutely necessary to be done in order to accomplish the desired result.

First. I believe it is absolutely necessary to reorganize the Office of the Supervising Architect, and place at the head of it a first-class architect who is also a practical, common-sense man of good executive ability. I admit that this combination is hard to find, as most good architects are, as a rule, impractical, visionary dreamers; but there are some who measure up to the requirement, and I have in mind now a gentleman who, in my judgment, will fully meet the requirements in this particular case.

Second. Standardization of buildings wherever possible. This question of standardizing has been much discussed, and most of the architects are opposed to the idea. But, Mr. Speaker, it requires no technical architectural knowledge to know that the plan is entirely feasible. [Applause.] It is not only feasible, but good business judgment demands it as a saver of both time and money in public-building construction.

I am fully aware that both climate and the topography of the country are to be considered, but from the first floor up a standard type can be used no matter what "the lay of the land" or climatic conditions may be. But, Mr. Speaker, my plan of standardization would be to divide the States of the Union into groups with particular reference to climate and topography, and then divide the cities and towns of each group into classes. For instance, I would form one group of the New England States, which for my present purposes I shall call "Group A." I would then take all the towns or cities in group A where the annual postal receipts were from ten to twenty-five thousand dollars and I would designate this as "class 1." I would then have the Supervising Architect draft plans and specifications for a post-office building for a town in class 1 of group A, and these plans and specifications would answer for every town of this class and group. It is absolutely nonsensical to tell me that a post-office building suitable for a certain-sized town in New Hampshire would not be equally suitable for the same-sized town in Rhode Island, or that a post-office building for a certain-sized town in Mississippi would not be equally suitable for a town of like size in Louisiana. A plan of this kind would save to the Government annually a large sum in the drafting of new plans, to say nothing of the immense saving in the matter of time.

In addition to the saving in the drafting of plans and time standardization would result in a tremendous saving in the cost of construction, and would also result in the erection of a class of buildings much better suited to the purposes of the Government from the standpoint of utility than those we are now getting. Of course in advocating standardization I am

speaking with particular reference to those buildings which are to be used solely for post-office purposes.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Is the position of Supervising Architect of the Treasury still under the civil service?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; but it is vacant now.

Mr. KAHN. Before anybody could be appointed he would have to pass the civil-service examination and be near the top of the eligible list, would he not?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Under the present law; yes.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to say here that the post-office building of the future should be essentially a workshop. It should be constructed with a view to utility and comfort rather than with a view to outside architectural beauty. The truth of the whole business is that the waste and extravagance of the past is chargeable directly to the fact that the esthetic dreamers who have been in the Supervising Architect's Office have sacrificed the utility of the building and the comfort of the workers therein to the gimcracks and curly cues of architecture. [Laughter and applause.] Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that with a common-sense system of standardization and a competent, level-headed architect with executive ability in charge of the Supervising Architect's Office we can effect a saving of at least 40 per cent in the building operations of the Government, have more and better buildings, and catch up with the work in less than three years.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that we should not have an omnibus public-building bill at this session of Congress, and I have heard but two reasons given in support of that contention. I desire to say right here that so far as I am personally concerned it makes very little difference to me whether we have a bill or not. I have only one town in my district unprovided for which, under the rule, is entitled to a public building. That town is already provided with a site, and if we have a general bill I shall in all human probability simply ask for a building on the site already secured. It seems to me that under these conditions I should be acquitted of any selfish motive in what I am about to say.

The objections to the passage of an omnibus public-building bill are:

First. That the Supervising Architect is so far behind in his work that it is unnecessary and useless at this time to authorize any further construction.

Mr. Speaker, this is no excuse at all. We can reorganize that office and soon have its work abreast of the authorizations. There is no question of this; and, second, that we are short of funds and can not afford it just now. We can not afford it, we are told, because we will need all the money we can raise for "preparedness." Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of reasonable "preparedness," but if "preparedness" means stoppage of all progress, if it means that all the works of internal improvement must cease, then I am against "preparedness" "tooth and nail," "forever and a day." In this question of "preparedness" a great and unexpected emergency confronts the country. The expense incident to it ought not to be paid out of the current revenues of the Government. It is an unexpected and extraordinary expense to be incurred more for the protection of the future than for the safety of the present, and therefore the logical and proper way to meet it is by an issue of bonds, using the current revenues for the ordinary expenses of the Government, including river and harbor improvements and the construction, enlargement, and repair of public buildings.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that some of our friends who are so extremely anxious to meet the desire of the people for an economic administration of public affairs have entirely forgotten the meaning of economy. One of the great reasons, in my humble judgment, which moved the people to turn the Republicans out and put us in in 1912 was the desire of the people for greater economy in public affairs. But the people did not mean by that verdict that they wanted all river and harbor improvement and public-building construction to cease; they simply wanted us to give them the same things which they had been getting for less money than our Republican friends had been giving it to them for. A cessation of progress is not economy; it is simply stagnation and dry-rot. Any man can save money by cutting off one meal a day; but that is not economy—it is pure cussedness and niggardliness. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, a great hue and cry has been raised in some of the metropolitan newspapers and some of the magazines of the country over the construction of public buildings in some of the smaller cities and towns, particularly in the West and South. These publications have had so much to say about "pork," "spoils," "looting the Treasury," and so forth, that all public-building legislation has been brought into ill repute in the minds of a great many good people. I desire for a short time to discuss this feature of the public-building activities of the Government and answer, if I may be able, the indictment which has been drawn and filed against the manner in which the work has been carried on. Let me assert in the beginning that it is beneath the dignity of this great Republic to occupy the position of a tenant for quarters in which to conduct the public business. Mr. Speaker, when this great Republic was born among the nations of the earth it was never once thought by the great men who established it that government among men was to be a money-making institution. The patriots of those days expected, and rightly expected, that the people who were to inhabit this God-favored land would be willing to pay for Government protection of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." They never dreamed that in the years to come a class of alleged statesmen would be found upon this floor seriously debating the question as to whether a certain proposed legislative enactment would be remunerative to the Government or not; they never supposed that men deemed worthy to represent 200,000 free-born American citizens in this great body would be sent here to waste hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's money annually in a demagogic opéra bouffe effort to cut down the mileage of Members; they did not believe that the American public would ever reach that stage of avarice and venality where their only concern about proposed legislation was whether or not it would pay. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are intelligent, broad minded, and patriotic. They want the best, and they are willing to pay for it. It has been suggested, and in some quarters it is strongly insisted, that a public building should not be erected at any place where the rent is less than the interest on the cost of a building plus the upkeep charges. I take issue with this contention, and shall endeavor briefly to give some of the reasons which impel me to take this position. I freely concede that this question of financial profit or loss should be considered, but I do most emphatically deny that this should be the controlling factor. In determining whether the Government should construct and occupy its own building in a given town quite a number of matters should be taken into consideration.

First. The present and prospective importance of the town, with particular reference to the volume of public business transacted there, and the probability of its increase in the near future. We now have a statute in which Congress has declared that in those places where there is no Federal activity other than the post office no site can be purchased where the postal receipts do not amount to at least $7,000 and no building can be authorized where the postal receipts do not amount to at least $10,000 annually. This rule was written into the law of the land in the Sixty-second Congress after conference between the two Houses and mature deliberation. So that your committee, in determining whether a public building should be constructed at a given place, not only investigates the postal receipts for the past year, but looks into the receipts for several years past, examines into the growth in population, business, and so forth, in order to determine as to the stability of the town and the likelihood of the continuance of its growth.

Second. The amount of rent being paid by the Government, the character of building occupied, and its distance from the railroad station or stations or steamboat wharves.

Sometimes we find that the rent is merely nominal, with the object of having the post office located in a certain section of the town. Sometimes we find that while the Government is paying a very small rental the office is located in a veritable fire trap, which is not only dangerous but a positive disgrace to a great Government like ours. Very frequently we find that the post office is located more than 80 rods from the depot or wharf, which entails on the Government the additional cost of carrying the mails from the depot or wharf to the post office and from the post office to the depot or wharf.

Mr. Speaker, it is proper for me to state here that in all towns or cities where the post office is located within 80 rods of the depot or wharf to which mail is brought the railroad or steamboat company, as the case may be, is compelled under the law to deliver that mail at the post office, and I have in mind now one city in the United States where the Government is under contract to pay, and is paying, $200,000 per annum for the hauling of the mail to and fro between the post office and the railway stations. I want to say in this connection that in every case of a new building your committee is, and has been for some years past, trying to locate it within this 80-rod limit.

Third. Whether any Federal activities other than the post office are located at that particular place. We do this because sometimes we find, particularly in the South and West, small towns whose postal receipts do not quite reach the required

amount, but where, in addition to the post office, there is a Federal court, land office, or some other Federal activity which must be housed.

Fourth. The location of the town. That is to say, whether it is a railroad or mining center or the center of a vast territory, growing rapidly and with an unquestionable future.

These are some of the principal matters, Mr. Speaker, into which your committee makes inquiry in determining the location of a public building for the use of the Government.

I hold no brief for the committee in what I am about to say, but speaking for myself alone, and as an individual member of this great body, I want to say that there are some other considerations which move me and operate upon my mind when giving attention to the matter of constructing Federal buildings in the smaller cities and towns, and particularly those of the interior. The great rural population of this country constitutes the very "bone and sinew" of the land—the backbone of the Republic. If I had the time, I believe I could show that they pay the great bulk of the taxes necessary to support the Government in times of peace, and God knows that in times of war the American country boy follows Old Glory where "thickest falls the red rain of human slaughter." He sees very little of the blessings of government beyond the post office and the rural carrier, and if I had the power I would erect for every presidential post office throughout the broad domain of the Republic a Government building representative of the sovereignty and the glory of this great country. From Maine to California and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, in every town of sufficient importance to have the President name the postmaster, I would erect a suitable but not extravagant building, and from its apex the Stars and Stripes, proud emblem of the glory of the Republic, should forever wave an inspiration to the youth of the land. Suppose here and there it should be a little more expensive in dollars and cents to own a building than it is to rent. Is it worth nothing to inspire patriotism and love of country in the hearts and minds of the youth of the country? No youth or citizen ever looked upon a Federal building in which the business of his country was being conducted but that he became a better American. Mr. Speaker, I remember quite well when I gazed for the first time upon this imposing building. It was just about 39 years ago, when I was a boy, not quite 17 years of age, and came to Washington for the first time. I had started from my home down in Georgia for the great Northwest, there to carve out my fortune. Although it was out of my way, I decided to come by Washington and see the wonderful city of which I had heard so much. I looked upon it as the seat of government of a foreign people, and somehow when I crossed the Potomac felt that I was on hostile soil. But, Mr. Speaker, when I came up Pennsylvania Avenue, and standing at the foot of the hill looking up at this magnificent structure, surmounting the dome of which stood a figure of the Goddess of Liberty; when I recalled the seven-years' struggle of the revolutionary patriots; the War of 1812; and the triumphant march of American soldiery across the sands of Mexico into the "Halls of the Montezumas," and remembered that the same blood which coursed through my veins had been shed in each of those three conflicts, I said, Thank God, this is my country, and Old Glory is my flag. [Applause.]

Breathes there a man with soul so dead
Who never to himself has said
This is my own, my native land?

[Applause.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KITCHIN, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. GARLAND, for three days, on account of death in his family.

STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 407) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 407, with Mr. Cox in the Chair.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The committee did not go into a long discussion of the merits of this bill, with the idea in view of taking it up under the five-minute rule so that it may be disposed of as expeditously as possible under all the existing circumstances. I just want to say a word in regard to the general features of the bill. It is well known that we have had for many years our 160-acre homestead law and that it has been effective in the West, and permitted the valuable tracts of land to be taken up, so that a man could go upon a tract with his family and get a comfortable living for himself and those dependent upon him. Following that we had the 320-acre homestead law, which applied to a different character of land than that provided in the 640-acre homestead. That applied to land that was nontimbered, land that was not then known to be subject to irrigation. At the same time we reserved the minerals to the Government in the 320-acre homestead and do the same in this bill. That law has worked well, has permitted many hundreds of thousands of acres of the public land of the West to be filed upon, and it gave homes to our citizens, to the end that they have been able to maintain their families successfully and assist in building up the community in which the land is located and in the construction of schools and towns and good roads. Before passing this it must be recognized, and I am sure that many of the Members have forgotten it, that we had in force for many years what was known as the timber-culture law, which permitted a man to obtain 160 acres adjoining his homestead by planting trees upon it, to be added to the rest of his home, that he might use it for agricultural as well as grazing purposes.

In conjunction with the homestead of 160 acres we had during many years what was known as the preemption law, which permitted a man to file upon 160 acres and, living upon that land for six months and paying $1.25 an acre for it, to obtain title to the land. It ought to be called to the attention of the committee, and I think I can safely say this, that with the exception of those who have gone there since the repeal of the preemption law, over half of the men in the West obtained a preemption claim and a homestead claim, which gave them 320 acres for their home. A number got the benefit of the timber-culture law. While few literally complied with the terms of it, it was afterwards amended to the extent that if they proved they cultivated a certain percentage of it they were permitted to make final proof. So that we find they were permitted to acquire a considerable quantity of land.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, we now find large tracts of land provided for in the bill which are chiefly valuable for grazing and for the purposes of raising forage crops, and which do not contain much of the timber and are not susceptible to irrigation from any known source, and we believe that 640 acres are reasonably required for the support of a family.

It is a fact that with a great deal of this land, of which there are millions of acres, that to plow it and destroy the native sod to a great extent ruins the value of the land for the farmer; and the purpose of the department, and that has been acted upon by the committee, is to give a man a sufficient quantity of land remaining which will permit him to go upon the land and live without cultivation, unless he can cultivate a small tract of 10 acres or 5 acres for the purpose of raising garden stuff and other things close at home, where he has a well or a spring, in order that he might raise stock, a few cattle, a few horses, and in some instances, in connection with cattle and horses, a few sheep. He will thereby become a permanent settler. He will add to the beef supply of the country, because it has been demonstrated by statistics which were thoroughly presented to the committee that in the settled communities and in the western public-land States there has been a large increase in cattle, in horses, and in many instances in sheep as the community settled and as the land became under private ownership, and that a better grade of cattle has been raised, for which the farmer received a better price. It is unquestionable and it is without doubt that the day of the great cattle king, horseman, and sheepman, so far as using the control of the great areas of the public domain is concerned, has passed.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Does the gentleman not think that he is now affording some opportunity to the stock owners, the big stock owners, to gather to themselves a large measure of the public domain by the passage of this act?

Mr. RAKER. No. In answer to that question I believe that the public-land States from the time of the 160-acre tracts to the 320-acre tracts and also the Kinkaid Act, which applied to western Nebraska, of 640 acres, the report will show that practically only 10 per cent—I believe it is less—of these homesteaders, of men living in that country, who own more than 640 acres, or

whose tracts have been disposed of, and from one or two millions the increase in productiveness and value has grown up to millions, and the department shows it is settled by good citizens, who live there, who have built up schools and churches and towns as well as they have in other parts of the United States, and that the large cattlemen have not been able to obtain the tracts that were possible to obtain at one time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How much land can a homesteader now own under existing law?

Mr. RAKER. He can obtain 160 acres as homestead land and 160 acres of timber and stone land or 160 acres of desert land, or 320 acres of desert land. Except from the Kinkaid Act and the enlarged homestead law, a man to-day can only get 320 acres, when years before—I just want to enumerate—you permitted him to get a preemption tract of 160 acres; you permitted him to get a homestead of 160 acres; you permitted him to get a stone and timber claim of 160 acres; you permitted him to get a desert claim of 640 acres, and in some locations you permitted him to get 640 acres of desert claim besides the 640 acres under the general desert-land law. In addition to that, you permitted him to get a timber-culture entry.

Now, notwithstanding all these many entries and the large amount that was involved, and when all the best land had been obtained, we ask now simply that you recognize the home-building people of the West and that a man may go there and receive a sufficiently large tract of land for him to make a home upon and from which he may support himself and family.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may have five minutes additional. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the settler has acquired 640 acres, is he now at his maximum which he can acquire?

Mr. RAKER. It is 320 acres now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is the maximum amount now that he can obtain—640 acres?

Mr. RAKER. No; 320 acres.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If he had 320 acres now, under the gentleman's bill can he obtain more?

Mr. RAKER. He can obtain 320 acres more, making 640 acres, provided the 320 acres he acquires is of the same class and character as that designated in this bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did not we have a bill passed in the last session that provided for a 640-acre tract?

Mr. RAKER. This is the same bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is this the same bill?

Mr. RAKER. Yes. If a man acquires, under subdivision 2, 640 acres, his right is exhausted.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What does this paragraph 9 bestow upon a man who has 640 acres; the right to purchase?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; the right to purchase where he has less than 640 acres.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not where he has 640 acres?

Mr. RAKER. No. In other words, if a man has 160 acres, and there is a tract of land adjoining him of this character, he may buy enough of it to make 640 acres. No; he can only buy 320 acres of this kind of land, and add to what he already has.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If this bill passes, a man could not acquire a maximum of more than 640 acres?

Mr. RAKER. Not at all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Under existing law and this additional law?

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And this pertains only to arid or semiarid lands?

Mr. RAKER. That is all.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Under this, is one who takes up 640 acres required to live upon it?

Mr. RAKER. He is; he can not commute it, the same as a 160-acre homestead; but the only thing he does not have to do is he does not have to cultivate it, because much of this land ought not to be cultivated; but he must put in $1.25 of improvements to the acre.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. What kind of improvements?

Mr. RAKER. Fences, houses, wells, barns, and things that are permanent for the purpose of developing and adding to his home.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In building a fence around 640 acres, is that accepted as doing all that is necessary?

Mr. RAKER. If he adds the value of $1.25 an acre, because that brings it to the very highest state of use and——

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. But would not that lead to the very thing the gentleman spoke of first——

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Now, wait a moment—of acquiring this land for the purpose of disposing of it to the very large owners of land there and stock raisers?

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And ultimately result in getting it into one big block of great areas of land under this law?

Mr. RAKER. From my observation and experience up to date, and the information which we get that has been presented by the department, and particularly under the Kinkaid 640-acre Act, from actual experience of 30 years I would say no; that these men would take them for homes, for the purpose of using it and occupying it and build up and become part of the community in which the land was situated.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Would the gentleman in charge of the bill consent to an amendment that improvements to the value of $1.25 an acre, exclusive of fences, should be required?

Mr. RAKER. Well, I think no; for this reason: Now, gentlemen know that this is for the purpose of a stock-raising homestead. Gentlemen, the use of the land, the value of the land, is the fact that a man by dint of hard work and skimping in the things he needs and his wife needs, so that he may be able to get enough money to put up a good, substantial fence under the State law around this 640 acres, so that he, and he alone, may get the benefit of it and add to the value of his holdings——

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma to answer the question, too.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McCRACKEN] have both raised a question that ought to be raised here and ought to be debated and looked into, and that is, Will the granting of a large unit to anybody result in it getting into the hands of a few people?

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. I merely wanted, if the gentleman will yield——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized in my own right.

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. I merely wanted to state in connection with that that the State I have the honor to represent in part has perhaps more public lands by a good deal than any State in the Union. In fact, we have one-fifth of the unappropriated public land in the United States, something over 50,000,000 acres. Now, I think there is nothing that the large cattle owner and sheep owner would get from this bill to the detriment of any citizen of this country, and nothing they want to get, for this reason: That they have absolute right now to run their herds over the public domain, and they can get it cheaper than they could by buying somebody's homestead right. I merely state that as a reason. Why should it be to their benefit to buy something when they do not have to pay anything at all now? The cattlemen and sheepmen do not favor this bill.

Mr. FERRIS. I thank the gentleman. The Department of the Interior had in contemplation the passage of this bill this year because it passed the House last year. I reintroduced it again this year on the first day of the session.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Was that bill called a bill to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes?

Mr. FERRIS. The bill is the same as last year. We did not cross a "t" or dot an "i."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The title is the same?

Mr. FERRIS. That is my recollection. I dropped it in the basket just as it passed the House last year.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I should like to inquire whether there is any provision in this bill for the granting of these homesteads to anyone under 21 years of age?

Mr. FERRIS. No; there is not. I think there is a separate bill pending, introduced by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], to grant homesteads to boys and girls of 18 years of age or over. That is not dealt with in this bill at all. As to the question raised by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McCRACKEN], as I said, the bill passed the House last year, and the Department of the Interior knew it was going to be introduced and pressed

again this year. So they made an investigation by sending men out to western Nebraska to determine what had been done under the only 640-acre law that had ever been passed, the Kinkaid Act. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] is still a Member of the House, and an honored one, and is entitled to great credit for having blazed the way for this 640-acre legislation. He got this legislation as applying to 37 counties in the sand hills of western Nebraska. At that time they could not get anybody to live there except cattlemen and sheepmen. They argued that if we passed a law giving them 640 acres of land, in a few years a few men would own it all and drive the cattle all out of the country. Now, as I have said, the Department of the Interior sent special agents out to investigate that very thing, first to ascertain if they would buy it all up, and if it really worked that way; and, second, if it really did drive the cattle out of the country.

Now, here is what they say on the subject of large holdings:

Of the land entered in Nebraska under the section law there is an average of one settler for every 571 acres.

Now, that is less than the unit originally granted.

In the 37 counties affected by this law it appears that there are 4,589,870 acres in the hands of the original entrymen, 6,411,963 acres in the hands of small holders—

These cases, I assume, are where the first entryman started out and sold to a second man who had a little more money and was able to stick a little tighter and remain a little longer, because it is still in the hands of the small owner. They say further:

And only 316,453 acres in the hands of what might be termed large holders; that is, those possessing areas in excess of 2,000 acres.

Now, the Kinkaid Act, passed 11 years ago, in 1904—pretty nearly 12 years ago—and you can see that a very small amount has crept into the hands of big holders, and you can see what a large amount has remained in the original entryman's hands, and you can see there is a family in that community for every 571 acres, which is less than the present size of unit. They say further:

The department is informed that the practically unanimous sentiment of the people in western Nebraska is that the law has been a benefit to them and to the country, causing a large increase in the population, promoting the development of the lands, and advancing generally the public welfare.

Let me go back and show you the figures as to whether or not it actually drives cattle out of the country. I have no doubt the Members of the House feel that because we pass a large unit, that runs the cattlemen out. Not at all. The small farmer has more cattle and produces more cattle on a given area than they do where the range is not protected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed further. I will not burn up much more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERRIS. The big objection to this legislation always is that it drives the cattlemen out of business and drives the sheepmen out of business and all that kind of argument. Let me give you the facts. The Kinkaid Act passed in 1904. The value of the cattle in 1904, when the Kinkaid Act was passed, was $3,176,109. Let us get this, because here is a point the committee ought to know:

In 1914—

That was last summer a year ago, when this investigation was made—

$4,267,055; increase, 34 per cent.

Now, listen to the rest of this showing:

In 1904—

That was the year when the Kinkead Act was passed—

30 counties produced 69,962 bushels of potatoes; in 1914, 2,671,924 bushels; increase, 3,719 per cent.

Now, gentlemen, in raising the unit a little——

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. SINNOTT. I want to know from the gentleman if the figures there give an increase in the number of head of cattle? The gentleman gave the value.

Mr. FERRIS. I believe it does. I will see if I can turn to it. I did not report this bill and have not given much attention to it. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] reported the bill. I think it does give the number of head.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. FERRIS. I do.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is familiar with the public-land laws. I would like to call his attention to section 10 of the bill, which provides—

That all entries made and patents issued under the provisions of this act shall be subject to and contain a reservation to the United States of all the coal and other minerals in the lands so entered and patented——

And so forth.

Mr. FERRIS. That is true.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would that cover the Government's interest in oil lands?

Mr. FERRIS. It would. We believe it would cover every kind of mineral. All kinds of minerals are reserved; and, more than that, it does not apply to timberlands or to lands susceptible of irrigation or any land that can get water from any known source. It merely gives the settler who is possessed of any pluck an opportunity to go out and take 640 acres and make a home there. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and I rode over it last summer, and if a man can stick on that land and convert it into a prosperous community, as was done under the Kinkaid Act, I say, "God speed him on."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If any oil should be discovered on these lands later on, the Government's right to that oil would be preserved under this mineral clause, would it?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; and further, this act authorizes the reentry upon these lands to extract oil and coal and anything else in the way of minerals that may be on it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not think it is necessary to specify oil?

Mr. FERRIS. No. That is a mineral. But I have no objection to it being mentioned specifically if it is at all thought necessary. I feel doubly sure, however, it is not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It has been called to my attention that the word "mineral" would not include oil.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think it is necessary; but if the gentleman thinks there is any conceivable doubt about it we will put it in, because not a single gentleman from the West who has been urging this legislation wants anybody to be allowed to homestead mineral land. This does not apply to a single acre of land in my own State, and therefore I have no selfish interest in it. But these gentlemen who are interested in it do not want to homestead mineral land or ordinary homestead land or oil land.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There is a provision here that permits a man who has taken up and homesteaded one of these tracts, and wants to give it up and take up 640 acres under this law, to do that?

Mr. FERRIS. That is true.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In case he does that and takes up 640 acres, is he required to live on it?

Mr. FERRIS. He is; and he is required to comply with every other requirement of this bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I did not understand that it was necessary for him to live on it at all.

Mr. FERRIS. Let me give the gentleman a practical example. Suppose under the existing law the gentleman from Michigan and myself resided in Colorado. Suppose we had made a 320-acre homestead of arid land, or 160 acres, which is as much as we can get, of better land. Suppose the gentleman and myself were just in the act of failing to stay there by reason of the smallness of our holdings. This bill says we can relinquish our holdings and turn them back to the Government and start over anew.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. I would call the gentleman's attention to section 9, on page 7. That answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. FERRIS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Chairman, I am not presumptuous enough to estimate that my humble vouching for the successful operation of the Nebraska act will add anything to the excathedra

report of the honorable Secretary of the Interior in reporting on the provisions of the pending bill, inasmuch as the report gives such a hearty and unqualified indorsement of the Nebraska act, of which I was the author.

Right here, Mr. Chairman, I must thank the Members who have given such generous indorsement of the virtues of the Nebraska act, incidentally complimenting the Nebraska Member, its author. I will at once admit the act to be fully deserving of the indorsement given it by the membership of this House, but I shall not admit myself to be fully entitled to the complimentary expressions bestowed upon me. However, I am very grateful both for justice done the act and the consideration given me by the Members of the House. I wish to again thank the Members who helped to pass the act in this House February, 1904. I wish also to thank, on this floor, the honorable Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and their able and painstaking assistants, both in the departments here in Washington and in the field service, for the careful, fair, painstaking, and thorough investigation made and report of the operation of the Nebraska act. This official finding, from which later I shall briefly quote, justly closes the question whether the act of April 28, 1904, was in the interest of the public welfare.

Mr. Chairman, it was a burning question in western Nebraska when I was first nominated for the House what was to be done with the public-land question. On the one hand, was it to be a leasing bill whereby the lands would remain public domain and nontaxable in the hands and under control of large ranchmen lessees indefinitely, or, on the other hand, should it be an enlarged homestead act whereby the many would be afforded an opportunity to acquire homes. I did not hesitate to choose the latter alternative, and I introduced a bill for a 640-acre homestead. It was regarded as rather a novelty here, and precedents were demanded. My answer was that we had better make a precedent, and that this case would be an experiment.

Very strong opposition did exist in my district to the bill, and this very naturally by those who had so long enjoyed the benefits of free range for their herds. Had it been deemed likely that the bill would receive favorable consideration by the Congress, I feel confident that opposition would have become organized and determined in an effort to defeat it. But no opposition came up from western Nebraska or other localities in the grazing West to protest to the Congress against the measure, and the bill became law.

Paradoxically as it would now seem in the light of the report of the present able Secretary of the Interior, the then honorable Secretary of the Interior refused the bill his sanction on the ground that the bill was being sought in the interests of the large ranchmen, who were, in fact, generally opposed to it. While the law was applauded by the mass of the people, its enactment evoked for a time strong opposition among large ranchmen both in Nebraska and in other parts of the grazing West to which it was feared its provisions might be extended.

Mr. Chairman, it is very gratifying to me to be warranted in stating the fact that practically all opposition in Nebraska which at first arose to the Nebraska act has gradually turned to hearty approval.

But while the operation of the act continued to gain for it popularity at home, organized influences outside of Nebraska, by newspaper and magazine publications, tried hard to write it down. In fact, it was only a year ago when delegates coming from the far West appeared before the Public Lands Committee of the House and charged that the operation of the Nebraska act had been a failure. But they were seeking the passage of a leasing bill in opposition to a homestead bill like the one now pending.

Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge that uncalled-for assaults made upon the measure by opposition organized in States west of Nebraska at times have caused me some annoyance, but I never deemed them of sufficient importance to require refutation on the floor of this House, but by analogy I found justification as well as consolation in the rule of evidence that the reputation of an individual is legitimately determined by what the people in his own vicinity may think of him, knowing full well that the Nebraska act was constantly being vindicated by the people in the territory included in its provisions.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of the change from a 160-acre to a 640-acre unit for a homestead in Nebraska soon wrought a great transformation. For a few years preceding its enactment the population in the territory covered by the act had actually been decreasing, contrary to the ordinary rule in a new and undeveloped country. The effect was to change this order to a rapidly increasing population. Hitherto in the small towns the lumberyards and the hotels had been abandoned. Now these businesses were restored and made prosperous, and all other branches of business were likewise favorably affected by the change. New paint was applied to the neglected buildings of these partially depopulated towns and a new atmosphere of activity, upgrowth, and prosperity was realized.

In keeping with the increase of population the number of school districts and schoolhouses was increased. The high standard of the Nebraska common school, second to that of no State in the Union, became extended more and more to the newly formed settlements. In passing it is proper to state all that is necessary to be done in Nebraska to secure funds for a good school is to perform the condition precedent of securing a sufficient number of children of school age to patronize it and profit by it, for a large school fund is permanently provided for. This insures the best quality of instruction, generally by young women in the country districts, graduates of high schools, State normal schools, and many of them graduates of our own Nebraska State University or other Nebraska universities, of which we are proud, as well as such educational institutions in other States.

Mr. Chairman, and the Sunday-school missionaries have also contributed bountifully to the general uplift. They have promoted so much for the good of these new communities that I find myself too much limited in time to accord them due credit. Let it suffice to say there has been employed to work with the new population of children a number of men—talented, most enterprising, faithful, energetic, up-to-date, and most efficient Sunday-school missionaries I have every known anywhere. Thus in the area in question creditable school buildings and churches in due proportion to the area partially reflect the rapid progress of the inhabitants. But I should add the pulpits are here filled as ably as anywhere in the Union.

Mr. Chairman, my time being too limited to longer dilate on the favorable change produced by the operation of the act, I shall here read from the report of the honorable Secretary of the Interior, made December 15, 1915, on the pending bill, to the House Committee on the Public Lands, beginning with the last paragraph on page 3 thereof and reading to the commencement of the last paragraph on page 4.

It reads:

Since the last session of Congress the department has been seeking information as to the advisability of the passage of such a law as is now proposed by this bill. Attention has been especially directed to the operation of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat., 547), which authorized the entry of not exceeding 640 acres of land in a considerable area of western Nebraska. The provisions of that act, as applying to that limited area, were in the main designed to meet the same conditions which the present bill proposes to meet as to other areas of the public lands. Eleven years have elapsed since the passage of the law relating to western Nebraska, and the investigations of the department as to the results of that legislation are both important and significant. Prior to the passage of the act of 1904 considerable land in western Nebraska had been entered under other laws, but the marvelous development since the passage of the act of 1904 is so marked that it must in great measure at least be attributed to that law. It has been found that some of the valleys and lower lands which intersperse the larger area have been made to produce through intensive cultivation varied crops of large value, and that the production of live stock has largely increased rather than diminished. The improvements placed by the settlers upon their claims indicate both prosperity and permanency of occupation, as dwellings of stone, cement, or frame construction, plastered and provided with conveniences, have generally supplanted the original sod houses, and the farmer who has not built barns, silos, or other structures for storing crops and protecting live stock is a rare exception. The live stock raised upon the small ranches is of a higher grade than that which was produced by grazing upon the vacant public lands.

It appears from statistics collected, covering 31 counties within the area to which said law is applicable, that the population was 124,508 in 1890, 107,434 in 1900, and 162,217 in 1910, an increase of nearly 50 per cent in population during said 10-year period, during 6 years of which the 640-acre homestead law was in force.

The value of household furniture increased from $174,779 in 1904 to $342,312 in 1914, an increase of 95 per cent.

The value of agricultural implements in 1904 was $139,609; in 1914, $243,304; increase, 74 per cent.

The value of cattle in 1904 was $3,176,109; in 1914, $4,267,055; increase, 34 per cent.

In 1904, 30 counties produced 69,962 bushels of potatoes; in 1914, 2,671,924 bushels; increase, 3,719 per cent.

Number of acres planted to rye in 27 counties in 1904, 47,451; in 1914, 91,336; increase, 92 per cent.

Number of acres planted to oats in 28 counties in 1904, 47,451; in 1914, 91,336; increase, 92 per cent.

Number of acres planted to corn in 28 counties in 1904, 564,554; in 1914, 1,143,916; increase, 102 per cent.

Number of acres planted to wheat in 27 counties in 1904, 122,799; in 1914, 297,900; increase, 142 per cent.

Number of horses in 31 counties in 1892, 107,295; in 1904, 168,556; increase, 57 per cent; in 1914, 282,624; increase, 67 per cent.

Number of hogs in 29 counties in 1904, 171,849; in 1914, 225,480; increase, 31 per cent.

The acreage of improved land in 27 counties increased 68 per cent in 12 years, 1892 to 1904; increased 77 per cent in 10 years, 1904 to 1914. The value of the improved land decreased 18 per cent the first period and increased 143 per cent the second.

The total assessed valuation of all property in 31 counties in 1892 was $23,468,899.69; in 1904, $27,480,836.57; increase, 17 per cent; in 1914, $57,278,766; increase, 108 per cent.

Of the land entered in Nebraska under the section law there is an average of one settler for every 571 acres. In the 37 counties affected by this law, it appears that there are 4,589,870 acres in the hands of

the original entrymen, 6,411,963 acres in the hands of small holders, and only 316,453 acres in the hands of what might be termed large holders; that is, those possessing areas in excess of 2,000 acres. The department is informed that the practically unanimous sentiment of the people in western Nebraska is that the law has been a benefit to them and to the country, causing a large increase in the population, promoting the development of the lands, and advancing generally the public welfare.

Mr. Chairman, there are few unacquainted with the territory covered by the act who can adequately conceive of the splendid picture—which is a reality—which this report presents; it shows plainly that an abundant harvest is being reaped from the operation of the law our Congress was wise enough to pass nearly 12 years ago. Is not 12 years a sufficient test and when successful a sufficient vindication of the merits of a law?

Mr. Chairman, no other public-land law has ever attained greater popularity than the Nebraska act is accorded by the people in the community where the lands lie.

Mr. Chairman, as I told my constituents at the time, the reason for providing for an enlarged homestead instead of for a leasing law was based upon the rule of legislation, "the greatest good to the greatest number," and this has abundantly proven to be the character of the act in this case.

Mr. Chairman, the pending Ferris bill fundamentally is the same as the Nebraska act, and its purpose is the same. And I am confident that if duly enacted into a law its operation will prove beneficent and inure to the great good of the people generally and to the States wherever the act may be applied. I am therefore most heartily in favor of the Ferris bill. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent that at the close of the gentleman's remarks debate on this paragraph may close.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, no; there are several gentlemen over here who wish to discuss it.

Mr. MANN. We would like to have 25 minutes on this side.

Mr. FERRIS. Then I think we can get along faster by not asking for any limitation.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman that he make his request.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of 35 minutes the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed.

Mr. MANN. Of which I am to have control of 25 minutes?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of 35 minutes debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed.

Mr. FERRIS. Twenty-five minutes to be yielded to the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty-five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri, and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in listening to the explanation of the gentleman on the committee who reported this bill as to its effect on the stock-raising industry of the West. If the bill has the effect of increasing the production of live stock in the West, as the gentleman anticipates, it will not only be of great benefit to the public-land States but to the entire country. Everyone familiar with the live-stock industry in this country has noted with alarm that in the last decade the supply of live stock has steadily decreased as the population and consuming power of the American people have increased. The explanation of that is very simple. As the land in the Missouri and Mississippi Valleys and in the older sections of our country becomes more thickly settled it becomes increasingly difficult for the farmer to raise the young stock necessary to keep up the supply. If he had an ample supply of stockers and feeders he could employ them profitably on his blue grass, with his corn, and fatten them for the market; but the difficulty has been in raising the supply of stockers and feeders; and frequently it is to be noticed that in the great live-stock markets of Kansas City, Omaha, St. Louis, and Chicago the stockers and feeders bring a price almost as high as that brought by cattle on the market.

I take it, this land will not be confined to raising stockers and feeders, because in the great alfalfa belt, in which the land is located, a large amount of the cattle—or a fair percentage of them—will be fattened for actual slaughter; but, as I understand, this will provide an increasing area for the raising of young stock, for stockers and feeders, for the more thickly settled portions of the country, and to my mind that is the solution of the American cattle business. We have ample blue grass in the Missouri Valley, ample pasturage and water, and ample corn. If the Department of Agriculture adopts standard grades of corn to be shipped in interstate commerce, there will be a certain amount of corn that must be fed on the farm and that can not be shipped profitably. Therefore the farmer must have some stock to eat the corn and other feed which remains on his farm.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes. I have not a great deal of time.

Mr. RAKER. In confirmation of what the gentleman has stated I want to read one sentence, if the gentleman will permit me.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. This comes from Montana:

> I believe that the enactment of the law providing for 640-acre homesteads will result in the production of a greater number of cattle than were found on those ranges during the most prosperous days of the cattle range.

Mr. BORLAND. I hope that will prove true. In the old days, when I was a boy in the live-stock business, we had an open range covering all the territory of the gentleman from Oklahoma and large parts of other States. To-day most of that range is either in private ownership or in forest reserves or otherwise withdrawn. The live-stock business has suffered in consequence, and we are going to Argentina and elsewhere to find beef for slaughtering in this country. In fact, some of our American packing houses are now located in the South American countries. If this bill does have a tendency to increase the live-stock production of this country, it will be a valuable thing for every section of the country, including the great consuming centers of the East.

In addition to that not only is the cattle industry affected but the sheep industry. In our section of the country sheep are used by the farmers principally to clear up pasturage and brushwood and stuff of that kind. It is difficult for our farmers to get sheep; sheep are selling high in Missouri to-day under the blessings of Providence and a Democratic administration. The farmers can not pick up bunches of sheep, as they would like to, for the purpose of clearing up old pastures and clearing up old woodland; but here is another outlet for enterprise and industry for our friends on the public-land States. They can raise sheep for the Mississippi and Missouri Valleys, and every bunch of young sheep would be readily taken up by the farmers in my section. I am glad to support the bill that will not only produce more population for the Western States but will tend to increase the live-stock industry in the whole country.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I have procured this time simply to ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a brief extract from an address by Prof. Charles H. Herty, of North Carolina, to the American Chemical Society, of which he is president.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an address of Prof. Charles H. Herty. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out, on page 1, line 4, the word "qualified" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "entitled."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 1, line 4, strike out the word "qualified" and insert in lieu thereof the word "entitled."

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, according to my reading of this section, the language is ambiguous as to whether the present phraseology would not grant to those who have already exercised the privilege of homestead an additional right to take 640 acres under this bill. I have read the section of the Revised Statutes applicable that gives the right to a homestead entry, and certainly there is nothing there that would forbid the person from exercising again the right under this law if he has heretofore exercised it. The word "entitled" clears that ambiguity, and certainly it was not the intention of the committee to grant to those who have already exercised the right an additional homestead.

Mr. FERRIS. That is right.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am in sympathy with the purpose of trying to increase the acreage for stock-raising purposes. There is no question but that the supporters of this bill will attain great popularity in those States where these lands are situated. We know the rare popularity and deserved popularity of the gentleman from Nebraska who gave to his people the addi-

tional privilege of locating on some 480 acres. Of course, every farmer in the western country who has already taken a homestead entry of 160 acres will be most thankful for the additional grant of 480 acres. That goes without saying.

But, Mr. Chairman, it can not escape my thought that some of these lands will fall into the hands of large stock raisers because there is no condition of tenure whatever placed upon those who take the additional amount and commute; as soon as he pays the $1.25 an acre he may, as soon as he gets the patent, sell to some large stock-raising concerns of whom we know so much by reputation, who have preempted the lands in great stock-raising estates in Montana and other Western States.

All through the bill runs the idea that you want to give additional land to the local person. As I view the question of the vacant public lands, I favor their retention for the benefit of those who have not to-day any public land. We all know that there are thousands living in the Middle West who wish to find some little spot where they may have land enough to call home. But this bill I hardly think will result in getting those people to go into the far West. It is said that the available public lands are of poor quality. I must confess that I do not know. And yet I have inquiries from constituents as to lands available to take up a home. If it were not for the fact that I believe that much of this land is suitable for a homestead under the present 320-acre law, I would be more inclined to support this bill very strongly. Every session bills are coming in here conferring additional grants to those who have already entered a homestead, and thereby taking away the land from those who are entitled by right to preempt it—those living in distant parts of the country, who have not availed themselves of that right. With the remaining public land, our policy should be to retain it for the benefit of those without a home, and there are many thousands who wish to locate on the public land, even though the best has already been taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONDELL) there were—ayes 14, noes 16.

So the amendment was lost.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], now that his amendment is defeated, that under the decisions of the Interior Department for the last two or three years, decisions rendered time after time, no one who has made and perfected a homestead entry for any area, even as small as 40 acres, would be allowed to take a homestead under this language.

Mr. STAFFORD. But this is a new law.

Mr. MONDELL. The decisions that have been rendered are under the 320-acre enlarged homestead law containing identical language.

Mr. STAFFORD. Those decisions are not written into this law.

Mr. MONDELL. Unless the department changes its decisions there would be no question about it, and the word the gentleman proposes is one that never has been passed upon, and no one can know what it would be interpreted to mean, whereas the term used is one that has been used in the law for years.

Mr. STAFFORD. The word I did suggest is one with a clear meaning, whereas the language here has not a clear meaning.

Mr. MONDELL. The word "qualified" has been passed upon frequently since we had homestead laws. At one time under the decision of the Interior Department the words "qualified entryman" were held to embrace all otherwise qualified who had not perfected entry to a full 160 acres, but several years ago they were held to include only those who had never perfected an entry.

As to the suggestion of our friend from Wisconsin that we are proposing to open up a lot of land to homestead entries for the benefit of those in the States where the lands lie rather than for those who may come from other States, it is true that there are some sections of this bill which would give benefits to those already on the ground, but the general provisions of the bill will be utilized in nine cases out of ten by people who come from other States rather than the States in which the lands are located. Under the enlarged-homestead bill which we passed several years ago, and which has been very useful, I am of opinion that nine out of ten of the entries made in my State were made by men from States east of the Missouri River, certainly by those not residents of what are known commonly as the public-land States.

Mr. Chairman, it is about 30 years ago that Maj. Powell, then at the head of the Geological Survey, suggested what he thought should be the orderly evolution of the homestead theory. He suggested that in the course of time we would pass from the 160-acre homestead to a larger homestead, as the lands to be taken were poorer in character—less productive—and that finally we would pass to a homestead of 640 or 1,280 acres, or even larger, for the very poor and desert lands of the country.

The first day of the last Congress I introduced what I think was the first general grazing-homestead bill introduced in the House, providing for a homestead of from 640 to 1,280 acres. I am of opinion that it would have been better to have this latitude as to area in a homestead bill of this character rather than confine the entries to 640 acres or less. The Secretary of the Interior, in discussing the matter, suggested the thought that it would be at this time difficult for them to make such an examination of the public lands as would enable them to intelligently judge as to what lands might be properly entered in 640-acre areas, and what lands might be properly entered in larger areas, expressing the opinion held by all who are familiar with the situation, however, that as to some of our lands we will probably go to a still larger homestead entry some time in the future. We passed the enlarged homestead bill, which I had the honor to introduce and report to the House as the first step in the evolution from the 160-acre homestead. In passing that bill we adhered to the farm-homestead idea, to the idea that the homesteader should be a farmer, and our thought was to make it possible to farm on the semiarid lands where farming is carried on under what are known as dry-farming methods. Under that law requiring specific and definite areas of cultivation, and the first homestead law to so require, we have settled very large areas in the West which otherwise would be and which, up to the time of their settlement, were retained in the possession of the great flocks and herds run under grange conditions. I said that was the first step in the evolution. I had forgotten for the time being the step taken some years ago which has been referred to here, applying the grazing-homestead idea to western Nebraska.

We had, as the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] has stated, a considerable discussion, and there was in Nebraska and elsewhere a long controversy as to what we should do. It was finally determined to try the grazing-homestead idea in western Nebraska. We were able to pass a law and to apply it to a certain definite territory, because in that particular territory there was neither timber nor mineral, and very little land left that was fit for cultivation. It was an area where the remaining public lands were practically all of them available or useful for grazing purposes only, and incidentally for a certain class of tillage for forage crops. The law has worked splendidly, even better than we hoped it would at the time we passed it. Some have suggested that under this 640-acre law, generally applied under the terms of this bill, there may be and there is danger of the gradual bringing together of these areas in very large ownerships. I think there is little danger of that in a harmful way. It is true that as you reach the lands that have a very small productive capacity—and undoubtedly some lands of that character will be taken under this law—there will be a tendency to the consolidation of those entries, and it is possible that in some localities where this law is utilized we shall finally reach a situation where instead of the economic conditions bringing about an average ownership of about 500 acres, as in western Nebraska, we may have an average ownership of considerable more and ownerships in some instances of as high as several thousand acres, but in my opinion as that tendency toward large areas in single ownerships will not go on to any great extent on lands that have any considerable productive capacity. It is common experience that the small stockman can in many cases make better use of these lands than the large stockman. Therefore the tendency is not toward very large areas, but to the reasonable areas used as a home, cared for in such a way as to produce the very largest return. There will, of course, be some localities where the best economy will be found in the consolidation of considerable areas in a single ownership or control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. MCCRACKEN].

Mr. MCCRACKEN. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the purpose of this bill. As the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] stated awhile ago, the purpose of this bill is to increase the number of live stock in this country, but I doubt very much if it will serve that purpose in my State. I am inclined to think it will have the opposite effect in many localities, for it will afford an opportunity to some entrymen to make an entry of large tracts of land without any intention of cultivating or improving it, but who merely intend to obstruct the free use of the open range by stockmen. I have known some instances

where men have made homestead entries on lands that were adapted for no other purpose than grazing and who would take the first opportunity to exact tribute from the first flockmasters who came along before he would permit stock to be driven over his land to the summer ranges. Even under the enlarged-homestead act entrymen have been known to deliberately enter lands with but one purpose in view, and that was to fix an arbitrary price for the little grazing privilege which his entry might afford. I do not intend to convey the idea that the enlarged-homestead act has not helped our State, for the fact is that thousands of entrymen have in good faith availed themselves of the privilege which that act affords, and they have increased the wheat yield in Idaho enormously. The little town of American Falls, in the southeastern part of Idaho, has become the second largest primary wheat-shipping point in the world. Rexburg, another town in southeastern Idaho, ranks close this year to American Falls as a wheat-shipping point. For miles around these two towns the farmers are successfully engaged in dry farming, and the larger number of them have made their entries under the enlarged-homestead act. If these people could be served by this act, I should be much in favor of it, but I do not see how it can be of advantage to any large number of people in the arid portion of the State of Idaho; but I can see where the act can be employed to harass and annoy both large and small live-stock owners who are trying to carry on their business in a legitimate way.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCRACKEN. I will.

Mr. NORTON. Why can not these men do the same kind of thing under the 320-acre enlarged-homestead act?

Mr. McCRACKEN. It has been done in some localities.

Mr. NORTON. This will not change conditions, then?

Mr. McCRACKEN. I think the act now proposed will give a larger advantage to the man who does not make his entry in good faith; I am sure it will.

Mr. GANDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCRACKEN. Yes.

Mr. GANDY. Did I understand the gentleman to say that a 320-acre entry was sufficient for his State; that a man can make a living on that land?

Mr. McCRACKEN. Yes; I believe that in most cases 320 acres of land suitable for agricultural purposes will afford the entryman an opportunity to make a living.

Mr. GANDY. If that is true, this will not hurt you a bit, because the 320-acre entry will continue, and a man will only take up those tracts of land where he must necessarily have 640 acres on which to support a family.

Mr. McCRACKEN. The bill proposes to allow the Secretary of the Interior to determine whether or not a given tract of land is sufficient to support a family. I doubt if there is anyone in the office of the Secretary who will be able to promulgate rules and regulations which will make this bill operative and which will distinguish the bona fide entrymen from the man who desires to acquire large tracts of the public domain in order that he might get control of a vast area of grazing land.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCRACKEN. I will.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. How many sheep are there in the State of Idaho?

Mr. McCRACKEN. I am unable to give the gentleman the number as shown by the assessment rolls of 1915, but I am informed that the value of the flocks in Idaho represent nearly $15,000,000.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. In my State they represent as much as 50 per cent of the money taken in, and we have the same trouble there. I am a sheep and cattle man both——

Mr. McCRACKEN. I want to say this, gentlemen, that I have been told by small owners of sheep and other live stock that if this bill becomes a law it will in large part destroy the live-stock industry in my State. Now, I do not think you want to do that, and certainly I do not want to do it. I am not the owner of any kind of live stock, but I want to plead for that which I think is for the best interest of the honest stock owner, who is obliged by the very nature of his business to range his stock upon the public domain during the grazing season.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD certain portions of an address delivered by the president of the Wool Growers' Association which relate to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Mr. Chairman, in connection with this discussion, I will say that at a recent meeting of the Wool Growers' Association, which was held last December in Boise City, the president of that organization, in his annual address, spoke in part as follows:

> The range situation is steadily growing worse from the viewpoint of the woolgrower. Every plan for the disposal of the public lands is an increased area for the settler, whether he can make use of the same or not; a grazing homestead of 640 acres is now the proposal advanced by Congress. This bill passed the House of Representatives during the last session, but failed in the Senate by reason of the adjournment of that body. There is no question but that such a bill will be again introduced. Should it pass, it will mean the end of the range business as we now know it. With the 2-mile limit law in the statute books, the priority-rights case decided against our industry, and the privilege of entering on 640 acres of land extended to all and sundry without any residence requirements or any proof to show they can put such an area to beneficial use, we can readily see our finish.
>
> But this is essentially a grazing country, and such land will eventually revert to be used for grazing purposes, but it will be in the hands of large corporations, who, owning the land, will enjoy privileges undreamed of by the woolgrower of to-day.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS].

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with the purpose of this bill, but I do not believe it will have the tendency to increase cattle raising in this country. On the contrary, I think the tendency would be to restrict the raising of cattle. I am thoroughly familiar with the territory comprised in the Kinkaid Act, and I know of my own knowledge that previous to the enactment of that act many more cattle were raised upon the territory comprehended therein than have been raised since.

I notice in the report of the Secretary of the Interior, which is before this body, that in stating the increase in cattle he places it in value instead of number.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. REAVIS. I do.

Mr. RAKER. Has the gentleman looked over the statistics in regard to the increase in the number of cattle in Nebraska and in the Western States for the last 10 years as population advanced and as the land has been built up?

Mr. REAVIS. I have not; but I take it for granted, from observation, that the production of cattle upon the range in the West, and especially in western Nebraska, is less to-day than it was 10 years ago.

I argue from the report of the Secretary of the Interior which accompanies this bill, that when he states the increase in volume of the potatoes produced, the increase in acreage of rye, oats, corn, and wheat, on the territory comprehended in the Kinkaid bill, when he further states the increase in the number of horses and the number of hogs, and states only the increase in the value of cattle without stating whether there was an increase in number, that there has been a reduction in the number of cattle, otherwise his report would not have been restricted to value alone. It has been the observation of every man within the sound of my voice that live stock, cattle especially, to-day and in 1914 are worth approximately double what they were in 1904, and the increase in value of the cattle upon the territory comprehended in the Kinkaid Act, from $3,176,000 in 1904 to $4,267,000 in 1914, would argue a decrease in the number of cattle rather than an increase. When this vast territory is divided up into farms of a section each it is no longer devoted exclusively to the raising of cattle as it is when the whole range is open to the great cattle firms. This is shown——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. REAVIS. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Would it have been possible for the Secretary of the Interior to have told anything about cattle from the taxation books of those counties? What proportion of those cattle that ranged that country at the time you speak of would have shown on the tax rolls of the counties which they range?

Mr. REAVIS. I have no means of knowing, Mr. Chairman, but he had sufficient information to enable him to show the number of horses that ranged on that territory, and the value of the cattle within its limits.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not better to raise one steer that is worth $100 than to raise three long-horned Texas cattle worth only $33.50 each?

Mr. REAVIS. The steer that you raise to-day was worth only $33.25 in 1904. But the reason for the decrease in the number of cattle is that the section taken up by the individual farmer is no longer devoted entirely to cattle raising. In the territory comprehended in the Kinkaid Act I find from 1904 to 1914 the increase in the production of potatoes in that territory was 3,719 per cent.

The increase in the acreage of rye was 92 per cent. The increase in the acreage of oats was 80 per cent, and I might follow the list on down. And the reason, Mr. Chairman, that the cattle produced in that territory, divided as this bill provides, are less in number than formerly, is that the acreage no longer is devoted exclusively to cattle raising, but is now devoted in part to the raising of grain. And yet I favor this bill, because I believe any bill that will offer a home to satisfy the land hunger of the homeless, that will permit individuals to make homes as they have made them in the district of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID], is a good bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Would the gentleman like one or two minutes more?

Mr. REAVIS. I would.

Mr. FERRIS. I yield to the gentleman a couple of minutes.

Mr. REAVIS. I can remember the day, 15 years ago, when I traveled over the territory that was comprehended by the Kinkaid bill, and it was as bleak and as barren a waste as one would ever expect to see in this Nation of ours. You may go to that same locality to-day—opened up to settlement by an act that granted to the settler a section of land; that granted to him sufficient territory to support his family, to rear his children in comparative comfort—and you will see a schoolhouse on nearly every hillside and a church in approximately every valley.

The only reason, Mr. Chairman, that they were constructed there is that this Government enlarged the homestead to an extent sufficient to permit those people to support their families in that locality. And this act will have the same effect. It will open up homes to many to-day who have no homes. I am in favor of it for that reason, but I insist upon the proposition that if you are expecting this act to increase the number of feeder cattle in America you are going to be disappointed in its purpose. It will not do so. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, on application or otherwise, to designate as stock-raising lands subject to entry under this act lands the surface of which is, in his opinion, chiefly valuable for grazing and raising forage crops, do not contain merchantable timber, are not susceptible of irrigation from any known source of water supply, and are of such character that 640 acres are reasonably required for the support of a family: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall not designate for entry under this act land of which, owing to its general character or general conditions, in his opinion, 640 acres clearly will not support a family.

Also, the following committee amendment was read:

Page 2, line 7, strike out the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall not designate for entry under this act land of which, owing to its general character or general conditions, in his opinion, 640 acres clearly will not support a family," and insert the following: "*Provided*, That where any person qualified to make entry under the provisions of this act shall make application to enter any unappropriated public land which has not been designated as subject to entry (provided said application is accompanied and supported by properly corroborated affidavit of the applicant, in duplicate, showing prima facie that the land applied for is of the character contemplated by this act), such application, together with the regular fees and commissions, shall be received by the register and receiver of the land district in which said land is located and suspended until it shall have been determined by the Secretary of the Interior whether said land is actually of that character. That during such suspension the land described in the application shall not be disposed of; and if the said land shall be designated under this act, then such application shall be allowed; otherwise it shall be rejected, subject to appeal. The provisions of this section shall also apply to the application of a qualified entryman to make additional entry of unappropriated public land, the area of which, together with his original entry, shall not exceed 640 acres."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, this should not be treated as a motion to strike out and insert; but it has two separate purposes—a motion to strike out, and then a separate amendment to insert. Am I correct in that?

Mr. FERRIS. I think the gentleman is right about that.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself first to the amendment proposing to strike out the original proviso as found in the bill, as follows:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior shall not designate for entry under this act land of which, owing to its general character or general conditions, in his opinion, 640 acres clearly will not support a family.

Before speaking of that, my colleague on the committee, Mr. KENT, of California, requested me to say that, with this language stricken out of the bill, if present he would vote against the bill. He is absent on account of illness to-day.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with reference to this proviso that the committee seeks to have stricken out of the bill, I recognize, of course, that upon its face it would place the discretion of the Secretary within very narrow limits, requiring him upon the one hand to designate land which, in his opinion, 640 acres was sufficient to support a family, and upon the other side requiring him to exclude from such designation land which, in his opinion, 640 acres clearly would not support a family.

But, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to afford homes for those who desire them. It ought not to be the purpose of anybody—and if it is the purpose of anybody it ought to be prevented, if possible—that any provision of this bill or of any other enlarged-homestead law should be used for purposes of speculation or a hold-up for anybody.

Now, I believe that the Secretary should make express designations of lands that should be subject to entry under this enlarged-homestead law. But, Mr. Chairman, lands—of which there are millions of acres in the West—that can not possibly support a family in tracts of 640 acres ought not to be subject to entry under this law, because, in the first place, the man who does enter is sure to fail. After he has made his improvements and after he has spent his time and his money he will sell out to a stockman for a song, and he would be glad to get the song in that case.

In addition to that the gentleman from Idaho, who addressed the committee a few moments ago, has informed me that the State of Idaho has upon its statute books a law providing that a sheep herder shall not drive his sheep within 2 miles of a homestead. Am I correct in that?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. What does that mean? That means if a man goes out here on this public land, 640 acres of which can not support a family, he will be compelled to abandon it sooner or later and sell out to a stockman, and in the meantime the land within 2 miles of the homestead that he has made can not be used for any purpose by a sheep raiser or otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, it ought to be sufficient in extending the liberality of this Government in a 640-acre homestead law first to exhaust the designations made by the Secretary of the Interior. It is not advisable on any account to allow railroad companies having lines out there to advertise all over the country that there are millions of acres of land open to entry, and have people go out and find that by no possibility the entryman can support himself or his family upon it; and for that reason I believe that provision should be retained in the bill, so that the Secretary, in making his designations, will not guarantee the support of a family, but will give some encouragement at least that the lands under this new law will afford some hope to the entryman that he will be able to make it succeed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] in what he has just stated. There are very considerable areas in the State which I have the honor to represent in this House, and I know that there are very considerable areas in a number of other States, where it would be utterly impossible for anyone to support a family upon 640 acres of land. It was for that reason that in the bill which I introduced I proposed a larger homestead for lands of that character. But the committee has seen fit to confine its bill to a 640-acre homestead, and I think perhaps, under all the circumstances and conditions, wisely. But in so doing I think the Secretary should be confined definitely in his designations to lands to which this bill will properly and reasonably apply.

In the first place, the Secretary should not designate lands which may be advantageously utilized under the 320-acre homestead law. There are still considerable areas of lands of that character elsewhere, and lands should be cultivated where they may be advantageously. We want lands farmed wherever they may be profitably farmed. This law, which does not require cultivation, should apply only to lands where cultivation is not ordinarily profitable or possible. It should not, however, offer temptation to men to go onto desert winter ranges and by taking up homesteads here and there very largely reduce the value of those lands for range purposes. There might be a case here and there where that would be done in perfect good faith, here and there a case where a home would be established and where the intent of the law would be fulfilled. But there would be many more cases where the homesteader would not benefit and where the benefit to the public generally for the use of the land for range purposes would be very largely reduced. I think the provision is a wise one and should remain in the bill. Under the terms of this bill the agents of the Secretary of the Interior must make careful examination before designation, for that designation, unlike that provided under the enlarged homestead law, is final and conclusive in bringing these lands within the purview of the act.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of 10 minutes the debate close on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that at the expiration of 10 minutes debate close on this amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands on question. Does the chairman maintain that the provision in the beginning of line 7, page 2, of the bill, which is stricken out there, is inconsistent in any way with the provision in italics? Does he maintain that the two provisions are inconsistent?

Mr. FERRIS. No. They are entirely different matters. They are not the same thing at all.

Mr. NORTON. Those two things could be permitted to remain in the bill without inconsistency?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; but I really think they ought not to be.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I hope I am not responsible in any way whatever for this committee amendment striking out the language which it is proposed shall be stricken out, although last year I remember, when the bill was up, I poked considerable fun at the committee and at the bill on account of the two provisions in the bill which, if literally construed, would prevent any land from being designated. I see now that they have separated the two propositions. I thought they were to be treated as one amendment. I prefer myself to keep in the bill the language that is proposed to be stricken out, and to keep out of the bill the language that is proposed to be inserted. I do not see any reason, under the second amendment as it is now separated, why anybody should be allowed to go on to these lands until they are designated.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman will recall that some years ago we passed the 320-acre amendment?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Then the gentleman will also recall, I know, because he keeps up with things, that on March 4, 1915—last spring—we passed a provision making this same thing applicable to the 320-acre homesteads.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. And we are only putting it in here to make this bill in conformity with the law as to the 320 acres. That is the object.

Mr. MANN. I understand, but I do not believe in it at all.

Mr. FERRIS. Of course, this language stricken out is another matter altogether.

Mr. MANN. I appreciate that fact. The tendency will be for people to go on these lands where they hope there will be a designation. If the land shall not be subsequently designated, then it is a great injustice to the man who has taken the chance on it. If the land shall thereafter be designated, it is a great injustice to those who have not taken the chance on it, who would have taken the chance if the land had been designated. I do not believe in giving a preference where a preference is not required.

I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that legislation of this sort will be enacted, and possibly it ought to be, though I do not question at all that sooner or later it will be found that most of this land will be consolidated in large holdings. A man can not make a living by raising stock on 640 acres of land which is not tillable. No man can make a living by grazing stock on 640 acres where he can not raise anything else. You can try it if you want to, but you can not succeed in doing that, because it is contrary to nature, and the result will be that when men try to make a living by raising stock on 640 acres which may raise a little grazing grass but will not raise anything else, they will lose their efforts, their time, some little money, and will sell out to some one who will graze on large tracts of land; and in the end it will pass out of the hands of the Government and go into the hands either of large corporations or individual large holders, where it will be profitable to graze stock upon thousands of acres combined.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, before lands can be designated at all under this act, the department must first find that it is chiefly valuable for grazing and the raising of forage crops, such as silo corn, broom corn, kafir corn, fodder, and so forth. They must next find that the land does not contain any merchantable timber. They must next find that it is not susceptible of irrigation from any known source of supply, and they must then find that 640 acres of land of this character is reasonably necessary to support a family.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]—whom I pause at this moment to say is one of the most clear-headed and helpful Members that ever served on any committee or in any House at any time, and to whom I am indebted now and every day for great services rendered me—would further provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall designate for entry under this act land which, owing to its general character or general condition in his opinion, 640 acres will clearly be needed to support a family.

Now, that forces the Federal Government to do a thing that it can not do. That forces the Federal Government to be an insurer of the thrift, ability, earnestness, and intelligence of men, a thing that no Government and no person can do. Two men enter homesteads side by side. One man is plucky, gingery, determined, industrious, thrifty, and faithful. Another man takes up a homestead on the adjoining section under precisely similar school conditions, water conditions, and soil conditions, everything being identical. Still one fails and the other succeeds. I am afraid if this amendment is agreed to, it will make the Government an insurer that both men will achieve the same result. A thing, in my opinion, totally wanting in practicability and feasibility.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that in the Reclamation Service they are determining the quantity that will be sufficient to support a family in making their allotments?

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman is entirely correct, but in reclamation work the area is small. They have to journey over only a small area, and they can tell from the water conditions and the quality of the water and the quality of the soil more nearly what can be done. But in journeying all over creation, in that wild, unsettled, and barren waste of land which they have out there, I think it would be impossible to do what the gentleman hopes.

Mr. LENROOT. If 1,000,000 acres or 10,000,000 acres are designated under this amendment, does the gentleman think it more likely that the land so designated will offer a better hope to the man who enters upon it than if all the land is thrown open to entry?

Mr. FERRIS. As a westerner who has gone through the thick and the thin, the fat and the lean, of building up a new country, I do not believe in it. I believe the moment the Government says, "This 640 acres will support a family," every real-estate grafter in that community or that State will seize the opportunity to bamboozle the public and will use the Federal Government as a catspaw to accomplish that purpose. I fear that is what will happen.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, if ten times as much is opened to entry, as will be opened with this amendment stricken out of the bill, does it not offer just tenfold opportunity to the real-estate grafters?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think so, although I do not want to be tenacious about it. This bill was sent to the department, as it is proper that all such bills should be sent there, to get the opinion of the department upon it. Our committee has been criticized good-naturedly and not good-naturedly for having the department draft these bills. That is true. We call in the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of the General Land Office and we get their opinion. We need their help. We appreciate their help and will continue to seek their help. Let us see what the Interior Department think of this. I quote from a letter written December 15, 1915, by First Assistant Secretary Jones, of the Interior Department:

> As suggested in my report of April 24, 1914, it is believed that it would be advisable to omit the proviso to section 2—

That is the proviso under consideration—

> found in lines 6 to 10, page 2 of the bill, thus leaving to the settler the responsibility of determining whether or not a specific 640 acres of land, designated under this act, would be sufficient for his purposes. Such has been the law and practice under the original and enlarged homestead acts, as well as the act of April 28, 1904, hereinbefore described. If, however, the committee believes some limitation to be essential, the proviso as it now stands is as far as the limitation should proceed.

I really hope that the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman means that he hopes the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, leave it out of the bill. I was technically stating it wrong, but I think the House understands it. To make it clear, I want the committee's action to stand.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on striking out the proviso.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. LENROOT and Mr. MONDELL) there were 38 ayes and 6 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the committee amendment, as follows:

At the end of section 2 insert the following:

"*Provided*, That where any person qualified to make entry under the provisions of this act shall make application to enter any unappropriated public land which has not been designated as subject to entry (provided said application is accompanied and supported by properly corroborated

affidavit of the applicant, in duplicate, showing prima facie that the land applied for is of the character contemplated by this act), such application, together with the regular fees and commissions, shall be received by the register and receiver of the land district in which said land is located and suspended until it shall have been determined by the Secretary of the Interior whether said land is actually of that character. That during such suspension the land described in the application shall not be disposed of; and if the said land shall be designated under this act, then such application shall be allowed; otherwise it shall be rejected, subject to appeal. The provisions of this section shall also apply to the application of a qualified entryman to make additional entry of unappropriated public land, the area of which, together with his original entry, shall not exceed 640 acres."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 2, after the word "appeal," strike out the remainder of the section.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, the language proposed to be stricken out by the amendment reads as follows:

The provisions of this section shall also apply to the application of a qualified entryman to make additional entry of unappropriated public land, the area of which, together with his original entry, shall not exceed 640 acres.

As that language now stands it is open to the construction that it is the purpose of the bill to grant to anyone who has made a former homestead entry the right to make an entry under this act to an amount of land, together with the original entry, that would make 640 acres. That was not the purpose of the committee in this amendment, the purpose being only to provide for a preference right to have designation made for those who shall be entitled to make an additional entry.

If this amendment is adopted, I will offer another making it clear that the right of preference shall be given to the original entryman, the one to be entitled under the bill to make additional entries.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, if this language was subject to the interpretation which the gentleman from Wisconsin places upon it, I should be opposed to having it stricken out, but I do not think it is subject to that interpretation. It is as a matter of fact an altogether ineffective proposition as it stands, and therefore should go out. Under the decisions of the Land Office for a number of years no one is a qualified homestead entryman under a provision such as this bill contains who has perfected a homestead entry of any size, and up to this time in this bill we have made no provision which would in any way tend to modify the ruling of the department. Therefore, a provision at this point to the effect that the application of a qualified entryman shall be received to make an additional entry would be of no effect, because under the rulings of the department anyone who has heretofore made an entry is not a qualified entryman.

Mr. BORLAND. Would it not accomplish the purpose if the word "qualified," in line 3, was stricken out?

Mr. MONDELL. It would. I am in favor of having such a provision and I intended to offer an amendment later.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman is in favor of a man who has taken a homestead in a public-land State of less than 640 acres being permitted to take the balance up to 640 acres under this law?

Mr. MONDELL. I am very much in favor of it.

Mr. BORLAND. Would not that be accomplished by striking out the word "qualified"?

Mr. MONDELL. It would be an indirect way, but not a very certain way of accomplishing it. I think it ought to be accomplished directly.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It seems to me that if the gentleman considers the other amendment which is to be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin it would obviate any objection he may have.

Mr. MONDELL. I have no objection. I think the language proposed to be stricken out would not be operative either to accomplish what was intended or what I would like to have accomplished, therefore I think it ought to go out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 12, after the word "make," insert the words "original or additional," so that the line will read:

"*Provided*, That where any person qualified to make original or additional entry under the provisions of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the committee amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I had supposed that somebody would, and perhaps somebody has, given us a statement about the amount of land entered as homestead in the last few years. I used very often to hear on the floor of the House a statement from gentlemen, sometimes from the West, complaining that all the land that people could cultivate was taken up, and that there was nothing left except land that you had to give away in large quantities in order to get people on it. I have not examined this year the report for last year showing the amount of land patented or entered as homestead.

Mr. LENROOT. I can give the gentleman the figures.

Mr. MANN. For a great many years I have noticed that notwithstanding the statements made to us every year that all of the good lands are gone each year there was more land entered under homestead entries than had been the year before, and since I have been a Member of the House I think more land has been taken under the homestead entry than had been taken altogether in the history of the Government prior to that time, and I am not sure but that in the last 10 years of my service in the House that statement would be true if limited to the 10-year period. I now yield to the gentleman to give me the figures.

Mr. LENROOT. Last year there were 37,343 homestead entries, covering an acreage of 7,180,981.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, that is a good deal more than was taken under homestead entries the first year, or the first years, that I came here. How much of that is taken under the 320-acre law I do not know, but all of the land which can be cultivated and support a family, with a reasonable acreage, is not yet gone, any more than have all of the fish yet been taken out of the sea. We are sometimes led to believe that there is no more good land left. Mr. Chairman, as a rule, there never was any good land left. When the people settled in the State of Illinois, even when I was a boy, long after a good many people had settled there, it was said the land was not worth anything. Most of the people thought that you could not raise much crop upon it; and they thought right, for you could not at that time, but they have made it over since. They were not troubled, as a rule, in my part of the country by any lack of water, I will say to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think something ought to be said at some point during the consideration of this bill along the lines of the suggestion made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. It has been made to appear whenever this question is brought up that there is no available land left for homestead entry under present laws. I hold in my hand the last report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and on page 67 of that report he gives the number of homestead entries made and the acreage year by year since the homestead law was passed in 1868. I will put into the RECORD merely the 10-year periods, so that we may see whether or not, so far as we can gather from entries being made, there is any necessity for the passage of this bill at all. In 1870 there were 4,041 entries, covering 519,727 acres. In 1880 the number increased to 15,441, covering 1,938,234 acres. In 1890 the number of entrymen increased to 28,080, and the acreage to 4,060,592. In 1900 there were 25,286 entrymen and 3,477,842 acres taken. In 1910 the number was 23,253 and the acreage 3,795,862, while in 1915, the figures I gave a moment ago, there were 37,343 entrymen with an acreage of 7,180,981.

So, Mr. Chairman, it does not appear from these statistics that there is any dearth of lands or entrymen as yet calling for the passage of this bill, at least to the extent of saying that there is no land left open for entry under the 320-acre homestead law and that they must be given 640. In the last three years there have been more homestead entries made and allowed by the Land Office and more acres have gone into private ownership under the homestead laws than there were in any five-year period since the homestead law was passed. That merely furnishes a reason why the provisions of this bill ought to be scrutinized pretty carefully and why we ought not to act upon the assumption that we have to indulge in the utmost liberality in order to secure homestead entries upon what is left of the public domain.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Since I have been a Member of this House I have frequently heard the assertion made that western Members are continually saying that all of the public lands are taken up that are suitable for homestead entry under existing laws. I have been a Member for five years, and I have never heard any western Member make any assertion of that kind. It has not been made since I have been a Member of the House.

I have heard frequently the western Members say that the good land, that which was irrigable and arable, in a large section of the country was taken up, and that is the fact. I will admit all that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has just said. But that does not prove anything, because he does not tell in what localities that land was taken nor in what sections of the country. There are yet large areas of public land that can be taken under existing law. There are a few States that practically have all that land, and there are other States that have thousands and hundreds of thousands of acres such as is covered by this homestead bill that is before the House to-day.

Now, in my own State we are not so greatly interested in this measure, although we have on river bluffs and in certain localities a lot of this character of land; but I do know from my knowledge of the West that there are in some States thousands of acres, hundreds of thousands of acres, and millions of acres of this kind of land that will make homes for people in time, and that will enable large areas that are now of no benefit to anybody, except a few nomadic stockmen, to come on the tax rolls and becoming taxpaying property and also add to the population of those States. I do not understand that this land is of a character that there can not be an acre of it farmed. I do not think that anyone contemplates that there could not be any of it farmed, but it must be chiefly valuable for stock raising and not for the raising of crops to enable a man to make a living for his family. I think the bill is a wise one. There may be in some cases mistakes made under the law. There has never yet been a homestead law but what there have been some mistakes made; but going on the principle of trying to benefit the greatest number of people, I think that this bill should pass, and that in time, as the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has said, we should enlarge the area. I am not one of those who believe that the nomadic stockman, the man who is getting the benefit of public property for nothing and who has had it that way for 30 or 40 years, should be continued in that privilege in perpetuity or during the rest of the existence of the United States.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the last word.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I am going to offer a substantial amendment. Some of us agree here that we might not know much about different characters of land, but we wondered a little about the language in the first sentence of this paragraph.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. What page?

Mr. MAPES. Page 2, section 2. Section 2 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to designate certain lands, "the surface of which is chiefly valuable for grazing and raising forage crops," and then continues "do not contain merchantable timber," and so forth. What is the subject of "do not contain"?

Mr. FERRIS. "Lands" is the subject.

Mr. MAPES. "Lands" is in the objective case, the object of "to designate."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. "Lands" is the subject.

Mr. MAPES. Then the words "and which" should be inserted after the word "crops" in line 3, page 2.

Mr. MANN. "Which" is there.

Mr. MAPES. But it refers to the word "surface."

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

Mr. MAPES. "The surface of which is." If that is the subject, then the verb should be in the singular, "does contain."

Mr. FERRIS. I think we are all right.

Mr. MAPES. I do not know which the committee desired to have the subject. If I can find out, I will offer an amendment.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I always hesitate to get into any argument in reference to grammar, and I do so with a great deal of trepidation now. My opinion is that "land" is the subject, and "surface" there relates back to land.

Mr. MAPES. "Lands" is in the objective case, the object of "to designate."

Mr. BORLAND. It is an objective phrase. If the gentleman will yield, it is an objective sentence, an objective phrase, as it is sometimes called.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I move to insert, in line 3, on page 2, after the word "crops," the words "and which," so that the sentence will read: "That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to designate lands the surface of which is valuable and which do not contain," and so forth. Some such amendment is necessary in order to make the sentence read correctly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "crops," insert the words "and which."

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we close debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto. Of course, I mean after we vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that debate close on this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. MONDELL. What is the gentleman's request? I have an amendment pending which I wish to discuss.

Mr. FERRIS. Does the gentleman wish five minutes?

Mr. MONDELL. I think there may be some discussion on it. It is an entirely new division.

Mr. MANN. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] that we would not like to enter upon a long discussion to-night, and I think, under the circumstances, there may be something in the House to be taken care of.

Mr. FERRIS. Let us get rid of this section.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me suggest——

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to close debate on this amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MONDELL. What is the request?

Mr. FERRIS. On this amendment only.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FERRIS. Can not we adopt this section?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division on the amendment that I offered.

Mr. MONDELL. I have an amendment to that section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] asks for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 16, noes 28.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject discussed to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on this bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. BORLAND having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COX, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 407) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be included in the same request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to address the House on Friday immediately after the reading of the Journal, unless it should interfere with the business in hand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman withhold his request for a moment for the gentlemen who are asking to extend remarks on the pending bill? Are there any more requests from gentlemen to extend their remarks on the pending bill?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to address the House for 40 minutes on Friday immediately after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. FERRIS. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman does not desire to interfere with this or any other regularly reported bill?

Mr. BAILEY. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks, subject to the regular business of the House, that he be permitted to address the House on Friday next for 40 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, it is very convenient for a Member to make a request so that he knows the very minute when he is going to address the House. As a rule he is lucky if he knows within a week when he is going to do so. I am constantly asked by Members of the House on this side

for time, and I have told them they would have to take chances on the general debate which is coming along on various bills. And unless there is special reason for it I will have to say the same thing to my friend from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object. I have no doubt that he can get in on Friday.

Mr. FERRIS. May I suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he might get in on the road bill to-morrow?

Mr. MANN. Or on Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday, if he is on the job.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 320. An act to authorize the county of Bonner, Idaho, to construct a bridge across Pend Oreille River;

H. R. 775. An act granting the consent of Congress to J. P. Jones and others to construct one or more bridges across the Chattahoochee River between the counties of Coweta and Carroll, in the State of Georgia; and

H. R. 7611. An act authorizing the Seaboard Air Line Railway Co., a corporation, to construct and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across what is known as Back River, a part of the Savannah River, at a point between Jasper County, S. C., and Chatham County, Ga.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, January 18, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a detailed statement of the number of documents received and the number distributed by this department during the calendar year 1915 (H. Doc. No. 587); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed statement of receipts from rentals, extension of Capitol Grounds, for the period beginning January 20, 1915, and ending November 30, 1915 (S. Doc. No. 25); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of harbor of refuge at Portage Lake, Manistee County, Mich. (H. Doc. No. 588); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Wickford Harbor, R. I. (H. Doc. No. 589); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Hendricks Harbor, Me. (H. Doc. No. 590); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and plan and estimate of cost of improvement of Pagan River and Jones Creek, Va. (H. Doc. No. 591); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting a change in the estimates of this department on page 58 of the Annual Book of Estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, under the title "Salaries, office of assistant treasurer at Cincinnati, Ohio" (H. Doc. No. 592); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8234) to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 46), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEWIS, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 153) to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 44), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLOOD, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8235) to provide for the maintenance of the United States section of the International High Commission, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 45), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CURRY, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 449) to provide for the appointment of 11 supervising inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, in lieu of 10, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 47), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas, from the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6057) to amend section 14 of the reclamation-extension act approved August 13, 1914, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 48), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. OGLESBY, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3042) to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, and amending the laws relating thereto, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 54), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7502) for the relief of Ellis P. Garton, administrator of the estate of H. B. Garton, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 49), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1584) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Louis Landram, administrator of William J. Landram, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 50), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. POU, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2180) for the relief of Albert Greenlaw, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 51), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2288) for the relief of Thomas R. Mason, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 52), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CAPSTICK, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4587) for the relief of C. C. Graham, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 53), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 9209) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Clayton, Jefferson County, N. Y., a brass or bronze cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 9210) providing means for assessments against the lands of restricted Creek Indians in drainage district No. 1, McIntosh County, Okla.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 9211) to provide for a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Lewisburg, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9212) to regulate the price of gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9213) to authorize the Gary Land Co. to construct a bridge across the Grand Calumet River in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 9214) to provide for the municipal collection and disposal of city refuse in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 9215) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908," approved March 4, 1907; and to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907," approved June 30, 1906; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 9216) to amend sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON: A bill (H. R. 9217) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Warrenton, Ga., two condemned bronze or brass cannon, with their carriages and a suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 9218) to authorize the construction and maintenance of a dike on South Slough, Lane County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CROSSER: A bill (H. R. 9219) to provide for the acquisition, ownership, and operation by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of all the street railroads located in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 9220) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to place on the firemen's pension roll of the District the names of certain persons; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 9221) for the relief of mail contractors; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 9222) to increase the compensation of certain employees of the Government Hospital for the Insane, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9223) for the purpose of preserving life at sea, etc.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 9224) providing for an increase in number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 9225) granting the consent of Congress to Georgia Lumber Co. to construct a bridge across Flint River, Ga., between Dooly and Sumter Counties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 9226) to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric light and power within the Lihue district and the Koloa district, county of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 9227) to prohibit the receipt of money by internal-revenue officials of the United States in payment of special taxes by dealers in intoxicating liquors, except in certain cases, and to provide punishments therefor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9228) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896," approved February 28, 1895; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 9229) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase certain lands for the use of the Seminole Indians of Florida; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 9230) to authorize the erection of a monument at Fort Seybert, W. Va., to commemorate the capture and massacre of Capt. Seybert and a number of men and women at that point and in the South Fork and South Branch valleys of the Potomac by the noted Indian chief, Kill Buck, and his band of Indian warriors in the year 1758; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 9231) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, amending section 913 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, relating to annual payments by the Honolulu Gas Co. (Ltd.), under its franchise, of a per centum of its gross annual receipts; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 9232) authorizing the extension of Kenyon Street NW.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 9233) authorizing a survey of Tangipahoa River, La.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. NORTH: A bill (H. R. 9234) appropriating money for the improvement of the Allegheny River, Pa., from Tarentum, Pa., to East Brady, Pa.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 9235) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOSTER: Resolution (H. Res. 94) amending paragraph 7, Rule XXIV, of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FLOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 95) for the relief of the widow of Junius B. Holloway, late an employee of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GANDY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 105) providing that hereafter no tribal funds belonging to any Indian tribes shall be expended without specific authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 106) providing that hereafter no tribal funds of any Indians shall be expended without specific authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Memorial from the Legislature of California, favoring Federal aid for indigent nonresident tuberculous patients cared for in hospitals which conform to the hygienic standard established by the United States Treasury Department; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of California, to standardize the treatment of tuberculosis in the United States, to provide Federal aid in caring for indigent tuberculous persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELSTON: Memorial of the Legislature of California, favoring Federal legislation in aid of indigent tuberculous persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 9236) granting an increase of pension to William H. Jacobs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9237) granting an increase of pension to George Garrard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 9238) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Waltz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9239) granting an increase of pension to William A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 9240) granting a pension to Clara Woomer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 9241) granting an increase of pension to Harriet A. Sargent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 9242) granting a pension to Helen Swan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9243) for the relief of August Schultz; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 9244) for the relief of Jacob Scott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9245) granting a pension to Charles B. Montgomery; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9246) granting a pension to Mary Sheridan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9247) granting a pension to Mariette Hathaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9248) granting an increase of pension to Morgan Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 9249) granting a pension to Thomas B. Perkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9250) granting a pension to Sarah E. Dillon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9251) granting an increase of pension to John H. Rusie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9252) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Kemp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9253) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Stierwalt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9254) to correct the military record of James Flint; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9255) to correct the military record of Martin Ali; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 9256) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Ordway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9257) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Comerford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 9258) for the relief of Joseph H. Lawrence; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 9259) granting a pension to Rosetta Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 9260) granting a pension to Edith Barcia; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9261) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Culhan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9262) granting an increase of pension to Harland R. Strong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 9263) for the relief of John N. Shiltz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 9264) granting a pension to Peter Kanuk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 9265) granting a pension to Emma F. Bonesteel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 9266) granting an increase of pension to Harlow Havens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9267) granting an increase of pension to William H. Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9268) granting a pension to Mahala Claflin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 9269) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9270) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cooke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9271) granting an increase of pension to William H. Pennington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 9272) granting an increase of pension to Levi R. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 9273) granting a pension to John W. Roderick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9274) granting an increase of pension to Maria M. Francis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9275) granting an increase of pension to James Hutson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9276) granting a pension to Charlotte A. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 9277) granting a pension to Nellie M. Tillman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9278) granting a pension to John C. Pearson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 9279) granting a pension to Frazier Ward; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9280) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Putnam; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 9281) granting an increase of pension to Narcissa N. Cooper; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9282) granting a pension to Lewis J. Crider; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9283) granting an increase of pension to Pollis Blon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9284) granting an increase of pension to Charles Lang; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9285) granting an increase of pension to Silas J. Shumaker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 9286) to correct the military record of William B. Johns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9287) granting a pension to Martin Guthrie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9288) providing for the refund of certain duties illegally levied and collected on acetate of lime; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 9289) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Glenn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 9290) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Loomis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEEKER: A bill (H. R. 9291) for the relief of the estate of Thomas J. Mellon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 9292) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Maris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 9293) granting a pension to Robert Chestnut; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 9294) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda A. Perine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OAKEY: A bill (H. R. 9295) granting an increase of pension to Minnie M. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLNEY: A bill (H. R. 9296) for the relief of Walter W. Parker for overtime work in the Navy Department; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 9297) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Dovell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9298) granting an increase of pension to Darwin Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9299) granting an increase of pension to Darwin Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 9300) granting a pension to Martha Provo; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9301) granting an increase of pension to John H. Ormsby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 9302) granting a pension to Sidney W. Ackerman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 9303) for the relief of Mrs. L. A. Butler; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROWLAND: A bill (H. R. 9304) granting a pension to Myrtle Hardy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 9305) granting an increase of pension to John Schwoebel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9306) granting an increase of pension to William H. Keen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9307) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor Stahler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9308) granting a pension to Emelia McNicol; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9309) granting a pension to Anna Bryson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9310) granting a pension to Charles W. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 9311) for the relief of Michael Flaherty, guardian of John Flaherty, claimant; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALKER: A bill (H. R. 9312) for the relief of the heirs of Solomon Cohen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9313) granting a pension to Anna Steele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9314) granting an increase of pension to John A. Golden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Papers to accompany House bill 6938, for relief of William C. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9143, for relief of Mary F. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of sundry merchants of Kansas, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Weyauwega, Wis., favoring woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of E. R. Hayhurst, favoring House bill 476; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. T. Russell, favoring the Smith-Hughes bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of Standard Bleachery Co., of Carlton Hill, N. Y., favoring passage of bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs in United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of House bill 8119, for the relief of Mary E. Temple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of F. W. Thurston Co., of Chicago, favoring the Hill bill, H. R. 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Merrimac Hat Co., of Amesbury, Mass., urging prompt passage of House bill 702, relating to the dyestuff situation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLYNN: Petition of the Winsted Hosiery Co., favoring bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of the Guardian Savings & Trust Co., of Cleveland, Ohio., protesting against stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. M. Pattison Supply Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of 50,000 members of the German-American Alliance, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring embargo on war munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the National Woolen Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring passage of bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEATON: Memorial of Washington Camp, No. 84, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Ashland; Clinton W. Sheafer and S. B. Edwards, of Pottsville, Pa., relative to national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Riber Manufacturing Co., of Pottsville, Pa., favoring passage of bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of Hockannin Mills, of Rockville, Conn., favoring passage of a bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Petitions of business men of Murfreesboro, Petersburg, Lewisburg, Smyrna, Manchester, Shelbyville, Fayetteville, and Tullahoma, Tenn., favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of Capt. Santwein and all other officers and enlisted men of Company C, First Infantry, National Guard of Missouri, favoring passage of militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Meiklejohn Co., of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Lymansville Co., of Providence, R. I., favoring passage of bill protecting manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of Albany, Minn., urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Milaca, Minn., urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Eden Valley, Minn., urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Rice, Minn., urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: Memorial of Branch 108, Paving Cutters' Union of United States and Canada, Willards Point, Me., favoring law preventing importation of foreign-made paving blocks to be sold at prices below reasonable cost of production in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Watertown, N. Y., favoring adequate measures to prevent shipping congestion; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of H. D. Pierce, of Pine City, N. Y., favoring a uniform divorce law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCULLY: Memorial of Religious Society of Friends, of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the American Neutrality and Peace Convention, relative to violation of neutrality by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Traffic Club of New York and Philadelphia Bourse, favoring repeal of the seamen's law; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Petitions of sundry banking and trust companies of Texas, favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry business men of the State of Texas, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of veterans of the Confederate Army, favoring law granting pensions to widows and minor children of Confederate veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of Woman's Missionary Society of Colorado, Tex., protesting against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Toledo (Ohio) Scale Co., against passage of House bill 150, to regulate weights and measures; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, memorial of Baraca class of the Tabernacle Baptist Church, of Utica, N. Y., favoring law censoring moving-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of Utica (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring assistance to relieve conditions relative to the congestion of freight at railway terminals in United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Utica (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the fixing of railway-mail pay by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petitions of Local Union 682 and District No. 2, United Mine Workers of America, protesting against military preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of District No. 23, United Mine Workers of America, and Kentucky State Federation of Labor, asking that the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations be printed in full; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Memorial of the Boulder Commercial Association, favoring passage of House bill 651, as fair to both shipper and carrier; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *January 18, 1916.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou hast enabled us out of various kindred peoples and tongues to erect a great empire dedicated to exact and equal justice and to the freedom of all. We bless Thee for the privileges of freedom. We come to Thee continually that we may be taught that higher liberty wherewith Thou dost make men free. Give to us the Divine inspiration that a conscience quickened by Divine wisdom may rightly decide all the issues of life. Give us the power by that spiritual appropriation that we may not be bound in the prison house of a merely sensuous intellect. God grant to lead us in the realm of the higher and eternal, that we may perform our functions not only as citizens of this state but of the higher kingdom. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM IDAHO.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, my colleague, the Senator elect from Idaho, is in the Chamber and desires to take the oath of office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho will present his colleague at the Vice President's desk that the oath may be administered to him.

Mr. BRADY was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. BORAH, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him.

SAN FRANCISCO WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, at yesterday's session of the Senate my colleague [Mr. PHELAN] had printed in the RECORD some matter relating to the Hetch Hetchy grant. I was very earnestly opposed to the grant at the time the bill was before the Senate, because, in my judgment, the city of San Francisco did not need the water and it was needed by the owners of land in San Joaquin Valley, as it would irrigate hundreds of thou-

sands of acres, and also because it would impose upon the city of San Francisco an enormous unnecessary debt.

As the matter has again been brought before the Senate, I desire to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle bearing upon the whole matter.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Jan. 11, 1916.]

SPRING VALLEY AND HETCH HETCHY—THE MAYOR AGAIN FAILS TO GIVE A CLEAR STATEMENT OF POLICY.

In his annual address the mayor advocates the uninterrupted development of the Hetch Hetchy water source and also calls upon the railroad commission to appraise such parts of the Spring Valley system as we desire with the view of again submitting to the people a proposal for purchase.

What the mayor fails to do is to give such an analysis of the city's financial condition as will demonstrate our ability to finance both enterprises.

And such a failure is inexcusable. It is suggestive of blind going ahead in the hope of muddling through somehow, which is the direct road to bankruptcy in private business.

The Chronicle does not know and can not see how the city can finance both enterprises at once. The city and county attorney, when advocating the purchase of Spring Valley, declared the double financing to be impossible, and that the Hetch Hetchy water must be "left to the next generation." Nobody has ever suggested a way by which, under our debt limit, we could buy Spring Valley and develop Hetch Hetchy.

Therefore, if the mayor sees a way, it is his official duty to explain it to the people. He does not do so. The conclusion must therefore be that he can not, and that he has no intention of developing the Hetch Hetchy water supply, but agrees with the city and county attorney that if we buy Spring Valley the Hetch Hetchy supply must be left to the next generation.

That being apparently the inevitable conclusion, the assumption must be that the mayor's policy is to acquire the Spring Valley property and construct a power plant on the Tuolumne River.

We suppose, in fact, that to be the mayor's policy.

The question then arises by what right money voted for a water supply can be used to construct a power plant.

And, if it is held that the power-plant reservoir will be useful for the next generation as a source of water supply, the question still arises by what right, legal or moral, money voted to procure a water supply for those now living can be used to construct a power plant on the chance that posterity will desire to bring the impounded water to this city.

There is another aspect to the case. Assuming that money voted for a water supply can be used to build a power plant, that certainly ought not to be done unless the power plant when built will be profitable.

It can only be profitable by the use of the power generated, for the city is forbidden to sell current at a profit. It can not be profitable unless the cost of the power delivered is enough less than the price at which it can be bought to make the profit.

And if the saving is so large, it can and should be demonstrated. And whether it will be profitable or not, the people are entitled to have the figures. Why does not the mayor give them?

REPORT ON LITIGATION OVER WITHDRAWN OIL LANDS (H. DOC. NO. 593).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney General, transmitting a supplement to his annual report for the fiscal year 1915, embodying a report upon the litigation over withdrawn oil lands of the United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1773) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Kermit, W. Va., with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 403. An act granting to the State of Oklahoma permission to occupy a certain portion of the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla., and to maintain and operate thereon a fish hatchery;

H. R. 3636. An act to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as reenacted and amended by act of February 23, 1909;

H. R. 4716. An act to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River;

H. R. 4954. An act directing the Secretary of War to reconvey a parcel of land to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss.; and

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MYERS. I present a petition signed by the commissioners of Polson, Mont., in favor of an appropriation of $1,000,000 for Flathead reclamation project in that State. The petition is short, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD with the signatures, there being only three of them, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLSON, MONT., *January 1, 1916.*

To the President and Congress of the United States:

We the undersigned commissioners of Polson, Mont., do most urgently request of Congress that they pass an appropriation of not less than $1,000,000 for work on the Flathead project for the ensuing year.

If this project is to be completed in an efficient, businesslike, and economical manner, it is necessary that the appropriations for construction work on the project be very materially increased.

It means much to the citizens and taxpayers of this city whether or not this project is to be completed within a reasonable length of time.

We trust you will give this matter the consideration it deserves and grant the very largest possible amount for this most worthy purpose.

Respectfully submitted.

J. W. CLARK, *Mayor.*
E. N. STOUGHTON, *Councilman.*
H. W. DOUGLAS, *Councilman.*

Mr. KENYON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Corning, Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the National School of Civic Evangelism, of Chicago, Ill., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, for the prohibition of the shipment of New England rum and other intoxicants to Africa, and to prohibit interstate transmission of race gambling odds and bets, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the National School of Civic Evangelism, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation for prohibition in the Philippine Islands, which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Iowa, praying for the placing of an embargo on munitions of war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Waverly, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to fix a standard price for trade-marked and patented articles, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also (for Mr. BURLEIGH) presented a petition of Local Branch No. 108, Paving Cutters' Union of the United States and Canada, of Willards Point, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect the paving-block industry, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I present a telegram and ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Censorship of motion pictures is the most dangerous attack on American liberties since the foundation of the Republic. The motion picture is a process of recording thought on yellow parchment without the use of printer's ink, and is as great an advance on printings as Guttenberg's invention was over the quill pen. The printing press revolutionized the world by bringing knowledge within the reach of thousands. The motion picture brings knowledge within the reach of hundreds of millions. To strangle this great art in its infancy will be a crime against humanity. Free speech is the foundation of our Republic. There is no reason for censorship. The motion picture is now cleaner than the spoken drama or the press. The police powers of the State are already ample. Any citizen can close any theater within an hour if the laws of morality are violated. A censorship of opinion is the aim of our enemies. Our fathers fled the Old World to escape this and founded the Republic to free the human mind from such shackles. Shall we go back to the dark ages? I first preached the Clansman as a sermon. No censor dared to silence my pulpit. I turned my sermon into a lecture and delivered it from Maine to California without license. I turned the lecture into a novel, and no censor has yet stopped the press of Doubleday, Page & Co. I turned the novel into a spoken play, and no censor has dared to interfere. I turned the play into a motion picture, and it has cost me $75,000 in lawyers' fees to fight the local censors the first 10 months. This condition of affairs is infamous. It is the immediate duty of Congress to reaffirm the principles of free speech in America and abolish all censors.

THOMAS DIXON.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of sundry citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Adrian, Mich., remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, kerosene, or crude oil, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Marquette, Mich., praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Nogales, Ariz., remonstrating against the recent massacre of Americans in Mexico and praying for action by the

United States Government in relation thereto, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Safford, Ariz., praying for a readjustment of the compensation paid to the railroads for transporting the mails, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against any alliance by the United States with European countries, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the National Federation Implement and Vehicle Dealers' Associations, of Abilene, Kans., praying for the creation of a nonpartisan tariff commission, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to relieve the congested condition of freight on the eastern seaboard, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the imposition of a prohibitive tax on intoxicating liquors, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina presented memorials of sundry citizens of South Carolina, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BRADY presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Council of Boise, Idaho, and a petition of the Socialist Party of Local View, Idaho, praying for the printing of the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations as a public document, which were referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Homedale and Cambridge, in the State of Idaho, praying for the imposition of a prohibitive tax on intoxicating liquors, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the State Highway Commission of Idaho, praying for an appropriation for the construction of a highway from Ashton, Idaho, through Targhee National Forest to Yellowstone Park, Wyo., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of the congregation of the Christ Congregational Church, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and a petition of sundry citizens of Albany, N. Y., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of the Bronx Co. and of Titus Blatter & Co., of New York City, N. Y., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THOMAS. I have a copy of a series of resolutions against war preparations, adopted by the Larimer County Farmers' Union, at Loveland, Colo., at a meeting held on December 3, 1915, and also against a large standing Army or any change in a military system tending to compulsory military service. I ask that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions against war preparations adopted by the Larimer County Farmers' Union at Loveland, Colo., at a meeting held on December 3, 1915.

Whereas the President of the United States has announced that the coming session of Congress will be asked to make greatly increased appropriations for the Army, the Navy, and the National Guard, and for other purposes, included in a program to prepare this Republic for war; and

Whereas more than 60 per cent of all Federal revenues are now used for war expenses, a burden that is already too heavy to be borne by producers without protest; and

Whereas the National Farmers' Union in convention at Lincoln, Nebr., representing the organized farmers of 31 States, adopted the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That we demand economy in all appropriations made by Congress and that we are especially opposed to any great increase in expenditures for the Army and Navy, but approve a reasonable outlay for coast defense by submarines or other weapons proved by recent experience to be effective for that purpose; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we are unalterably opposed to a large standing Army and to any change in our military system tending to compulsory military service."

Therefore we, the members of the Larimer County Farmers' Union, in regular meeting, declare and order:

First. That we are opposed to the proposed plan for making appropriations amounting within the next five years to more than $2,000,000,000 for the Army and Navy and other war preparedness.

Second. That we reaffirm and indorse the resolutions of the National Farmers' Union against huge appropriations for war preparedness and particularly against a great standing Army and a change in our military system that we believe, if adopted, would ultimately result in universal compulsory military service.

Third. We demand that our Senators and Congressmen vote against the proposed program for military preparedness and use all their influence to prevent any such measure from being enacted into law.

Fourth. We indorse the position of our official organ, The National Field, in opposing unnecessary appropriations for war preparedness and Army and Navy increases.

Fifth. That copies of these resolutions bearing the signature of the president and attested by the secretary be sent to the Senators from Colorado and to our Representative in Congress from the second district, the Hon. CHARLES B. TIMBERLAKE, and to the local papers of this county for publication.

Sixth. We demand that the Congress redeem all pledges made to the farmers and proceed at once to enact a rural credit law, a law against gambling in produce, options on boards of trade, a law providing for national standards for grain grading and inspection, and a law creating a national bureau of markets, all of which were indorsed by the national convention of the Farmers' Union at Lincoln on September 8, 1915.

[SEAL.] LARIMER COUNTY FARMERS' UNION,
P. H. BOOTHROYD, *President*.
L. H. FAGAN, *Secretary*.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CLAPP, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 136. A bill for the relief of Eva M. Bowman (Rept. No. 46); and

S. 137. A bill for the relief of Omer D. Lewis (Rept. No. 47).

Mr. KENYON, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 43) authorizing and directing the Department of Labor to make an inquiry into the cost of living in the District of Columbia and to report thereon to Congress as early as practicable, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 45) thereon.

Mr. NELSON. On yesterday the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] submitted an amendment to the bill (S. 3331) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce. Through inadvertence the amendment was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It should have gone to the Committee on Commerce. I move that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

FISCAL AFFAIRS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 247).

Mr. FLETCHER. From the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably with an amendment the resolution submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] on January 14, being Senate Resolution No. 68 to print the manuscript entitled "Report of the joint select committee appointed under the act of March 3, 1915," as a Senate document. There is considerable demand for it. The matter is in type, and these copies can be run off without any trouble. The committee propose to increase the number from 850 to 1,600 copies. I ask unanimous consent to have it considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The amendment of the Committee on Printing was, in line 8, before the words "additional copies," to strike out "eight hundred and fifty" and insert "one thousand six hundred," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the report of the joint select committee appointed under the act approved March 3, 1915, to determine the fiscal relations between the United States and the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 495), together with the hearings held thereon, be printed, with accompanying illustrations, as a Senate document, and that 1,600 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADY:

A bill (S. 3615) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Payette, Idaho; and

A bill (S. 3616) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Blackfoot, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 3617) for the relief of Elizabeth Davis; and

A bill (S. 3618) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to subdivide the southeast quarter of section 18, township 46 north,

range 4 west, Boise meridian (the same being that portion of the town site of Plummer, Benewah County, Idaho, not yet platted), into 5-acre tracts for sale, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3619) to advance funds for the construction of a road within the Targhee National Forest, in the State of Idaho, and the Madison National Forest, in the State of Montana (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

A bill (S. 3620) to provide for the establishment and maintenance of mining experiment, mine safety, and mine assay stations, for making investigations and preparing and issuing information to those engaged in mining, for keeping records of mining properties, for making assays for prospectors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

A bill (S. 3621) for the relief of John J. Muehleisen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3622) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Overholtz (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3623) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Cochran;

A bill (S. 3624) granting an increase of pension to James A. Saurbaugh;

A bill (S. 3625) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Wheeler;

A bill (S. 3626) granting an increase of pension to Leonard E. Griffiths;

A bill (S. 3627) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Casey;

A bill (S. 3628) granting an increase of pension to James McNamara (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3629) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Mullen (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3630) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton Davis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3631) granting an increase of pension to John J. Foraker (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3632) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Platt (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3633) granting an increase of pension to John Curtis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3634) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. C. O'Connor (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3635) granting an increase of pension to Simon Jensen (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3636) granting an increase of pension to John Wilson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3637) granting an increase of pension to Lewis W. Graham (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3638) granting an increase of pension to Frank L. Simpson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3639) granting a pension to Philip Hutchinson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3640) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Abel (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3641) granting a pension to George W. Bass (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3642) granting a pension to Daniel A. Williams (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3643) granting an increase of pension to Viola C. McConville (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 3644) to pension widows and minor children of officers and enlisted men who served in the War with Spain, Philippine insurrection, or in China; and

A bill (S. 3645) granting an increase of pension to Edward Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 3646) to amend the act of February 11, 1915 (38 Stat. L., p. 807), providing for the opening of the Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3647) for the relief of Moses C. Tingley; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 3648) for the relief of M. A. Sweeney Shipyards & Foundry Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMMONS:

A bill (S. 3649) to establish a fish-cultural station on Lumber River, in Moore County, N. C.; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 3650) to convert the premises connected with Fort Johnston, in the town of Southport, N. C., into a public park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3651) for the erection of a monument to Nathaniel Macon; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 3652) granting an increase of pension to Jamison S. Tweed (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3653) granting a pension to Charles A. Stockard (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3654) granting a pension to Mary E. Gosnell; and

A bill (S. 3655) granting a pension to Bertha Z. Smith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES:

A bill (S. 3656) granting an increase of pension to Whitfield H. Lance; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 3657) for the removal of the college women's dormitory and the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a new dormitory at the Columbia Institution for the Deaf in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3658) to establish a naval academy at some point in the State of Washington to be designated by the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 3659) to establish a military academy at some point in the State of Washington to be designated by the Secretary of War; and

A bill (S. 3660) for the relief of volunteer officers and soldiers who served in the Philippine Islands beyond the period of their enlistment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3661) to improve the aids to navigation at the entrance to Willapa Bay, Wash.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3662) authorizing the leasing of the lands embraced within the Hoh Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3663) making timberlands available for homestead settlement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 3664) for the relief of William W. Danenhower (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 3665) to amend act of October 3, 1913, known as income-tax law; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENYON (for Mr. BURLEIGH):

A bill (S. 3666) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Huntley;

A bill (S. 3667) granting an increase of pension to John C. Gray; and

A bill (S. 3668) granting an increase of pension to Hanson Hutchings, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 3669) to amend section 20 of an act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, as amended, to provide for certain penalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 3670) to establish a military academy at Fort Snelling, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3671) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth W. Allen (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3672) granting an increase of pension to William Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND (for Mr. SMITH of Michigan):

A bill (S. 3673) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to Curtis Buck to a certain piece of land located in Michigan (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3674) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Blackmar, now Mary E. Bruson; and

A bill (S. 3675) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Newell (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANE:

A bill (S. 3676) for the relief of Joseph Stoich (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3677) granting an increase of pension to Larkin Russell; and

A bill (S. 3678) granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Bratton (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 3679) granting an increase of pension to Joseph N. Foster (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STONE:

A bill (S. 3680) to authorize the payment of indemnities to the Governments of Austria-Hungary, Greece, and Turkey for

injuries inflicted on their nationals during riots occurring in South Omaha, Nebr., February 21, 1909 (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 3681) for the relief of the owners of the steamship *Esparta;* to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 3682) granting a pension to Nettie Lay (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3683) granting an increase of pension to Millard C. Loveless (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3684) granting an increase of pension to Annie B. Dear (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 3685) granting certain lands to the State of Alabama for the use of the insane hospital for the colored; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. STONE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 80) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point Mr. René W. Pintó y Wentworth, a citizen of Cuba (with accompanying paper); and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 81) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy, at Annapolis Mr. Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán, a citizen of Cuba (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JONES:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 82) providing for a survey of Bakers Bay, near the mouth of the Columbia River, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BRADY:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 83) for the relief of James L. Cardwell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. BORAH. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60), creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee, which was reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and is now on the calendar. I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table and that the joint resolution and amendment be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to lie on the table and be printed, and the joint resolution and amendment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee.

Resolved, etc., That the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate and the Committee of the House of Representatives on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, through a joint subcommittee to consist of five Senators and five Representatives, who shall be selected by said committees, respectively, be, and they hereby are, appointed to investigate the subject of the Government control and regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, the efficiency of the existing system in protecting the rights of shippers and carriers and in promoting the public interest, the incorporation or control of the incorporation of carriers, and all proposed changes in the organization of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the act to regulate commerce, with authority to sit during the recess of Congress and with power to summon witnesses, to appoint necessary experts, clerks, and stenographers, and to do whatever is necessary for a full and comprehensive examination and study of the subject and report to Congress as expeditiously as may be; that the sum of $25,000, or so much thereof as is necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution and to pay the necessary expenses of the subcommittee and its members, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Said appropriation shall be immediately available and shall be paid out on the audit and order of the chairman or acting chairman of said subcommittee, which audit and order shall be conclusive and binding upon all departments as to the correctness of the accounts of such subcommittee.

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BORAH to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee.

On page 3, line 13, after the word commerce," insert the following: "also the subject of Government ownership of all public utilities, such as telegraph, telephone, express companies, and railroads engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, and report as to the wisdom or feasibility of Government ownership of such utilities and as to the comparative worth and efficiency of Government regulation and control as compared with Government ownership and regulation."

WILLIAM SCHULDT.

Mr. BRADY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $101 to credit to the account of William Schuldt, of Lewiston, Idaho, for traveling expenses on official business, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

COST OF ARMOR PLATE AND ARMOR PLANT.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from South Carolina will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That 500 additional copies of House Document No. 193, Fifty-ninth Congress, second session, entitled "Letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of the Board of Naval Officers appointed under the act of March 3, 1905, as to cost of armor plate and armor plant," be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

Mr. SMOOT. Has that report already been printed as a Senate document?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been printed as a House document.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have been told by the printing clerk of the Senate that it will cost about $125.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not a question of cost; the House which has ordered the printing of a document should also order its reprinting when necessary.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, however, happens to want this document, and the supply is exhausted in both document rooms.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs desires the document, they should have it. I am not saying that they should not; but, as I said, if the House in the first instance ordered the printing of the document, it thereby became a House document, and if an increased number is desired that increase should be ordered by the House which ordered it printed in the first instance.

Mr. PENROSE. I did not hear what the document was, and I ask the Senator from South Carolina to inform me.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is Niles's report on armor plate.

Mr. PENROSE. That document ought to be printed.

Mr. TILLMAN. I repeat, the supply of this document is exhausted in both document rooms.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from South Carolina, however, that the chairman of the Committee on Printing can order $200 worth of printing without any action on the part of the Senate; and I suggest to him that he withdraw the resolution and request the chairman of the Committee on Printing to give the order to the Public Printer for the printing of 500 copies of the document for the use of the committee.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am willing that the Senator from Utah shall proceed in his own way, so that I get the document printed. That is all I want.

Mr. SMOOT. The way I suggest would be best.

Mr. TILLMAN. Under the assurance of the Senator from Utah that he will take care of the printing of the document, I withdraw the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution is withdrawn.

RIGHTS OF FOREIGN TRADE.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, for several days past the papers have had a good deal to say about the probable extension of the order of blockade by Great Britain, and the implication has been in these publications that by such an order some additional power would be given to the allies to restrict the trade of neutrals through neutral ports in neutral goods. In point of fact, there is nothing upon which to base such a claim. No such additional power would be given.

I hold in my hand a portion of the letter of the State Department to Great Britain of date March 30, 1915, which really covers this question. In discussing the orders of March 1 and March 11 the rights under a blockade to interfere with neutral trade to neutral ports in neutral goods by opposing belligerents is considered. I ask that this page and a half be printed in the RECORD, and in connection with doing so I will read just one paragraph from it:

It is confidently assumed that His Majesty's Government will not deny that it is a rule sanctioned by general practice that, even though a blockade should exist and the doctrine of contraband as to un-

blockaded territory be rigidly enforced, innocent shipments may be freely transported to and from the United States through neutral countries to belligerent territory without being subject to the penalties of contraband traffic or breach of blockade, much less to detention, requisition, or confiscation.

I ask that this page and a half from this letter of the State Department be printed in the RECORD. I think just at this time it is very interesting.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

(The Secretary of State to Ambassador W. H. Page.)

No. 1343.] DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 30, 1915.

You are instructed to deliver the following to His Majesty's Government, in reply to your Nos. 1795 and 1798, of March 15:

The Government of the United States has given careful consideration to the subjects treated in the British notes of March 13 and March 15 and to the British order in council of the latter date.

These communications contain matters of grave importance to neutral nations. They appear to menace their rights of trade and intercourse, not only with belligerents but also with one another. They call for frank comment in order that misunderstandings may be avoided. The Government of the United States deems it its duty, therefore, speaking in the sincerest spirit of friendship, to make its own view and position with regard to them unmistakably clear.

The order in council of the 15th of March would constitute, were its provisions to be actually carried into effect as they stand, a practical assertion of unlimited belligerent rights over neutral commerce within the whole European area, and an almost unqualified denial of the sovereign rights of the nations now at peace.

This Government takes it for granted that there can be no question what those rights are. A nation's sovereignty over its own ships and citizens under its own flag on the high seas in time of peace is, of course, unlimited; and that sovereignty suffers no diminution in time of war, except in so far as the practice and consent of civilized nations has limited it by the recognition of certain now clearly determined rights, which it is conceded may be exercised by nations which are at war.

A belligerent nation has been conceded the right of visit and search, and the right of capture and condemnation, if upon examination a neutral vessel is found to be engaged in unneutral service or to be carrying contraband of war intended for the enemy's government or armed forces. It has been conceded the right to establish and maintain a blockade of an enemy's ports and coasts and to capture and condemn any vessel taken in trying to break the blockade. It is even conceded the right to detain and take to its own ports for judicial examination all vessels which it suspects for substantial reasons to be engaged in unneutral or contraband service and to condemn them if the suspicion is sustained. But such rights, long clearly defined both in doctrine and practice, have hitherto been held to be the only permissible exceptions to the principle of universal equality of sovereignty on the high seas as between belligerents and nations not engaged in war.

It is confidently assumed that His Majesty's Government will not deny that it is a rule sanctioned by general practice that, even though a blockade should exist and the doctrine of contraband as to unblockaded territory be rigidly enforced, innocent shipments may be freely transported to and from the United States through neutral countries to belligerent territory without being subject to the penalties of contraband traffic or breach of blockade, much less to detention, requisition, or confiscation.

Moreover, the rules of the declaration of Paris of 1856—among them that free ships make free goods—will hardly at this day be disputed by the signatories of that solemn agreement.

His Majesty's Government, like the Government of the United States, have often and explicitly held that these rights represent the best usage of warfare in the dealings of belligerents with neutrals at sea. In this connection I desire to direct attention to the opinion of the Chief Justice of the United States in the case of the *Peterhof*, which arose out of the Civil War, and to the fact that that opinion was unanimously sustained in the award of the Arbitration Commission of 1871, to which the case was presented at the request of Great Britain. From that time to the declaration of London of 1909, adopted with modifications by the order in council of the 23d of October last, these rights have not been seriously questioned by the British Government. And no claim on the part of Great Britain of any justification for interfering with these clear rights of the United States and its citizens as neutrals could be admitted. To admit it would be to assume an attitude of unneutrality toward the present enemies of Great Britain, which would be obviously inconsistent with the solemn obligations of this Government in the present circumstances; and for Great Britain to make such a claim would be for her to abandon and set at naught the principles for which she has consistently and earnestly contended in other times and circumstances.

The note of His Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs which accompanies the order in council, and which bears the same date, notifies the Government of the United States of the establishment of a blockade which is, if defined by the terms of the order in council, to include all the coasts and ports of Germany and every port of possible access to enemy territory. But the novel and quite unprecedented feature of that blockade, if we are to assume it to be properly so defined, is that it embraces many neutral ports and coasts, bars access to them, and subjects all neutral ships seeking to approach them to the same suspicion that would attach to them were they bound for the ports of the enemies of Great Britain, and to unusual risks and penalties.

It is manifest that such limitations, risks, and liabilities placed upon the ships of a neutral power on the high seas, beyond the right of visit and search and the right to prevent the shipment of contraband already referred to, are a distinct invasion of the sovereign rights of the nation whose ships, trade, or commerce is interfered with.

The Government of the United States is, of course, not oblivious to the great changes which have occurred in the conditions and means of naval warfare since the rules hitherto governing legal blockade were formulated. It might be ready to admit that the old form of "close" blockade, with its cordon of ships in the immediate offing of the blockaded ports, is no longer practicable in face of an enemy possessing the means and opportunity to make an effective defense by the use of submarines, mines, and air craft; but it can hardly be maintained that, whatever form of effective blockade may be made use of, it is impossible to conform at least to the spirit and principles of the established rules of war. If the necessities of the case should seem to render it imperative that the cordon of blockading vessels be extended across the approaches to any neighboring neutral port or country, it would seem clear that it would still be easily practicable to comply with the well-recognized and reasonable prohibition of international law against the blockading of neutral ports by according free admission and exit to all lawful traffic with neutral ports through the blockading cordon. This traffic would, of course, include all outward-bound traffic from the neutral country and all inward-bound traffic to the neutral country except contraband in transit to the enemy. Such procedure need not conflict in any respect with the rights of the belligerent maintaining the blockade, since the right would remain with the blockading vessels to visit and search all ships either entering or leaving the neutral territory which they were in fact, but not of right, investing.

The Government of the United States notes that in the order in council His Majesty's Government give as their reason for entering upon a course of action, which they are aware is without precedent in modern warfare, the necessity they conceive themselves to have been placed under to retaliate upon their enemies for measures of a similar nature which the latter have announced it their intention to adopt and which they have to some extent adopted; but the Government of the United States, recalling the principles upon which His Majesty's Government have hitherto been scrupulous to act, interprets this as merely a reason for certain extraordinary activities on the part of His Majesty's naval forces and not as an excuse for or prelude to any unlawful action. If the course pursued by the present enemies of Great Britain should prove to be in fact tainted by illegality and disregard of the principles of war sanctioned by enlightened nations, it can not be supposed, and this Government does not for a moment suppose, that His Majesty's Government would wish the same taint to attach to their own actions or would cite such illegal acts as in any sense or degree a justification for similar practices on their part in so far as they affect neutral rights.

It is thus that the Government of the United States interprets the language of the note of His Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs which accompanies the copy of the order in council which was handed to the ambassador of the United States near the Government in London and by him transmitted to Washington.

LECTURE BY HENRY J. PIERCE ON NECESSITY FOR WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, there is an invitation that I should like to extend to Senators, but after conference with some of those who know about such things it is thought that probably it might create a precedent that we might not like. So I will not extend it, but I will content myself with asking Senators to note the invitation on page 1161 of the RECORD of this morning, in the second column.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I have an editorial here from the Evening Times, of Pawtucket, R. I., one of the most considerable papers in that State. I should like to have it read and printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Secretary proceeded to read the editorial.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I object to the further reading of that paper. I do not believe it is proper for the Senate to put itself in the attitude of assailing the President of our own country in behalf of or in comparison with a man who is reputed to have been a murderer, cutthroat, and usurper.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Shall the document be read?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Montana was right in objecting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the document be read?

Mr. STONE. Wait a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not debatable.

Mr. STONE. I ask permission to make a single observation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has indicated more than once his intention to object in such cases. I merely wish to say, if I may, that it seems to me while it is probably true that some newspaper writer can state the attitude of some Senators better than they can state it themselves, I hope in the future—and I intended to say this at the conclusion of the reading of this article—we will not have any more of this sort of thing attempted or done in the Senate. If the Senator from Utah will not carry out his frequently declared purpose to object, I shall do so myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now, the question is, Shall the matter be read. [Putting the question.] The noes seem to have it. The noes have it. The matter is stricken from the RECORD.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his clerks, announced that the President had, on January 18, 1916, approved and signed the following act:

S. 1230. An act to authorize the construction of bridges across the Fox River, at Aurora, Ill.

JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (H. DOC. NO. 594).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the reports of the clerk and chief probation officer of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia for the two years ending June 30, 1915, together with a letter of transmittal from the judge of said court.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1916.*

NOTE.—Report accompanied similar message to the House of Representatives.

BRIDGE ACROSS TUG FORK, BIG SANDY RIVER.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1773) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Kermit, W. Va., which were, in line 9, after "near," to insert "Warfield, Ky., and" and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Warfield, Ky., and Kermit, W. Va."

Mr. BECKHAM. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 403. An act granting to the State of Oklahoma permission to occupy a certain portion of the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla., and to maintain and operate thereon a fish hatchery, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4954. An act directing the Secretary of War to reconvey a parcel of land to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 4716. An act to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River; and

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

H. R. 3636. An act to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as reenacted and amended by act of February 23, 1909, was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, what reference was made of that bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If I am not mistaken in regard to the bill, it ought to go to the Committee on Finance. I understand it was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads at the last session of Congress and re-referred to the Committee on Finance. It is a House bill which has been called to my attention.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO.

During the transaction of routine business,

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, if it is appropriate at this time, I desire to move that Senate concurrent resolution No. 9 be immediately committed to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent, that may be done.

Mr. BORAH. Is that the resolution which we have had under discussion?

Mr. LEWIS. It is the resolution, I will answer the Senator from Idaho, introduced by myself touching the question of conferring upon the President authority to cooperate with any other Government in his judgment appropriate in sending such armed force as may be necessary for the protection of American citizens in Mexico. It is the one the Senator from Idaho, I believe, heard me discuss the other day in the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I had the pleasure of listening to the Senator. The suggestion I was going to make is this. I am ready, so far as I am concerned, to shape and dispose of that resolution here upon the floor now.

And, Mr. President, I make this single suggestion, that the resolution had just as well be withdrawn for any good it will do the American citizens who are being murdered in Mexico day by day, as to send it to the committee. In saying that I do not mean to reflect upon the committee, but this very hour is the time when those people need protection and need decisive action. The Senate ought to take a decided step this morning to notify the Mexican people that so far as the Congress are concerned we are ready to use the armed force of the United States to protect our people. What we need at this time is prompt and decided and unmistakable action.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the resolution going to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. LEWIS. May I be permitted an observation? I will say to the Senator from Idaho——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The whole thing is out of order. It can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. BORAH. I ask, then, that the resolution may go over until we get through with the morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being an objection, it is not now in order to move to send it to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

After the transaction of further routine business, which appears under its appropriate heading,

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I desire to recur to the subject which was under consideration a short time ago, and I move that Senate concurrent resolution No. 9 at once be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I will state that my reason for so doing is because the committee meets to-morrow, and I have reason to believe that they will act promptly upon the resolution, and to-morrow make such disposition of the matter as will comport with the view of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] by giving immediate hearing. For that reason, I move that the resolution be now sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HUGHES. Will not the Senator from Illinois withhold that request until morning business is concluded?

Mr. BORAH. May I say a word, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has already once ruled upon the question, that until the conclusion of the morning hour, except by unanimous consent, the calendar or anything upon the calendar can not be taken up.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I misunderstood the Chair. As I now understand it, I think the ruling of the Chair is unquestionably in accordance with the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Nothing can be taken up during the morning hour, prior to 1 o'clock, except by unanimous consent. That has been the uniform ruling of all presiding officers.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois misunderstood the Chair's application.

After the transaction of further routine business, which appears under its appropriate heading,

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk to be read, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 71), as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and instructed to use the Army and Navy of the United States for the protection of American lives and property in Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I notice in the morning papers of to-day an intimation that the President of the United States has——

Mr. STONE. I object. Of course, my motion is an objection to the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. LIPPITT. There is a motion before the Senate, and I was going to say a few words upon it.

Mr. STONE. I ask for the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LEWIS. Under the rules, if objection were made the resolution would lie over one day, would it not?

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

Mr. LEWIS. I rise to a point of order. Under objection it lies over a day, and can not be discussed at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If objection is made it goes over a day, but objection has not yet been raised.

Mr. LIPPITT. I hope the Senator will not raise that objection hastily, and I should like to say just a word or two in regard to this matter. First, I think it is a very important matter, and I think the situation is such at the present time that the

Senate ought to give immediate consideration to this question. American lives are being lost and American property is being destroyed every day in Mexico, and we ought not to sit here idly without expressing our opinion and considering such a situation as that.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LIPPITT. Not for a moment, Mr. President. I was about to ask the Senator from Missouri a question, if he will allow me.

Mr. STONE. If the Senator will permit me to say a word, if the resolution goes over under a mere objection until to-morrow morning and then comes up for consideration the motion which I have made to refer it to the Committee on Foreign Relations would then be in order. Under that motion, being debatable, the Senator from Rhode Island or any other Senator could proceed to debate it. So far as I am concerned, I see no reason why the Senator should not express himself, so far as he wishes, this morning as well as to-morrow morning; but I renew the motion which I have made to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to have the resolution read for information.

Mr. LEWIS. I object to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just one second.

Mr. STONE. But I have made a motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; but the Senator from Illinois, as the Chair understands, has objected to the present consideration of the resolution, which will carry it over, together with the motion in connection with it.

Mr. LEWIS. Under that objection it lies over a day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It certainly does, under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, there are some of us who do not know what the resolution is, and we should like to have information concerning that point.

Mr. STONE. I will inquire of the Senator from Illinois what is the object of having it go over until to-morrow morning, when the same situation will be here then that we have now?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, if he feels that he would rather not have the objection made to carry the resolution over, and out of deference to him as head of the committee I withdraw my objection.

Mr. STONE. Then let the motion which I have made to refer be the pending motion.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair begs pardon of Senators; the Chair's attention was distracted. Does the Senator from Illinois withdraw his objection?

Mr. LEWIS. I withdraw the objection in deference to the views of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the pending motion is to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I did not understand what the Chair said.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending motion is to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Senator from Rhode Island has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. LIPPITT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. Is this a Senate, a concurrent, or a joint resolution?

Mr. LIPPITT. It is a Senate resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator think that the Senate of the United States alone can give the authority to the President which the resolution seeks to give?

Mr. LIPPITT. It can be made a joint resolution. I am not particular about the exact form in which it is done. It is the substance of the matter which concerns me.

Mr. THOMAS. It seems to me my suggestion is a very substantial one.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, in the press this morning I saw a statement that the President of the United States has made an agreement with certain Republics of South America under which it is impossible for him to take any action in Mexico without their consent. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri, who is in special touch with the administration on account of his position as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of this body, if he has any idea how long it is going to take for the United States to get the permission of Peru, Guatemala, and Argentina to protect the lives of its own citizens and the property of its own citizens in Mexico? I presume that some arrangement of the kind has been made, and before I proceed further to the discussion of the resolution which I have offered I should like to know if the Senator can give us any information as to how long it is going to be before this great American Republic will be allowed to act in the protection of its own people.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the question the Senator propounds is so puerile and inconsequential that it scarcely deserves an answer. To ask whether the Government of the United States is bound to consult any other Government in the world as to what it may or may not do, I repeat, is so—I wish I could find just the word; I wish to be parliamentary—so far beneath the dignity of a Senator of the United States that I decline to answer. It is a question based, as suggested by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], on some newspaper report.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I am very glad to hear the Senator from Missouri characterize this statement in the very strong language which he has used. I would not have referred to it at this time, coming from the source it does, as the Senator says—a mere newspaper declaration—if it were not for the fact that for more than two years negotiations have been carried on with various parties in Mexico without any information being given to this body as to their intention or their character.

There has been recently passed by this body a request for full information in regard to the Mexican situation. It is information that, in my opinion, ought to have been given to this body long since, and without any special request. That request, however, unanimously passed by this body, has now been in the hands of the President for nearly two weeks without any response as yet being made to it, without any statement that there is going to be any response made to it; and I, for one, am in the dark as to what the situation is in regard to Mexican matters. As is the case with every other Senator in this body, I have been obliged to rely upon newspaper reports for information as to what is going on in connection with Mexico. The information which I now have, reading from the Washington Post, is that—

> Congress will be fully informed of the agreement entered into between the United States and the Republics of Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Bolivia, Uruguay, and Guatemala.
>
> The chief provision of this agreement is that any step taken by the United States of a more aggressive character will be at the instigation of the Central and South American countries. The President and Secretary Lansing have in effect pledged this country to be guided by the views of their associates in the undertaking.

The Senator from Missouri may characterize that as puerile. He may say it is impossible that such an agreement can be made, and I sincerely hope it is impossible; but until we have information from some higher source I am obliged to rely upon reports of this character. Therefore I do not think it was improper for me to ask the Senator from Missouri about the accuracy of such a report as that, which is of such vital importance at this time, when American lives are being destroyed.

The Senator from Missouri also, in a few remarks which he made here last week, asked the Senators on this side of the Chamber to be fair, because he said there would be other American lives lost, and that we had to expect that incidents such as occurred last week, the destruction of the lives of 18 Americans, would be repeated. It seems to me, in the light of such a declaration as that and in the light of such a declaration as this in the paper, that it is not improper that information should be asked about it.

On August 27, 1913, in discussing the Mexican situation, the President of the United States used this language:

> We should let everyone who assumes to exercise authority in any part of Mexico know in the most unequivocal way that we shall vigilantly watch the fortunes of those Americans who can not get away, and shall hold those responsible for their sufferings and losses to a definite reckoning. That can be and will be made plain beyond the possibility of a misunderstanding.

Sir, the doctrine of "I can" is one that is very congenial to the spirit of the American people. The American people have been a people of accomplishment. They have been in the habit of doing things; and when anybody makes that declaration, it meets a very responsive note in the heart of every American citizen. Hand in hand with that doctrine goes the statement "I will," for America expects that its citizens will do what they can do. So, sir, the doctrine of "I can" and "I will" is one that epitomizes the spirit of the American people for more than 250 years. If that statement and that doctrine had been carried out in connection with this Mexican matter, I think, sir, we would not have been in our present situation.

Unfortunately, however, the President of the United States has also made another declaration in connection with Mexican matters. At Indianapolis, about a year ago, he made the re-

markable statement that "it was the right of the Mexicans to spill as much blood as they pleased and as long as they pleased."

Sir, with that cruel and brutal and pusillanimous doctrine I have no sympathy. There are different kinds of blood. There is Mexican blood, and with that we have no particular concern in this body; but there is also American blood, and with the spilling of that we have great duties and responsibilities. Those duties and responsibilities can not be evaded until such time as their consideration will be of no effect if we are to act as we ought to in such circumstances.

Further than that, the administration has been very solicitous about the foreign trade of this country. It has been urging American citizens to engage in it. The President, in his tariff message, said that we must encourage trade, especially foreign trade. Now, sir, foreign trade means foreign complications. If a man sends his merchandise to the other countries of the world, it means that he must sometimes go there himself to watch over it and guard it. We are now confronted with the situation that the President of the United States, and recently the Secretary of State, have said that all of our people in Mexico should be compelled to leave that country and to abandon their property.

Sir, we can not be a great trading Nation in the foreign countries of the world if in time of trouble we are going to say to our people that their property there will not be protected. If we encourage our people to engage in foreign commerce, it is our manifest duty to protect them in the difficulties that may arise in connection with such transactions.

The Senator from Missouri a day or two ago asked one or two Senators on this floor what they would do in connection with the Mexican matter, and they gave such answers as seemed to them suitable. In view of the considerations I have stated I will say for myself, in answer to the question of what I would do, that if I had been President of the United States last week, when the report of these Mexican murders arrived in Washington, and had been Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, another sun would not have set over the Sierra Madre Mountains before American soldiers would be hot on the trail of those murderers. The first scrap of paper that I would have used in connection with that affair would have been a telegram instructing those soldiers to use every possible effort to secure those murderers, dead or alive; and I would have had in it a strong intimation that they need not object to including in those provisions some of their accomplices and sympathizers. And, sir, I would have kept up that policy until the life of every American ranchman in Mexico was as safe as though he had been in the streets of Washington, until every head of cattle upon his ranch was as safe from robbers and bandits as the children in his house.

Such a doctrine as that, I believe, will meet a responsive note to-day in the hearts of the American people. It is not war on Mexico or her people. It is maintaining order and protecting Americans. Sir, the time has come when we can not sit idly by and see our people murdered and their property lost on the excuse that we are not capable of effective action.

It is with those feelings, sir, that I have introduced this resolution, and I hope it may have the action of the Senate.

Mr. STONE obtained the floor.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, before the Senator begins, will he yield to me to offer a simple resolution on another subject? It is a matter of importance.

Mr. STONE. Does it relate to international affairs?

Mr. MYERS. No; it relates to another subject entirely. It is a routine matter.

Mr. STONE. Can not the Senator withhold it? Is it very urgent at this particular moment?

Mr. MYERS. Well, no; but I should like to offer it at some time before 2 o'clock. I will wait, then.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be a violation of the rule. The Chair is going to assume the responsibility from now on, until the Chair changes his mind, of enforcing the rule of the Senate that no Senator shall be interrupted for the purpose of making a report or introducing a bill or memorial or any other document. The Senator from Missouri is entitled to the floor.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I shall occupy the attention of the Senate for only a brief while. It may be that you could find a Senator, possibly two or three, on the other side who may be really anxious for war with Mexico and who would like forthwith to unleash the dogs of war; I am not sure as to that, but I seriously doubt whether there is a genuine sentiment among the level-headed and sensible, the conservative and patriotic Senators on that side for any proceeding of that kind. I hardly believe, Mr. President, that if that sentiment represented the consensus of opinion on that side the Senators over there would select their most indiscreet, intemperate, and impulsive associates instead of their more level-headed men to give expression to their attitude. I can not but think that these wild ones speak only for themselves.

Mr. President, I do not believe that Senators on that side are really desirous of war or that they have an impatient thirst or appetite to lick their tongues in Mexican gore. I do not believe that. On the contrary, I think that a declaration of war by the Congress would be the last thing the sensible men on that side would desire. It would be the last thing any sensible man would desire, but they above all others. A declaration of war would break their hearts. There are a few Senators on that side who for party reasons, as they see it, talk about war because seemingly some of them have not anything else to talk about, and because they think they must make fuss and feathers and create what may at least approach a sensation. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] suggests sotto voce that all of them are past military age. Still, a man may be beyond military age and his capacity for voluble exploitation remain unimpaired, or, as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] suggests aside to me, that such a man in other ways may be just as valuable as ever, whatever that may mean.

Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island, who is striving in these grave emergencies to leap into the leadership of his party, in an apparent effort to force it into an attitude of desiring and insisting upon war, refers to something I said a few days ago about the possibility—aye, the probability—of a repetition in some place or in one way or another of the murderous incident that occurred at San Ysabel some days ago. As to that, I wish to say that, however regrettable it would be if such incidents should in future occur, it would probably be due to foolhardiness and adventure on the part of those who suffer, whether Americans or the nationals of other countries. If knowingly and deliberately men go into a nest of bandits, or go among wild Indians, who have a wholly different code of morals and ethics from ours; if they deliberately go right into such dangers, they are apt to get into trouble. It has not been very long ago since men took their lives in their hands when they went out among the Apaches or Comanches on our own plains and in our own mountains; and they knew it when they went, and they took the hazard like men. Men do those things. They have done it all through history here and there. It may have been, and still may be, foolhardy, but men do such things. More than that, I will say at this juncture that I think it is a foolhardy thing for men or women to go aboard a ship and ride recklessly into a zone of danger, where they know that behind every wave lifting the ship death is lurking. But they do it. This Government no doubt is under some measure of obligation to do what it can to protect even the people who do these foolish things, but that does not lessen the foolishness of the act. When men do things of this kind their recklessness is in a way a crime against the American Government they look to for protection, since it tends to involve the Government and our people in most dangerous controversies.

No doubt men will do these things in the future as they have done them in the past, and if they do them the same old result will probably follow. If Americans or other foreigners go into a nest of Villa bandits, who openly declare their bloody purposes, we know they take their lives in their hands; or if they go out into the Sierra Madre Mountains, among the Yaqui Indians, we also know that they take their lives in their hands. But I have not any doubt that men will continue to do just such things. Even in the very incipiency of the Carranza de facto government, before a half-fair opportunity has been given that government to restore and maintain order in that country, I suppose such people as I speak of will continue to do such foolish things as I deprecate. Hence I have said that such bloody and regrettable incidents as the one recorded a few days ago are likely to occur again.

Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] said that if he had been President, immediately upon receiving word that 18 American citizens had been killed, he would have directed our military forces along the Mexican border to invade Mexico to pursue the bandit murderers—and as my friend from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] says, on the side, without even consulting Congress. Perhaps the Senator from Rhode Island does not know, but he should know, that the President of the United States is without constitutional authority to order our Army to invade Mexico for such purpose as he outlines—that is, to follow these bandits into the heart of Mexico and pursue them over the country for an indefinite period.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

Mr. STONE. That would be war, and the President——

Mr. LIPPITT. Will the Senator from Missouri yield to me for one minute?

Mr. STONE. I will.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri if the President of the United States did not, without any authority other than that which he now has, land marines in Vera Cruz?

Mr. STONE. The President came to Congress with respect to that subject, and Congress authorized him to take that action.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me one minute——

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. LIPPITT. Is it not true that in the middle of the night, while Congress was discussing the question whether they would or would not authorize that action, word was received in this Chamber that marines had been landed in Vera Cruz by order of the President of the United States? It is within the memory of every man in this Chamber who was here at that time that the President took that action without any authority other than he now has at this minute. It would seem to me that if he had the authority to land marines he has authority to send American troops over the border.

If the Senator will excuse me, I am not for a minute talking about war with Mexico in this resolution.

Mr. STONE. Then what is the Senator talking about?

Mr. LIPPITT. I am talking about defending American lives and property, which is quite another proposition.

Mr. STONE. But the Senator has been talking about war. He said he thought the President ought to have ordered the American Army to invade Mexico and that if he had been President he would have done that very thing.

Mr. President, whatever may have been done at any time by anybody, without stopping to discuss the incidents of a particular event, and without stopping to criticize or justify any particular event, I undertake to say that the President of the United States has no constitutional right to order an invasion of Mexico in the circumstances we have before us. He would subject himself to impeachment if he should do so. If American citizens should be killed in southern Mexico by the Zapata band, would any Senator contend that, without consulting the Congress, the President, on his own motion could constitutionally order 20,000 or 100,000 or more men to invade and overrun the whole Republic of Mexico? If that be true, then the constitutional power vested in Congress to declare war is a meaningless thing.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. STONE. I yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have not before me at present the message which the President sent to Congress at the time he asked us to justify his intervention with the Army and Navy in Mexico, but it is my strong recollection that the President stated in his message that while he himself entertained no doubt whatever of his constitutional authority to use the Army and the Navy in Mexico, still the consequence of its use would probably be so grave that he hesitated to do it without securing the consent of Congress. As I said, I have not the message before me.

Mr. STONE. Nor have I.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. But I think I recollect that very clearly.

Mr. STONE. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut, who is a lawyer of ability and eminence, whether he believes that the President, without consulting Congress, in the case before us, where American citizens were murdered 100 or 150 miles south of our border in Chihuahua, could have ordered the American Army to invade Mexico, as stated by the Senator from Rhode Island? Does the Senator believe that?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator couples his question with a good many conditions.

Mr. STONE. Well, without conditions.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I would have to be allowed to answer in my own way, if I were to answer at all, because it depends, in my opinion, entirely upon the extent to which it is done. I think, of course, it goes without saying that the President has no authority to make war against a foreign nation without the consent of Congress. It is exclusively in the control of Congress to declare war and to make peace. But it has been repeatedly held, and the Senator will so find—he knows it himself without my telling him so—that a mere intrusion to rescue citizens or to protect the property of citizens is not an act of war, and the President has repeatedly and unquestionably exercised such authority by the landing of marines and then retiring after the object has been accomplished. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. STONE. That has been done.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. When the Senator asks if they can go 100 or 150 miles, and so forth, there the Senator is entering upon another field, and I am not prepared to answer him.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has, acting, I think, within his authority, in some instances intervened where the lives of American citizens were imperiled, and even on occasions naval officers of the United States, acting largely on their own authority, have intervened to protect the imperiled lives of American citizens, and their course was sustained by the Government. That is one thing, but a different thing from the case wherein the Senator from Rhode Island declares that he, if President, would have ordered the Army into Mexico to run down rioters or bandits who had killed American citizens, and to pursue them as he pleased anywhere over that Republic. To do that would unquestionably have brought our Army into conflict with the Army of the Mexican government. It would have done that with any government anywhere in the world that might have dared to resist such an invasion. Such an invasion would have been war pure and simple.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. STONE. The present President of the United States would not do such a thing as that. I was about to say no President would do that, but perhaps that statement would require modification.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator will allow me——

Mr. STONE. It may be possible that we have had, or might yet have, a President who would do that—a President who would recognize no restraint upon himself. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator will allow me, he certainly can recognize the fact that the President of the United States, as has been brought out here upon the floor within the last few minutes, did invade Mexico with the armed men of the United for the purpose of preventing a cargo of ammunition from being landed there from Germany. This is a question of the deepest importance. It involves the lives of American citizens.

I see no reason why such action as I have described in the present disordered state of Mexico might not be done with the full authority and permission of the so-called government of Mexico. I presume and hope that when we receive information about the Mexican situation it will be found that the President of the United States has not entered into a partnership with Mr. Carranza without having some agreement and understanding with him about what shall happen there, what rights the American Government shall have there, in case Mr. Carranza himself is not able to establish order.

But the proposition that I have made is far from war. It goes no further than to announce to the Mexican people and to all the world that the United States proposes, to the ultimate limit of its ability, to protect the lives and the property of its people wherever they are; and if there is any question of authority now, the purpose of the resolution is to remove that doubt by distinctly authorizing the President to do these things.

Mr. STONE. If the resolution merely means what the Senator says it means, that the Government of the United States and the people of the United States will protect American citizens throughout the world, then it is a useless resolution. It states what everybody subscribes to.

I ask that the resolution may be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, we are on the eve of a presidential campaign. It has been the custom of each party to present its indictment against the party in power during the session immediately preceding such a campaign. During such session it has been the custom to engage in crimination and recrimination, and to exhaust the time in partisan attacks rather than to spend it usefully in correctional or constructive legislation.

This has been the custom of both parties. I do not present a charge against the Republican Party to-day that could not have been made with equal correctness against my own party in past times.

I deplore, however, that the fact that in a crisis of this kind, when the President of the United States is engaged in negotiations that relate to two wars—a civil war on our borders in Mexico and an international war abroad—and when the questions of the highest delicacy are being considered by the man charged by the Constitution with responsibility regarding the conduct of our foreign relations, we should allow a question of our foreign relations to enter into these controversies of crimination and recrimination.

Just before the Cuban war I happened to be a Member of the House of Representatives and a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. At that time the country was excited with reference to the condition of Cuba. An election was approach-

ing and the party of which I was a member was then engaged in somewhat the same form of attack upon Mr. McKinley as is now being indulged in by the Republican Party upon Mr. Wilson. I recall that during that time the President was embarrassed by the consideration of numerous resolutions presented by the leaders of the adversary party in the House of Representatives regarding the recognition of belligerent rights and other matters of that kind. I recall that at a conference of the Democrats of the House the question came up as to whether this mode of attack was proper and would be fruitful of results. I ventured to inquire at that time whether the Democratic Party wished to get into war, and I was assured it did not; that it was a mere question of party tactics; that the commencement and the maintenance of a war pending a national campaign would insure the retention in power of the dominant party. My reply was, then this resolution will drive this administration into war. An answer came back from a prominent Democrat that the Republican Party could not be kicked into war. That mode of attack went on. Disaffection increased in the Republican Party; in the Northwest, particularly, the sentiment was intense and Republicans felt that their seats were in danger at the approaching election. They formed an organization called the "Insurgents," and called upon the President with reference to the pending situation and insisted that the administration should take decisive action.

Finding himself gradually losing the support of his own party in his deliberate methods, the President finally announced that he would deliver a message to Congress upon the Cuban situation on a particular day, the following Friday. The House of Representatives met in expectancy of that message. Business was suspended; the atmosphere was surcharged with electricity. Contention arose on the floor in one or two cases leading almost to physical violence while they were awaiting the presidential message. Whilst I stood there philosophically viewing the scene and wondering at the turbulence of a so-called deliberative body the Sergeant at Arms informed me that the President desired to see me at the White House. I went there and in the anteroom found two other Democrats, minority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. We were immediately ushered into the President's office. He sat there at a table upon which lay a document bound in red ribbon, evidently the message which he was about to send to Congress. I could not but contrast the calm and the dignity of that room and of the President himself with the scene of turbulence which I had just left. The President informed us that he had just received a telegram from Consul General Lee at Habana advising him that Habana was in a high state of excitement with reference to his anticipated message; that there were 500 Americans in Habana whom he wished to send back to this country before that message was announced and asking him to postpone its delivery.

Mr. McKinley stated that the country expected this message upon that day and that Congress expected it; that he could not announce to the country the cause of postponement, for if the telegram were published it might produce in Habana the same effect that might be produced by the presidential message. He said that he had, therefore, called us as members of the minority and adversary party to ask our judgment regarding the situation. We told him that we thought the message ought to be postponed. He replied that he thought so, too; that he would rather lose his right arm, as he expressed it, than run the risk of losing a single American life, but that he was unable to make any public statement regarding the matter, and he requested us to pass around, without publicity, among our associates on the floor of the House and state that the President of the United States had taken us into his confidence and had presented to us good reasons for the postponement of the message. We assured him that we would do so, and we thought the undertaking an easy one, but when we arrived at the House we found the turbulence of that body increased, not diminished. Word had been passed around that we had been sent for and the purpose was suspected. The result was a flood of denunciation, particularly from the so-called "insurgent members" of the Republican Party, some of whom in my hearing, upon our return to that body, when we were passing around in a rather ineffective way stating the result of our communication with Mr. McKinley, denounced him as a man without a backbone or with a rubber backbone. I have often since then thought of that contrast between the quiet and the calm of the President and the excitement of a so-called deliberative and representative body.

Mr. President, Mr. McKinley was driven into that war both by the adversary party and by the insurgents in his own party. He was always confident that he could have secured the freedom of Cuba without war, but the war sentiment of the country was so aroused that he found it impossible to resist it. What was the result? A war which cost the American people thousands of lives and $600,000,000 in treasure, which put into our possession as the result of the spirit of conquest aroused by that war 3,000 isles 7,000 miles away from our base, involving an annual military expense since that time for their defense of at least $25,000,000, nearly $600,000,000 more up to the present time, and we are now seeking methods of withdrawing from those islands to whose abandonment we have become reconciled, not so much as a matter of altruism as because the retention of the islands does not pay.

During the period of that war we neglected our domestic affairs, and whilst we were conquering other countries the trusts conquered our own, and we have been 10 years in freeing ourselves from the subjection which they imposed upon the American people whilst our attention was diverted in other directions.

It will be easy for this country to get into war with Mexico; it will be easy for this country to get into the European war if the war spirit of the country is aroused; and the war spirit of the country will be aroused if the leading men of the Nation constantly add fuel to the flames. So I appeal to members of the adversary party not to push these conditions of war into this political campaign. You may in search of a partisan advantage push the country too far. If you do, and we get into war, the country will stand by the existing administration and you will imperil your chances of party success at the next election, and beyond that you will open a Pandora's box of trouble for the United States for the next 20 years.

Mr. President, I have no very harsh judgment regarding these matters. It is a very natural instinct to prod the adversary party; it is an instinct that exists in both parties; it is an instinct which has dominated both parties in the past and will in the future, but I do beg of the Members of this body, the highest deliberative body in the world, a body that ought to move with deliberation, caution, and judgment, not to lend itself to the kindling of a flame that may mean universal conflagration; and I appeal to them to let these matters rest with the executive department of the Government, charged with responsibility under the Constitution, without undue criticism, without making the way of the President of the United States hard and difficult, reserving until his task is complete that judgment which the American people will always pronounce upon either success or failure.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I believe this resolution, together with the resolution offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and all other resolutions upon this subject, should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe that committee should be given a reasonable time to consider these resolutions, and I think within a reasonable time it ought to make a report.

I intend only to take a minute or two of the time of the Senate, and in that time I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate a message or telegram I received from a leading Democrat in the State of Kansas on the 15th of December, which I that day brought to the attention of the State Department. The sender of this message says he does not care for publicity. He predicted what would happen, just as it did happen, and a few days later I asked the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations this question:

Does not the Senator think that if the State Department would refuse to permit Mexican troops to cross the territory of the United States in going from one part of Mexico to another, and if the State Department would prevent Mexican generals representing the Carranza government from having headquarters in the United States, perhaps some of this trouble would be stopped?

To that the chairman of the committee replied:

Mr. President, that may be or may not be true; I do not know. The Senator's question implies a criticism of the act allowing Carranza troops to pass through our territory. I do not wish to be diverted into that kind of a discussion.

It was not my intention to criticize, but it was my intention to point out, if I could, an error that the department has made. To show that it had full information, and in order that this committee may fully consider this question, I am going to now, with the permission of the sender of this telegram, to ask the Secretary to read it for me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., *December 15, 1915.*

Hon. CHARLES CURTIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

By private code my advices from Mexico for two days by wire from sources I consider absolutely reliable is to the effect that the continued permission of our State Department for Carranza to transport his troops over American territory and American railroads to where he needed them most to fight Gen. Villa has so infuriated the Mexican people of the interior, a large majority of whom are opposed to Carranza, that there is very great danger. I think it probable that there

will be a massacre of Americans not in the north alone, but probably in all Mexico, of whom there are hundreds in the north and thousands in the whole country yet and to a great extent unable to get out.

I myself saw the 5,000 Carranza troops go through El Paso from Laredo to Douglass, October 31, and saw the battle of Agua Prieta a day or two later, and met Gen. Villa at Naco, after the battle, and talked with him at length. I see that they have shifted Carranza troops over American territory back and forth from Nogales to Agua Prieta by permission of the State Department, and right now they are starting a Carranza troop movement eastward over American territory and American railroads to border points several hundred miles east, probably opposite Ojiniga. While the recognition of Carranza was a colossal blunder, our right to do so probably could not be questioned nor our right to place an embargo on the shipment of arms and ammunition, provided we applied it to both Carranza's and Villa's armies; but when we apply the embargo to Villa only, and allow Carranza to transport his troops over our territory, convoyed by American soldiers, and otherwise aid and assist Carranza, why is not our action an act of war, and are we not an ally of Carranza? We have gone beyond recognition. We are an active ally, and our action, if in Europe, would bring a declaration of war in 24 hours.

Is it the desire of our administration to precipitate a war with Mexico and her 16,000,000 people? If so, we can readily understand our participation. I was told in Mexico a year ago that if we made war on Mexico we would have not Mexico alone to whip. You can readily understand that this transporting of Carranza troops over our territory is infuriating the masses in Mexico; they are a quick-tempered, hot-blooded people, and regard the action of our Government in aiding Carranza as an effort to saddle a president on them by a foreign power, and they hate and resent foreign interference in their internal affairs.

If the transportation of Carranza troops over American territory is not stopped at once and immediately by the President and Secretary Lansing I sincerely believe that these justly infuriated people will retaliate in a frightful way; and if they do, the blood of several hundred, perhaps a thousand, murdered Americans will be on the heads of Wilson and Lansing on account of their ill-advised and reckless action. Is Carranza or the desire to aid him more important than the lives of innumerable Americans? My information is that the feeling is so great that Villa will not be able to control his people, or, to use their words, "He will not be able to hold them down." It is possible that if these troop trains now loading were stopped at once and where they are and further transportation over American territory denied, and those en route returned, that a possible massacre can be avoided, but if these troops are transported as now arranged the President and Secretary Lansing will have to answer and be responsible for such consequences as result. Our troops can not save our helpless people in the interior of Mexico from the consequences of ill-advised and impractical action at Washington. Carranza is impossible, and stands no more show of being President of Mexico than the man in the moon.

Will you be so kind as to read this message from your Democratic friend and constituent at once to Secretary Lansing and to the President, if he will condescend to hear it, because if the worst comes the odium will fall on them. I would greatly prefer that no publicity be given this communication at this time.

Mr. CURTIS. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. STONE. Who signs it?

Mr. CURTIS. I will ask the Secretary to read the name.

The Secretary read as follows:

Signed, Frank S. Thomas.

Mr. STONE. Ah! Mr. President, will the Senator permit me?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, sir; for a question. I want to finish my remarks.

Mr. STONE. The Senator knows Mr. Thomas?

Mr. CURTIS. I have known Mr. Thomas all his life.

Mr. STONE. I know Mr. Thomas also. I have known him a number of years. Within the last two years he has come to see me at Washington and other places to confer with me. I heard what he had to say. He came to me as the agent and employee of Gen. Villa, working for Villa, in a sense his representative to this country to confer with American officials in the Villa interest. What there was in it for him I do not know.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

Mr. STONE. If my friend will pardon me further——

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. This telegram—which I assume the Senator indorses, or else he would not have presented it—complains that this Government permits Carranza soldiers to pass over American territory in pursuit of bandits, or of those opposing the government there, while other Senators arise here and insist that we should ourselves throw our troops into Mexico because the Carranza forces can not suppress outlawry. One objects to our allowing Mexican troops to pass even across the borders of our country in pursuit of criminals, while another Senator on that side urges us to send in our own troops.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yielded for a question.

Mr. STONE. I am through.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to state that I did not have this telegram read with a view of criticizing. I had it read so that the Senate might know, and so that the Senate committee might consider, the objections that were being raised by members of the majority party and the errors that were being pointed out by the members of their own party. Before I conclude my remarks I want to ask to have printed an editorial from the El Paso Times of December 17 or 18 on the same subject, criticizing the action of permitting Mexican troops to be taken across our territory in going from one point in Mexico to another; and that is a question that the committee should consider. If the taking of Carranza troops over the territory of the United States has caused the death of American citizens, then the order permitting such action should be revoked.

I am not here to say that I am for war. I want the Committee on Foreign Relations to take what action is necessary to protect the lives and the property of American citizens in Mexico; and, so far as I am concerned, I would want them to take every step necessary to avoid war as long as it can be avoided with honor. But it is the duty of this Government to protect the lives of American citizens; and if, by permitting Mexican troops to come across our border, they are endangering the lives of American citizens, then they should stop it.

Mr. President, another thing. The Senator from Missouri criticized and said that these Americans who crossed the border the other day had committed a crime. Far from it. If the newspapers are to be believed, those men went across the border with the assurance of protection; and it was said in the newspapers that a troop of Carranza's men had been taken in a train ahead of them. If so, why were they not given protection by Carranza?

In old times it was said, and it ought to be said now, that an American citizen's protection was in the Stars and Stripes; but that can not be said of the last two years in Mexico. Not only according to newspaper reports, but according to information that comes from Americans who were there, at Tampico American citizens had to depend for protection upon a foreign flag, and our ships sailed away and left them helpless and at the mercy of the men who were shooting them down.

A few weeks ago there came to my office a citizen of Oklahoma, who was in Tampico at that time, and he told me it was shameful the way American citizens were left there, and that if it had not been for a German officer he does not know how many of them would have been killed at Tampico.

I want to say to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that I will join with him and the other Senators in this body in passing a resolution that will protect the lives of American citizens, but there should not be too much delay. Let us give consideration to every side of this question. I do not know whether Frank Thomas represents Villa or not. I have known him since he was a boy. He is an insurance agent and a money loaner in the city of Topeka. But even if he is Villa's representative, would it not be better for this administration to send a man like Frank Thomas to consult with Villa, rather than to send down there some man who wants to give them only the information they want, and not give them the truth?

I venture to say that if the President of the United States would send for Frank S. Thomas and consult with him Frank Thomas would tell him the truth about the situation; and I think the difficulty has been that this Government has not been given the truth about the situation in Mexico.

I ask that the editorial from the El Paso paper to which I have referred may be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, that will be done.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Editorial from the El Paso Morning Times.]

ANOTHER NUISANCE HEREABOUTS.

More Carranzista troops are to be transported through the United States. This time we learn that a portion of Obregon's army is to be transferred from Agua Prieta, Sonora, to Ojinaga, Chihuahua. These ragged ruffians will necessarily have to pass through El Paso. They will probably be delayed here several hours, as they were while en route to Agua Prieta from Mexican border towns to the east of El Paso. There are thousands and thousands of Mexicans in El Paso, and while these Carranza troops are here much uneasiness is felt by El Pasoans. It is true that these Mexican soldiers are guarded by American troops while here, but there is ever the possibility of an outbreak among the Mexicans opposed to the newly recognized de facto government of Mexico. Unless we are mistaken—and we don't think we are—the majority of El Paso's present Mexican population is antagonistic to the Carranzistas. At any rate, the appearance here of these Carranzista troops is not calculated to encourage peace and quiet among the Mexicans, for the Mexicans who are opposed to the cause of the Carranzistas deeply resent the action of the American Government in granting permission to them for the transportation of the troops through American territory.

As a matter of fact, the Carranzistas are already abusing the privilege of moving their troops through American territory, and the Morning Times for one is going to protest against the American Government granting any further permits for troop transportation through American territory to the de facto government in Mexico. Absolutely nothing was accomplished by the original movement of troops to Agua Prieta. The Villistas really made only a half-hearted attack on that town, and the troops which were already there could as easily have defended it. And Obregon, instead of mustering his army and going out in the open in pursuit of the Villistas, commenced transferring his troops back and forth from one Sonora border town to another through the United States, while he hung around the border. He was outgeneraled at every turn, the Villistas having either accomplished their purpose in invading Sonora or, having failed to accomplish it, returned to Chihuahua. But the opportunity of the Carranzistas to engage them in a decisive battle was not taken advantage of, and as a consequence the situation in northern Mexico is as bad, if not worse, than

before the first consignment of Carranzista troops were permitted to pass through American territory.

Now, Obregon proposes transferring his troops to Ojinaga. And when he finds that he can accomplish nothing by occupying that town he will perhaps seek permission to transfer them to some other border town, the passage, of course, to be made through the United States. Where will it end? Nobody knows. We do know, however, that these frequent excursions through American territory are becoming a nuisance, to say nothing of their menace to the peace and quiet of the American borderland. The sooner the practice is discontinued, through the refusal of the American Government to grant permission for these transfers of troops through American territory, the better it will be.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a minute on the matter to which I called the attention of the Senator from Missouri, in relation to the question whether the President had authority, without consulting Congress, to order the Army and Navy into a foreign country.

I read from the President's message of April 20, 1914. He had been discussing the question of sending the Army and Navy into Mexico to exact amends from Mr. Huerta. He says:

No doubt I could do what is necessary in the circumstances to enforce respect for our Government without recourse to the Congress and yet not exceed my constitutional powers as President, but I do not wish to act in a matter possibly of so grave consequence except in close conference and cooperation with both the Senate and House. I therefore come to ask your approval that I should use the armed forces of the United States in such ways and to such an extent as may be necessary to obtain from Gen. Huerta and his adherents the fullest recognition of the rights and dignity of the United States, even amidst the distressing conditions now unhappily obtaining in Mexico.

So that whatever may be the fact about the right of the President to do that, there is no doubt that the President thought he had the right at that time, and so stated to Congress.

In order that there may be no misconception about the matter, and that I may not be thought by anybody to be taking a particular paragraph from the context or distorting its meaning, I will ask that the entire message, which is only two or three short pages, be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Gentlemen of the Congress, it is my duty to call your attention to a situation which has arisen in our dealings with Gen. Victoriano Huerta at Mexico City which calls for action, and to ask your advice and cooperation in acting upon it. On the 9th of April a paymaster of the U. S. S. *Dolphin* landed at the Iturbide Bridge landing at Tampico with a whaleboat and boat's crew to take off certain supplies needed by his ship, and while engaged in loading the boat was arrested by an officer and squad of men of the army of Gen. Huerta. Neither the paymaster nor anyone of the boat's crew was armed. Two of the men were in the boat when the arrest took place, and were obliged to leave it and submit to be taken into custody, notwithstanding the fact that the boat carried, both at her bow and at her stern, the flag of the United States. The officer who made the arrest was proceeding up one of the streets of the town with his prisoners when met by an officer of higher authority, who ordered him to return to the landing and await orders; and within an hour and a half from the time of the arrest orders were received from the commander of the Huertista forces at Tampico for the release of the paymaster and his men. The release was followed by apologies from the commander and later by an expression of regret by Gen. Huerta himself. Gen. Huerta urged that martial law obtained at the time at Tampico; that orders had been issued that no one should be allowed to land at the Iturbide Bridge; and that our sailors had no right to land there. Our naval commanders at the port had not been notified of any such prohibition; and, even if they had been, the only justifiable course open to the local authorities would have been to request the paymaster and his crew to withdraw and to lodge a protest with the commanding officer of the fleet. Admiral Mayo regarded the arrest as so serious an affront that he was not satisfied with the apologies offered, but demanded that the flag of the United States be saluted with special ceremony by the military commander of the port.

The incident can not be regarded as a trivial one, especially as two of the men arrested were taken from the boat itself—that is to say, from the territory of the United States—but had it stood by itself it might have been attributed to the ignorance or arrogance of a single officer. Unfortunately, it was not an isolated case. A series of incidents have recently occurred which can not but create the impression that the representatives of Gen. Huerta were willing to go out of their way to show disregard for the dignity and rights of this Government and felt perfectly safe in doing what they pleased, making free to show in many ways their irritation and contempt. A few days after the incident at Tampico an orderly from the U. S. S. *Minnesota* was arrested at Vera Cruz while ashore in uniform to obtain the ship's mail and was for a time thrown into jail. An official dispatch from this Government to its embassy at Mexico City was withheld by the authorities of the telegraphic service until peremptorily demanded by our chargé d'affaires in person. So far as I can learn, such wrongs and annoyances have been suffered to occur only against representatives of the United States. I have heard of no complaints from other Governments of similar treatment. Subsequent explanations and formal apologies did not and could not alter the popular impression, which it is possible it had been the object of the Huertista authorities to create, that the Government of the United States was being singled out, and might be singled out with impunity, for slights and affronts in retaliation for its refusal to recognize the pretensions of Gen. Huerta to be regarded as the constitutional provisional President of the Republic of Mexico.

The manifest danger of such a situation was that such offenses might grow from bad to worse, until something happened of so gross and intolerable a sort as to lead directly and inevitably to armed conflict. It was necessary that the apologies of Gen. Huerta and his representatives should go much further; that they should be such as to attract the attention of the whole population to their significance and such as to impress upon Gen. Huerta himself the necessity of seeing to it that no further occasion for explanations and professed regrets should arise. I therefore felt it my duty to sustain Admiral Mayo in the whole of his demand and to insist that the flag of the United States should be saluted in such a way as to indicate a new spirit and attitude on the part of the Huertistas.

Such a salute Gen. Huerta has refused, and I have come to ask your approval and support in the course I now purpose to pursue.

This Government can, I earnestly hope, in no circumstances be forced into war with the people of Mexico. Mexico is torn by civil strife. If we are to accept the tests of its own constitution, it has no government. Gen. Huerta has set his power up in the City of Mexico, such as it is, without right and by methods for which there can be no justification. Only part of the country is under his control. If armed conflict should unhappily come as a result of his attitude of personal resentment toward this Government, we should be fighting only Gen. Huerta and those who adhere to him and give him their support, and our object would be only to restore to the people of the distracted Republic the opportunity to set up again their own laws and their own Government.

But I earnestly hope that war is not now in question. I believe that I speak for the American people when I say that we do not desire to control in any degree the affairs of our sister Republic. Our feeling for the people of Mexico is one of deep and genuine friendship, and everything that we have so far done or refrained from doing has proceeded from our desire to help them, not to hinder or embarrass them. We would not wish even to exercise the good offices of friendship without their welcome and consent. The people of Mexico are entitled to settle their own domestic affairs in their own way, and we sincerely desire to respect their right. The present situation need have none of the grave implications of interference if we deal with it promptly, firmly, and wisely.

No doubt I could do what is necessary in the circumstances to enforce respect for our Government without recourse to the Congress and yet not exceed my constitutional powers as President, but I do not wish to act in a matter possibly of so grave consequence except in close conference and cooperation with both the Senate and House. I therefore come to ask your approval that I should use the armed forces of the United States in such ways and to such an extent as may be necessary to obtain from Gen. Huerta and his adherents the fullest recognition of the rights and dignity of the United States, even amidst the distressing conditions now unhappily obtaining in Mexico.

There can in what we do be no thought of aggression or of selfish aggrandizement. We seek to maintain the dignity and authority of the United States only because we wish always to keep our great influence unimpaired for the uses of liberty, both in the United States and wherever else it may be employed for the benefit of mankind.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the Senator whether the resolution passed in pursuance of that message giving the President authority to obtain a salute from Huerta was actually passed before or after the Americans were landed at Vera Cruz and engaged in that battle?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. My strong impression is that when the resolution which was finally passed in response to the President's message, and which was a substitute for a resolution that had already been adopted by the House, was being considered by the Senate at an evening session the marines had already been landed from the ships which the President had sent to Vera Cruz, and several of our men had lost their lives in the street fight which ensued.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. There is no question whatever about that. It had not occurred when the resolution passed the House; but the morning when the substitute resolution passed the Senate our marines were on the streets of Vera Cruz, actually engaged in the struggle, and being killed. I think at that moment nine had already been killed. There is no question but that when we passed the resolution we were engaged in actual combat in Mexico.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEWIS. If the floor is yielded by the Senator from Connecticut, I wish to inform the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that I now renew my motion, and move that Senate concurrent resolution No. 9, submitted by myself, be now referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that there is a resolution now before the Senate, and the pending question is the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] to refer my resolution to the committee.

Mr. STONE. The motion I made was the same the Senator from Illinois had previously made, but which was afterwards lost in the shuffle, as mine seems to have been.

Mr. LEWIS. If I may be pardoned, my motion related to my own resolution and the motion of the Senator from Missouri, as I understood it, related to the resolution of the Senator from Rhode Island. Am I correct?

Mr. STONE. Yes; my resolution related to the resolution of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. As there seems to be some confusion about it, I request that my resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Illinois yield, if at all?

Mr. LEWIS. I had the floor.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. STONE. The Senator can not make the motion. I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order will be stated.

Mr. STONE. My motion to refer the resolution of the Senator from Rhode Island to the Committee on Foreign Relations is the pending question, and upon that this debate has been proceeding. I thought the Senator from Illinois had reference to the same matter. The point of order is that until the motion that I made is disposed of the other motion is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] has the floor.

Mr. LEWIS. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has informed us that there is pending a motion that has not yet been disposed of. I recognize the fact that another motion could not be made unless by way of amendment to or substitute for it. My motion being an independent one, I ask for a disposition of the pending motion.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMOOT. The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived, and the unfinished business has been laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business has been laid before the Senate, and the Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho for an interrogatory or an observation.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Illinois has stated that he has reason to believe that if his resolution goes before the Committee on Foreign Relations, it will be considered to-morrow. That being true, I do not desire to interpose any delay and I am quite willing that it shall go without further contest to the Foreign Relations Committee. I will ask the Senator from Nebraska, having the Philippine government bill in charge, if he will not consent to laying his bill aside temporarily until that question can be disposed of.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That would depend on how long it would take.

Mr. BORAH. I say I do not propose to oppose it, and I do not think anyone else does.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I still am in a dilemma, if the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee insists there is pending a motion which precedes my own. If it does not, I now move that Senate concurrent resolution 9 be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. STONE. Of course, that motion can not be made while the unfinished business is pending, but if the Senator from Nebraska will accede to the request of the Senator from Idaho and agree to lay aside the unfinished business temporarily, I would be very glad, if it can be done without debate, to have both these resolutions referred.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I would be very glad to pursue that course, if it can be done without debate.

Mr. LEWIS. As far as I am concerned, I have no observations to make upon the resolution I submitted.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that these resolutions may be referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to that course?

Mr. LIPPITT. Will the Senator from Nebraska also include the resolution which I have offered upon identically the same subject?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will, under the same conditions, without debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. STONE. Except, Mr. President, I want to say, after the remark of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that he consents to the reference of the resolution at this time and in this way to the Committee on Foreign Relations under the impression or expectation that it is to be taken up and disposed of to-morrow morning by the Foreign Relations Committee, that may or may not be correct. I would not like to have the Senator give consent, as he says he does, under any misapprehension.

Mr. BORAH. Permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Missouri, who is chairman of the committee. Will he concede that we shall take it up to-morrow and dispose of it when we may?

Mr. STONE. I concede that to-morrow is the day of meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee. There is a mass of matter before the committee. The Senator from Idaho being a member of the committee can call it up if he wishes, but what disposition the committee will make of it I am not authorized or prepared to assert, nor do I think the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Idaho can do that. It will be for the committee.

Mr. BORAH. Very well, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Permit me to say that the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Idaho may call it up if the Senator from Missouri does not lay it before the committee, but there is another remedy in case that is not done. So I will not object to the request of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have asked the unanimous consent of the Senate that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to laying aside the Philippine government bill temporarily? The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. LIPPITT. That has been done, has it not?

Mr. STONE. It is done now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is now temporarily laid aside. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEWIS. I now move that Senate concurrent resolution No. 9 be committed to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so referred.

Mr. STONE. Let us see. Wait a moment. Did the Senator move that the Senate concur in the resolution?

Mr. LEWIS. The resolution submitted by myself is a concurrent one. I now am moving to have the resolution introduced by myself sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations, but it is a concurrent resolution, as distinguished from the resolution offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], which is a Senate resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the concurrent resolution being referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations? If not, it will be so referred.

Mr. STONE. Now, I ask that the resolution offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, which has been the subject of consideration this morning, be likewise referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that course will be pursued.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Now, I ask that the Philippine government bill be again laid before the Senate.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I believe the time has now come when the Senate can consider the committee amendments. I ask that the first one be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the first amendment of the Committee on the Philippines.

The SECRETARY. On Page 5, line 10, strike out the words "polygamous or plural marriages are forever prohibited" and insert:

Contracting of polygamous or plural marriages hereafter is prohibited.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be adopted.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 15, strike out the words:

That the rule of taxation in said islands shall be uniform.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; I want to ask the Senator having the bill in charge why that provision is stricken out?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was done for the reason that the provision would possibly invalidate certain lines of taxation which have been in force in the Philippine Islands for some time. It is also in line with the policy of a number of States which recently have withdrawn that prohibition from their constitutions. It will make no change in the policy of the Philippine Islands, because heretofore that limitation has not restrained the lawmaking power.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course I am in favor of any legislation that will enhance the interests of the Filipinos or of the islands. I wish that this bill referred only to legislation. I could heartily support nearly all the provisions in it, and in fact I might say I would even go further and grant them a still greater degree of self-government; but in doing so, Mr. President, I do not believe we ought by an act of Congress to lay it down as a rule "that the rule of taxation in said island shall be uniform" or "shall not be uniform." I think any legislation that we pass here affecting taxation in the islands ought to follow the line of our own laws and Constitution.

I believe we ought to announce to the Philippine people that taxation should be uniform, and I thought when I read the bill first before it was acted upon by the committee that that was one of the good provisions of the bill. I am doubtful of the wisdom of striking this provision from the bill. I believe, Mr. President, it ought to be in the bill, because I believe that no matter what country it is, whether the Filipinos or any other people, it ought to be taxed uniformly. There must be some reason other than that which has been stated by the chairman, and, if the chairman really has that information at hand, I would for one like to have him give it to the Senate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, of course it should not be understood that the striking out of this line will be an instruction to the legislative power in the Philippine Islands to make taxation without any regard to uniformity. But it is a new provision. The legislative power of the Philippine Islands heretofore under the authority of Congress has not been restricted by such a limitation. For instance, they have exempted from taxation the property of very poor people there. That would not be possible under a limitation of this sort. There are some forms of taxation which in their nature are not uniform. I thought I could put my hand upon it; I have not been able at the moment to do so, but to put this provision in the act would compel the repeal of taxation laws which have been in effect in the Philippine Islands for many years. They have been inherited in part I suppose from the Spanish régime. So the striking out of this provision creates no new condition in the Philippine Islands, but permits them to run along as they have in the past with a gentle and very mild form of taxation.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. STERLING. I will ask if the provision of taxation in the islands in regard to uniformity is not a part of the organic act.

Mr. SMOOT. I myself was going to ask whether it was in the organic act. If so, of course then it would not be necessary to put it in the bill. But if it is not a part of the organic act it should be here of course, if that should be the future policy of our Government in passing laws for those people.

Mr. STERLING. I hold in my hand the act "temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," and one provision is "that the rule of taxation in said islands shall be uniform."

Mr. SMOOT. Then, Mr. President, if it is in the organic act, I have no objection whatever to having it stricken out. That is the very question I was going to propound to the chairman of the committee when the Senator from South Dakota interrupted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The next amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 9, line 22, strike out the word "city" and insert "cities."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 9, line 22, strike out the word "Manila," insert the words "Cebu, Iloilo, and Zamboanga."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 13, lines 7 to 10, strike out the words "prior to the 13th day of August, 1898, held the office of captain municipal, gobernadorcillo, alcalde, tenientes, cabeza de barangay, or member of any ayuntamiento" and insert "under existing law are legal voters and have exercised the right of suffrage."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to make an inquiry in regard to the amendment in italics, "under existing law are legal voters and have exercised the right of suffrage." I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska whether that means that they must possess both qualifications—those of legal voters and that they have exercised already the right of suffrage—before they are entitled to vote?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The clause in question as it was originally placed in the bill was merely a repetition of existing law, which gives to any man the right to vote provided he has held one of the unpronounceable offices named in the paragraph. Instead of repeating that, it was thought wise to insert a provision which in substance is that a man should be allowed to vote who heretofore has exercised the right of suffrage. It is merely to simplify the provision.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the chairman of the committee state to the Senate just what offices these are that are being stricken out? It is as clear as mud to me.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. They are for the most part merely municipal offices or offices which correspond to justice of the peace or small tribunals in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

The SECRETARY. On page 13, after line 16, insert:

(d) Those to whom the privilege of suffrage may be granted by the Philippine Legislature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On the same page, line 26, strike out the word "Bataan" and insert the word "Bulacan."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 14, line 1, strike out the word "Bulacan" and insert the word "Bataan."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 14, line 3, strike out the word "Cavite" and insert the word "Laguna."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On the same page, lines 3 and 4, strike out the word "Laguna" and insert the word "Cavite."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 14, line 20, after the words "nineteen hundred and," strike out the word "fifteen" and insert the word "sixteen," so as to read:

The first election under the provisions of this act shall be held on the first Tuesday of June, 1916, and there shall be chosen at such election one senator from each senate district for a term of two years and one for four years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 16, line 24, after the word "receive" insert the words "until otherwise provided by the Philippine Legislature."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 17, line 1, after the word "services" insert the words "of $2,000 and $1,500, respectively."

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Nebraska a little further as to the advisability of a provision like this. The section provides for annual sessions of the legislature, and then provides for special sessions which may be called by the Governor General. Does not the Senator think that an annual salary of $2,000 for senators and $1,500 for representatives in the Philippine Legislature is a little excessive, and that a better method of providing compensation for them would be a per diem compensation with a limitation as to the number of days of the session?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the testimony before the committee indicated that the members of the assembly already receive a compensation which approximates the $1,500 named in the bill, and it was not thought wise to make any change in that. On the other hand, the committee did not think it wise to leave in the bill the provision that they should receive a compensa-

tion to be ascertained by law, because there might be a disposition to unduly raise their salaries. The salaries of the senators are made slightly higher than those of the lower house, and I think they should be, considering the fact that they represent a larger territory and also because of the fact that they have other duties than legislative duties.

Of course the committee were not well informed as to the cost of living and as to the question whether men of good ability could be secured for this service at a lower salary, but in order not to disturb existing conditions and permit them to receive substantially what they have received in the past the amount was left as stated in the bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, it is my impression that the amount which they are receiving now is about $2,000 to $2,500 each. It is a per diem of ₱30—$15—a day while they are in session. The bill as introduced at the last session provided for $2,000 for representatives and $2,500 for senators. My impression is that this session it was introduced for the same amounts and we changed it. I do not see any change indicated in the bill, but evidently the amount is lower than it was in the bill which was in this body in the last Congress. That is not a large amount. They have to come great distances; transportation there is not cheap and is very difficult. A great deal is overland; a great deal is over paths instead of good roads. We thought, all things considered, that $2,000 and $1,500 would not be out of the way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 2, to strike out the words "ascertained by law."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 17, line 22, after the word "who," insert "in case he shall then not approve."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the same is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 19, line 16, after the words "nineteen hundred and," strike out "fifteen" and insert "sixteen," so as to read:

SEC. 21. That the qualified electors of the Philippine Islands shall, on the first Tuesday in June, 1916, and at the general elections thereafter provided for the election of senators and representatives to the Philippine Legislature, elect two Resident Commissioners to the United States, who shall hold their office for a term of four years beginning with the first Monday in the month of December following their election, and who shall be entitled to an official recognition as such by all departments upon presentation to the President of a certificate of election by the Governor General of said Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. That concludes the committee amendments, the Chair is informed by the clerks at the desk.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I am not certain but it will be necessary to change the language on page 13, lines 10 and 11, and I will take the liberty of reserving an exception there when the bill gets into the Senate for further conference with the chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not understand that the amendments in the preamble of the bill have been agreed to. That comes later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the question of the preamble will come after the passage of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that is the case under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to ask the Senator about section 30, page 29, of the bill, which covers the matter of jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States in cases of appeal. The language is:

That the Supreme Court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to review, revise, reverse, modify, or affirm the final judgments and decrees of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands in all actions, cases, causes, and proceedings now pending therein or hereafter determined thereby in which the Constitution or any statute, treaty, title, right, or privilege of the United States is involved.

That language is all right so far as it applies to the Constitution or a statute or treaty, but it seems to me that the language is inappropriate as applied to the further expression "title, right, or privilege of the United States." What, I presume, is meant is a title, right, or privilege claimed under the United States.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. I referred to that the other day. It seems to me what was intended is the Constitution or any statute, treaty, right, or privilege under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; or statute.

Mr. KENYON. There is something evidently missing.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It should be "in which the Constitution or any statute or treaty of the United States is involved or any title, right, or privilege claimed under the Constitution or any statute or any treaty of the United States."

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It certainly does not mean a case where the right of the United States is involved or the privilege of the United States is involved. What does the Senator from Nebraska say about that?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think that is merely a reenactment of the organic act. I was endeavoring to see if that is not correct or whether the language is inaccurate. I think, perhaps, I can turn to it in a moment.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, following the language used in our own legislation, it would be "which the Constitution or any statute treaty or right or title under the Constitution or statute is involved or any right, title, or privilege under the Constitution or statute of the United States." It is undoubtedly an inadvertence.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think so.

Mr. CLAPP. Even if it be in the organic law.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Was it in the organic law?

Mr. CLAPP. I do not know; but we should follow the usual language used in our own Constitution.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. For example, I have before me now the language used with reference to appeals from decisions of the highest court of the State. That language is section 237 of the code:

A final judgment or decree in any suit in the highest court of a State in which a decision in the suit could be had, where is drawn in question the validity of a treaty or statute of or an authority exercised under the United States, and the decision is against their validity; or where is drawn in question the validity of a statute of or an authority exercised under any State on the ground of their being repugnant to the Constitution, treaties, or laws of the United States, and the decision is in favor of their validity; or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity—

The word "immunity" is also omitted—

or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is claimed under the Constitution, or any treaty or statute of or commission held or authority exercised under the United States.

Mr. CLAPP. I suggest that the matter be passed over until the language can be formulated in accordance with the custom with reference to our own laws. I do not think there is any question about this being an inadvertence.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I find that I am correct—that section 30, to which the Senator calls my attention, is a reenactment of section 10 of the organic act.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Still the language is unfortunate and inappropriate even in the organic act, because what is intended evidently is only to include a case where a title or right or privilege is claimed by somebody under the United States. It is not a title or right or privilege of the United States, but of some person or corporation claimed under the Constitution or the laws or a treaty of the United States. That obviously is what is intended, and the bill ought to be made to conform to it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, it would be a statute of the United States or a treaty of the United States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh, yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Or a title.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No.

Mr. CLAPP. It would be a right, privilege, or title claimed under the United States. There is not any question but that the use of this language must have been an inadvertence in the first instance. I suggest that the matter be passed over temporarily until the proper language can be framed.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I notice in the bill there has been an inadvertence in the fixing of a certain date; and I desire to move to strike out, on page 20, line 12, the words "first Monday in December, 1915," and to insert in lieu thereof "4th day of March, 1917." This language relates to the time that the two Resident Commissioners to the Congress of the United States shall hold office; that is the time when their commissions expire. These words were placed in the bill two years ago and are entirely inapplicable now, because the year 1915 has passed. It seems to me the date for the expiration of the office of these commissioners should be the end of the

term for which they were elected. For that reason I move the amendment which I have suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUGHES in the chair). The amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 20, lines 12 and 13, it is proposed to strike out the word "first Monday in December, 1915," and to insert the words "4th day of March, 1917," so as to read:

The present two Resident Commissioners shall hold office until the 4th day of March, 1917.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 12, after the word "prohibited," it is proposed to insert:

That no intoxicating drink or drug shall be manufactured for sale or gift, imported for sale or gift, or sold or offered for sale or gift for use as a beverage.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am informed that since the Philippine Islands came into the possession of the United States liquor has been sold or is being permitted to be sold there in what we call saloons. I am also informed that in no period prior to the time the United States became the owner of those islands was there any liquor sold in saloons in the islands. I am further informed that the Philippine people can not be considered as a drinking people or as a people who care for intoxicating liquors as a beverage. I think it is now our duty at least to leave the islands in the condition in which we took them. I think that both from a moral and economic standpoint we should say, and say explicitly, that the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors shall be prohibited in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. President, I am glad to be able to say that I come from a State that has never had within its borders, since it became a State, a saloon. We have for more than a quarter of a century had prohibition in the State of North Dakota, and discussing it from an economic standpoint only, it has been a saving to the people of that State of many millions of dollars. We are trying all over the United States to get rid of the saloons. It is a question that is being discussed in every State of this Union; it is a question with which we must deal not only in the individual States but in the entire Nation; and it seems to me that now is a good time to provide in this bill that no liquor shall be sold or manufactured in the Philippine Islands; especially so, when the Filipinos themselves say that they do not care to have the liquor traffic going on in the islands.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GRONNA. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. HARDWICK. The regulation of the question to which the Senator refers, namely, the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Philippine Islands, is now left to the Philippine people themselves and to the Philippine Assembly, is it not?

Mr. GRONNA. I suppose all these regulations, to some extent, are left with the Philippine Assembly.

Mr. HARDWICK. I mean does not the Senator know that under the law as it now stands the Philippine people themselves, through their own assembly, can prohibit the sale of liquor if they so desire?

Mr. GRONNA. To a certain extent that is true, Mr. President; but I simply want to put the islands in the same condition in which they were prior to the time the American people took possession of them.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. GRONNA. I gladly yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should like to suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that the plan of government which the United States is now proposing to give to the Filipino, believing that it will probably be the prototype by which the Filipino will shape his own government when he becomes independent, ought to contain everything that the American Congress thinks will be for the best interests of the Filipino; and, while the Filipino Legislature have the right to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquor in the Philippine Islands, I agree with the Senator from North Dakota that it would be wise for the American Congress to start them out without this handicap of the saloon.

I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be adopted, because the liquor traffic is a handicap, and the people of the Philippines, who are struggling to establish a government, are entitled to this assistance. The Senator's amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. GRONNA. I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. Mr. President, I do not wish further to delay the proceedings of the Senate. I simply ask for a vote on my amendment, unless some other Senator wishes to discuss it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I was out of the Senate temporarily when the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota was read from the desk, but I want to say that I hope the amendment will be agreed to. I had the pleasure of spending some time in the Philippine Islands, and, in my judgment, there is no better time than now to give them prohibition. There are not many saloons now in the various towns of the islands; there are a few in Manila and perhaps in some of the other cities, and the time to take action is before the saloons are opened and before the people get the drinking habit. The Filipinos are not a drinking people. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA].

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hollis	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Hughes	O'Gorman	Smoot
Beckham	Husting	Overman	Sterling
Borah	James	Owen	Sutherland
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	Page	Thomas
Catron	Jones	Phelan	Thompson
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Pittman	Townsend
Clapp	Kern	Pomerene	Underwood
Colt	Lane	Robinson	Vardaman
Cummins	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Wadsworth
Curtis	Lewis	Sheppard	Warren
du Pont	Lippitt	Sherman	Weeks
Fletcher	McLean	Shields	Williams
Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	Works
Harding	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	
Hardwick	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	
Hitchcock	Newlands	Smith, Md.	

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am authorized to say in behalf of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD], who is absent, that he is confined to his house through illness.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. MCCUMBER] is absent from the city, but is paired with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. STERLING. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota] is unavoidably detained from the Senate Chamber on account of sickness.

Mr. CATRON. My colleague [Mr. FALL] is detained from the Senate on account of sickness.

Mr. HOLLIS. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is absent on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA].

Mr. GRONNA. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I desire to say a word in regard to this amendment, inasmuch as few Senators are here now who were present at the time it was proposed. This is an amendment to the Philippine bill which proposes to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or importation of intoxicating liquors of all sorts. My first objection to it is that this is a bill to authorize the Filipino people to legislate for themselves; but the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota is legislation that Congress heretofore has never attempted to impose upon the Philippine people. In so far from that, Mr. President, the whole course of American Government in the Philippine Islands has been to recognize local customs, to recognize existing conditions, to interfere as little as possible with the habits of the people, and to make them content under the present conditions.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to the organic act under which we are now operating in the Philippine Islands. It provided at the opening:

That the action of the President of the United States in creating the Philippine Commission and authorizing said commission to exercise the powers of government to the extent and in the manner and form and subject to the regulation and control set forth in the instructions of the President to the Philippine Commission, dated April 7, 1900, * * * is hereby approved, ratified, and confirmed, and until otherwise provided by law the said islands shall continue to be governed as thereby and herein provided.

What were the instructions of the President of the United States to the commission which he sent out to the Philippine Islands? Let me quote:

In all the forms of government and administrative provisions which they are authorized to prescribe the commission shall bear in mind that the government which they are establishing is designed not for our satisfaction or for the expression of our theoretical views, but for the happiness, peace, and prosperity of the people of the Philippine Islands; and the measures adopted should be made to conform to their customs, their habits, and even their prejudices to the fullest extent consistent with the accomplishment of the indispensable requisites of just and effective government.

Mr. President, under that instruction of President McKinley, which now has practically the force of law by reason of being included in the organic act, the people of the United States have permitted to continue in the Philippine Islands some 44,000 establishments where the native drinks of the Philippine people are sold as groceries are sold, such drinks as vino, such drinks as basi, tuba, and topuy. This amendment will make it impossible either to manufacture or sell those drinks to which the Philippine people for generations have been accustomed.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. GRONNA. Undoubtedly the Senator from Nebraska is more familiar with the conditions in the Philippines than am I, but I have been informed on very good authority that the Philippine people are not a drinking people; that they do not care for the saloon nor do they care for liquor; that the Filipino people are an abstemious people, a sober class of people; and I thought, Mr. President, that it was only the duty of Congress to enact in this provision in this bill, which, in reality, is only an addition to or a plank in the constitution of the Filipino people. The Senator from Nebraska, I suppose, will not maintain that Congress has no right to adopt such an amendment as this. Is that the view taken by the Senator?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Oh, no; I am not claiming that Congress has no such right; but I say that this provision is entirely inconsistent with this bill, which proposes to give to the Filipino people a larger measure of legislation, while the amendment of the Senator proposes to take away from them some powers they have heretofore possessed.

Mr. President, I may say that the Senator is correct when he declares that the Filipino people are not a drinking people in the sense of becoming drunkards. They drink their native wines, as they eat their fruit and their other foods, in moderation; drunkenness is not an evil in the Philippine Islands among the Philippine people, and the testimony before the Philippines Committee indicated that fact and led the committee to reject the amendment which the Senator from North Dakota proposes.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not yield for a speech, only for a question.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I am not going to make a speech. I only want to make a suggestion to the Senator from Nebraska: The same objection which he urges against the adoption of this amendment or one similar to it might be urged against the adoption of a prohibition law affecting the States of the Union. Whisky has been sold in some of the States for 100 years or more. There is, however, this further fact to be considered: While the Filipinos may not be a drinking people now, if the saloons are permitted to be opened there under American control and our civilization shall be forced upon them, the appetite will be created as a business enterprise. I think it is a duty of this Congress to protect the people of the Philippine Islands against such an insidious enemy.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I did not yield to the Senator for a speech; I only yielded for a question.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to ask the Senator from Nebraska what is the nature of the drinks which he says are peculiarly Filipino drinks, and what is the nature of the liquor which the Filipinos use? Is it such as is ordinarily sold in American saloons?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is not. There is some sale of American drinks in the Philippine Islands—some sale of beer and some sale of whisky—and some beer is made in the Philippine Islands and was made there for a great many years under the Spanish occupation, but it has not been consumed by the Filipino people to any extent, nor is whisky consumed by the Filipino people. The amendment which the Senator from North Dakota has offered would strike down, as I have said, all of the small retail establishments, such as grocery stores and provision stores, where three or four kinds of native drinks are sold. For instance, it would destroy the trade in tuba, which is a drink taken directly from the coconut palm, I think, a drink which at the time it is extracted is absolutely without any alcoholic effect, but which gradually becomes stronger. It would strike down the trade in basi, which, I believe, is made from rice, and would strike down the trade in tapuy, which, I think, is a provincial drink used only in part of the islands. I think that the amendment which the Senator offers is so sweeping, so destructive, as to strike at the very habits of the Filipino people when there is no evil to be struck at. I think it would cause resentment and cause a great deal of disturbance in the islands.

There is a lesser evil which would grow out of it, to which I may refer. It would destroy one-sixth of the Philippine revenues, and they are not very large, and they are having a hard time, as they are a poor people, in getting on as it is. They derive from customs duties at the present time something like ₱300,000 a year on imports into the islands, chiefly from the United States.

Mr. BORAH. From imports of liquor?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I presume so; from imports of wine and beer, and probably whisky. It would destroy an internal revenue amounting to something over ₱3,000,000, ₱3,832,000 in 1914, which is an internal-revenue tax on the 44,000 retail establishments where these native drinks are sold.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. WORKS. I should like to ask the Senator if he knows how many saloons are in operation in the Philippine Islands at the present time?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, I have heard that the saloons in the Philippine Islands are practically confined to Manila and to two or three other towns. Probably the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], who has recently visited the islands, if not the saloons, may be able to tell us. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I will state that my understanding is that in nearly all the large cities and towns—and there are a number of large towns in the islands—where there is an American population there are saloons in limited number, but not to the extent that they are found in this country.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, the Philippine people may not be a drinking people now, but, if the American saloon is allowed to prevail there for very long, they will probably become a drinking people.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. CLAPP. The Senator made the remark that this was passed on by the committee. I do not understand that it was considered by the committee. It certainly was not while I was present in the committee room.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should say to the Senator from Minnesota that this bill was considered by the committee at the previous session of Congress, before the committee was favored by the addition of the Senator from Minnesota. It is very true that it was not considered at the recent session.

Mr. CLAPP. At this session we did not consider it; but, as I understand the situation out there, the Filipinos themselves are not what might be called a drinking people. The drink that they make is consumed, I understand, very largely by the so-called non-Christian tribes. I should have no hesitation at all, so long as we assume to govern these people, about withholding from the Filipinos the right to traffic in liquor with the less intelligent, less civilized portion of their population.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Nebraska stated a moment ago that to impose this limitation upon the Filipinos would not be consistent with the bill which we are engaged in considering, and which has for its purpose the enlargement of the rights and privileges of that people. The Senator recognizes, of course, that in the bill itself we have denied to the Filipinos the right to legislate upon a great variety of subjects. Here are 14 or 15 paragraphs devoted to one purpose—to limit the power of the Filipino government in legislating respecting themselves.

For instance, the Senator has just had adopted an amendment to this bill which prohibits polygamy, in the future, at least. We are in that way curtailing the right of the Filipino people to determine what is best for themselves. We prohibit the legislature there from making any law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise of it. We are prohibiting the legislature there from using any of the public money for the benefit or support of any religious organization. We are prohibiting slavery. We are providing that no law shall be passed that will restrict or abridge the freedom of the press; and so I might proceed almost indefinitely.

I mention this in order to suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that the prohibition of the liquor traffic is entirely consistent with the theory of the bill, if we believe it is not wise for the Filipino Legislature to authorize the liquor traffic; and it seems to me that it is a question for the judgment of the Members of the Senate with regard to the best interests of these people. If we believe in prohibition, we ought to impose it upon the Filipino people. If we do not believe in prohibition, then we ought not, I assume, to impose it.

For myself, I very much favor the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota, for that is the condition that I would have prevail in those islands. In doing it we have pursued exactly the same course that the committee has pursued in regard to all of these important matters which constitute a limitation upon the power of the Filipino Legislature.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CUMMINS. I am very glad to yield, although I recognize that I have no right to yield.

Mr. LIPPITT. I simply wish to ask the Senator a question, with the permission of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator says he thinks that if we are in favor of prohibition we would have the right to prohibit the sale of liquor in the Philippines, and that if we are not in favor of prohibition we would not have that right.

Mr. CUMMINS. No; I did not say that.

Mr. LIPPITT. I so understood the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. I said that if we are in favor of prohibition, those of us who are in favor of prohibition ought to vote to impose that policy on the Philippine Islands. Those of us who are not in favor of prohibition might well hesitate before they would vote to establish there a policy which they refuse to establish at home.

Mr. LIPPITT. I was only going to suggest to the Senator that, inasmuch as this Senate has declined to impose prohibition on our own country, it would seem rather inconsistent to impose prohibition on a foreign country, and one so far off.

Mr. CUMMINS. I supposed we had not declined as yet.

Mr. LIPPITT. This particular Senate, it is true, has not; but its predecessor did so decline.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator mean with regard to the District of Columbia bill?

Mr. LIPPITT. No; I think there was a measure before the Senate providing for national prohibition. I will say that I am corrected. I find that such a proposal was made and was referred to a committee, and the committee never reported it, which is a very strong demonstration of the fact that the Senate was not in favor of it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator refer to the proposed constitutional amendment?

Mr. LIPPITT. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think I can give the Senator from Rhode Island reasonable assurance that the committee to which it is now referred will report it and that the Senator will have an opportunity to vote upon it before very long.

Mr. LIPPITT. That may be, Mr. President; but the fact remains that while the subject has been suggested to this Senate as applicable to our own people we have so far declined to take action upon it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the question which the Senator from Iowa started to ask me has grown into rather a large affair. The gist of his point is that it is inconsistent for us, while imposing certain limitations on the Filipino Legislature, to refuse to impose this limitation. Now, the Senator from Iowa is in error. All of the limitations imposed upon the Filipino Legislature by the bill now before the Senate are in accord with existing limitations in the control of the islands; but the prohibition amendment which is offered by the Senator from North Dakota is a new and stringent limitation, tending to interfere with and uproot their local customs, tending to destroy their revenues, and throw the islands into confusion.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska permit a question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. There is nothing in the organic act which imports or gives it the nature of inerrancy, is there? What is the objection, even though this provision is not in the original draft, to perfecting it by putting this in the proposed act?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. My objection I have stated, Mr. President. It is that it will inevitably result in social confusion in the islands by attempting to enforce upon them something which it will require armies of officers to do. It tends to destroy their innocent habits of life, which involve no evil of drunkenness. It destroys one-sixth of the revenues of the Philippine Islands, and it strikes at an evil which does not exist there.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Does the Senator think that the saloon business there is as sacred and as highly prized by the Filipino as the right to a multiplicity of wives, or polygamy?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. This does not limit itself to the saloon evil. There are saloons existing in only five or six of the leading towns, and only very few in them. This amendment, however, strikes at 46,000 institutions, little provision stores, which are not saloons in the American sense.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will it interrupt the Senator for me to ask him a further question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Not at all.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Are not the drinks sold by these little stores of the same nature and character as the stuff which is sold in the saloons?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No.

Mr. VARDAMAN. It will not disturb the ordinary trade of the little store. It will only prohibit the little store from dealing in this poison. No; it will not hurt the business of the little storekeeper. On the contrary, it will promote the legitimate business of the little store, because the money that would be spent for the poisonous drink would probably be spent for groceries for the family use if the drinks were not on sale.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There is this difference: The Filipino comes into one of those 46,000 stores and buys his cigarettes, puts down a cent, gets a drink of vino or tuba, and goes out. He goes there to buy his provisions. It is not a saloon in the American sense at all. If this amendment proposed to strike only at the few saloons that have been brought in by Americans, and that exist there largely by reason of American patronage, that would be a different thing; but the amendment goes entirely too far. It strikes at the very habits and customs of the Philippine people, and it will inevitably breed disorder.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Under the existing law in force in the Philippine Islands, I suppose the Legislature of the Philippine Islands now is perfectly competent to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors if it pleases to do so?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is entirely competent.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will ask the Senator whether or not any sentiment that the Senator knows anything about has developed in the Philippine Islands in favor of prohibition?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not think it has been an issue. I am not prepared to answer, because I have never heard anything on the subject; but such witnesses as we had before the committee indicated that it was not an evil existing there among the Philippine people.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. May I suggest to the Senator that there is a prohibitory law there now as to the non-Christian tribes, passed by the Philippine Assembly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is a law?

Mr. KENYON. There is a law there now. All this is doing is imposing upon the Christians what they have imposed upon the heathen.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does the Senator mean by that a law which forbids the sale of liquor to uncivilized tribes; or what does he mean?

Mr. KENYON. To what are termed the non-Christian tribes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The uncivilized tribes?

Mr. KENYON. Well, yes; as we commonly call them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is in line with the legislation which we have always passed in this country to prohibit traffic in intoxicating liquors with the Indians.

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But that law does not apply, as I understand, to the civilized and intelligent people of the islands.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, are we to understand from the statement of the Senator from Iowa that the only way to get a drink in the Philippine Islands is to get religion?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know. The Senator from Iowa can answer that question.

Mr. KENYON. I think I stated before that the only way to get a drink there is to become a Christian.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, before I take my seat I want to say simply a word about the proposed amendment.

I take it that the Congress of the United States does not desire to make itself ridiculous, even upon the subject of prohibition. If we put this provision into the proposed legislation, it will be absolutely meaningless. What penalty is prescribed for its violation?

Suppose we write this provision into the law and somebody in the Philippine Islands continues to sell intoxicating liquor and somebody else buys intoxicating liquor. What is going to happen? We will have simply a moral principle in this law, by way of gentle admonition, that "no intoxicating drink or drug shall be manufactured for sale or gift, imported for sale or gift, or sold or offered for sale or gift for use as a beverage." There is no penalty attached to it and no method of enforcing it. It is an absolutely meaningless thing. It is not even a limitation upon the Legislature of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, what the Senator from Utah says is true. It is simply an expression, I take it, largely of opinion and sentiment. But what he has just said with regard to the effect of this amendment, if it were adopted, is also true of the amendment the committee has proposed, and which has been adopted by the Senate, with regard to polygamy. There is no penalty for it. There is no punishment provided. I take it that it is simply a proclamation that we do not believe in polygamy, ordinarily speaking.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; what the Senator says is probably true, that neither of these provisions amount to anything. But what earthly sense is there in solemnly writing into a law which is supposed to have some meaning and some effect a statement of this kind, which is simply a declaration of our opinion about a moral principle?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senate, as I understand, has already adopted the amendment proposed by the committee prohibiting polygamy without prescribing any penalty for the violation of it. Is that true?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is no reason why we should keep on loading down the law with provisions of that sort.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I will suggest to the Senator from Utah that if he really believes this amendment ought to be adopted, it will take but a very few moments to add a penalty.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let the law be complete, then. Let us not vote upon a proposition of this kind. Let us frame a law that will cover the subject, or let us leave it alone.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] has demanded the yeas and nays on his amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, a moment ago I asked the Senator from Nebraska something about some of the drinks which are peculiarly Filipino drinks. I find in the hearings some evidence which throws some light upon his matter, and I will read it:

> The CHAIRMAN. How about the habit of the people in regard to drinking? Do they drink to excess? I am speaking of the Moros.
>
> Col. YOUNG. Not at all. They have a drink there called vino, which is a native drink. If a white man drinks it it sets him crazy. The Moro will not drink it at all, but he will sell it to other people. You can buy enough to make everybody drunk for 5 cents. All the Moro wants is to get the 5 cents, but he will not drink it himself.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. What is it made of?
>
> Col. YOUNG. It is made of the milk of the coconut. They put it out in the sun and let it stand there. Then the Moro will put anything he happens to have into it, a little alcohol, for instance.
>
> Senator LIPPITT. A second time?
>
> Col. YOUNG. A second time, or tobacco or anything else.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. While you were there did you permit them American drinks, whisky and beer?
>
> Col. YOUNG. No. I never saw a Moro drunk in my life. They do not drink. I have heard that there have been cases of that kind, but they just do not drink—

And so forth.

Mr. President, I only want to say that my interest in the proposed amendment arises out of the fact that I should like to be helpful in preventing what is known as the American saloon from going into the Philippine Islands. If the amendment could be so drawn as to distinguish between those drinks which are peculiarly Filipino drinks and such as come under the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska, I should feel considerably as the Senator does in regard to leaving the matter for their determination, as they seem to have control of it and indulge in drink very little. I do think, however, that as the American saloon is entering that field, it is the business of the American people to keep that singular instrument of evil from among those people. It was not there, as I understand, before we went there. It has gone into the Philippine Islands with American civilization; and I feel quite sure that we would do the right thing if we would prevent its spreading and establishing itself throughout the Philippine Islands.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Idaho a question?

Mr. BORAH. Yes, sir.

Mr. CUMMINS. Has the Senator from Idaho observed—and it is entirely in harmony with what he has just stated—that under this bill it would not be possible for the Filipino Legislature to exclude importations of intoxicating liquor from the United States?

Mr. BORAH. It would not be possible?

Mr. CUMMINS. It would not be possible.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. CUMMINS. Has the Senator noticed that?

Mr. BORAH. I understand that to be true; yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. So that we could flood that country with our liquor, even though they were strongly opposed to the practice.

Mr. BORAH. It might be, Mr. President, that it would be well to leave the Filipino to his habits and to the tastes and appetites which he has heretofore acquired. It might be well not to undertake by law to deal with those things. Perhaps it would be wiser to deal with their peculiar drinks in an educational and moral way. But I do think that we are under every obligation, from a moral and from a religious standpoint, to prohibit what is known as the American saloon from going into the Philippine Islands. It is bad enough here at home; surely it ought not to be permitted to establish itself among a primitive people.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, if there is one fact which has been established by the nations of the earth, it is that the traffic and sale of intoxicating liquor increases the consumption of it by the people, and the consumption of it by the people is one of the most insidious and deleterious evils with which society is afflicted.

The fact that the importation of this poison is a source of revenue to the Filipino is no argument whatever in its favor. If it is necessary to raise revenue by direct taxation, it would be very much cheaper for the Filipino to run his government in that way than it would be to pay for it in the form of a revenue from the importation of this drug. It is the same old story over again the world over. Whatever is profitable in dollars and cents is of more concern and importance than that which is best for the human being.

The United States has taken over the Philippine Islands for the purpose of developing those people—not for the good of America, not for the profit to be enjoyed by certain enterprises, but for the benefit of the Filipino. He may not be a drinking man now; but we all know that if he is to be held and controlled by the Americans and the American saloon is to be established there the appetite will be cultivated; it will grow, and the enormous profits which are reaped from the business will cause it to spread rapidly over the islands.

I believe it is the duty of this Congress to start the Filipino on the right road. If this amendment carries with it no penalty for its violation, let it go for the moral effect it will have upon the Filipino. It can not do any harm. Every influence that will flow from it will tend to discourage, if no more, the traffic in liquor. It is a condemnation by the American Congress of that miserable business.

I am in favor of destroying the liquor business in America, and if I can not strike it in the face I will hit in the back. If I can not manifest my disapprobation and condemnation of it in any other way, I will hamstring it. I want to embarrass it, because I regard it as the greatest enemy of the human race on earth to-day. It has blighted more lives, it has frustrated more ambitions, it has caused more scalding tears to fall from the eyes of woman than every other evil among men. I believe it is the duty of this Congress, working in the interest of the Filipino, to bring to bear upon him every influence that tends to uplift and benefit him in the management of his own government.

Mr. BORAH. I wish to offer an amendment to this amendment; after the word "beverage" to add:

But this shall not apply to native wines and beverages commonly known as "vino" and the other three which have been named.

Second. That anyone violating this law shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of $100 or imprisonment for six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

I will add, at the suggestion of Senators, "not more than $100 and imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I was in hopes that the Members of the Senate would have an opportunity to vote directly upon this question. It may be true, Mr. President, that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Idaho would to a certain extent protect the Filipino people from the saloon, but I have been informed that the liquors described in the Senator's amendment are as intoxicating as any liquors manufactured in the United States. Mr. President, it would not stop the trafficking in intoxicating liquors if the amendment of the Senator from Idaho were adopted.

I sincerely hope that the Senator from Idaho will let us have an opportunity to vote upon this question directly, and if the amendment which I propose shall be defeated, I shall be very glad to see that we at least protect the Filipino people to the extent of prohibiting the shipment of intoxicating liquors into the Philippine Islands.

But I can not accept the Senator's amendment; nor can I vote for it without having first had an opportunity to vote for the amendment which I presented, which I know would ultimately have the effect of making the Philippine Islands the same as some of the States of the Union—a prohibition territory—and that the trafficking in and manufacturing of intoxicating liquors will be done away with.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota offered an amendment here which, so far as it announced the principle, contained a good principle; but the Senator will agree with me that there is nothing quite so futile and so ineffective as a prohibition against the sale of liquor to which there is attached no punishment. There is nothing in the amendment which would cause any man who desired to sell liquor in the Philippines to hesitate for a moment, and if there is anyone who needs to be reminded that there is punishment in the law it is the man who is engaged in the sale of liquor.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Idaho a question. Does not the Senator think that a bill contracted for liquor in the Philippine Islands would be uncollectible if we should pass this amendment? Would not that in itself discourage the operation of saloons in the islands?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it might in a measure discourage it, but now imagine the effect of the discouragement in an open saloon where the business is being carried on from day to day, where the drink is paid for over the counter at the time it is taken, where the man who offers to buy does not have any disposition to impeach the integrity of the contract under which he gets his drink. It might have an effect of disparaging it as between the wholesale dealer and the saloons to some extent, but how utterly futile would that kind of a law be in the United States even when we add the most drastic penalties. The great argument against prohibition in the United States is that by no method or means can you enforce a law, and if you pass a law which has no penalty attached to it at all and put it upon the Philippine people, who have their own peculiar habits and tastes and appetites, of course they will give no consideration to it.

We are doing, in my judgment, as the Senator from Utah suggested, the same thing. We are, to some extent, advertising our ineffective support of prohibition.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The defect the Senator complains of could be cured very well by eliminating from your amendment the exception, those drinks that are excluded from the operation of the law, and impose a penalty for a violation of the law, as in the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA]. That would meet the Senator's objection.

Mr. BORAH. That should be done, but I think there is much strength in the argument of the Senator from Nebraska, that we ought not to undertake to deal drastically and by punishment without any sentiment being built up in the Philippines in favor of it in the first instance, with those appetites and tastes and habits which have characterized them through years and years.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. I rise to ask the Senator from Idaho if he is not willing to divide his amendment? I think the question is divisible anyhow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. CUMMINS. That will obviate all the difficulty which has been suggested.

Mr. BORAH. I am quite willing that it should be divided. I mean I am willing to withdraw it until the Senator from North Dakota shall have an opportunity to present his amendment. I do not desire to embarrass it, but I have a great desire to assist in what, I hope, may be effective legislation against introducing into the Philippine Islands the American saloon. I would try in the first instance and until a later day, at least, to confine my legislation to preventing them from acquiring vices not now among them to any marked extent.

Mr. WORKS. I suggest to the Senator from Idaho that his proposed amendment does not reach the saloon at all, to which he very frankly says he is opposed. At least we ought, if possible, to exclude the open saloons from the Philippine Islands. I think in that respect his amendment falls short.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, as I understand it, these native wines are seldom sold in saloons at all; that is, saloons are not maintained for them, but they are sold in their grocery stores.

Mr. LANE. If the Senator will allow me, I would like to suggest to him that it seems to me the adoption of his amendment would look to the Filipinos as though we were inconsistent. His amendment forbids the importation into the Philippine Islands of wine, beer, and whisky, in behalf of temperance, in behalf of prohibition, as our expression is, to the Filipinos, that we believe it is bad for them, yet at the same time it leaves them to drink vino, which, as can be found by reading an excerpt from somebody's testimony, is a drink of such power that by the expenditure of a nickel you can not only get drunk yourself but you can invite your relatives and friends and get them drunk.

Mr. BORAH. I read that statement. Taking it as an entirety, the writer says that the native was entirely too shrewd to drink the stuff and that he did not drink it.

Mr. LANE. No; he sold it to somebody else.

Mr. BORAH. He sold it to the white man or to Americans.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The testimony quoted from the Army officer who was over there was simply in effect that American soldiers bought about five times as much as the native Filipino would buy. The Filipino who takes a drink there takes a cent's worth. The American soldier takes a nickel's worth. He takes five times as much. It is the old American habit of going to excess. There was no testimony at all to show that Filipinos went to any excess.

Mr. BORAH. If I should withdraw the exception with reference to wine, I sincerely hope that the Senator from North Dakota will add something to his amendment which will make it effective. I have no desire to enact merely a sentiment, because it may be sentimentally popular.

Mr. GRONNA. I was going to say to the Senator from Idaho that I shall be very glad to accept that portion of his amendment which provides for a penalty.

Now, as to why I did not provide for a penalty in the amendment which I offered, it was for the reason that I was told by men who I think ought to know the law that the Filipino Legislature could not prohibit the shipment of intoxicating liquors into the islands. For that reason I offered the provision in accordance with the language used to prohibit polygamy. If the Senator from Idaho will modify his amendment so that it will provide only the penalty, I should be very glad to accept it, and I know that friends who are with me in this movement will also accept it; at least I think they will.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho, I understand, has withdrawn his amendment pending action on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota. All the Senator from North Dakota has to do is to ask that there be reported as a part of his amendment the language relating to penalties in the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho. Let the Senator just use the penalty without the rest of the language.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask that that be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho withdraw his amendment?

Mr. BORAH. For the present I withdraw it, although I will say that I think a little more reflection upon the part of those who are interested would lead to the conclusion that my amendment would make the bill much more acceptable, because it would prohibit and prevent the acquiring of appetites and practices which they have not got. This law will likely be ignored entirely with reference to those habits and appetites which are characteristic of the Filipino people.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss this amendment very much, but it seems to me that the real essence of this question is the fact that in any event we have to trust to the Filipino people and the Philippine government to enforce a law of this kind, if we pass it. It is well known to everybody that the great trouble with the prohibition laws has been the impossibility of enforcing them in communities that are not favorably inclined to them. If we pass this amendment, either with or without the penalty that has been prescribed by the Senator from Idaho, still the ultimate result will have to depend upon the Philippine government to enforce it. You may have a law and you may have a penalty, and if there are not the officers of the law and the various provisions for enforcing it and getting evidence it is a dead letter. We have given to the Philippine people full authority to deal with this question in accordance with their desires. In the organic law now which applies to these islands, in the part of it which was written by President McKinley, he says:

> The measures adopted should be made to conform to their customs, their habits, and even their prejudices, to the fullest extent consistent with the accomplishment of the indispensable requisites of just and effective government.

I quite agree with the Senator from Nebraska that the purpose of this bill is to trust the Filipino people with a larger measure of their self-government. I agree that so far as that is the intention of the bill it carries out the present policy of this Government in the Philippine Islands. It does seem to me that if we are trying to establish the fact whether or not the Filipino people are running their government in a proper method, as near as possible to ideal principles, we can as well trust to them local self-government on the question of the use of liquor as we can in a hundred other points that we are submitting to them for their action and consideration.

I do think it is a little inconsistent for the Senate to impose upon the Filipino people a doctrine that they are not yet ready to impose upon their own people. I do think that to put this law in the statutes and have the Filipino people not in sympathy or the Philippine government not ready to provide the officers and the paraphernalia for carrying it out has a little tendency to bring all the American laws we are making into disrepute. It seems to me, taking those things into consideration, it would be wiser if we did not put this into the law.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should like to ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat. Is the Senator in favor of giving the Filipino the right to govern himself?

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I have occupied some 10 or 12 columns in the RECORD on that subject.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I understand.

Mr. LIPPITT. I would prefer that the Senator should read that.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator is complaining that Congress should prescribe for the Filipino in matters of this kind. The Senator says it is inconsistent. I heard the Senator very eloquently and entertainingly on this question, and he took the ground, if I remember correctly, that the Filipino is incapable of self-government and needs the legislative strait-jacket to make him walk in the narrow path.

Mr. LIPPITT. I am sorry that the Senator from Mississippi got that impression of my remarks. What I tried to say, and I hope I did say, was that I thought the experiment, which was once called in Rhode Island the "lively experiment," of giving self-government to the Filipino people up to the point it has now arrived had been a very great success; that it had gone far enough to justify us in hoping that by continuing the same policy for a certain period we might ultimately arrive where the Filipino would be so trained that we could very wisely give him a larger self-government; that perhaps ultimately we might arrive at complete self-government, or whatever you like to use for an expression. I have never said I thought the Filipino people were incapable of being trained for self-government.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I did not say that.

Mr. LIPPITT. I do say I think for the Filipino people it would be unwise at this moment to give them independence. But I think my remarks were perfectly consistent and plain on this subject.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I can not conceive of anything that would help the Filipino more in the development of the capacity for self-government than keeping his body sound and his brain clear and sane. There is no effort on the part of Senators who entertain the views I do to tie the Filipino or to limit him in the development of his own Government and his own civilization after the American Government has withdrawn from the Philippine Islands. It is the purpose of this legislation to give him an idea, to furnish him a plan by which he can organize and build his own civilization. If he wants to go back to the whisky business, if he wants to legalize the whisky traffic after the United States has withdrawn from the islands, that is his affair. I would not proscribe him. I would not limit him in that way; but it is the duty of Congress to help him in so far as Congress can as long as he is a subject and a ward of the Government, and after we turn him loose, then, wishing him Godspeed, let him work out his own salvation.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I ask leave to modify my amendment to strike out that portion of the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho providing for the exception and inserting the clause which provides for a penalty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add at the end of the amendment as a proviso the following words:

> That anyone violating this law shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than $100 or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I will state as a member of the committee that at the last session of Congress we considered this question quite thoroughly, and we came to the conclusion that we did not believe it was best to insert such a provision in the measure. I think I have voted for prohibition on every occasion where I have had an opportunity. I believe in prohibition as applied to ourselves and as applied to any people who pass upon the matter.

But, Mr. President, when we have no prohibition law in the very territory over which we are exercising exclusive jurisdiction, namely, in the District of Columbia, when we have not adopted prohibition as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, it comes with poor grace from us to enforce prohibition, without their consent, on people who are 7,000 miles from us and with whose habits and customs we are not familiar.

This is not a permanent measure. It is not intended for a permanent measure. We are simply to legislate and prescribe what the Philippine General Assembly shall do for a limited period of time. It does seem to me that to force a change entirely of their customs with respect to this matter is not wise policy. If those people are very desirous of those native drinks, it will be very difficult to enforce the law.

But, Mr. President, the Filipino does not go into an American saloon. In those saloons the price of the drinks are the same as here, I understand, and it is beyond their ability to buy them. That is one of the reasons they do not drink the American whisky.

But the great objection which it seems to me exists to the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota is that we are trying to let those people settle to a large extent their own government and we can not in the temporary occupation that we propose to have under this measure, change their customs, and if we do it would be considered by many a great hardship and wrong.

I have always felt that whenever an alien people attempt to legislate and prescribe limits as to the customs of other people it is hardly fair. These are conditions that exist by reason of their own will. I have not any doubt that the prohibition question will come up in the General Assembly of the Philippines and I have no doubt that they will solve that problem according to the best interests of the Philippine people. We can not consider all the problems and attempt to settle them and fix exactly what they shall do. It seems to me this is a problem which they ought to determine for themselves.

Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I believe that we ought to leave the bill just as it is.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make one further suggestion with reference to the form of this amendment. I suggested a moment ago that if it were adopted in the language written by the Senator from North Dakota, it would be wholly innocuous, that it could not be enforced because no penalty was prescribed. Now, the Senator has offered an amendment, which reads that anyone violating this law shall upon conviction thereof be punished, and so on. The amendment itself is proposed to be inserted on page 5, line 11, of the bill.

Mr. GRONNA. I have changed that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Where does it come in now?

Mr. GRONNA. It comes in following the word "prohibited," after "polygamy."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then it comes in after line 12?

Mr. GRONNA. After line 12.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Very well. Now let us read the proposed law as it will read if this amendment were inserted. Taking that paragraph, it would read:

That no law shall be made respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and that the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be allowed; and no religious test shall be required for the exercise of civil or political rights. No public money or property shall ever be appropriated, applied, donated, or used, directly or indirectly, for the use, benefit, or support of any sect, church, denomination, or system of religion, or for the use, benefit, or support of any priest, preacher, minister, or other religious teacher or dignitary or sectarian institution as such. Contracting of polygamous or plural marriages hereafter is prohibited.

That no intoxicating drink or drug shall be manufactured for sale or gift, imported for sale or gift, or sold or offered for sale or gift for use as a beverage; but this shall not apply to or include the native wines and beverages commonly known as vino, tuba, basi, and tapuy.

Which means, of course, that anybody who misuses public moneys or who does any of these other things, including the contracting of polygamous or plural marriages, or the sale of intoxicating liquors, or any of the other things that I have not stopped to read preceding this amendment, would be liable to this penalty, whereas I suppose the Senator means simply to confine it to the sale of intoxicating liquors or drugs.

Mr. President, that shows the utter futility of trying to frame a law in the open Senate in this manner. I will predict to the Senator from North Dakota that if he will still further amend this law so as to make it clear that the penalty applies only to the sale or manufacture of intoxicating liquor, yet the provision has been drawn so hastily that ingenious lawyers will find loopholes through which they can drive a cart and horse. All of which demonstrates the unwisdom of undertaking to legislate in this haphazard way.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say, Mr. President, to the Senator from Utah that of course I expected this to be a new paragraph and that it would apply only to intoxicating liquors and would not apply to anything which the Senator has read.

I will also say to the Senator from Utah that this very amendment itself, in the very same language in which I offered it, has stood the test not only of the State courts but of the Federal courts of the United States.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota can very quickly and very easily obviate the objection of the Senator from Utah by the insertion of the words "with relation to the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors," and I have no doubt he will be willing to do that.

Mr. GRONNA. I am very glad to accept that suggestion.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to say just one word with regard to the position taken by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], which seems to me to be very illogical and unsound. We are dealing with the Filipino people upon the assumption that they are not capable fully of managing their own affairs. It is the very foundation stone of this structure that is being reared with such care and patience. If we believe that with regard to this subject they are not yet capable of self-government or self-disposition, it becomes our duty to supply that weakness and do what we can to make society there stable and sober.

But the Senator from Colorado forgets apparently the suggestion I made a few moments ago to the Senator from Idaho. This bill does not leave the Philippine Legislature in possession of the subject at all. It leaves the Philippine Legislature with power to prohibit the importation of liquor from Great Britain, or France, or Japan, or anywhere else, but it denies them the liberty or power to prohibit the importation of liquor from the United States. A most inequitable, unjust, and unfortunate limitation of power on the part of the government about to be established there. I ask the Senator from Colorado, if the committee desired to leave the legislature of the islands with the power to determine the policy that ought to prevail in the islands, does he not think that we ought to give to the authorities there the right to say what the relations between the United States and the Philippine Islands shall be respecting liquor? So long as that is reserved, it is for us, and not for the Philippine Legislature, to declare the policy in this respect. I propound that question to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I believe the Philippine Legislature ought to be given the power to determine whether or not intoxicating liquors shall be shipped from the United States there, and I would be perfectly willing to vote for a provision that authorized that; but the question is whether or not the Philippine Legislature should have this power. The Senator from Iowa has said that these people are incapable of self-government. I do not agree with the Senator in that respect. This is a limitation of power upon the legislature. I want to inform the Senator, though he probably knows it, that every one of the 81 members of the Philippine Legislature is a graduate of a college or of a university. Consequently, they are perfectly capable of passing whatever laws they think are for the best interests of the Philippine people.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Colorado misunderstood me if he understood me to say that I thought they were incapable of self-government.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know that the Senator said so, but I inferred that from what the Senator said.

Mr. CUMMINS. On the contrary, I said that the theory of this bill was that the Filipinos are not competent to fully and completely govern themselves. I do not agree with the theory of this bill, as the Senator from Colorado certainly well knows.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Of course, Mr. President, every bill is a subject of compromise; there is no doubt about that, nor is there any doubt there are provisions in this bill which do not satisfy me or perhaps any other one man. You can not have legislation in a bill covering 40 or 50 pages to which every one exactly agrees, but I maintain that the position which we are trying to take in the bill is to let the legislature of the Philippine people deal with this question; that it is a question which affects those people. They know more about it than we do and could tell you more about it in a month than I could tell you in a lifetime. Consequently, they are the ones who ought to determine the question. I am satisfied that they are not a drinking people. I have been over there twice and have spent considerable time in the islands, and I never saw a Filipino drunk in my life, although I have been on the streets time and time again. There is no necessity for this great change in policy.

If they are going to be taught self-government, they should be given the opportunity to govern themselves. If they decide that this shall be the policy, well and good; I hope it will be, but I want them to take the action. I do not want this policy to be imposed upon them by a power that they may think is exercising an act of tyranny. For this reason it seems to me that we ought to leave this matter to an intelligent legislature which exists over there; let them determine it. Put whatever provision you desire into the bill giving them the power to prohibit the importation of liquors from the United States; I believe in that. I believe they should have the power to determine that very question; and if the Senator will propose an amendment to permit the Philippine Legislature to determine the question of the importation of liquors from the United States or from the world at large, I shall be perfectly willing to vote for it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, if the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] is rejected, if some other Senator does not do so, I certainly shall offer an amendment removing the limitation that the bill imposes upon the Philippine Legislature with regard to the importation of liquor from the United States; but, inasmuch as I believe it to be a wise policy so long as we are legislating for these islands to establish the fundamental doctrines of organized society, I intend to support the amendment commanding prohibition.

If the Filipino people are not accustomed to strong drink—and I am happy to believe that they are not—they will not be seriously injured if we prohibit them the opportunity to become accustomed to strong drink. We are not destroying ideals; we are not compelling them to move in strange ways or paths; apparently we are simply instituting a policy which they will recognize as just and wise more readily than we seem to have done. I hope that the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota will prevail.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a word in further answer to the Senator from Iowa. The question of prohibition in our States has been much discussed, and there are certain classes of our own people who think it is tyranny, that it is oppression, to pass any law which, as they term it, would be an embargo upon their stomachs. They claim it is the violation of an individual right. That contention comes from our own people, and our population is pretty evenly divided on the question, for in most of the States the majority for prohibition is merely a small one.

If some of our own intelligent American citizens feel that we have not any right to legislate as to what they shall eat or drink, and they regard such legislation as an act of tyranny, though I do not think it is, because I believe that the majority have a right to control in that matter—but if such legislation is so regarded by our own people, with how much more force must the same view appeal to the Filipino if he thinks that his rights are invaded by an alien people 7,000 miles away? For that reason, it seems to me, Mr. President, that we ought to let this matter stand where the committee has placed it, and let the Filipino Legislature determine the question. I am satisfied that they will ultimately determine it for the best interests of the Filipino people.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA]:

In line 3 of the Senator's printed amendment, after the word "beverage," I move to insert:

But this shall not apply to or include the native wines and beverages commonly known as vino, tuba, basi, and tapuy.

Mr. CLAPP. Just a moment, if the Senator from Nebraska will pardon me. I ask him to withhold his amendment until the Senator from North Dakota perfects his amendment, if he will do so, so as to make his amendment complete in itself.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, it is manifest that this bill can not be passed this afternoon or that the vote will not be taken upon it. I think, therefore, it would be prudent to let this matter all go over until morning and give the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] an opportunity to perfect his amendment. I think that course would be in the interest of economy of time and might save trouble in the future, for I do not want to vote on immature legislation. I repeat, we can not finish the bill this afternoon, because there is an agreement to take up the Clarke amendment to-morrow. I think it would be better if we could have the night to consider these amendments; and, from the discussion here this afternoon, I think a proper plan might be evolved.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska withdraw his amendment to my amendment until my amendment, as perfected, can be stated?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not want my amendment to the amendment to lose its position.

Mr. GRONNA. Not at all.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will ask the Secretary to state the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota for information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment as perfected by the Senator from North Dakota.

The SECRETARY. Mr. GRONNA proposes to perfect his amendment as follows: After the word "beverage," the last word in the printed amendment, he proposes to insert:

That anyone violating this law relating to the manufacture, sale, or gift of intoxicating liquors or drugs shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $100 or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then I offer my amendment, to be inserted in the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, after the word "beverage."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska offers an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "beverage" it is proposed to insert the words:

But this shall not apply to or include the native wines and beverages known as vino, tuba, basi, and tapuy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA].

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I can understand why the proponents of this bill do not like to have any more inconsistencies introduced into it than it already contains. I can understand why, if they actually believe that the Filipino is capable of self-government and practically fitted for independence, they should wish to relegate this intoxicating-liquor question to the Filipinos themselves. Believing, as I do, that this is not true, that we are making a serious mistake in greatly enlarging the governmental powers of the Filipinos and in promising them independence at this time, believing that these people are not competent for self-government and that it would be a great mistake for the United States to relieve itself of power while it retains responsibility in the archipelago, I shall oppose the passage of the bill. I shall also oppose the so-called Clarke amendment when it comes up, and upon which I propose to speak briefly later.

I think the experiment in the Philippine Islands by the United States thus far is admitted by everybody to have been a splendid success. Everybody that I have heard speak upon the subject has said that we are doing very well in the Philippine Islands; that we are performing the greatest work that any nation has ever done for a dependent people. Every person whom I have consulted, and who was entitled to speak with authority on this subject because of his personal knowledge, has said that we ought not to hold out to Filipinos the encouragement of independence in the immediate future, and that we ought not to grant them a much larger degree of self-government than they already possess until the experiment that we are conducting has been carried forward further than it is at the present time. Why not continue on the course that is proving so satisfactory? Why invite more trouble when we already have quite enough?

I recognize that it is the popular thing for some temperance people, prohibition people—and I am of that class, being in favor of practical prohibition legislation where possible—it is popular, I say, to tack prohibition onto all sorts of bills and inject its discussion on every possible occasion. That does not, however, help the cause of temperance. Senators have been insisting that the Filipinos are capable of self-government and that it is oppressive for the United States to impose government upon them, and yet some of these Senators are about to repudiate their own arguments by voting to take away a power which they now possess. I would not at this time greatly enlarge the legislative powers of our oriental wards, neither would I take from them powers which they now possess. Senators in dealing with this question should be reasonably consistent.

We ought to retain the respect of the Filipinos, if possible. The United States certainly should not contribute anything to their detriment, to their injury. Therefore I can see where it would be consistent, according to my theory, of still retaining authority in the islands, to prohibit the importation of liquors into the islands, and for that proposition I can cheerfully vote; but I shall not consider myself less in favor of prohibition or of temperance if I vote against a clear interference with the right of the Filipinos to govern themselves in regard to domestic and local matters, which they have shown ability to handle. I think we would make a mistake by thus interfering; that we would lose the respect and confidence of these people; and while, as I have said, I am going to vote against the Clarke amendment and against the bill, because I think they are both unwise and loaded with trouble not only for us but for the Philippine Islands, I shall vote for an amendment, if I am permitted to do so, to prohibit the importation into the Philippine Islands of intoxicating liquors. I am in sympathy with that proposition. It surely is the duty of the United States to protect these islands from all enemies from without, but inasmuch as it is admitted and uncontradicted that domestic intoxicants are not harming the Filipino, and he has shown sense enough to handle them much better than we handle the liquor question in the United States, I want to leave him in undisturbed control of domestic intoxicants.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA].

Mr. VARDAMAN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STERLING (when the name of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota was called). I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota] is unavoidably detained from the Chamber on account of sickness.

Mr. LIPPITT (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I do not at the present time see him in the Chamber. So I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I announce that I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. He not being present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. POINDEXTER (when his name was called). I was paired with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. My understanding, however, was that the arrangement for the pair expired yesterday, so I shall vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). On all except two propositions connected with this bill I am paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], and, therefore, withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. POMERENE (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Maryland was called). The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] is unavoidably detained from the Chamber. He is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM].

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], who is absent, is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I inquire whether the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed he has not voted.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have a pair with that Senator, and, on account of his absence, withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I inquire whether the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed he has not voted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I can not vote, because I have a pair with him. If I were privileged to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have been requested by the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to announce that he is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] and to state that he is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY] and his pair with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Referring to my last announcement, I wish to transfer the pair which I have with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], and with that transfer I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. RANSDELL. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. BROUSSARD] on account of illness.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am requested to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. WARREN] on business of the Senate.

Mr. CHILTON. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. If present, I do not know how he would vote; but if I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

I also desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent from the Senate on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. CATRON. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. FALL] is unavoidably absent on account of sickness.

Mr. PAGE. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. DILLINGHAM] is absent on important business, and, as has been stated by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], my colleague is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. COLT. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. LIPPITT. I transfer the pair I have with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WEEKS. My colleague [Mr. LODGE] is absent on account of illness. He is paired with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] has announced his pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY]. I wish to add in that connection that the Senator from Delaware is detained at home by illness.

I also wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. REED], who is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], is absent on urgent and necessary business.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER], which I transfer to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. KENYON. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence for the day of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. CHILTON. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Borah	Hardwick	Lee, Md.	Simmons
Bryan	Hitchcock	Lewis	Smith, Ga.
Catron	Hollis	McLean	Sterling
Chamberlain	Hughes	Martine, N. J.	Stone
Clark, Wyo.	James	Page	Townsend
Fletcher	Johnson, Me.	Ransdell	Underwood
Gore	Kern	Robinson	Wadsworth
Harding	Lane	Shafroth	Williams

NAYS—26.

Ashurst	Gronna	Nelson	Smoot
Bankhead	Husting	Norris	Swanson
Beckham	Jones	Oliver	Thompson
Chilton	Kenyon	Owen	Vardaman
Clapp	Lea, Tenn.	Poindexter	Weeks
Cummins	Lippitt	Sheppard	
Curtis	Myers	Sherman	

NOT VOTING—38.

Brady	Gallinger	Penrose	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Goff	Phelan	Smith, S. C.
Broussard	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Sutherland
Burleigh	La Follette	Pomerene	Thomas
Clarke, Ark.	Lodge	Reed	Tillman
Colt	McCumber	Saulsbury	Walsh
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Shields	Warren
Dillingham	Newlands	Shively	Works
du Pont	O'Gorman	Smith, Ariz.	
Fall	Overman	Smith, Md.	

So the amendment of Mr. HITCHCOCK to the amendment of Mr. GRONNA was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, as amended.

Mr. SMOOT. On that the yeas and nays have been ordered, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] and its transfer to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN]. I vote "yea."

Mr. COLT (when his name was called). I again announce my pair, and withhold my vote.

Mr. STERLING (when the name of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota was called). I again announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. GRONNA (when Mr. MCCUMBER'S name was called). I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. MCCUMBER] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. I wish this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. OLIVER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], who is unavoidably absent, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. STONE (when Mr. REED'S name was called). I wish to make the same announcement that I did on the last vote with respect to my colleague [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY].

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair which I have before announced, I vote "yea."

Mr. POMERENE (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Maryland was called). I make the same announcement as before with regard to the absence of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and his pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM].

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as before respecting my pair, and, on account of my pair, withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I again announce my pair and withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I understand that in my absence I have been paired with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. I should like to transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. BORAH. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. BRADY] on account of illness. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. He is paired with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. CHILTON. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. GOFF] on account of illness.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH].

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—35.

Ashurst	Curtis	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Fletcher	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Gore	Overman	Smoot
Borah	Gronna	Page	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones	Poindexter	Swanson
Chilton	Kenyon	Shafroth	Thompson
Clapp	Lane	Sheppard	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Lea, Tenn.	Sherman	Vardaman
Cummins	Myers	Simmons	

NAYS—23.

Bryan	Hughes	Lippitt	Stone
Catron	Husting	McLean	Underwood
Harding	James	Martine, N. J.	Wadsworth
Hardwick	Johnson, Me.	Newlands	Weeks
Hitchcock	Lee, Md.	Ransdell	Williams
Hollis	Lewis	Robinson	

NOT VOTING—38.

Brady	Gallinger	Owen	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	Goff	Penrose	Smith, Mich.
Broussard	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Sutherland
Burleigh	Kern	Pittman	Thomas
Clarke, Ark.	La Follette	Pomerene	Tillman
Colt	Lodge	Reed	Walsh
Culberson	McCumber	Saulsbury	Warren
Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Shields	Works
du Pont	O'Gorman	Shively	
Fall	Oliver	Smith, Ariz.	

So Mr. GRONNA's amendment as amended was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 19, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 18, 1916.

CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Samuel Alschuler to be United States circuit judge, seventh judicial circuit.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

Tillman D. Johnson to be United States district judge, district of Utah.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

J. William Thurmond to be United States attorney, western district of South Carolina.

H. A. Sawyer to be United States attorney, eastern district of Wisconsin.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Charles J. Lyon to be United States marshal, western district of South Carolina.

Samuel W. Randolph to be United States marshal, eastern district of Wisconsin.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

W. Burch Lee to be surveyor of customs in customs collection district No. 20.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named citizens to be assistant paymasters:

Edward R. Eberle.
Robert B. Huff.
Andrew L. Huestis.
Malcolm G. Slarrow.
Benjamin S. Gantz.
Raymond N. Hickman.
William D. Alexander.
Homer C. Sowell.
Morton L. Ring.
Raymond M. Bright.
Vernou H. Wheeler.
Louie C. English.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

John D. Ainsworth, Wesson.
Red Thomas, Fordyce.
Alfred Watts, Yellville.

CONNECTICUT.

Willis S. Gilbert, Ridgefield.

FLORIDA.

James A. Haisten, Cocoa.
Richard J. Mays, Monticello.

MARYLAND.

Oscar S. Barrick, Woodsboro.
Joseph Reading, Rockville.
G. Walter Wright, Cambridge.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Charles T. Farrell, Stoughton.
James H. Hoar, Fall River.
Stephen C. Luce, Vineyard Haven.

MICHIGAN.

George Baskin, Ubly.
Elmer Bremer, Montgomery.
James H. Bush, Norway.
Charles E. Dean, Mesick.
George M. Hubbard, Hudsonville.
Henry McCarty, Fremont.
James McKenna, Sault St. Marie.
Edward J. Marrinane, Grass Lake.
Charles Powers, Saugatuck.

NEW YORK.

Patrick H. Cantillon, Perrysburg.
Claude S. Cooper, Odessa.
Roy E. Dietrich, La Fargeville.
George W. Niece, Port Leyden.
Dominick W. Gilligan, Shortsville.
George F. Ketchum, Warwick.
George W. Salisbury, Phelps.
George Staplin, jr., Mannsville.

OHIO.

Morris Albaugh, Murray.
Peter J. Blank, Canal Fulton.
Michael J. Callaghan, Bellevue.
Lee R. Carman, Belmont.
Emmet H. Dixon, Byesville.
Patrick J. Dunn, Strasburg.
William Hosick, Mineral City.
Albert E. Kroske, Arlington.
M. E. Miskall, East Liverpool.
Perry E. Montgomery, Greenspring.
C. D. Royer, Bowerston.
Daniel W. Rumbaugh, Chicago Junction.
George Russ, Sciotoville.
George N. Young, Tiffin.

OKLAHOMA.

Jessie A. Tucker, Comanche.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Menzo M. Burt, Roulette.
John M. Ebling, Schuylkill Haven.
Percy E. Faust, Weatherly.
Richard O. Heilman, Catasauqua.
P. H. Gherrity, Bellefonte.
Mertie T. Gillies, Devon.
Frank W. McFadden, McKeesport.
Edward S. Laughlin, Oil City.
P. H. Salmon, Moosic.

RHODE ISLAND.

Joseph A. Hughes, Pawtucket.

VERMONT.

Asa C. Oakes, Stowe.

VIRGINIA.

Charles N. Graves, Stanley.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *January 18, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in whom we live and move and have our being, make us conscious of Thy presence, working in and through us, and of Thy love, manifest in a thousand blessings, new every morning and fresh every evening, that we may go forward with faith and confidence to do the work Thou hast given us to do, and thus be worthy recipients of Thy love and care. So may we honor, praise, and glorify Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF A BILL.

Mr. HAMLIN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] will permit.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well.

Mr. HAMLIN. On December 10 I introduced the bill H. R. 3695, and my attention has been called to the fact that this bill was passed at the last session. In reintroducing other bills, which I was not so fortunate with, I reintroduced this bill, and I ask unanimous consent that it be withdrawn from consideration by the Committee on Military Affairs and stricken from the files of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the gentleman will be granted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HOWARD rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. HOWARD. I rise to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the question of preparedness.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the question of preparedness. Is there objection to the request?

There was no objection.

MINORITY REPORT ON THE CHILD-LABOR BILL.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Virginia rise?

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. To make a request for unanimous consent, sir. On yesterday a report was made from the Committee on Labor on the bill (H. R. 8234) to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes. On the part of myself and other minority members of that committee I ask unanimous consent to have five legislative days in which the views of the minority may be filed upon that subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent for five legislative days in which the minority can file their views on House bill 8234, the child-labor bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF THE CHILD-LABOR BILL.

Mr. KEATING rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Colorado rise?

Mr. KEATING. To submit a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I ask unanimous consent that the calendar print of the bill (H. R. 8234), to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes, and report No. 46 be corrected. In submitting the printed bill the clerk to the committee neglected to report one amendment, and we desire permission to include that amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] asks unanimous consent that the calendar print of House bill 8234 and the report thereon be corrected. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MAINTENANCE OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE.

The SPEAKER. Before the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] begins the Chair wants to make a suggestion to the Members in the interest of order, and that is that Members when they undertake to make remarks in the House ought to talk so that people can hear them. That is one of the things that contributes to the chronic disorder in this House. Men will not refrain from talking when they can not hear what a man on the floor is saying.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. ELSTON rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a private pension bill was improperly referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions—the bill (H. R. 9264) for the relief of a veteran of the Spanish War. It should have gone to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, all Members ought to be informed that improper references of private bills are corrected by the clerks on request without bringing them up in the House under the rules.

The SPEAKER. That is a very pertinent suggestion.

Mr. ELSTON. Very well.

SEIZURE OF THE "HOCKING."

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a communication from William Bayard Hale upon the seizure of the *Hocking*, a vessel passing from one American port to another.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a communication from William Bayard Hale on the seizure of the ship *Hocking*, passing from one American port to another. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the extent of the publication? It is not a book, is it?

Mr. FESS. Oh, no. It is simply a communication.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO RULE XXIV.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a privileged report of a resolution from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 94 (Rept. No. 58).

Resolved, That paragraph 7 of Rule XXIV of the House of Representatives be amended by adding thereto the following:

"*Provided*, That not more that two hours of general debate shall be permitted on any measure called up on Calendar Wednesday, and all debate must be confined to the subject matter of the bill, the time to be equally divided between those for and against the bill: *Provided further*, That whenever any committee shall have occupied two Wednesdays it shall not be in order, unless the House by a two-thirds vote shall otherwise determine, to consider any unfinished business previously called up by such committee, unless the previous question had been ordered thereon, upon any succeeding Wednesday until the other committees have been called in their turn under this rule."

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the other side of the House if any time is desired there for the discussion of this rule? How much time do the gentlemen desire on that side?

Mr. LENROOT. Twenty minutes on this side.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of 40 minutes the previous question be considered as ordered on the resolution.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not do that. It is possible that the gentleman may accept a slight amendment, is it not?

Mr. FOSTER. I will say frankly, Mr. Speaker, that so far as I am concerned and so far as the committee is concerned, our hope is that we have got some amendment to Calendar Wednesday that would make it more workable.

Mr. MANN. I suggest that my colleague from Illinois proceed with the debate for 40 minutes. The gentleman has the right to move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can have an hour if he wants it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, Calendar Wednesday was established in 1909, in the hope of giving one day when committees might have the opportunity of calling up bills for consideration in the order in which the committees appear in the rules. I think every Member recognizes that Calendar Wednesday has been a most excellent thing. As the result of our experience from 1909 until the present we believe that the efficiency of Calendar Wednesday can be increased by making this addition to the rule. I think it has been decided by the Speaker that when the consideration of a bill has continued until the end of the second day, the committee having the bill in charge has the right to go ahead and complete that bill, though it may take the whole session. However good a bill may be, I do not believe that any committee should have the right to occupy a good many Wednesdays during a session of Congress. If a bill is of importance—and I am not saying that any bill which has been considered here on Calendar Wednesday has not been of importance—it ought to be considered under a special rule that will provide consideration, or give it some privileged status in some other way, and not occupy the whole time on successive Calendar Wednesdays.

Another provision here is that in the consideration of these bills not more than two hours general debate shall be had upon any one bill, and that that debate must be confined to the subject matter of the bill, so that on Calendar Wednesday we can confine the day to the actual business of the House, and not talk about everything in the world except the bill.

We provide that at the end of the second Calendar Wednesday, unless the previous question has been ordered, the committee shall lose the right to consider another bill until all the committees have been called again in their turn, unless the House, by a two-thirds vote, decides to take it up for further consideration, upon the next succeeding Calendar Wednesday, the bill which was under consideration.

I believe that the addition of this rule will be of advantage to the Members of the House, and will help to expedite the public business.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. I should like to inquire of the gentleman in the event that a bill of much importance to the House is in the regular order of procedure taken up on Calendar Wednesday, so that it can go nowhere else, and there is no other means of getting the bill before the House, what becomes of it after its consideration on the second Calendar Wednesday? I have in mind the printing bill, which I consider of much importance not only to the membership of the House, because of its advantage to them, but of importance to the well-being of the Treasury of the United States. Now, suppose an important bill of that kind comes up on Calendar Wednesday. In the very nature of things the length of the bill is such that it could not possibly be concluded in two days' consideration. Could any other means be provided under this rule by which a bill of that nature might be taken up except by a two-thirds vote?

Mr. FOSTER. I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that I fully agree with him as to the importance of the bill which he speaks about. It is an important bill; but, as the gentleman well knows, a bill of that character requires a good deal of discussion and a long time to pass it. If this rule is adopted, there will be no way by which such a bill could be brought up for further consideration after the second Calendar Wednesday except by a two-thirds vote; and I submit to the gentleman from Indiana that it is hardly fair to other Members who have bills which they desire to reach that one bill should hold Calendar Wednesday possibly for two, three, or four months. It seems to me that is not what was intended of Calendar Wednesday when it was established, but it was established in order that each committee might during some part of the session have the right to be called. Yet, as we all know, when the calendar becomes congested it is impossible to reach many of these committees during the session, and Members who have bills of great importance sit around here without being able to get the opportunity to have them considered. Now, I say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] very frankly that I am for the consideration of the bill to which he refers, and I should be glad to do everything I could to help to take up that bill; but I do not believe it is right to place upon this calendar a bill to revise some code of laws which requires the entire session of Congress for its consideration or the printing bill of the gentleman, which I would be glad to help him get up in some other way if I could. I say it is hardly fair to the membership of this House that several Calendar Wednesdays and possibly several months be taken up in the consideration of that particular bill to the exclusion of all others and all other committees in the House.

Mr. BARNHART. Let me inquire of the gentleman, under his proposed procedure, if a bill of that sort were taken up on Calendar Wednesday and had the right of way, after two Calendar Wednesdays what would then become of it?

Mr. FOSTER. If the House, by a two-third vote, decided that the gentleman should go ahead with his bill, he would have the right to do so.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It would come up the next time the committee was called in its order.

Mr. FOSTER. If the House did not decide by a two-thirds vote to continue its consideration, the gentleman would have to wait until all the other committees were called, and then the bill would come up again as unfinished business.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. The Committee on Rules could bring in a special order.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course it could be taken up under a special order.

Mr. BARNHART. The chairman of the Committee on Rules has given his word to the Committee on Printing that it can have a rule on this bill, inasmuch as it has passed the House once and the Senate once, and a great majority of the Members are entirely familiar with it, and probably it will not take very much time; but in my own case I am only trying to safeguard the possibilities of getting the bill considered and completed after it has taken so much time in the committees and on the floors of both branches of Congress.

Mr. FOSTER. I fully agree with the gentleman that that bill ought to be taken up, because some reform ought to be made in the matter of printing for this House.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] 20 minutes, and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LENROOT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, Calendar Wednesday was an experiment. My colleague [Mr. FOSTER] says he thinks it was undoubtedly a good experiment. I myself have always questioned whether it was for the interest of the House, because practically now we have the call of committees on Calendar Wednesday only, after we get really started on the work of the House. Under the existing rule it is possible for a majority of the House to stop the consideration of any bill on Calendar Wednesday, whether it has been considered one day or two days or not at all, because the question of consideration may be raised in the Committee of the Whole on Calendar Wednesday, and was raised in the last Congress on one of the codification bills; and although the other side of the House was protesting against the delay, yet the House continued to consider that bill, knowing full well that it had no chance of becoming a law, and that its only use was to take up the time of the House. It is possibly a good thing to shut off somewhat the delay on Calendar Wednesday. I think it would have been better in this rule to provide means of closing debate rather than to limit debate to two hours. There are some bills that come up in the House of great importance that ought to have more than two hours' discussion. But I am quite willing to try it. If the majority wants to give us the opportunity of increasing the power of the minority, as this amendment does, we will be content during this Congress at least.

The majority have it in their power to say whether consideration of a bill shall be continued, but under this rule the minority will determine whether you proceed with the consideration of a bill on Calendar Wednesday, because under the rule it takes a two-thirds vote to continue consideration. Under the existing rule it takes a majority vote to discontinue the consideration.

But upon all of these rules it is more or less, as we make changes, a matter of experiment. I believe myself that some of us, if we would undertake it, could revise the rules of the House so as to protect the rights of the majority, protect the rights of the minority, and yet very much expedite the transaction of business. The House has grown so large in numbers, and the number of bills reported favorably to the House is so great, that toward the end of the session of Congress we find ourselves in the position where we are trying to put 100 pegs in one hole, a process that is not always agreeable and never possible to accomplish. As we go along the length of the calendars increase and the time is shortened. It is impossible for those who have not been here to understand fully how the pressure comes, as the days of Congress dwindle, to get consideration of certain measures in which Members are interested, knowing full well that it is impossible owing to the length of time for all the measures to be considered.

I do not know whether my friend from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] will get his printing bill passed or not. I think he ought to take it up and spend two days on it, anyhow. Then he can look at it sorrowfully and with regret as he lays it away in its final resting place. [Laughter.] Calendar Wednesday will become a sort of receiving tomb.

I would like to ask my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, a question or two about the construction of this rule. If the committee has had two days, or a part of one day and a full day, is that to be considered two days?

Mr. FOSTER. My recollection is that the House has so considered it.

Mr. MANN. That is undoubtedly the construction of the present rule, and that would be the construction of this rule. When is the motion to be made for further consideration of the bill?

Mr. FOSTER. I should say on the succeeding Wednesday, if the bill was not completed. The chairman would have the right to make the motion.

Mr. MANN. Before the call of committees proceeds?

Mr. FOSTER. Before the call of committees is resumed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I am in sympathy with the proposed amendment. In my opinion it should be changed in two respects. After the word "that" in line 4 I believe there should be inserted the words "unless otherwise ordered by the House." That would give the House the right to determine if more than two hours' debate should be allowed on any bill, and it would not be dependent on unanimous consent. There is another change that may be very important if the purpose of the rule is to be carried out. Having hastily examined the resolution, I wish to call the attention of the members of the Com-

mittee on Rules to the wording of the proposed amendment. In line 9 it provides:

That whenever any committee shall have occupied two Wednesdays it shall not be in order, unless the House by a two-thirds vote shall otherwise determine, to consider any unfinished business previously called up by such committee, unless the previous question had been ordered thereon, upon any succeeding Wednesday until the other committees have been called in their turn under this rule.

Under that wording of the rule, Mr. Speaker, the committee could call up a bill and occupy two Calendar Wednesdays. It could not continue the third day in consideration of such a bill, because it would be the unfinished business. But is there anything in the rule as it is now worded that would prevent the committee from calling up a new bill on the third day?

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. CRISP. Does not the rule itself prohibit that? The rule itself provides that no committee can occupy more than two days except to complete unfinished business.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not believe that it does. I shall read the provision again:

That whenever any committee shall have occupied two Wednesdays it shall not be in order, unless the House by a two-thirds vote shall otherwise determine, to consider any unfinished business previously called up by such committee, unless the previous question had been ordered thereon, upon any succeeding Wednesday until the other committees have been called in their turn under this rule.

I take it the purpose of the committee is to make the Calendar Wednesday rule the same that applies to the call of committees under the old rule.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Paragraph 4 of rule 24 provides that whenever any committee shall occupy the morning hour on two days it shall not be in order to call up any other bill until the other committees have been called in their turn.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is the rule for the call of committees on any day except Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. MANN. But the rule for Calendar Wednesday refers to that rule.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Speaker on several occasions has determined that that provision of the rule does not apply to business on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. MANN. I beg the gentleman's pardon, Calendar Wednesday rule is this:

On Wednesday of each week no business shall be in order except as provided by paragraph 4 of this rule, unless the House by a two-thirds vote on motion to dispense therewith shall otherwise determine.

It makes the exception that Union Calendar bills may be called upon Calendar Wednesday. Otherwise paragraph 4 of rule 24 covers it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It does not help out for this reason. There would be nothing to prevent a committee from laying aside on the second day the consideration of the bill under consideration.

Mr. MANN. That is true, but the House could raise the question of consideration.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am taking into account the desire of the majority of the House sometimes to filibuster. Calendar Wednesday was designed to prevent the majority of the House resorting to skillful parliamentary tactics to prevent the consideration or to reach the consideration of a bill. The suggestion I intended to make to the committee was to strike out of line 12 the words "previously called up by such committee" and insert after the word "any," on line 11, the words "business from such committee except unfinished business and consideration of which the House is then engaged." So that it would read:

Whenever any committee shall have occupied two Wednesdays it shall not be in order, unless the House by a two-thirds vote shall otherwise determine, to consider any business from such committee except unfinished business in the consideration of which the House is then engaged.

It may be that by construction that objection would be overcome. I merely make the suggestion.

I believe, however, that there should be some modification so that the House itself would have the power, if it wished to exercise it, to extend the time for general debate more than two hours. It would not occur often, as the debate must be germane to the bill; but there are some bills called up under the rule on Calendar Wednesday that are of very great importance and on which the discussion would be practically entirely in the general debate, with very little desire for opportunity under the five-minute rule. I am in sympathy with the purpose of the Committee on Rules and intend to support whatever they eventually decide. I simply have given expression to these views at this time, so that if the changes are deemed desirable they can be made now.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am in thorough sympathy with this proposed rule. We represent 100,000,000 people, comprising the greatest Government the world has ever known, and in my judgment this is the greatest legislative forum in the world. My observation has been that the Representatives are all earnest, active, and sincere in representing to the very best of their ability the interests of their respective constituencies. We have a great country with many diversified interests, and there are many measures introduced into this body by the various Representatives that mean much to their respective communities, but which are not of such general, Nation-wide interest that in the multiplicity of bills introduced into the House one can get them considered. Bills of general interest, those of such general interest that they are given a privileged status, can always take care of themselves and be given a hearing in this body, but local bills, bills in which various local communities are interested, owing to the thousands of bills introduced into the body never reach a hearing under the general rules of the House. Speaking to my new colleagues who are serving their first term in this House, they do not now and can not now grasp the truth of that statement, because up to now there has been practically no trouble in getting bills reported from the committees considered; but when the committees are at work and the calendars are filled with bills you will find these local measures do not stand very much chance of getting a hearing. That was the reason that Calendar Wednesday was created—to give those bills a chance to have a hearing, bills local in nature and which are not privileged and can not be brought up at any time.

Practical observation and experience with this rule, however, has shown that it is possible to call up under it some long bill, a bill of great importance to this country, and a committee can lodge one of those bills before the House on Calendar Wednesday and it will destroy Calendar Wednesday for the rest of the session of Congress, so far as the consideration of other measures is concerned, whether that is one week or four months. That is the practical operation of it. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] says that you can raise the question of consideration. That is true, but when a bill is before the House and is being considered, it is very hard to get the House, by a vote, to displace it. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] states that he is in sympathy with the rule, but he thinks it should be amended to allow more than two hours' general debate of a bill called up under Calendar Wednesday, if the House saw fit. I do not favor that suggestion, because if the measure called up is to be considered for only two legislative days, and it may be in effect practically one legislative day if it be called up late in the afternoon of the first day, I think two hours of general debate ample, and I think the old Members of this House will agree with me that, so far as legitimate discussion of the measure up for consideration is concerned, it takes place under the five-minute rule and not under the general debate.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Take the Philippine bill, which may be up and can be called up on Calendar Wednesday. Does not the gentleman think that it would be proper, if the House saw fit, to give more than two hours general debate on that?

Mr. CRISP. Answering the gentleman, I do not think the Philippine bill or a bill of that magnitude should be brought up under Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. MANN. That may be true, the gentleman may not think so; but still if the chairman of the committee thought so, he would bring it up on that date, if it was ready.

Mr. CRISP. If that is true, the House can raise the question of consideration, and if a majority of the House agreed with the one raising that question, the Philippine bill could not be called up under Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's argument a moment ago would answer his present statement. The House would not refuse to consider a bill reported by a committee—a majority of the House probably would not.

Mr. CRISP. My statement was, when the House had the bill already up for consideration and had been considering it for two days that it would be difficult then to have the question of consideration sustained.

Mr. MANN. Would it not become the practice, where a majority of the House desired to prevent debate, to seek the opportunity of taking up a bill on Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. CRISP. I do not quite understand the question.

Mr. MANN. Where a majority of the House desired to prevent debate it would seek the opportunity of calling a bill up on

Calendar Wednesday, in which case, under this rule, it would not require a vote of Members to shut off debate.

Mr. CRISP. I do not agree with the gentleman. I think a bill like the Philippine bill, a bill like the printing bill, which is a very great bill and will save the people a great deal of money, ought to be considered——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. I have only two minutes, but I yield for a question.

Mr. BORLAND. The main purpose, the main reform in this amendment, is to prevent one committee from occupying more than two Calendar Wednesdays with unfinished business?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Then it is not important whether you limit debate to two hours or not in this reform?

Mr. CRISP. Well, I believe that as far as legitimate discussion of a measure before the House is concerned, it is better subserved under the five-minute rule than under general debate. My observation is that general debate generally touches and covers everything under the sun except the question before the House.

Now, as I was saying, bills of the character of the Philippine measure, the printing bill, and bills that are of general interest, I think ought to be considered, and I think the Committee on Rules should bring in a rule giving them a special privilege and let them be discussed on their merits, and I do not believe that the framers of this Calendar Wednesday rule ever intended that bills of that character should be brought up under it.

Now, answering another stricture of my friend from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], that you could get a bill up under this proposed amendment and just before you adjourn lay that aside and bring up another bill, I desire to say that is not possible under the rules of the House, even should this resolution be adopted; and I call the attention of the gentleman to clause 4 of Rule XXIV, which refutes his argument. Under the present rules of the House when a bill is called up, either on the daily call of committees or on Calendar Wednesday, it can be considered for two days; and if it is finished then the committee loses the call, and the call passes on to the next committee, with this exception: If the committee has occupied two days and at the expiration of those two days they have a bill pending, they can go on ad infinitum, so far as Calendar Wednesday is concerned, until the unfinished measure is disposed of, but when that measure is disposed of the committee loses the call.

I think, gentlemen, the proposed amendment is a good one. I think the practical operation of it will make your Calendar Wednesday more workable than it has ever been and will give the Members of this House an opportunity to consider many bills of vast importance to their constituents, but which are of local character and, owing to the great number of bills introduced in the House, stand very little chance or opportunity of getting a hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FOSTER. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to ask the gentleman from Georgia whether, in his opinion, if this amendment is adopted with a proviso as to Calendar Wednesday, it would abrogate that general rule of the House in respect to bills coming up on Wednesday?

Mr. CRISP. Not at all. The Calendar Wednesday rule is part and parcel of Rule XXIV and ancillary to clause 4 of that rule, which provides for a call of committees; and this proposed rule simply adds an additional proviso at the bottom of the rule providing for Calendar Wednesday, which simply makes it impossible to call up some big bill and hold the floor on Calendar Wednesday for weeks and months, thereby absolutely destroying the Calendar Wednesday rule for the remainder of the session.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the gentleman's opinion there is no antagonism between the two provisos?

Mr. CRISP. I think they are in perfect harmony, and that there is no conflict whatever between them.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I used?

The SPEAKER. Thirty-one minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET].

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, this rule is reported from the committee of which I am a member, and I desire to give a reason or two why I shall support it. When I was a member of the majority I always maintained that the majority had the right to the control of the House, and had the right—as long as it was not oppressive to the minority—to erect its own machinery. This resolution comes within that rule for which I then contended, and as a member now of the minority I ought consistently to maintain the same position. Personally I am not inclined to be very enthusiastic about the rule, and if I were a member of the majority I think I would be even less enthusiastic. It takes from the hands of the political majority of this House the right to control, which, under certain circumstances, it ought always to have. It places that power in the hands of a minority, where I do not think, under our system of government, it ought ever to be; but certainly if it is not oppressive of the minority, we on this side ought to have no objection. I do recognize that the majority is placing upon our sense of justice and fair play a very high degree of responsibility. I think that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is quite right in his position that rules of this character are in a measure an experiment and evolution. We are just at the threshold of a long and what ought to be a very serious session. The responsibility now, as always, is upon the majority of this House. The majority desires, as a part of the machinery of government, this rule, and as the responsibility is their own and as the rule is certainly not unfair to the minority, the minority ought not to object to the majority working out by experiment a rule for the proper conduct of the business of this House. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back one minute. Of course, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] will understand that 31 minutes, as the Speaker stated, was all that was left of the gentleman's hour.

Mr. FOSTER. That leaves me 11 minutes, as I understand.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, conditions have not been such as that I could attend the meeting of the Committee on Rules, of which I am a member, to consider this resolution. I have been in attendance upon another committee. I shall support the resolution which the House has before it, not that I approve of it in its entirety, but because I think it does make some advance in providing for the doing of public business. It is rather a peculiar thing to me, and has been ever since I have been a Member of the House, that the rules of the House should be the constant football of politics. The most dramatic fight that I have ever witnessed in this House was over the question of the rules and the relation of the Speaker thereto. I suspect it was the most dramatic episode in any Congress for the last 30 years. I think that the rules of the House need a very complete reformation, not in their fundamentals, but in the manner of administration and procedure.

The rules are a matter of development and growth. After all, as parties have come and gone in the control of this country, there have been very few changes in the fundamental features of the rules. There ought to be some sort of a provision here by which gentlemen could know day by day what is to occur. There is no good reason that any man can give why the Speaker of the House should not be a member of the Committee on Rules. Of course, the present Speaker does not desire to be a member of that committee, but in the matter of business procedure he who is charged with passing upon these matters ought certainly to have knowledge of what is going to arise from day to day.

I do not think this proposition will get us very far. I do not think Calendar Wednesday got us very far. I am willing to support this as a proposition looking toward better procedure than we have had heretofore.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back half a minute.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message, in writing, from the President of the United States by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries.

AMENDMENT TO RULE XXIV.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I think it will hardly advantage us to determine whether or not this resolution will benefit the majority more than it will benefit the minority. I believe the primary consideration in the mind of every Member of the House should be, Is it in the interest of greater justice to the individual Members of the House? Is it in the interest of the furtherance of business? Will it tend more to give to the House the benefits intended by Calendar Wednesday? And if

those things shall be answered in the affirmative, then it seems to me that it is the duty of every Member of the House to vote to support this proposition. Because, Mr. Speaker, after all, the things that concern parties, the majority and the minority, are an inconsiderable part of the legislation of this House, and certainly if this shall be in the interest of facilitating the business of the House in all of its branches, it occurs to me there ought to be no hesitancy on the part of any man in voting for it. If it shall be considered as a concession of the majority in the interest of justice, in the interest of fair play and dispatch of business, then I congratulate the gentlemen who have brought it here and the majority of the House, and as a member of the minority I thank them not for their graciousness but for their justness.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there can be no question regarding the real practical operation of this resolution. It has been suggested by gentlemen who have opposed it that two hours will not be a sufficient time for the consideration of large measures. It should be remembered by Members that in every instance it is with the committee who reports favorably a bill to determine how they will present it to the House, and if they present an important bill that can not be determined fairly with two hours general debate, then certainly the committee will not call it up on Calendar Wednesday, but will ask a rule for its consideration that will give them a longer time for general debate.

But in the vast majority of cases, as gentlemen well know, two hours' general debate, when limited to the express object under consideration, is all that will be necessary. It is sufficient to allow a fair statement of the bill on the part of its proponents and a fair statement of objections on the part of those who may oppose it; and the real debate, as everyone of experience knows, in this House is not in general debate, but under the five-minute rule, when the bill is read for consideration by the House. And that, in my judgment, is amply sufficient to guard against any injustice that might occur.

Again, it is said that two days will not be sufficient for consideration. That, in my judgment, is carefully enough guarded. This House has the right by a two-thirds vote to continue the time for the consideration of any bill if it so desires. And, in justice to all of those who may have bills for consideration by the House, it certainly would be an exceptional case where in fairness to the 435 Members of this House a bill should be allowed to be considered for more than two days. And if it is of sufficient importance, and if the House desires to do so, under the terms of this resolution they have the right to extend the time.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment this bill is a step forward in the right direction toward the advancement of the business of the House both for this session and for the future, and I predict if it shall be adopted by this House at this time it will never be repealed in its substantive parts as long as we have Calendar Wednesday.

I yield back the balance of my time, if I have any.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman used half a minute more than he was entitled to. [Laughter.]

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] if he desires any more time.

Mr. LENROOT. We will conclude on this side with one more speech.

Mr. FOSTER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] three minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the Rules Committee, neither do I pretend to know much about the rules, but I do pretend to know a little about the actual working capacity of the Calendar Wednesday rule, and I think I know it is almost completely broken down. It has not accomplished what the House intended it to accomplish. Of course the authors of it and the proponents of it were well meaning at the start and everybody vainly thought that they could get their bills considered under it. But they could not and they did not, and it has not worked. This proposed amendment from the Rules Committee does a little of what I wish they would do a good deal of, and that is to cut off endless debate. Some one has said here that two hours' general debate is not enough time. In my opinion it is an hour and 20 minutes too much time. This House has suffered more from too much talk and too little consideration of the real thing under consideration. In journeying along over the bills that come before the House everyone here on both sides of the aisle knows that the real thing that is accomplished is always done under the five-minute rule, and if there were no other method of being sure that everyone would get all the talk they wanted under the five-minute rule, they could look at the emptiness of these benches and know the rights of every Member who could make the point of no quorum and use an hour instead of five minutes, and that question will be answered.

I wish the committee would agree to an amendment making it 20 minutes on a side, 40 minutes in all, for general debate, and then carefully take up the bill section by section and go over them, under the five-minute rule, and let everybody offer amendments that cares to offer them, let us have a vote on the different amendments, and let us have full consideration.

Too long a time accorded in general debate always does one of two things. First, it either empties all the benches, or, second, it induces Members who participate in debate on the bill to talk about something else. Calendar Wednesdays have been days when we would talk about Jack Johnson's wedding or anything else on earth that happened to enter the mind or the head of the gentleman who had the floor, when in reality the time ought to be spent in trying to consider and pass the little bills that are of importance to Members of the House here.

I do not wish to be understood as criticizing the committee; on the contrary, I want to congratulate the committee for bringing on this much help. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] says this may be a morgue. I can conceive that it may be. On such a day we may have two roll calls to bring in a quorum, and those, with the time otherwise wasted, may make four hours; and then some one else rises to a question of privilege, which may be debated for an hour, and that makes five hours; and then some one moves to adjourn, and we adjourn, thus consuming the day. I can imagine what happens in reading a bill under the five-minute rule with no quorum here and then demanding a roll call on the second paragraph, and the next Wednesday is spent in the same way, and, after attempted consideration for two Wednesdays, the bill is not finished.

I desire, if I can get a chance, to substitute 40 minutes for 2 hours to be bestowed on a bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Eleven minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the majority members of the Committee on Rules on the bringing in of this resolution.

Members will remember that on the first day of this session there was an effort made on the part of some of us to defeat the permanent adoption of these rules and to adopt them temporarily only, in order to secure a modification of this rule with reference to Calendar Wednesday. We were defeated in that attempt, but the discussion that was then had and the vote that was then had was so productive and so influential that at last we have, as the fruit of it, the resolution which is now pending before the House.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there was nothing partisan in the proposition then; there is nothing partisan in the proposition now. There is nothing in this proposition that ought to be considered upon the theory that it deprives the majority of some of its powers, or confers upon the minority greater powers than it now possesses. While it is true that not many bills have been considered on Calendar Wednesday during the six years in which it has been in operation, I can not now recollect of a single bill that has been considered on Calendar Wednesday that has involved any partisanship whatever, and making Calendar Wednesday a working day instead of a holiday is in the interest of every Member of this House on both sides of the aisle.

True it is that the minority, if it choose to exercise it, will have greater power to embarrass the majority than it now possesses if this amendment be adopted. But, I say, Mr. Speaker, that if the minority, which is Republican now, and which will be Democratic in the next Congress, shall attempt to use that power merely for the purpose of embarrassing the majority, it will prove a boomerang to the minority that uses it, and will only injure themselves.

As the situation now exists Calendar Wednesday is practically worthless. Unless this amendment be adopted we will have the entire session consumed this year, as it was last, by the Committee on Printing, and the very purpose of Calendar Wednesday is absolutely defeated, which is to give the membership of this House opportunity to have consideration of bills that are not privileged, but are of greater or less general importance.

Now, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] makes the inquiry as to what would become of his bill, for instance, after he has occupied two Wednesdays, if this rule be adopted. I will say, in the first place, that the gentleman is no worse off than if Calendar Wednesday did not exist at all, and he is this much better off: That if he has occupied two Wednesdays in

the consideration of his bill and the bill is then unfinished business, he has a better chance before the Committee on Rules to make his bill privileged than he otherwise would have, while if we did not have Calendar Wednesday his only opportunity would be a special rule from the Committee on Rules. As to any bill of general public importance that may be unfinished business at the end of the second Wednesday occupied by a committee, if it is of sufficient importance, the Committee on Rules is always open to give a special rule permitting the conclusion of the consideration of that bill upon any day; in other words, to make it privileged.

Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] criticizes the latter portion of this rule and attempts to construe it to the effect that it would only apply to unfinished business so far as occupying two Wednesdays are concerned; that, except as to unfinished business, a committee might occupy an indefinite number of Wednesdays. That has been completely answered, because the rule itself refers to paragraph 4 of the rule, which expressly provides that only two days shall be occupied by the same committee.

I want further to call attention to the fact that this second proviso, which covers this portion of the subject, refers only to unfinished business and nothing else, leaving the rule exactly as it stands as to any business that is not unfinished business.

And just a word, Mr. Speaker, with reference to a possible construction of one feature of the rule. The committee uses the language that "whenever any committee shall have occupied two Wednesdays it shall not be in order," and so forth. It was suggested to the committee, and was considered by the committee, whether the language should be "two succeeding Wednesdays," and the committee deliberately did not incorporate the word "succeeding." The reason was that it is within the power of the House at any time to dispense with Calendar Wednesday upon a two-thirds vote, and we did not wish to raise the question of whether, if the House by vote had dispensed with one Wednesday when a committee had occupied one Wednesday, it had lost its right to the Wednesday next following. And as the rule now stands it is entirely clear, I think, that each committee, under the Calendar Wednesday rule, will have the right to call up a bill on one Calendar Wednesday and occupy the next Calendar Wednesday when Calendar Wednesday is in operation. I do not think there is any possibility of any misconstruction of the rule in that regard.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back three minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] is recognized for one minute.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report of the Committee on Rules. The committee met and without partisan division gave thorough consideration to this amendment to the rule. We believe that the verbiage of it as presented to the House is good, and that no amendment is necessary. Our purpose was to make Calendar Wednesday a working day, and not a holiday, as it is now under the present rules of the House. This rule as we propose will do a great deal of good and will go far toward facilitating the business of the House. We think it ought to be adopted promptly. We are sure that it will help the business of the House and relieve the congestion of the calendar. We have submitted it as the unanimous action of the Committee on Rules, and hope it will be ratified by the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE PRESS GALLERY.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send it up.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 97.

Resolved, that clause 2 of Rule XXXV be amended so as to read as follows:

"Such portion of the gallery over the Speaker's chair as may be necessary to accommodate representatives of the press wishing to report debates and proceedings shall be set apart for their use, and reputable reporters and correspondents shall be admitted thereto under such regulations as the Speaker may from time to time prescribe; and the supervision of such gallery, including the designation of its employees, shall be vested in the standing committee of correspondents, subject to the direction and control of the Speaker; and the Speaker may assign one seat on the floor to Associated Press reporters, one to the Sun Press Association, one to the United Press Association, one to the National News Association, and one to the New York Herald Syndicate, and regulate the occupation of the same. And the Speaker may admit to the floor, under such regulations as he may prescribe, one additional representative of each press association."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, from the reading of the rule by the Clerk I caught the proposed change of the present rule, but I think the gentleman ought to state it to the House.

Mr. HENRY. The amendment to the rule is simply this: It is a reenactment of clause 2 of Rule XXXV, with the exception of the added language which gives to the standing committee of correspondents the control of the employees of the press gallery. That is to say, the standing committee of correspondents, under the supervision of the Speaker, shall have control of the gallery, and with this addition it is provided that they shall appoint the employees in the gallery. That is the amendment.

Mr. MANN. The control of the gallery and the employees both. That is the amendment.

Mr. HENRY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I notice that the Clerk read "shall be set apart for their use." I suppose there is no difference between "setting aside" for their use and "setting apart" for their use, and I wondered why the committee changed the word in the existing rule, which says that he shall set aside a part of the gallery, and why they made it read "set apart" instead of "set aside."

Mr. HENRY. That was the way we intended to keep it, as the gentleman suggests. It is merely a clerical error in copying.

The SPEAKER. What amendment does the gentleman from Illinois suggest?

Mr. MANN. The existing rule says "shall be set aside for their use." This says "set apart for their use."

Mr. HENRY. We intended to follow the wording of the existing rule, and I ask the Clerk to change the word "apart" to "aside."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend line 4 by striking out the word "apart" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "aside."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], I will say a word on a subject which has just been very forcibly brought to my attention, and, I think, to the attention of many gentlemen here, by the fact that we are being asked to vote upon amendments to the rules without proper opportunity for Members upon the floor, except the gentlemen who are fortunate enough to be sitting close to the committee table, to have access to a copy of the rules. I do not wish to see a return to the old desks for Members—far from that—but our experience to-day shows the urgent necessity—a necessity often before demonstrated—of having put here, somewhere convenient to each seat, some sort of a receptacle that shall contain copies of the rules and of such other books and documents as may be needed. Also, there could and ought to be adjustable appliances on which, with a pencil, to write amendments, or motions, or to make notes.

To-day, with few exceptions, the Members of the House, unlike those of any other legislative body in the United States, are compelled to go to the Clerk's desk or committee table for a copy of the rules. Nor are there on the floor suitable, often necessary, conveniences for such writing as I have mentioned. In other words, the present conditions are not convenient nor just for the great majority of the Members of the House. I have been told, by men competent to know, that with but little trouble and expense there could be provided for each seat a convenient receptacle for papers and books, and something upon which to write. The privilege of being able easily, promptly, to procure copies of the rules and of other books and documents when needed and of having some such appliance as I have indicated on which to write ought not to be confined to gentlemen fortunate enough to sit at the committee tables.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Does not the gentleman think we could manage the writing if we could have copies of the rules?

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman know that any Member can get a copy of the rules by pushing the button and sending to the document room? That is the way these copies of the rules come to the table here.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. They are kept there.

Mr. MANN. Oh, not at all.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. They are kept here in the drawers of the tables during the day.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I do not want any controversy with the gentleman from Wisconsin, and merely rise to say that I will try to see that he gets a copy of these rules.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Texas ought to know that attempting to be funny does not aid us

with the facts. The gentleman attempted to be funny on the first day of the session in what he said about the proposition of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and of my colleague [Mr. LENROOT] to have the rules adopted temporarily until January 17, with the privilege of the committee on that day to offer amendments to the rules before their final adoption. During the debate on this proposition it was especially and strongly urged that at the proper time there must be an amendment adopted to regulate Calendar Wednesday. The gentleman from Texas said that the proposition must be rejected because of its partisanship. Yet now he comes on the 18th of January, one day later than the time proposed by the gentleman from Illinois and by my colleague, with an amendment to regulate Calendar Wednesday. His proposition fails of being partisan by just one day.

Mr. HENRY. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I was not trying to be funny. I agree that when the gentleman wants information from the House that he should get it. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there is a good deal in the suggestion made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER]. I would like in that connection to suggest to the Committee on Rules that in matters of this kind, which do not require immediate consideration, it would be an exceedingly good practice if the committee would report such a resolution, and let it lie over for a day before it is called up for consideration, so that the rule and report, if there be one, may be printed, and Members have access to it before it is called up. Of course, that could not be the case in a rule for the consideration of a bill.

Mr. HENRY. The Committee on Rules has no objection to that, but here is a report where there is no contest about it, and it is manifestly necessary. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, I present the following resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 96.

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House be granted permission to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MOTIONS TO RECOMMIT.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to make a suggestion to Members of the House, and that is when a Member has a motion to recommit containing instructions, that he submit it to the Chair some time in advance, so that the Chair may have an opportunity to consider it and be ready to rule upon it.

Under a special order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] is recognized for 45 minutes.

PREPAREDNESS.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, we are all more or less the creatures of environment. The word "preparedness" seems to be on the lips of everyone. We all talk preparedness. Nobody asks the question what is this preparedness for, what are we to prepare against, whom we are to prepare against. It seems but logical that when we use the word "preparedness" the question against whom and against what are we to prepare should immediately suggest itself.

Modern wars are wars of more than one nation against another. They are wars of combinations of groups of nations. When we now talk about being prepared we must imply preparation against the contingency of fighting a combination of nations. If it was possible for revolutionary France to ally herself with the most reactionary nation in Europe, with the absolute monarchy of Russia; if it was possible for England, the mother of constitutional democracy, for England, that has given to the world the free Republic of the United States and the Dominion of Canada and the Commonwealth of Australia, and has laid the foundation of constitutional law—if it was possible for England to ally herself with Russian czarism, what is there to prevent a combination of France, England, Germany, Japan, Russia, Italy, Portugal, Denmark, and all other powers against the United States? And if we are to prepare we should prepare against a possible combination of all European powers. We would then have to construct a navy large enough to fight the combined navies of the world. We would have to build up an army larger than any that has ever been organized in this or any other country.

What is this talk of preparedness all about? Let us analyze it. I will waste no time in proving that there is money in the manufacture of munitions. Of course, there is money in it. The manufacturer of munitions has an elastic conscience. A man who can make profits out of the business of manufacturing death-dealing instruments has a conscience that will adapt itself to anything. He will buy officials, he will corrupt, he will acquire and control newspapers, he will influence ministers of the gospel, he will defile all political life. In the manufacture of munitions there is no soul. I am not interested in the question of how much profit there is in the manufacture of death-bringing munitions. One thing is certain, and that is, that no matter how the war results the business of manufacturing munitions will be taken out of private hands in every civilized country of the world and become a Government function. [Applause.]

When you investigate this matter of preparedness you will find that the manufacturers of munitions have the largest share in creating this sentiment, but they are not the exclusive authors of it. There are other elements. There is the insidious conspiracy, the secretive element of the American imperialist. These are the elements which are responsible for the acquisition of the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico in 1898. These are the captains of industry who undertook to be the guardians of the American people. They are the men who want to influence world affairs. They are the men who seek foreign markets and foreign colonies. They have not the courage to say so, but they would like to have an army and a navy large enough to be able to coerce Europe, to be able to coerce the rest of the world into yielding to American capital new spheres of influence, new colonies, new empires. The 600,000 noble men who responded to the call of President McKinley in the Spanish-American War believed they were fighting to liberate oppressed Cuba. That was the belief of the men who were sacrificing their lives, but Uncle Sam's imperialists immediately proceeded to reward themselves, were quick to take advantage of the movement of liberation by acquiring Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands, and by tying a string to Cuba. Capitalism rewarded itself without delay. These imperialistic elements are behind the preparedness movement. There is a third element. There are the old women of both sexes—frightened, scared out of their wits, honestly believing that somebody is going to fight them, and they see in every bird an aeroplane and in every fish a submarine. They would like to change every ferryboat into a dreadnaught and prepare to fight, fight, fight. There is a fourth element, and that is the political element. There is the Republican Party, the minority party to-day. They are trying to play a trick on the Democrats, and the Democrats are just stupid enough to fall into the trap. [Laughter.] The Republicans know well that an increase of the Army and Navy require additional taxation.

I heard the discussion on the tariff, a discussion which is only about a hundred and twenty-five years old, and I was greatly interested when they delivered those political tariff chestnuts. They know and we all know that the war is largely responsible for the cutting down of the revenue from the tariff. They also know that the war has, to a great extent, upset American industry. They know that as a result of the prohibition movement there has been a diminution of revenue from a source which was considered a pretty good Democratic source, as there was a time when the saloon was the only university and inspiration of the Democratic Party [laughter], but that has since changed. In New York, however, it is still almost the only college that a Democrat attends. [Renewed laughter.] They know well that revenues have diminished because of conditions over which the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, or, for that matter, the Government of the United States itself has no control, and they know that agitation for preparedness will compel the Democratic majority in Congress to assume the responsibility for imposing additional and burdensome taxes, and they want you to impose these taxes, they want you to put revenue stamps on everything and everybody—and then they will go out with the slogan, "Lick stamps or lick the Democrats." [Laughter.] Look out for that preparedness talk and agitation.

As a Socialist, I consider it a great privilege to have the opportunity to explain the attitude of the socialist movement on the subject of war. I am in a better position than you Democrats or Republicans. I can speak honestly and conscientiously on the subject, because, beginning with the year 1871, the socialists warned Europe against this very war. You take the literature of the socialist movement of 1871, right after

the Franco-Prussian War, take the prediction of Carl Marx, the expounder of scientific socialist thought, and see what he said. He warned against the danger of acquiring Alsace-Loraine, and he said:

Whoever is not totally stupefied by the noise of the moment must realize that the war of 1870 bears in its womb the necessity of a war with Russia. If they (the German imperialists) take Alsace-Loraine, then Russia and France will make war on Germany.

In another manifesto, issued immediately after the Franco-Prussian War, Marx said:

Do the Teutonic patriots seriously believe that the independence of France, the liberty and peace of Europe can be secured by driving France into the arms of Russia?

In the international socialist congresses, and in all of the parliaments of the world, the socialists pointed to the danger of large armies and navies.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman care to be interrupted?

Mr. LONDON. I prefer not to. I will try to conclude 10 minutes before my allotted time, so as to afford an opportunity for questions, which I will endeavor to answer. I have not yet learned to write out a speech. I have a great deal of collected material which is not quite in shape. I will be glad to answer any questions later. In all the congresses, in all the parliaments, the socialist movement opposed an increase of armaments, and pointed to the presence of large armies as a most serious menace to the peace of the world. There exists among the great masses of the people a notion that the present war is an accident, that somebody became crazy, particularly that a certain ruler with a long military mustache became crazy, and that all is to be blamed upon that crowned individual. That is absurd. That is baby talk; that is talk that you get from the headlines of newspapers. Reason the thing out, study it, and you will find that this war is not an accident. This war is the direct result of a serious clash of economic interests of nations. It represents the struggle of nations, each of which is an economic unit, seeking expansion and seeking free and full development. Poor little Serbia wanted access to the Adriatic so as not to be crushed by prohibitive tariffs. Russia, with hundreds of miles of land frontier to one mile of sea, without a single warm-water port, with a population of 190,000,000 people, covering one-ninth of the habitable globe, wanted to have a warm-water seaport.

That is a sensible and justifiable demand for a nation. Germany, with her wonderful civilization and culture—Germany, with her splendid literature and philosophy, with her magnificent industrial development, with an intelligent, educated, working class—Germany was seeking opportunity for expansion; she wanted to increase her colonies. Her ambitions collided with those of Great Britain, which tried to retain the possession of her wonderful colonies all over the world. So it was not an accident. The moment when the war took place might not have been foreseen, but the war itself was foreseen and was inevitable with armies serving as the handmaid of industry. It was primarily an economic struggle, an outward expression of economic conflict. Of course, it was a conflict in which other factors entered, as they do in all human life. There are so many forces in the economic and political life of nations. There was in it the element of prejudice and race hatred; and every fool can at any time utilize national and race hatred for any vile purpose. [Applause.] There was national and race prejudice. There was a military caste in Germany, a caste brought up with the idea that everybody not in uniform was an inferior. Then there was Russia, with a population—three-fourths of which are illiterate—believing that the "White Father" is a representative of God. These things complicated the situation, but the primary cause of the war was the economic struggle of nations. And while it was an economic contest, gentlemen, it would not have been so dangerous if it had not been for the presence of large armies and navies. When two men get into a fight, if they have no revolvers they would not fight with revolvers, but if they have revolvers and ammunition and large stores of explosives, at the very moment when their interests collide they will use the means they have at their disposal for destroying each other.

Let me attract your attention for a moment, gentlemen, to a very interesting incident. A few days before the war broke out the German social democracy was encouraged by the minister of war to continue antiwar demonstrations. I have it on the most reliable authority. The idea was conveyed to the German social democracy that the Emperor did not want to fight. The idea was conveyed to them that it was desirable to develop large antiwar demonstrations, so as to have an excuse for not fighting, so as to have an excuse for not supporting Austria in her unreasonable demands upon poor little Serbia. I heard only a few days ago from an English lady, whose father is a member of Parliament, whose brother is a member of Parliament, whose brother-in-law is a member of Parliament, that she was permitted three or four days before the war commenced to go to Germany, which shows that the people of Great Britain did not expect any war. But what happened? There were large armies on both sides, and large navies, and the leaders of the armies said, "A fight may come at any moment. Our diplomats may not be able to reach an understanding. Now, if the fight must come, let it begin right now," so that every consideration of statesmanship, every dictate of reason, every rule that ever inspired men to nobler action was subordinated to the wisdom of the military strategist.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Amen!

Mr. LONDON. It appears that German military strategy was right. The great armies of the allies have so far been unable to take back an inch of the territory captured by the German armies during the first six weeks of the war. Organizing armies for its protection Europe has prepared the means of its own destruction. The greater the army, gentlemen, the smaller is the people which has that army. [Applause.]

The greater the American Army, the greater the American Navy will be, of which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] talked so much, the smaller will be the American people. [Applause.] In all parliaments we protested against the war. The socialists have no apology to make to history. The socialists could not stop the war for the very simple reason that there were not enough of them. They did their best, and they spoke honestly and not as patriots. I do not know—people talk about patriotism as something big. It is very easy to be a patriot; every fool can be a patriot. Every rogue can proclaim himself a patriot; every blackguard can sing a national hymn and wave a flag. It takes a manly man to live a life of devotion and sacrifice for the best ideals of his country. [Applause.] That is the only kind of patriotism I recognize. I do not know what Americanism means to others, but to me Americanism means not only an opportunity to do better than the rest of the world, but the imperative duty to be nobler than the rest of the world. [Applause.] The socialists were the real patriots and well-wishers of the people, as they everywhere opposed the war.

Little Serbia had one or two socialist representatives. Only a month or two before the Balkan war the representative of the socialist movement in Serbia delivered these significant and prophetic words:

We are opposed to war among the people of the Balkans not only because that war will be bloody and horrible, not only because it will ruin the Balkans, but because the war will not fail to bring about the intervention of the great capital States, and that intervention may mean a general conflagration in Europe, colossal bloodshed, and the disappearance of economic and political gains due to the efforts of previous generations working for centuries to realize them.

That was said in 1912. How prophetic.

The one socialist representative in the Parliament of Serbia had the courage to speak boldly and openly against the "patriots," against the real enemies of the people, against men who sought to plunge Serbia into war, although it threatened to bring about the general destruction of European civilization.

During the first Balkan war the international socialist movement found it necessary to call a special congress of the socialists of the world. In the resolutions which they adopted they warned the English working class, they warned the German people, against the artificially stimulated hatred between the German and the English peoples. The congress advocated a federation of the Balkan peoples, and protested against the sinister designs of both Russia and Austria-Hungary upon the Balkans.

It will be relevant to cite to you an extract from a speech delivered by the chairman, or what we would call here the leader, of the Social Democratic minority on the floor of the German Reichstag when the question of increasing the army came up in 1913. He said:

You are speaking now of preparedness, of defending our border. What you want is not a defense of our borders. What you seek is free elbow room to give full play to the economic aspirations of your imperialists. You seek new colonies. You seek to establish and maintain the prestige of Germany by the power of the sword.

And in 1913 the representative of the Social Democratic movement in Germany warned Germany against the danger of a clash with Great Britain; the very same thing was done by Keir Hardie and McDonald in the British Parliament. I consider it a misfortune for the socialist movement of America that they have only one Representative in this Congress, who can not possibly perform his duty as a socialist with any degree of adequacy. I feel extremely uncomfortable when, after this short service in Congress, I have to force myself on the House. I feel as if I were imposing upon you. But believe me, gentlemen, I am not inspired by any vanity or any desire to

hear myself talk. I hate the process of talking. Talk is valuable only when talk is action. But I am animated and inspired by a solemn and sacred duty to express to you in the name of the socialist movement of America and in the name of the international socialist movement my abhorrence of and my protest against that agitation for preparedness, which in speaking for preparedness against war will inevitably lead you into war with the nations of the world.

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. LONDON. If you will allow me one minute. I find great difficulty in congesting so much material in so short a time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. LONDON. I will yield. It will give me time to look over my papers.

Mr. QUIN. In your judgment what influences in the United States are responsible for this wild propaganda sent out to the newspapers?

Mr. LONDON. There are three. I referred to them before. They are, first, the manufacturers of munitions, who have been exporting hundreds of millions of dollars worth of munitions, and who feel that as soon as the war is terminated they will be left without a customer, and they will need Uncle Sam's generosity. Second, the many people who have already been scared, and who really believe that they are in danger. Third, the very same influences that would lead you to go to war with Mexico so as to protect their capitalistic investments—the very same people who are responsible for the acquisition of the Philippine Islands and for the acquisition of Porto Rico. Their work is insidious. You do not see them or hear their names, but it is powerful work they are doing.

I say that the German Social Democrats had the courage to speak out boldly, and they said to the Emperor a few days before the war, and a few days after the war had broken out, that the military camarilla of Germany was responsible for this war, baiting Austria into insisting upon her iniquitous ultimatum against defenseless Serbia.

The socialists are not cowards. We are not afraid. More than 20 years ago I addressed an audience consisting of two good-natured fellows on the east side of New York, and every 10 minutes I would lose half of my crowd because one of them would go in to take a cup of coffee. [Laughter.] But I kept up my work. I knew the time would come when our movement would grow, when we would get more adherents. I knew the development of the United States 20 years ago did not offer a receptive soil for our philosophy and our theory, but I knew the social problem that was pressing Europe was universal in its character and that the people of the United States would awaken to its importance some day; and they are awakening very rapidly.

Now, gentlemen, I want to impress upon the American people the need of fighting the insanity of preparedness with the sane, rational, insistent demand for international peace. That is why I introduced on the 6th day of December a joint resolution calling upon the President of the United States to convene a congress of neutral nations to offer mediation to the belligerents of Europe. I sent a copy of that resolution to every Member of Congress, and if you will permit me, I will just say a few words about it. This is the resolution:

Joint resolution calling upon the President of the United States to convene a congress of neutral nations to offer mediation to the belligerents in Europe.

Whereas the people of the United States, while neutral, can not be indifferent to the fratricidal conflict which is devastating Europe; and

Whereas the longer the war is continued the more does the code of physical force replace every other code of human conduct; and

Whereas the war has brought about a state of fear in the minds of millions of the American people which menaces the normal development of this Nation and beclouds the real issues which confront our generation by the artificial issue of "preparedness" against an invisible and unnamable enemy; and

Whereas a declaration by Congress in favor of an immediate conference of neutral nations will strengthen the hand of the President of the United States in his efforts for international peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, called upon to convene a congress of neutral nations, which shall offer mediation to the belligerents and which shall sit in continuous session until the termination of the war; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the judgment of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States that a durable peace can be established if the following principles shall be made the basis of discussion in said congress of neutral nations:

First. Evacuation of invaded territory.

Second. Liberation of oppressed nationalities.

Third. Plebiscite by the populations of Alsace-Lorraine, Finland, and Poland as to their allegiance or independence.

Fourth. Removal of the political and civic disabilities of the Jewish people wherever such disabilities exist.

Fifth. Freedom of the seas.

Sixth. Gradual concerted disarmament.

Seventh. Establishment of an international court of arbitration, with the commercial boycott as a means of punishment for disobedience. And be it further

Resolved, That the sum of $100,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated from the current revenues of the United States, to be used by the President of the United States in carrying out the purpose of this resolution.

I know that any man who now talks international peace is looked upon as a madman or a fool; that the only wise people are those who shake their heads and say, "We can not do anything," or those who say, "War existed, war exists, and there will always be war."

These men forget that the horse car has been replaced by electricity, and that just as surely as the horse car is replaced by electricity just so surely will the reactionary and conservative be replaced by the revolutionary, vigilant, and intelligent man who refuses to think in a rut.

The resolution was taken seriously by the press of the world. Let me tell you something amusing. A Democratic paper published in the city of Chicago, a weekly, one of the best papers you have, called The Public, not having been informed that I introduced the resolution, but being under the impression that Senator LANE, of Oregon, was the author of it—I need not tell you that I am grateful to the Senator for introducing it in the Senate—had the following editorial on the 24th of December:

DEMOCRATIC PEACE TERMS.

The resolution of Senator LANE, of Oregon, for a peace congress of neutral nations is a democratic and statesmanlike measure—

The author of the resolution is not only a good Democrat, but a statesman of senatorial timber. Look out for me. [Laughter.] It proceeds:

Senator LANE proposes that the suggested peace congress submit to the belligerents peace plans based on evacuation of invaded territory, decision by popular vote of Alsace, Finland, and Poland as to their independence or allegiance, freedom of the seas, gradual disarmament, and arbitration of all disputes. These terms are perfectly just, and no government which honestly desires peace with honor will refuse them. There properly might be some additions made to the list of suppressed peoples to be allowed to vote on independence. Bosnia, Herzegovina, India, and others might well be included, and the United States might set the example by liberating the Philippines. But even as proposed, the terms are such that refusal on the part of any belligerent must be taken as conclusive evidence that justice is not what it has been fighting for.

They could have enumerated 12 or 15 other nationalities. [Laughter.]

It is rather interesting, this editorial from the Democratic weekly. Let me also read from an editorial from the Labor Leader of Manchester:

The American Socialist Party has one Representative in Congress, Mr. MEYER LONDON, but, though he is alone, he is doing his utmost to hasten the coming of an enduring peace. He has given notice that he will move a resolution instructing the President to convene a congress of neutral nations to offer mediation, sitting continuously until the declaration of peace. The resolution also asks Congress to affirm as essential to permanent peace:

The evacuation of invaded territory; the liberation of oppressed nationalities; a plebiscite of the populations of Alsace-Lorraine, Finland, and Poland concerning independence; the removal of all disabilities of Jews; the freedom of the seas; gradual concerted disarming; the establishment of an international board of arbitration, with a commercial boycott for punishing disobedience.

That was said immediately after I had announced that I would introduce the resolution. Then it goes on:

We thank Mr. LONDON on behalf of the Independent Labor Party in this country for the lead he has given.

The sentiments that I expressed in this resolution are not the result of my imagination. They are the result of the study of peace terms and peace conditions. They are the result of the study of the economic struggle of Europe. Ten peace groups, working in France, in England, in Holland, and Germany—there is one German organization—10 peace groups have worked out a series of principles upon which a durable peace can be founded, and every one of these 10 groups favors a majority of the demands contained in my resolution. International socialist congresses held before the war and during the war promulgated the same principles. My resolution presents a consistent, logical, intelligent method of dealing with the problem of international peace.

Let me tell you one thing, gentlemen: You may be very modest men—we may all be very modest men—but I refuse to believe that God Almighty has picked out some special material out of which he created statesmen and diplomats, and that He created the rest of mankind out of some common clay. [Applause.] No; we are all made of about the same material, and I refuse to abdicate the right to think to diplomats and statesmen. The diplomats have so cleverly managed the world that they have got everybody fighting except themselves. [Applause.]

I would extend democracy to international relations. I would ask every Member of this American Congress to take my reso-

lution earnestly. I would ask every Member of this American Congress to study it. You can not do anything nobler than to help bring about a conclusion of this war.

I was in England in August, 1914, immediately after the war broke out, and I saw the desperate attempts of the British press to arouse the people against the Germans. There was no enmity against the German people then. Nonsense! How could they hate each other? They were in constant intercourse, and have been for successive generations. The German language is well known in England now. The English have abandoned the idea that their own language is all-sufficient. They began to study European languages, and he who knows more than one language has a better opportunity to sympathize with other people and to understand them. There was no hatred in England of the German people, and there was no hatred of England by the Germans at the beginning of this war. It was a war of Governments, and not a war of the people.

In my resolution I ask that the President of the United States be requested to urge the convening of a congress of neutral nations. My idea is that he should be enabled to say that the collective conscience of the American people as expressed by its Congress has forced him to initiate peace negotiations and is compelling him to convene a congress of neutral nations.

There may be some men who think that all this talk about internationalism is entirely out of place in this Congress. They are mistaken. Everything worth while, gentlemen, is international. There are national prejudices; there are national hatreds. But science is international. Art is international. Music is international. Religion is international. All that you cherish in your religious system has been transmitted to you from the past generations, from other climes and other lands and other continents. Let us abandon that narrow conception of patriotism which consists in the doctrine, "My country, right or wrong," because there is a nobler doctrine, a higher doctrine, "My country must always be right." [Prolonged applause.]

To this higher conception of patriotism, gentlemen, I ask you to listen now. I suppose I shall have to resort to the expedient of asking and obtaining your unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks. Not that I wish to say a great deal more in the RECORD. I do not believe in canned speeches, but I will put my remarks into shape.

I desire to thank you from the very bottom of my heart for the fairness you have shown toward me, for the encouragement you have given me. I shall not abuse your kindness. I shall not abuse your courtesy. I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. KING. To ask a question of the gentleman, if he will submit to it.

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. KING. The gentleman is speaking for the Socialist Party of the United States, and is their sole spokesman upon the floor of this House. Referring to various of his remarks, I would like to ask the gentleman, if the American flag which hangs behind the Speaker of this House should be attacked by a foreign foe, what would be the attitude of the socialists as to its defense?

Mr. LONDON. I desire to say that if the American people were attacked, every socialist would rise in defense of the American Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. KING. The question is as to the flag.

Mr. LONDON. I speak of the American people. I want to reject the old code of national honor which we have inherited from monarchs and rulers of the Old World.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. I will.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman tell us what is the distinction that he makes between the American people and the American flag, which we suppose stands for the American people?

Mr. LONDON. The distinction between the American people and the American flag is just this: That the people are living beings, throbbing with life. The American flag is an emblem. A fool, a rascal, an idiot may insult the flag. It is something different to attack the American people. Every intelligent man should understand the difference. A madman, rushing out of a lunatic asylum, may attack that flag, and not realizing its sacredness may tear it to shreds. Will you fight him? No. But if anybody should attack the people of the United States, then every socialist, together with the rest of the American people, would rush to the defense of America.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York be kind enough to answer the question that I asked him?

Mr. LONDON. I believe I have answered it.

Mr. KING. As to what the attitude of the Socialist Party will be with reference to the flag of the United States if it is attacked by a foreign foe or a combination of foreign foes?

Mr. LONDON. I believe that a foreign foe can not attack our flag. Flags are not attacked. People are attacked. Do not draw that artificial distinction. You can not attack a flag. A flag does not feel anything. You can not attack a flag, but when a people are attacked, they have a right to defend themselves.

Mr. JAMES. I can hardly believe it is true; but I read in one of the New York papers the other day that the American socialists were adopting and signing this pledge. I should like to ask the gentleman as a socialist if he thinks it is so? It is headed "A league of treason." This is the pledge:

I, being over 18 years of age, hereby pledge myself against enlistment as a volunteer for any military or naval service in international war, offensive or defensive, and against giving my approval to such enlistment on the part of others.

I would like to ask the gentleman from New York as the representative of the Socialist Party if he thinks any socialist would sign such a pledge?

Mr. LONDON. I am glad the gentleman has brought that up. The socialist movement everywhere recognizes the right of a nation to defend itself. I would not sign a pledge which would prevent me from sacrificing my life for the American people whenever the American people were in danger. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FERRIS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask that the gentleman have five minutes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from New York if he desires the five minutes to finish his remarks?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Or whether he proposes to yield to questions?

Mr. LONDON. I propose to yield to questions.

Mr. MANN. I shall object to any time for the purpose of yielding to questions. If the gentleman desires time to finish his remarks, I shall not object to that.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my colleague will not object. There are some gentlemen here who desire to ask questions.

Mr. MANN. We would be all day at it, and then to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, well——

Mr. MANN. My colleague [Mr. FOSTER] gave us a good lecture this morning about proceeding to business.

Mr. LONDON. I will ask 10 minutes, that is all.

The SPEAKER. How does the gentleman say he is going to use the time—to conclude his remarks, or to yield to questions?

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my remarks I promised to answer questions, and I would ask the House for 10 minutes to answer questions. At the end of 10 minutes I will cease.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] asks unanimous consent to continue for 10 minutes, for the purpose of answering questions. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. LONDON. I do.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. One of the most serious questions since I have been here is presented in this, and I want my brother, representing one of the great centers of our civilization and representing the undercurrent of life, to answer this question: If this country was invaded by a foreign army landing on our shores, could we expect the socialists as an organization to help us defend our country?

Mr. LONDON. My answer is that the Social Democracy of the world is opposed to war, but if we are attacked we must defend ourselves. If something should happen to the United States—something that can only happen in the imagination of some gentleman from Massachusetts—if the territory of the United States were to be invaded by any other people, every socialist will consider it his obligation to defend this country. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman spoke with some earnestness in condemnation of the infamous ultimatum that Austria sent to Serbia. As I recollect it, the ultimatum grew out of a criminal act of the citizens of Serbia against a nobleman of Austria. How does the gentleman view the present talk in high quarters of revenge against 15,000,000 people in Mexico?

Mr. LONDON. I look on the talk of revenge as the talk of savages, and as out of place in a civilized community.

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LONDON. Certainly.

Mr. LOBECK. The question has been asked the gentleman whether the socialists would defend this country if attacked. I want to ask if in the war now in Europe the socialists support their own Governments in which they live?

Mr. LONDON. In the European war the socialists are performing a difficult task. They were for peace until the last moment. In Germany they were told that it was a war for defense. They took the attitude that it was their duty to defend their own country, to defend their culture and civilization against a country of an inferior civilization, and at the same time they are now everywhere in Europe advocating the necessity of terminating the war. In the German Reichstag and in the Austrian Reichsrath, in England, and everywhere else they are advocating peace negotiations, and I have no hesitation in predicting that if the war is not terminated within a few months the world will witness one of the greatest revolutions in the history of mankind.

Mr. LOBECK. In every case they will defend their country as they see it?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. What does the gentleman think of the phophecy expressed in this House just before the breaking out of the European war, that this world would never see another war?

Mr. LONDON. It is very dangerous to make prophecies. Thomas Paine predicted in 1790 that by the end of the eighteenth century every country in Europe would be a Republic, but it seems that he made a slight error. In 1884 Frederick Engels predicted that by the end of the nineteenth century a cooperative commonwealth would be installed in every country, still we have only one Socialist among so many Republican and Democratic Representatives in 1916.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I do not think the gentleman has answered my question. I have heard many say that they were opposed to preparedness and that we would never have another great war. Does not the gentleman think that if the Monroe doctrine is insisted on by the United States there is great necessity for preparedness?

Mr. LONDON. I have tried to prove that the war was not an accident; it was the clash of economic interests between various European countries. My argument is that there is no clash between the economic interests of the United States and other countries; there is no conflict that would lead us to war. If there is such a conflict, we want to know it. I would not vote for any appropriation unless I knew what it was for.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Does not the gentleman think we are bound toward progress in a commercial way, and in that connection does not the gentleman think that we ought to be prepared?

Mr. LONDON. You are bound to progress in a commercial way, but progress does not lie in the direction of a protective tariff. The progress of the world and the progress of the United States lies in the creation of an international court of arbitration to settle disputes in a civilized manner. The progress of the world lies in the removal of the protective barrier. Every protective tariff is a barrier between the nations of the world. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. In response to a question asked by some one, the gentleman said that unless this war concludes within a few months some serious revolutions will take place. I do not understand what the gentleman means by that.

Mr. LONDON. What I wanted to say is this: The Franco-Prussian War of 1871 was followed by the bloody Commune—the revolution in France. The Russo-Japanese War was followed by the Russian uprising of 1905, in which 20,000,000 people participated. Basing my reasoning upon what occurred in the past and upon the agitation in all European countries against the continuance of the war, I predict that, unless an effort is made by a great neutral power to terminate it, the European nations will reject the advice of their misleaders, who brought about this world catastrophe, and will bring about a violent change.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY. Of course the gentleman has stated that he is opposed to increasing the Army and Navy. I am wondering if he thinks the country would be better off if we had no Army and no Navy?

Mr. LONDON. I do know that the less this country relies upon its Army and Navy, and the more it relies upon the genius of the American people, the better off will this country be.

Mr. KELLEY. And the gentleman thinks that we ought not to have any Navy or Army?

Mr. LONDON. I have not said that.

Mr. KELLEY. That is what I would like to have the gentleman say—one way or the other.

Mr. LONDON. I have not said so. I have not said so.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman has not stated he thinks we ought to have no Army or no Navy. Would he be willing now to state whether he is in favor of the maintenance of an Army and Navy?

Mr. LONDON. I believe that as long as armies are maintained by others it is necessary to have some physical power for defense. I do know that the Army of the United States, and particularly the militia, has been more frequently used to suppress the struggles of the working people for better wages and shorter hours than against foreign enemies.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. One more question.

Mr. LONDON. And I want to ask permission to rephrase that answer, as it came out rather clumsy.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. May I ask the gentleman this question. Since he believes in the maintenance of an Army and a Navy, does he believe in the maintenance of an efficient Army and Navy?

Mr. LONDON. If it were necessary for the United States to maintain an Army and Navy——

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. But the gentleman says that he is in favor of that.

Mr. LONDON. If it were necessary, I would advocate an Army which would enable every man in the United States to know the art of arms. I would like, for the sake of the working people, if a large Army should be necessary, to see every workingman know how to use a gun, and not be the victim of the militia. But we have not come to that pass. No one threatens you. You are the victims of a nightmare of your own imagination. [Laughter.]

[By unanimous consent, Mr. LONDON was granted leave to extend and revise his remarks in the RECORD.]

STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 407, to provide for stock-raising homesteads.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 407, with Mr. Cox in the chair.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment pending, adding a new paragraph at the end of section 2. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that amendment, so that I may present it at the end of section 3, when we reach that section, and to offer in lieu thereof an amendment to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to call attention to a feature of this legislation which I think at least those who live in the country where it applies should have very clearly in mind. In the past, in legislating relative to the distribution of the public land, we have provided that the entryman may by conforming to certain conditions secure lands of a certain character. The enlarged-homestead law contained a provision that the Secretary of the Interior should make designations of lands that in his opinion were not susceptible of irrigation before they could be entered under that law, but the designation was not final as to the character of the land. This act very vitally modifies the past procedure in that its first provision is a provision of designation, and in the second section it then provides for the entry

lution earnestly. I would ask every Member of this American Congress to study it. You can not do anything nobler than to help bring about a conclusion of this war.

I was in England in August, 1914, immediately after the war broke out, and I saw the desperate attempts of the British press to arouse the people against the Germans. There was no enmity against the German people then. Nonsense! How could they hate each other? They were in constant intercourse, and have been for successive generations. The German language is well known in England now. The English have abandoned the idea that their own language is all-sufficient. They began to study European languages, and he who knows more than one language has a better opportunity to sympathize with other people and to understand them. There was no hatred in England of the German people, and there was no hatred of England by the Germans at the beginning of this war. It was a war of Governments, and not a war of the people.

In my resolution I ask that the President of the United States be requested to urge the convening of a congress of neutral nations. My idea is that he should be enabled to say that the collective conscience of the American people as expressed by its Congress has forced him to initiate peace negotiations and is compelling him to convene a congress of neutral nations.

There may be some men who think that all this talk about internationalism is entirely out of place in this Congress. They are mistaken. Everything worth while, gentlemen, is international. There are national prejudices; there are national hatreds. But science is international. Art is international. Music is international. Religion is international. All that you cherish in your religious system has been transmitted to you from the past generations, from other climes and other lands and other continents. Let us abandon that narrow conception of patriotism which consists in the doctrine, "My country, right or wrong," because there is a nobler doctrine, a higher doctrine, "My country must always be right." [Prolonged applause.]

To this higher conception of patriotism, gentlemen, I ask you to listen now. I suppose I shall have to resort to the expedient of asking and obtaining your unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks. Not that I wish to say a great deal more in the RECORD. I do not believe in canned speeches, but I will put my remarks into shape.

I desire to thank you from the very bottom of my heart for the fairness you have shown toward me, for the encouragement you have given me. I shall not abuse your kindness. I shall not abuse your courtesy. I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. KING. To ask a question of the gentleman, if he will submit to it.

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. KING. The gentleman is speaking for the Socialist Party of the United States, and is their sole spokesman upon the floor of this House. Referring to various of his remarks, I would like to ask the gentleman, if the American flag which hangs behind the Speaker of this House should be attacked by a foreign foe, what would be the attitude of the socialists as to its defense?

Mr. LONDON. I desire to say that if the American people were attacked, every socialist would rise in defense of the American Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. KING. The question is as to the flag.

Mr. LONDON. I speak of the American people. I want to reject the old code of national honor which we have inherited from monarchs and rulers of the Old World.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. I will.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman tell us what is the distinction that he makes between the American people and the American flag, which we suppose stands for the American people?

Mr. LONDON. The distinction between the American people and the American flag is just this: That the people are living beings, throbbing with life. The American flag is an emblem. A fool, a rascal, an idiot may insult the flag. It is something different to attack the American people. Every intelligent man should understand the difference. A madman, rushing out of a lunatic asylum, may attack that flag, and not realizing its sacredness may tear it to shreds. Will you fight him? No. But if anybody should attack the people of the United States, then every socialist, together with the rest of the American people, would rush to the defense of America.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York be kind enough to answer the question that I asked him?

Mr. LONDON. I believe I have answered it.

Mr. KING. As to what the attitude of the Socialist Party will be with reference to the flag of the United States if it is attacked by a foreign foe or a combination of foreign foes?

Mr. LONDON. I believe that a foreign foe can not attack our flag. Flags are not attacked. People are attacked. Do not draw that artificial distinction. You can not attack a flag. A flag does not feel anything. You can not attack a flag, but when a people are attacked, they have a right to defend themselves.

Mr. JAMES. I can hardly believe it is true; but I read in one of the New York papers the other day that the American socialists were adopting and signing this pledge. I should like to ask the gentleman as a socialist if he thinks it is so? It is headed "A league of treason." This is the pledge:

I, being over 18 years of age, hereby pledge myself against enlistment as a volunteer for any military or naval service in international war, offensive or defensive, and against giving my approval to such enlistment on the part of others.

I would like to ask the gentleman from New York as the representative of the Socialist Party if he thinks any socialist would sign such a pledge?

Mr. LONDON. I am glad the gentleman has brought that up. The socialist movement everywhere recognizes the right of a nation to defend itself. I would not sign a pledge which would prevent me from sacrificing my life for the American people whenever the American people were in danger. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FERRIS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask that the gentleman have five minutes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from New York if he desires the five minutes to finish his remarks?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Or whether he proposes to yield to questions?

Mr. LONDON. I propose to yield to questions.

Mr. MANN. I shall object to any time for the purpose of yielding to questions. If the gentleman desires time to finish his remarks, I shall not object to that.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my colleague will not object. There are some gentlemen here who desire to ask questions.

Mr. MANN. We would be all day at it, and then to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, well——

Mr. MANN. My colleague [Mr. FOSTER] gave us a good lecture this morning about proceeding to business.

Mr. LONDON. I will ask 10 minutes, that is all.

The SPEAKER. How does the gentleman say he is going to use the time—to conclude his remarks, or to yield to questions?

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my remarks I promised to answer questions, and I would ask the House for 10 minutes to answer questions. At the end of 10 minutes I will cease.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] asks unanimous consent to continue for 10 minutes, for the purpose of answering questions. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. LONDON. I do.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. One of the most serious questions since I have been here is presented in this, and I want my brother, representing one of the great centers of our civilization and representing the undercurrent of life, to answer this question: If this country was invaded by a foreign army landing on our shores, could we expect the socialists as an organization to help us defend our country?

Mr. LONDON. My answer is that the Social Democracy of the world is opposed to war, but if we are attacked we must defend ourselves. If something should happen to the United States—something that can only happen in the imagination of some gentleman from Massachusetts—if the territory of the United States were to be invaded by any other people, every socialist will consider it his obligation to defend this country. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman spoke with some earnestness in condemnation of the infamous ultimatum that Austria sent to Serbia. As I recollect it, the ultimatum grew out of a criminal act of the citizens of Serbia against a nobleman of Austria. How does the gentleman view the present talk in high quarters of revenge against 15,000,000 people in Mexico?

Mr. LONDON. I look on the talk of revenge as the talk of savages, and as out of place in a civilized community.

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LONDON. Certainly.

Mr. LOBECK. The question has been asked the gentleman whether the socialists would defend this country if attacked. I want to ask if in the war now in Europe the socialists support their own Governments in which they live?

Mr. LONDON. In the European war the socialists are performing a difficult task. They were for peace until the last moment. In Germany they were told that it was a war for defense. They took the attitude that it was their duty to defend their own country, to defend their culture and civilization against a country of an inferior civilization, and at the same time they are now everywhere in Europe advocating the necessity of terminating the war. In the German Reichstag and in the Austrian Reichsrath, in England, and everywhere else they are advocating peace negotiations, and I have no hesitation in predicting that if the war is not terminated within a few months the world will witness one of the greatest revolutions in the history of mankind.

Mr. LOBECK. In every case they will defend their country as they see it?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. What does the gentleman think of the phophecy expressed in this House just before the breaking out of the European war, that this world would never see another war?

Mr. LONDON. It is very dangerous to make prophecies. Thomas Paine predicted in 1790 that by the end of the eighteenth century every country in Europe would be a Republic, but it seems that he made a slight error. In 1884 Frederick Engels predicted that by the end of the nineteenth century a cooperative commonwealth would be installed in every country, still we have only one Socialist among so many Republican and Democratic Representatives in 1916.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I do not think the gentleman has answered my question. I have heard many say that they were opposed to preparedness and that we would never have another great war. Does not the gentleman think that if the Monroe doctrine is insisted on by the United States there is great necessity for preparedness?

Mr. LONDON. I have tried to prove that the war was not an accident; it was the clash of economic interests between various European countries. My argument is that there is no clash between the economic interests of the United States and other countries; there is no conflict that would lead us to war. If there is such a conflict, we want to know it. I would not vote for any appropriation unless I knew what it was for.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Does not the gentleman think we are bound toward progress in a commercial way, and in that connection does not the gentleman think that we ought to be prepared?

Mr. LONDON. You are bound to progress in a commercial way, but progress does not lie in the direction of a protective tariff. The progress of the world and the progress of the United States lies in the creation of an international court of arbitration to settle disputes in a civilized manner. The progress of the world lies in the removal of the protective barrier. Every protective tariff is a barrier between the nations of the world. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. In response to a question asked by some one, the gentleman said that unless this war concludes within a few months some serious revolutions will take place. I do not understand what the gentleman means by that.

Mr. LONDON. What I wanted to say is this: The Franco-Prussian War of 1871 was followed by the bloody Commune—the revolution in France. The Russo-Japanese War was followed by the Russian uprising of 1905, in which 20,000,000 people participated. Basing my reasoning upon what occurred in the past and upon the agitation in all European countries against the continuance of the war, I predict that, unless an effort is made by a great neutral power to terminate it, the European nations will reject the advice of their misleaders, who brought about this world catastrophe, and will bring about a violent change.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY. Of course the gentleman has stated that he is opposed to increasing the Army and Navy. I am wondering if he thinks the country would be better off if we had no Army and no Navy?

Mr. LONDON. I do know that the less this country relies upon its Army and Navy, and the more it relies upon the genius of the American people, the better off will this country be.

Mr. KELLEY. And the gentleman thinks that we ought not to have any Navy or Army?

Mr. LONDON. I have not said that.

Mr. KELLEY. That is what I would like to have the gentleman say—one way or the other.

Mr. LONDON. I have not said so. I have not said so.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman has not stated he thinks we ought to have no Army or no Navy. Would he be willing now to state whether he is in favor of the maintenance of an Army and Navy?

Mr. LONDON. I believe that as long as armies are maintained by others it is necessary to have some physical power for defense. I do know that the Army of the United States, and particularly the militia, has been more frequently used to suppress the struggles of the working people for better wages and shorter hours than against foreign enemies.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. One more question.

Mr. LONDON. And I want to ask permission to rephrase that answer, as it came out rather clumsy.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. May I ask the gentleman this question. Since he believes in the maintenance of an Army and a Navy, does he believe in the maintenance of an efficient Army and Navy?

Mr. LONDON. If it were necessary for the United States to maintain an Army and Navy——

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. But the gentleman says that he is in favor of that.

Mr. LONDON. If it were necessary, I would advocate an Army which would enable every man in the United States to know the art of arms. I would like, for the sake of the working people, if a large Army should be necessary, to see every workingman know how to use a gun, and not be the victim of the militia. But we have not come to that pass. No one threatens you. You are the victims of a nightmare of your own imagination. [Laughter.]

[By unanimous consent, Mr. LONDON was granted leave to extend and revise his remarks in the RECORD.]

STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 407, to provide for stock-raising homesteads.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 407, with Mr. Cox in the chair.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment pending, adding a new paragraph at the end of section 2. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that amendment, so that I may present it at the end of section 3, when we reach that section, and to offer in lieu thereof an amendment to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to call attention to a feature of this legislation which I think at least those who live in the country where it applies should have very clearly in mind. In the past, in legislating relative to the distribution of the public land, we have provided that the entryman may by conforming to certain conditions secure lands of a certain character. The enlarged-homestead law contained a provision that the Secretary of the Interior should make designations of lands that in his opinion were not susceptible of irrigation before they could be entered under that law, but the designation was not final as to the character of the land. This act very vitally modifies the past procedure in that its first provision is a provision of designation, and in the second section it then provides for the entry

of the land as designated, the designation being final. This departure from our past policy has some advantage from the standpoint of the entryman. He knows under this legislation, as he has not in the past, that when the designation has been made and his entry is accepted, the case is closed as to the character of the land, and can not thereafter be raised. That is, assuming the department construes the provisions of the act in accordance with their evident intent.

On the other hand, it does present this situation: While under the 320-acre homestead law the Secretary's designation was in no way final, and the question of the character of the land could be raised at any time prior to final proof, under this law the Secretary's designation is final, that is, if it is construed in accordance with its intent. Therefore the officials under the Secretary making the designation will no doubt be cautious in making the designations not to include lands which do not properly come under this law. That will result in the necessity of sending men into the field for the classification of this land, something we have not to any considerable extent done heretofore, in order that no land containing merchantable timber be designated, in order that no irrigable land be designated, in order that no land fit for general agricultural purposes, if any there be, may be designated. That will render the work of designation slow, and so people must not be disappointed if there is delay in designations under the provisions of this act. There is another important effect that it will have. It will, in my opinion, make it more difficult to secure the designation of present entries as of the character of land described in this act in order to give the present entryman the benefit of one of the several sections of the bill providing for additional entries. Those sections all provide that his right must have been of this character. That means that the Secretary must determine that the region did not contain merchantable timber, was not irrigable, and, further than that, that it is of such a character that 640 acres are required to support a family. Now, just what the Secretary's policy may be when he reaches land that has been taken under the 320-acre law on the theory that 320 acres would support a family I do not know; but I make this observation, throw out these suggestions in order to show my understanding of what the effect of the bill is likely to be. I am rather inclined to think that under the bill, if it becomes a law in its present form, it will be very difficult to secure the designation that any present entry is of the character contemplated by the act, thus making the holder eligible to secure an additional acreage. There are some advantages, as I have suggested, but there are features which are very serious disadvantages.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Now, in my State there are approximately 700,000 acres of land recently designated under the act of February 19, 1909, the enlarged homestead act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. May I have one minute more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from Wyoming having an additional minute? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of one minute debate shall close on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. That designation will apply to the working of this act.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, of course, I can not say what the Secretary may think about this land. I am raising this query. Lands having been designated under the 320-acre law; more having been entered under that law on the theory that they could be to some extent cultivated and were sufficient in area to support a family, what will be the Secretary's policy, then, in designating this land heretofore entered as of this character in order to make the entryman upon them eligible for an additional area? I am frank to say I fear that will be slowly done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That any qualified homestead entryman may make entry under the homestead laws of lands so designated by the Secretary of the Interior, according to legal subdivisions, in areas not exceeding 640 acres, and in compact form so far as may be subject to the provisions of this act, and secure title thereto by compliance with the terms of the homestead laws: *Provided*, That instead of cultivation as required by the homestead laws the entryman shall be required to make permanent improvements upon the land entered before final proof is submitted tending to increase the value of the same for stock-raising purposes, of the value of not less than $1.25 per acre, and at least one-half of such improvements shall be placed upon the land within three years after the date of entry thereof.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment——

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk began the reading of the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. If it is to be inserted as a new section, then it will be necessary——

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Wyoming offering it as a new section?

Mr. MONDELL. As a new paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

To be inserted at the end of section 3:

"Persons who have heretofore perfected homestead entries for areas less than 160 acres and who no longer own or have an interest in the lands embraced in their former entry, if otherwise qualified, may make an entry under this act of an area which together with the area of the former entry shall not exceed 640 acres."

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman from Wyoming withdrew his amendment. The gentleman from South Dakota rose, a member of the committee, asking for recognition. How does this get in?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Wyoming gave notice that he would offer the amendment at the end of this paragraph.

Mr. FERRIS. But he withdrew the amendment, and moved to strike out the last word, and the gentleman from South Dakota, a member of the committee, rose and got recognition, and is entitled to be recognized first.

Mr. MONDELL. The Chair will remember the gentleman from Wyoming gave notice of the offering of this amendment at the end of this paragraph at the time he withdrew it.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman from Wyoming can not consume all the time on all paragraphs and give notice that he is going to consume it in the future. Mr. GANDY is a member of the committee, and was recognized, and I think he is entitled to have his amendment offered first.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state his recollection of the proposition. The gentleman from Wyoming had his amendment lying on the Clerk's table and asked leave to withdraw it, stating at the same time that he would offer it at the close of section 3.

Mr. FERRIS. If that is so, it will have to be reoffered in the regular way. He withdrew his amendment and moved to strike out the last word. After he had concluded a member of the committee rose to offer an amendment, was recognized, and is entitled to offer his amendment first.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma may possibly be correct in that, but the Chair understood the gentleman from Wyoming to say—I believe the RECORD will show—that he temporarily withdrew it and stated at the same time that he intended to reoffer it at the close of this paragraph. It is true I did not recognize the gentleman temporarily.

Mr. MONDELL. What I did was this. I temporarily withdrew my amendment to substitute and offered an amendment to strike out the last word, and offered my amendment at the end of the next paragraph of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the Chair's recollection of it.

Mr. FERRIS. Even if all that both the Chair and the gentleman from Wyoming say is true, the amendment has to be reoffered. The gentleman withdraws his amendment, which he has the right to do, and he offers a new one, which he has the right to do, to wit, to strike out the last word. I do not think it is of any great consequence, but I think we ought to proceed regularly.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming has been reported. If the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota is on the same subject, it is very easy to offer it as a substitute.

Mr. FERRIS. Surely. It is an amendment the gentleman has that has been talked over and pretty well agreed to, and we understand it. He is a member of the committee. The other procedure balls up the committee.

Mr. MANN. The members of the committee are usually entitled to preference; but, after all, they are not the whole thing.

Mr. FERRIS. I understand that. It is hardly fair for the gentleman to say that.

Mr. MANN. Well, I said it good-naturedly. I have no criticism of the committee.

Mr. FERRIS. The committee has been exceptionally modest in the reservations of time,

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is always modest and able.

Mr. FERRIS. I am probably not entitled to have that said; but we are entitled to have this said, that in this almost endless debate we generally save one or two minutes for all the members of the committee, and the rest is consumed by nonmembers.

Mr. MANN. In this case the gentleman slept on his rights.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman does not think so; but we submit. Go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment has been reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment has not been reported, then the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. GANDY] is entitled to proceed.

Mr. MONDELL. Of course, if the members of the committee want to take up the whole afternoon——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is recognized.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which the members of the committee seemingly do not desire to have the House understand is simply this: Throughout the eastern part of the country in times past many men have taken homesteads of less than 160 acres. Those men, having had experience as homesteaders, make the very best sort of homesteaders. We want to give them an opportunity to come out on these lands from wherever they live—Missouri, Iowa, Oklahoma, or in our own region farther west—and take such areas of these lands as, together with their former entry, will make 640 acres. It is an amendment in favor of the man who has once homesteaded in any State of the Union less than 160 acres. It will affect largely not men now living in the States to which this bill applies but men living in the States farther east, whom we hope to have come out and take lands. The amendment which the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. GANDY] would offer, and which the chairman seems to favor, is an amendment which will only give this opportunity to the men who have homesteaded in this very same region and on this same character of land. I want to give that right to the old homesteader from anywhere who did not receive the full 160 acres and give him an opportunity to secure such portions of this land as will, with his original holding, make 640 acres. The amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota will not only benefit solely those who have homesteaded in the far West; it will benefit few of them or only such as can get the Secretary of the Interior to decide and determine that the lands embraced in the former entry were of the character described in this bill. Not one in a hundred will be able to have that done.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. MANN. Under the gentleman's amendment, if a man has taken a homestead of 160 acres, he may take 480 acres of this kind of land.

Mr. MONDELL. No; not any.

Mr. MANN. And if he had taken 140 acres, he would not get any right under this. It makes a distinction between the man who got 140 acres and the man who got 160 acres?

Mr. MONDELL. My amendment applies only to the man who has had less than 160 acres. Heretofore, until the last two or three years, it was held that a man who had not secured 160 acres was a qualified entryman. Recent holdings are to the effect that, having made an entry of any acreage, he is not a qualified entryman. That holding barred such a man from an entry under the enlarged homestead law; it would bar him under this law. I offer this amendment to make such a man eligible for an entry to making his combined entries 640 acres, so that a man coming from outside these States, as well as one from within, may take up these lands. Otherwise many men we should bring under the law have no rights.

Mr. MANN. I thought we passed a bill in the last Congress in certain cases giving the right to take additional land where a man had taken less than 160 acres in the first instance.

Mr. MONDELL. There are statutes under which a man who has not taken 160 acres may take enough to make 160. There is a law whereby a man who has not taken 320 acres now living on that kind of land may take enough to make 320 acres; but this law is to enable a man who no longer owns his former homestead to take these lands in such area as will make 640 acres in all.

Mr. MANN. That will practically give to anyone who has a homestead entry anywhere the right to take 640 acres, because upon the homestead which he owns it is supposed he can not support his family?

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of such time as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] may desire the debate on this amendment close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment under consideration is directly violative of the principle on which the bill is drawn. This bill in various sections gives the right to any former entryman still possessed of his land, who has entered upon the same kind of land as is herein designated, to make additional entry so as to total 640 acres; but nowhere in this bill is there any such principle involved as is carried in the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] giving every person who has heretofore made a homestead entry and then sold it, perchance, the right to enter upon the remaining fraction that would be left after deducting the acreage in his original entry. It is inconsistent with the very purposes of this bill, as pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois. It is assumed that it takes 640 acres of stock-raising land for a man to support himself. A man may have heretofore entered 160 acres, and he would have, under the amendment proposed, the right to enter upon 480 acres. But why should a person who has heretofore exercised his right and taken a homestead upon agricultural land be privileged now to take this fractional part of stock-raising land, as suggested by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]?

He suggests that it is for the benefit of the people living in my country. No; it is designed exclusively for those who live in the Western States; who have sold out, perhaps, to the large stock-raising barons out there, and who again want to preempt some additional land so that they may turn this over also to those large stock-raising barons. I am opposed to it, and I think it is in opposition to the whole principle contained in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GANDY:

"Page 3, line 13, after the word '*Provided*,' insert: 'That a former homestead entry of land of the character described in section 2 hereof shall not be a bar to the entry of a tract under the provisions of the act, subject to the requirements of law as to residence and improvements, which, together with the former entry, shall not exceed 640 acres: *Provided further*.'"

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer as an addition to section 3, which section provides that a qualified entryman may enter not exceeding 640 acres of land that has been designated by the Secretary of the Interior as enterable under this act, the following amendment:

Provided, That a former homestead entry of land of the character described in section 2 hereof shall not be a bar to the entry of a tract under the provisions of this act, subject to the requirements of law as to residence and improvements, which, together with former entry, shall not exceed 640 acres.

Mr. Chairman, in our public-land practice we have heretofore recognized that consideration should be had for the man who, for some reason or another, is unable to secure the full amount of land permitted to be entered under any public-land law. In the bill which is now before the House provision has been made for persons taking an original entry of 640 acres of such lands designated by the Secretary of the Interior as reasonably requiring 640 acres to support a family, and for an additional contiguous entry for one who has heretofore filed on lands of this kind, the original and the additional entry not to exceed 640 acres. As the bill was reported to the House by the Public Lands Committee there is no provision for an additional entry for a homestead entryman on lands of the kind described in this act where there are no vacant public lands adjoining the land embraced in his entry. As the bill was introduced, section 6 provided that, in cases where there are no contiguous vacant lands, entrymen might file an additional not to exceed 10 miles from the original, with credit for residence on the original. The honorable Secretary of the Interior, in his report on this bill, suggested the advisability of striking out that section; and the Public Lands Committee, by a close vote, followed his sug-

gestion. Later on in this discussion I will have something to say about the principle involved in that section.

Many years ago, when we had only the quarter-section law, it was found that many persons filed on a forty, or an eighty, or a hundred-and-twenty acre tract. The act of March 2, 1889, granted to those persons the right to file an additional entry of such an amount of land as, when added to the quantity previously entered, would not exceed 160 acres, with a proviso that additional entrymen must comply with the homestead law in all respects. There was no limitation on where the additional entry might be secured, and the entryman who had filed on less than the maximum amount permitted by law could go into any public-land State for his additional.

The Kinkaid Act, applicable only to portions of western Nebraska, was passed on April 28, 1904, and in his report on this bill the Secretary of the Interior calls attention to how well the Kinkaid Act has worked out and the great development in western Nebraska thereunder, in the following language:

Since the last session of Congress the department has been seeking information as to the advisability of the passage of such a law as is now proposed by this bill. Attention has been especially directed to the operation of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat., 547), which authorized the entry of not exceeding 640 acres of land in a considerable area of western Nebraska. The provisions of that act, as applying to that limited area, were in the main designed to meet the same conditions which the present bill proposes to meet as to other areas of the public lands. Eleven years have elapsed since the passage of the law relating to western Nebraska, and the investigations of the department as to the results of that legislation are both important and significant. Prior to the passage of the act of 1904 considerable land in western Nebraska had been entered under other laws, but the marvelous development since the passage of the act of 1904 is so marked that it must in great measure at least be attributed to that law. It has been found that some of the valleys and lower lands which intersperse the larger area have been made to produce through intensive cultivation varied crops of large value, and that the production of live stock has largely increased rather than diminished. The improvements placed by the settlers upon their claims indicate both prosperity and permanency of occupation, as dwellings of stone, cement, or frame construction, plastered and provided with conveniences, have generally supplanted the original sod houses, and the farmer who has not built barns, silos, or other structures for storing crops and protecting live stock is a rare exception. The live stock raised upon the small ranches is of a higher grade than that which was produced by grazing upon the vacant public lands.

It appears from statistics collected, covering 31 counties within the area to which said law is applicable, that the population was 124,508 in 1890, 107,434 in 1900, and 162,217 in 1910, an increase of nearly 50 per cent in population during said 10-year period, during 6 years of which the 640-acre homestead law was in force.

The value of household furniture increased from $174,779 in 1904 to $342,312 in 1914, an increase of 95 per cent.

The value of agricultural implements in 1904 was $139,609; in 1914, $243,304; increase, 74 per cent.

The value of cattle in 1904 was $3,176,109; in 1914, $4,267,055; increase, 34 per cent.

In 1904, 30 counties produced 69,962 bushels of potatoes; in 1914, 2,671,924 bushels; increase, 3,719 per cent.

Number of acres planted to rye in 27 counties in 1904, 47,451; in 1914, 91,336; increase, 92 per cent.

Number of acres planted in oats in 28 counties in 1904, 137,032; in 1914, 246,722; increase, 80 per cent.

Number of acres planted to corn in 28 counties in 1904, 564,554; in 1914, 1,143,916; increase, 102 per cent.

Number of acres planted to wheat in 27 counties in 1904, 122,799; in 1914, 297,900; increase, 142 per cent.

Number of horses in 31 counties in 1892, 107,295; in 1904, 168,556; increase, 57 per cent; in 1914, 282,624; increase, 67 per cent.

Number of hogs in 29 counties in 1904, 171,849; in 1914, 225,480; increase, 31 per cent.

The acreage of improved land in 27 counties increased 68 per cent in 12 years, 1892 to 1904; increased 77 per cent in 10 years, 1904 to 1914. The value of the improved land decreased 18 per cent the first period and increased 143 per cent the second.

The total assessed valuation of all property in 31 counties in 1892 was $23,468,899.69; in 1904, $27,480,836.57; increase, 17 per cent; in 1914, $57,278,766; increase, 108 per cent.

Of the land entered in Nebraska under the section law there is an average of 1 settler for every 571 acres. In the 37 counties affected by this law it appears that there are 4,589,870 acres in the hands of the original entrymen, 6,411,963 acres in the hands of small holders, and only 316,453 acres in the hands of what might be termed large holders; that is, those possessing areas in excess of 2,000 acres. The department is informed that the practically unanimous sentiment of the people in western Nebraska is that the law has been a benefit to them and to the country, causing a large increase in the population, promoting the development of the lands, and advancing generally the public welfare.

If there is any objection to the Kinkaid Act or any of its provisions, the Secretary would have told of that in his report, and having heard so strong a commendation by so high an official as the Secretary it would be entirely proper for this House to write into this bill any of the provisions of the Kinkaid law. When the venerable Member from Nebraska, Judge KINKAID, wrote that law he placed therein a provision which has now stood the test of almost 12 years, and which permits an additional entry of such an amount as will bring the entryman's total to 640 acres. The exact wording of that proviso is:

That a former entry will not be a bar to the entry, under the provisions of this act, which, together with the former entry, shall not exceed 640 acres.

This bill applies only to certain kinds of land. You will note that sections 4 and 5 grant the right of a contiguous additional entry to one who has or who has not proved up, whose original entry was of the kind described in this act.

Gentlemen of the House, there are other people worthy of consideration in addition to those whose homestead entries adjoin vacant land. Many persons have quarter or half section entries on lands of the kind and of the character described in this act, where no vacant land adjoins their land, who pasture their stock on near-by public lands. The land which they have been permitted to acquire under the homestead laws is not sufficient for the pasturage of their stock. If you, in this legislation, provide for the homesteading of the vacant public land and at the same time do not provide for this class of settlers who have no vacant lands adjoining them, and for whom I plead, then they must buy or lease pasturage lands or move. They will be compelled to quit, for the pasturage privileges that are now being enjoyed by them will be denied to them if all of the near-by vacant lands are taken up.

This amendment is not as broad as the proviso of the Kinkaid Act, for under that act there was no restriction as to the quality of land embraced in the former entry. Now, I am only asking you for a noncontiguous additional right for those who have had entries of the kind of land proposed to be disposed of by this act, and I submit that they of right ought to be provided for; that we ought to think of the man now there, of the men who have gone out on this kind of land and are doing the best they can to support themselves and their families.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. GANDY] may have five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GANDY. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understood from the remark just made by the gentleman that the purpose of his amendment is to protect those who have formerly entered upon this kind of land, but who have not taken the full 640 acres. Am I correct or not?

Mr. GANDY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I read the gentleman's amendment, it enables anyone who has heretofore entered upon this kind of land to enter upon the remainder of the amount to which he would be entitled after deducting the amount contained in the original entry.

Mr. GANDY. If the land is of like kind.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then there is no provision whatever, according to the gentleman's amendment, that would safely limit this. The vice of it is the same as the vice of the amendment introduced by the gentleman from Wyoming. You grant to any person, whether he is on the land or not, the right to go and make an additional entry. It gives an additional right. It does not require settlement upon this additional fraction. Persons out in the territory who have entered upon the land and sold it can make a double entry and sell it the next day after they have conformed to the conditions of this law.

Mr. GANDY. Just one moment, in answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin. This proviso reads—

that entries made under the provisions of this amendment are subject to the requirements of law as to residence and improvements.

Mr. STAFFORD. But you do not forbid those who have heretofore entered and sold their rights to an entry from entering anew. As soon as he enters he turns right around and sells it to some adjoining land baron. Will the gentleman deny that that may not take place?

Mr. GANDY. I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] that he is raising a bogey man who is not seen in any place except in imagination. He is mistaken when he surmises that a man as soon as he enters this land will sell it to some adjoining landowner. The land contemplated by this act is low-priced land, and yet we are requiring three years of residence and improvements to the extent of $1.25 per acre. I leave it to the judgment of the Members of this House as to whether or not it is fair to presume that a man could make much money out of selling a half section or a three-quarter section of this kind of land, taking into account the three years of residence and the cost of his home and other improvements that he will be required to place on this land and that he will, of necessity, be compelled to place thereon in order to make it habitable for him. The chance for speculation there is small.

indeed, unless the man's three years of time are absolutely valueless to him.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will not deny that it is possible for a man who has heretofore sold his homestead to come in under the gentleman's amendment and take this additional land?

Mr. GANDY. If his entry was of the kind and character contemplated by this act.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GANDY. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Under the amendment proposed by the gentleman will a man who has taken a homestead heretofore of an acreage less than the limits prescribed in this bill and who has disposed of his holding and who is not a settler there at all be permitted to make an entirely new entry and get enough land to make up 640 acres?

Mr. GANDY. If his original entry was of the kind and character contemplated by this act, and I insist that that is a principle that is as old as the administration of the public-land laws in this Nation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Further suppose that I had gone out there into that country and taken up land to the amount of 160 acres and after proving up had sold it and had returned to my home in Michigan. To-day could I go out there and under this law get enough land to make it up to 640 acres? Having once shown my bad faith, that I did not intend to make a home out there, that I was not a bona fide homesteader, that I had sold out the land on which I had settled, could I go out there now under the amendment offered by the gentleman and again repeat the process through which I had gone?

Mr. GANDY. If the entry was of the kind and character contemplated by this act; and I submit that the fact that a man has sold his entry does not necessarily mean that he has shown bad faith or in any way attempted to commit any fraud upon this Government or on society. Let me call your attention to the situation in my district. The country adjacent to the Black Hills received its first homestead settlers in the latter seventies and early eighties. Following this, in the nineties, there came a period of depression, when the valuation of lands, as well as other things, reached low-water mark. In those days, in addition to the burden of financial stringency, crops were failures, and a quarter section of land could be purchased for from $150 up. I venture the assertion, without fear of successful contradiction, that in those days the average value of a quarter section of land was from $200 to $400. The quarter section which was embraced in a homestead entry would not produce a sufficient return to maintain a family, and unless the entryman had outside means of support he had to give up the effort that he was making in good faith to establish a home for himself and those dependent upon him. After proof many persons lost their places because of indebtedness which had been incurred in complying with the homestead laws, and others, being unable to even pay the taxes, were compelled to see their lands sacrificed at tax sales. Thus, through no fault of their own, but really because of the adversities which nature and a world-wide financial upheaval combined to visit upon that section, hundreds of persons lost the land embraced in their homestead entries. Some of them have been provided for under laws that have been passed by Congress at one time or another, and it is but fair now that in this bill provisions should be made for all who have heretofore entered a quarter section or a half section of lands that are of such character that 640 acres are reasonably required for the support of a family.

I realize that some argument has been advanced against this proposition, for it has been said here that no man ought to be permitted to take a less quantity of this kind of land than 640 acres on the ground that he absolutely needs that much to support a family. Now, there is nothing in this act or any other act which would prohibit an additional entryman under this amendment of mine from buying or leasing such an amount of land above that which he can secure as a homestead entry as will be necessary to support himself and those dependent upon him. The responsibility is on the entryman, and he must earn this additional in order to get it. If he is willing, after having once homesteaded a tract of land of this kind, to spend three years earning 320 or 480 acres of land while his neighbor is earning 640 acres, we ought not to say to him, "nay."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Does not the gentleman think that this right to take the additional homestead ought to be limited to those who are settlers now, and who need additional land?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. GANDY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. This enlarged homestead law is less than seven years old now, and in some cases it has been charged here that people have gone on that dry land and have been unable to stay there, that lands which have been designated under the enlarged homestead law were of such a character that a man could not make a living upon 320 acres. There are some cases of that kind; but I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] has in mind settlements that may have been made several years ago in Eastern States under the 160-acre law, on good land. Now, this does not contemplate that.

Mr. GANDY. In closing, now, I plead with you to remember those in the West who have filed on land of the kind described in this bill, but who have no vacant land adjoining their original entries. The precedent established by the additional-homestead law of March 2, 1889, and almost 27 years of the equitable and successful result of that law sustains my contention. Almost 16 years of the existence on the statute books of a more liberal proviso in the Kinkaid law and the wonderful result obtained thereunder, in Nebraska, justifies my position to-day. Adopt this amendment and you will have dealt rightly, justly, and equitably with all citizens who are entitled to the benefits of this act.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not care how old the law is nor how old the man is who made the entry if, after swearing that he was a genuine homesteader, he sold out and perhaps left the country, and having once taken advantage of the laws of this country to acquire a home he has not been willing to comply with the laws and make a home, evidently never intending to do so, I think another law ought not to be enacted to permit him to go through with the same process again. It seems to me there ought to be a provision in this law limiting this right to actual settlers, those who wish to stay there, those who have gone there with an evidence of bona fide intention to become residents. This law might be extended to help men of that kind to make permanent homes and to acquire additional land on which they might make a living.

Some queer statements are made here in regard to the value of this land and what one can do and can not do with it. Judging by some of these statements, evidently the land is of no value whatever, yet the more a man gets of it the better off he is. It seems to me some of these statements are very inconsistent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall not be able to remain longer in the House because I have a committee meeting calling me now, but I have it in mind that something should be put into this bill to insure that those who avail themselves of its privileges shall be actual settlers, and one of the amendments that I think should be made is that improvements allowed for should not all be fences. Under this law as it is now drawn——

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman seems to have a curious conception of a homestead out in the West. Does the gentleman think that under the provisions of this bill a man can comply with the law by living on a fence rail? Would a fence be the only improvement necessary?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. No; but there ought to be some evidence of permanent improvement with the idea of remaining on the place. A man might live in a temporary structure of some kind, of no particular value, and for which he could claim no particular credit, and might be given no credit under this law. Then he would be permitted to gain credit for having built a fence and so putting that land in shape to be disposed of. I have no disposition to place obstacles in the way of acquiring homesteads, and if it is proper in that part of the country to acquire homesteads of 640 acres, let them have homesteads of that size. Let them acquire them under circumstances outlined by this bill, but let there be some safeguards.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Would the gentleman inform the committee whether or not he has been over any of this land that this bill would apply to see whether his criticisms are just?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I have been through that part of the country a number of times. I have never made any such investigation as would enable me to say whether or not your entrymen had shown good faith in making their entries or in presenting their proof in order to get their patents. If that is what the gentleman's question means I have made no such investigation. But there is no question in the world, Mr. Chairman, everyone knows it, that fraud has been perpetrated time without number. Many men have gone out and taken possession of public lands under the homestead law, occupied them, or pretended to, acquired title, and have disposed of the lands, evidently carrying out their plans to profit by the law without complying or intending to comply with the spirit of the law.

Everything they did was with the intention of ultimately or immediately acquiring the land and disposing of it. This law should be so drafted, if possible, as to prevent that improper practice.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Chairman, if some entrymen under the homestead law should be guilty of bad faith, that would not be a sufficient reason why the whole system should be condemned and set aside. Furthermore, it is incompatible with our institutions that any man having selected a particular place or a particular locality where he homesteads should be required to forever remain there. But when the department passes upon the final proof of the homestead entryman and grants him a patent, that precludes the right of any man thereafter to allege any bad faith existing in securing the title to that land.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I regard the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. GANDY] as one of the most equitable provisions in the bill. In fact, the act will not be completely equitable unless this amendment be adopted.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINKAID. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. I would like to have the gentleman tell me if I understand the amendment. Suppose a man enters 320 acres in Nebraska. Would he be permitted under this amendment to go out and enter 320 acres of this land?

Mr. KINKAID. If the Secretary of the Interior finds that the land of Nebraska is of the same character as this land he is to enter, he would.

Mr. BOOHER. It must be of the same character, but you are punishing the man by putting him on 320 acres. He is going to take it up and sell it, for he never can live on it.

Mr. KINKAID. Well, this is a free country, and it is for the individual to say whether or not he will cast his lot in a certain locality as a homesteader. This act will not do equity unless the amendment shall be adopted, for the reason that without it former entrymen obtaining less than 640 acres will not be afforded the opportunity to even up in area with entrymen under this bill. It will not be serving all citizens alike. If the amendment is adopted, it will afford all an equal opportunity. It is one of the fundamental principles of our institutions that we shall have equality before the law, and that this amendment will afford. It affords all a chance who have not had an equal opportunity heretofore.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINKAID. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Is the amendment so drawn that a man who has taken 320 acres under the Kinkaid Act in Nebraska can take 320 more in Nebraska, or can he go out in some other public-land State and take 320 acres?

Mr. KINKAID. Yes; he can go to any State if the Nebraska land is the same kind of land that is in the other States. But I am not speaking for Nebraskans alone, but for justice to all alike.

Mr. BORLAND. Does not the gentleman think that the 640 acres settled ought to be contiguous?

Mr. KINKAID. I think the man who has entered less than 640 acres ought to have an opportunity to make himself equal to those who have secured 640 acres, and this amendment will do that justice. Mr. Chairman, a vote for the amendment will be consistent with the maxim, "Equality before the law."

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, after the word "*Provided*," insert "That a former homestead entry shall not be a bar to an entry of a tract under the provisions of this act subject to the requirement of law as to residence and improvements which, together with the former entry, shall not exceed 640 acres."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The amendment now offered is one of a general character not restricted to an entry of the character of land provided in the bill. This would have been a proper substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming. His amendment provided for those who had made homestead entry of any kind of land whatever. This amendment should have been offered at that time as a substitute and not at the present time.

Nothing is better established in parliamentary practice than the rule that when one proposition is before the House the right to exhaust amendment must be made; any relevant amendment must then be offered. Otherwise we would be in interminable discussion in offering amendments at any time on matters that had previously been passed on by the committee.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to debate the point of order. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is mistaken about the germaneness of the point of order. We are dealing with a homestead bill; we are dealing with the qualifications of homesteaders; and we are dealing with what particular class of homesteaders will be entitled to enter land under this bill. I do not think the point of order will lie. I do not say this in support of the gentleman's amendment, for I think I shall have to oppose him. I think the point of order is not well taken, because we are dealing with the precise thing the gentleman's amendment deals with.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the amendment is germane and overrules the point of order.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, a great many members of the committee seem to be laboring under the delusion and nightmare that a compliance with the homestead laws on the part of an entryman is a sort of Sunday picnic. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] seemed to labor under the delusion that a man who goes out and complies with the present homestead laws by residing for three years on a tract of land does that with the main idea in view of disposing of it to some imaginary stock baron. If the gentleman knew the actual conditions in the West he would know that year by year the large landowners in the West are selling out, and that the farms and ranches are becoming smaller each year.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly; I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Is the gentleman sure that that is a fact?

Mr. NORTON. I am absolutely certain of it.

Mr. BAILEY. The statistics furnished apparently do not bear out that assertion. The Census Bureau seems to reach a different conclusion.

Mr. NORTON. That the acreage in farms is becoming larger?

Mr. BAILEY. I think so.

Mr. NORTON. That is not true in any section of the West that I have observed, and I have been through all of the western public-land States.

Mr. BAILEY. I think on examination the gentleman will find that the Census Bureau so reports.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman furnish those statistics?

Mr. BAILEY. I know they exist.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I will say that in the Dakotas, in Montana, in Idaho, where this law will apply, during the past decade there have been no great tracts of land gathered up by this mysterious person called the land baron, spoken of by the gentleman from Michigan. My substitute purposes to give to any man who in the past has been one of a band of pioneers to an undeveloped section of the country, and has complied with the homestead laws, the right to make entry on an additional tract of land, which with his former entry will not exceed in the aggregate 640 acres of land.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman regards the purpose of this act as providing homes?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. And section 2 provides that the land which is to be granted under this 640-acre homestead act shall be of such character that 640 acres are reasonably required for the support of a family?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. If a man already had 160 or 320 acres, which he has disposed of, and he is given another 320 or 480 of a character such that 640 are necessary for him to support a family, what kind of a home will he have acquired?

Mr. NORTON. In reply to that I would say, as I said yesterday, that if it were left to me I would legislate to provide that he have the right to make entry on the entire tract of 640 acres. I would give him the right——

Mr. CRAMTON. But that is not the gentleman's proposition, however.

Mr. NORTON. No, it is not; and it is not for the reason that there are so many delusionists in the House here who imagine that a man who goes out and makes entry on a homestead in a new country has some wonderful privilege given to him by the Federal Government, whereas in truth and in fact the country where he goes owes more to him after he has spent three years there in building up the country than he owes to it or than he receives from the Government. Railroad companies interested in the question of immigration and the further settlement of the West have made calculations as to the value of a settler in a new country, and their estimates show that a new settler adds each year about $1,000 to the increased production of a new territory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORTON. Every man who goes out and settles on a homestead and makes his home there adds each year to the production of the country approximately $1,000. By the amendment I have offered I purpose to give the same right to every man who is willing to go out on one of these 640-acre tracts and reside there three years and otherwise comply with the law. I purpose to give this right to the man who in the past has made entry on 160 acres of land and who, through one misfortune or another, has lost his homestead. In giving him such privilege I feel—in fact, I know—that the section of the country where he may take up his residence will be permanently benefited; and that he, with the experience and wisdom of his early pioneer days, will cause to grow two blades of grass where scarcely one grew before, and with his new desire for a home will raise and care for many sheep and cattle on these lands that now are unoccupied and unproductive. [Applause.]

This bill, if enacted into law, will cause to be settled up thousands of acres in the Dakotas, in Montana, in Idaho, as well as in the Southwest.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Upon what premise does the gentleman base the statement that if this bill becomes a law it will greatly increase the population of my State—the State of Idaho?

Mr. NORTON. I base that on the fact that there is to-day in Idaho a great deal of land on which settlement will be made under the provisions of this act.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Where?

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman contend that in the southern part of Idaho there is not to-day much land that would be included under the provisions of this law?

Mr. McCRACKEN. I did say so; and I say that the greater part of that land will be taken up by the large stock owner, who proposes to gather a large area of the public domain where he can control the grazing. Now, that is my objection to this bill; and I believe I voice the objection of every settler in my own State. I can prove that by letters which I have here, and I would like to read them for the gentleman's information. I do not think the gentleman has the right to speak for the State of Idaho. I have not any doubt but what this bill will probably work to the benefit of the gentleman's State, but the range conditions in his State are very different from those in my State.

Mr. NORTON. I am very much obliged to the gentleman. I do not wish to place myself in the position of speaking for the people of Idaho. The distinguished gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McCRACKEN] is well able to do that. I am willing to stand corrected, if I should be corrected in the reference I made to conditions in the splendid State of Idaho. While this bill may not be of so much importance to Idaho as to my State and to other States, I still contend that a man who is willing to go out and live for three years on this land, build his home there, and make thereon permanent improvements for stock raising purposes to the value of $1.25 an acre should be given the right to make entry on one of these grazing homesteads, notwithstanding the fact that at some time in the past he may have made and perfected homestead entry.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of 20 minutes all debate close on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that at the expiration of 20 minutes all debate close on this amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. How is the time to be divided?

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman from Colorado wants a little time, the gentleman from Nebraska wants a little time, and I wish a few moments to oppose the amendment for the committee.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, the Kinkaid Act contains this proviso:

> That a former homestead entry shall not be a bar to the entry under the provisions of this act of a tract of land which with the former entry shall not exceed 640 acres.

According to the report of the Secretary of the Interior this act has worked admirably. This great bugaboo that our friends look for does not appear. It is all wiped out. It is not in existence. The amendment that is now pending is the same as the Kinkaid Act. The amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota contains a proviso which has the saving clause of land of the character described in section 2 thereof, and his original entry must be of the character named in the bill. Personally, I would have no objection on earth to the substitute. It could not do any harm and would not do any harm. Those provisions have been found to be beneficial, but to show the committee that we are not extending beyond the kind and character of land involved in this legislation we believe that a man who has exercised his right to 160 acres described here and sold it should go to this country and he will not be debarred, or will not lose the right to enter upon 480 acres of land of the character provided for in this bill.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAKER. I yield.

Mr. McCRACKEN. The gentleman has an irrigation project in his State, has he not?

Mr. RAKER. Very little. We have collected in my State about $7,000,000 which is going to some place else, I am sorry to say, but we have got 10,000—ten hundred thousand—acres susceptible of irrigation, which we want to irrigate if we can get the money and get the department back of us, all of which, I think, will be done eventually.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Take a case of this sort: Suppose a man has taken up one small unit on an irrigation project, and he has a number of cattle that he can not sustain by the forage which he produces upon this——

Mr. RAKER. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. McCRACKEN. I am getting to that point. Assuming that he now has 40 or 50 calves and he wants to go upon the range which is a considerable distance from home——

Mr. RAKER. That would not make any difference.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Is there anything in this bill which will give that man an opportunity to go upon the range and select a range homestead so that he can take his cattle there?

Mr. RAKER. It will give him the same right as anybody else.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Then, how can the gentleman argue that you are going to encourage the stock raiser?

Mr. RAKER. Why, we are going to, because we are going to encourage his building; we are going to develop the country by which we will have more school houses, by which we are going to have better roads; we are going to be in a position to raise one steer that is worth five times that of the little long-horned ones they raise now, scattered over the range unprovided for and uncared for. We are going to give to them more meat for the market. We are going to have a better opportunity than we have, by permitting those who can assist to obtain a home and thereby get more land under farms. The provisions of this bill enacted into law and faithfully carried out will be of great good to the country where it will apply.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, if there were less applications for entry than there was land, I could readily see the purpose of this amendment. If there is more land than there are people who want homes, I can see how we might grant to one who had had his chance under some former homestead law a second chance under this act. The purpose of the homestead act, as I understand it, is to provide homes, but whenever that purpose is prostituted to satisfy land greed, the purpose for which the act should be enacted is destroyed.

In every community in this land, not restricted to any locality, are those working upon salaries or for wages who are haunted constantly with the idea that age is creeping upon them, that the time will come when the burden of years will decrease their efficiency and when they will lose employment. Such men are looking forward to the accumulation of some property that will be their haven when the evil days shall come. This land in the West is never settled by those who live in its immediate locality. The hills are always greener on the other side. The opportunities always lie outside the limit of man's immediate activity, for if the opportunities afforded by his own location were as good as those beyond the horizon, he argues, "I would have done better than I have done here." In the minds of thousands of these men constantly grows the hope that some time they may settle upon some spot of ground they may call their own which will furnish a haven when the other days shall come.

Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why, under the purpose of a homestead act, we should grant to some men two homes and deny some men one home. If there were fewer entrymen than there was land upon which the entries are to be made, I can see why we should give an opportunity to a man who had taken a less acreage to file upon enough of the land comprehended in this bill to bring his holdings up to 640 acres.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REAVIS. I ask for two minutes more.

Mr. FERRIS. Will one minute help the gentleman any?

Mr. REAVIS. One minute will help me.

Mr. FERRIS. All right. I will yield one minute more.

Mr. REAVIS. The proposition I have to make in the moment I have left is this: If I am correct in the purposes of this act,

if it is to furnish homes for persons who want to take advantage of the opportunity granted by this act, why should we deprive them of it by giving some other man, who has already had his chance, a second one, while to many we give no chance at all? The amendment will have that effect, and I oppose it for that reason. [Applause.]

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that under this act opportunity would be afforded for the enlargement of land ownership in the West. It was suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the statistics will show that to be the case in the last 10 years. I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that the statistics of the Census Office will show to the contrary, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in that direction.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the discussion upon this amendment to the enlarged homestead law with a good deal of interest. I see those and hear those who are building for those who have not had an opportunity to take a homestead anywhere. I want to appeal, gentlemen, for those who have taken homesteads and who, because of the circumstances under which they labored, have lost the same. They have not received the benefits that have been accorded to others who have also become homestead entrymen in this far western country. Having been receiver of the United States land office in my State for many years, I came very close to the homesteader, and I want to appeal here and now for those who came out into that western country and filed on 160 acres of land that was not susceptible of large returns, in consequence of which, although they were allowed seven years in which to offer final proof to secure title to their lands, were granted the privilege of making proof within five years. They underwent five years of the hardship of that western country. Prior to the passage of the act of 1909 it became necessary for them to offer proof on their land to get title to the same in order that they might obtain credit from the business houses in order to maintain their families. The result was that about the time that they offered proof the 320-acre law came into effect, and they were barred by the provisions of that act from getting contiguous land. The neighbor, who had not undergone all the hardships undergone by this man, was allowed to come in and file on another 160 acres contiguous to his land. These operations have gone on for years, and the reason for my support of this amendment is to keep those people and enable them to make homes and support their families. I gladly welcome men from other States, from the Eastern States and from the cities, to come out West and avail themselves of the privileges offered; but we do not want the men that have undergone hardships in these Western States to be forever debarred from the provisions of this act. I do hope that it may prevail in this House.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, the provision that was in the bill last year and passed the House last year was section 6; that is now stricken out. That passed the House last year practically by unanimous consent. I reintroduced it, but when it came up in the committee I was sure it reached too far and did too much. It practically made a gift of the additional land to the homesteader who had had one entry, without requiring him to move or do anything toward getting it. I believe he had to spend $1.25 an acre, but did not have to make his home on the land. We struck that out in the committee. But in doing that we went further than we ought to have gone, in my opinion. I think we went too far. Here is the Kinkaid Act, which permits anybody to make another entry who has had a preceding entry. Why, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] goes too far. He does not require them to move on the land and make a home. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. GANDY] introduces a middle ground, and says, first, that the original entry must be of a like kind, to wit, it must be nonmineral, it must be nontimber, it must be nonirrigable, and the Government reserves all the title. And the succeeding entry, if there be enough to make up the 640 acres, must be nonmineral, must be nontimbered, must be nonirrigable, with no water supply flowing into it at all, and in addition to that, under the Gandy amendment, he must move on it—he must take up residence on it. He must earn the addition.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] a moment ago was of the opinion that it would be wrong to let a man here take 320 acres additional, because he was of the opinion that he could not make a living on it, and therefore would make a failure, or he thought that we ought to put a line around it and draw him within the 10-mile limit. Now, he may be right about that. My own opinion is, however, if a man's first entry was either 160 or 120 acres, it will do no harm to let him take another grant which will amount to 320 acres.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman knows that anyone who has made a homestead entry and a preemption entry—a disclaimer entry—prior to 1900 has the right to make another homestead entry.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman is right about that, but still we are giving him a larger unit.

Mr. NORTON. Why not give him the same as was given prior to 1900?

Mr. FERRIS. We are giving him a larger unit. I want to beg of my friends from the West not to insist on so much that they will break down their wagon. I am in favor of a 640-acre grazing bill because I think it will help those States.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield? If the land is restricted to that of such a character that 640 acres are reasonably required for the support of a family, and you give a man under the Gandy amendment land of such a character that he can not make a living on it and it goes into other hands, does it not defeat the purpose of this bill?

Mr. FERRIS. No; I do not think so.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, why not?

Mr. FERRIS. I have heard the gentleman's reasoning on that, and——

Mr. CRAMTON. Then you must believe that the department is going to construe this contrary to its purpose and include lands of a better character than the bill contemplates.

Mr. FERRIS. No. There is a positive prohibition against that. There is no danger of the department doing that.

Mr. CRAMTON. If it is of the character that requires 640 acres on which to maintain a family and you give him only 320 acres, he can not maintain his family on it and he loses it, and you thereby defeat the purpose of the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. If 320 acres is sufficient to support that family, then will the gentleman say it ought to be of this class of land?

Mr. FERRIS. No. I think both the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Michigan trip as they go along. Their reasoning stumbles and falls over the obstacles that have been erected. It will not work that way. There is a positive prohibition in the bill against the designation of any land that is not nontimbered, of any land that is mineral land, and of any land that has any known source of water supply upon it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Why do you skip the last prohibition?

Mr. FERRIS. Wait one moment. The gentleman knows I have only a moment's time.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; but I did not limit the gentleman's time.

Mr. FERRIS. I did. The gentleman is not to blame for that. We are trying to get along. Let me proceed for just a minute. This is a grazing proposition anyway. For instance, the land is 10 miles away from the former entry. The entryman could run his herds on that by digging a tank or pond and building a wire fence around it, and run a few cattle on his original entry, and also on his subsequent entry, although they are of the same kind.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question again?

Mr. FERRIS. Just in a moment. Montana has 376,000 people, Idaho has 325,000 people, Wyoming has 145,000 people, Colorado has 799,000 people, New Mexico has 327,000 people, Arizona has 204,000 people, Utah has 273,000 people, and Nevada has 81,000 people. Now, gentlemen, we do not want to run mad and leave our wits behind us, and we do not want to depart from reason and common sense. The people who have gone out into those States and lived there and existed there—Nevada containing only 81,000 people—have need of some relief from somewhere to get some people out there. The people in my State who are without homes need some place where they can exist. The people of Wisconsin and the people of Michigan, and indeed of all the States, need somewhere where they can find a place that they can call their own and remain on, and you have got to give them a little larger area in order to do it. That reaches the general proposition.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope what the gentlemen will do is to object to the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota, because, for instance, a man from Oklahoma could already have 160 acres of land, and yet under the gentleman's amendment he could go and take one of these entries; or a man from the State of Missouri or from any other region could go and do that. I do not think that is fair. It might, it is true, help people of my State, but it is not fair. I myself have taken a homestead, and I own it yet. It would not be fair for me, having a homestead that is worth a few thousand dollars, to go out to the State of Wyoming, for example, or to Colorado, to again

take up anther homestead and deny another good man the right to take a home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment:
Amend the amendment by adding, after the word "tract," in line 2 of the amendment, the words "within a radius of 10 miles from such former entry."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment reported now as amended?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report it as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

That a former homestead entry of land of the character described in section 2 hereof shall not be a bar to the entry of a tract within a radius of 10 miles from such former entry under the provisions of this act, subject to the requirements of law as to residence and improvements, which, together with the former entry, shall not exceed 640 acres: *Provided further.*

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, if it is desired to carry out the consistent purposes of this bill, this amendment will be adopted. If this amendment is not adopted, the bill itself will be absolutely inconsistent with itself.

But let me say first, Mr. Chairman, that this entire controversy, so far as the committee is concerned, arose over the striking out of section 6 by the committee. That section provided that an entryman, if there were not lands contiguous to his original entry, might make another entry within a radius of 10 miles from his first entry upon complying with the provisions of the act, so far as improvements are concerned. It did not require residence. That meant that if that section stood in the bill an entryman could build a fence around 320 acres of land, or whatever amount was necessary to make up the 640, thereby complying with the act, if that fence cost $400, and then receive a patent to the land. He would not need to use it for homestead purposes at all, but could sell it immediately upon getting his patent, and use this section as a means solely of speculation.

When this bill was referred to the department, the department took that view of it, and in the report which is found in the report of the committee to this House it recommended that that section be stricken out of the bill, because, as the department said, it would promote speculation. Thereafter, after the committee had voted to strike this section 6 out of the bill, the gentleman from South Dakota came to me with reference to the question as to whether or not we could get together upon some proposition that would enable entrymen to get some land that was not contiguous to his original entry. I had supposed we had an understanding that the amendment now proposed by the gentleman from South Dakota should be limited to land that was within 10 miles of the first entry. I want to say frankly that that was a misunderstanding on our part. I do not for a moment charge the gentleman from South Dakota with misrepresenting what he desired to do in any respect, but I did not understand it.

Now, I did not object, and I do not object, to amending this bill so as to provide that an entryman may make an additional homestead entry, if the land of the original entry is of the same character as that proposed by this bill and if the additional entry is within 10 miles of his first entry, to the amount of 640 acres, because the theory is that both of those tracts of land will or may be used for a home, and that combined they will give to the homesteader an opportunity to make a livelihood upon 640 acres of land.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Is the gentleman now advocating an amendment that will prevent a man locating within 10 miles of his original tract?

Mr. LENROOT. No; it must be within 10 miles.

Mr. BORLAND. Then I misunderstood the amendment. I was going to ask how a man could farm two tracts that must be at least 10 miles apart?

Mr. LENROOT. No; they must be within 10 miles of each other, under this amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. That is a different proposition.

Mr. CRAMTON. Do I understand that there is anything in the original amendment that is suggested, or in the gentleman's amendment to that, which requires that the first entry shall not have been disposed of?

Mr. LENROOT. No. It may have been disposed of.

Mr. CRAMTON. It may have been disposed of, and hence the reasoning advanced by the gentleman may entirely fail.

Mr. LENROOT. That is true, in part. The gentleman is right about that. I had not thought of that; but that is not an argument against the adoption of my amendment. It is an argument against the adoption of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Dakota. Now, I want to call the attention of the Chair and the members of the committee to this proposition: If the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota be adopted without the amendment that I have proposed, it means that the House in passing this bill requires the Secretary of the Interior to designate lands of a character which, in his opinion, will require 640 acres on which to support a family——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. If the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota be adopted as proposed by him, it permits a homestead entry of 320 acres of land, upon the theory that that will support a family. Now, I submit to the gentleman that if a 320-acre tract is enough land upon which to support a family and enable the homesteader to make a living it ought not to be within this designation at all; and therefore, if this bill is to have a consistent purpose, no entry of 640 acres ought to be permitted unless the original entry and the additional entry can be used in conjunction with each other.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield for a moment?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Since the gentleman proposes to make it within a radius of 10 miles, would he not be willing to extend it and make it within a radius of 40 miles? I will give the gentleman my reason for asking that. Here is a man who writes me a letter. He occupies a homestead upon an irrigation project, and he says that he has now about 70 head of calves. He says he can not furnish enough feed for the calves from his small tract upon the irrigation project. He wants to go outside and get more land. He is not asking for a homestead; but would not the gentleman be willing, and would not the committee be willing to allow men who are situated as this man is to go out upon the range and locate grazing homesteads, so that they could find forage enough for their cattle? This man would have to go probably 50 miles before he could get to that point.

Mr. LENROOT. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Dakota and by myself would not take care of the case mentioned by the gentleman at all, because the land in the original entry must be of this character.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Would it satisfy the gentleman to modify his amendment so as to allow the taking of another entry of like kind within the same land district?

Mr. LENROOT. I do not think that ought to be so. There is a land district in California that is 200 miles across.

Mr. FERRIS. Of course we are going further than the Kinkaid Act went, and further than we went last year. If a man should make entries 11, 12, or 15 miles apart, the two homesteads could be used in conjunction.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; but a land district, as the gentleman knows, in some places in the West would cover hundreds of miles.

Mr. FERRIS. That might be.

Mr. LENROOT. In southern California I think there is one which is 200 miles across.

Mr. FERRIS. Would the gentleman have any objection to a limitation of 20 miles?

Mr. LENROOT. I have no objection to increasing it to 15 miles, but I do want to make the bill consistent to the theory, at least, that the two tracts of land would be used in conjunction with each other.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. There is one law with a limit of 20 miles; would not the gentleman accept that?

Mr. LENROOT. What law?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The law that we passed for Idaho or Utah.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; the colonization act.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; and it was deemed practicable in that act to colonize within 20 miles.

Mr. LENROOT. If the committee thinks this should be done, I would be willing to accept the 20-mile limit. But before that is accepted I want to call attention to another reason why this should be adopted: Unless there is a limitation made, I wonder if gentlemen realize that any man that took up a homestead in the East where there was a sand-barren or worthless land would be entitled to make an entry in the West, and the Land Office would be compelled to send an agent to examine the original entry, say, in any State in the East to determine whether or not he was entitled to the additional entry. That furnishes another reason why there should be some limitation of a right to the entryman.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin by making it 20 miles instead of 10 miles.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be an amendment of the third degree.

Mr. LENROOT. Very well, Mr. Chairman, I will accept it as a substitute.

Mr. MANN. I would like to hear the amendment reported.

Mr. FERRIS. It only changes the 10 miles to 20 miles. Mr. Chairman, I ask that all debate on this amendment and the section close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks that all debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, section 6, which was stricken out, was intended to cover this class of settlers—those still living on their lands, although they had made proof on them, who had no contiguous land that they could enter as additionals. That was stricken out. The gentleman from South Dakota introduced an amendment which went much further. It allowed any former entryman of lands of this character, whether he owned and lived on the land or not, to secure an additional entry to make up the 640 acres. Clearly the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin is not in harmony with the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota, for his amendment would include, for instance, a man who had formerly had a homestead in South Dakota and who wanted to take a homestead in Montana or Wyoming. It would affect a man having had a homestead in New Mexico who might want to take one in Colorado or Utah. It strikes me as being ridiculous to insert in that amendment a provision limiting a man to within 10 miles of his original entry which might have been a thousand miles away from where he is now living and wants to make entry.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that never in the history of the administration of the public-land affairs in this Government when we have conceded the right of a man to a noncontiguous additional entry have we placed any limitation thereon. You may just as well argue, if you please, that the original homestead act which placed the limitation at 160 acres carried with it the presumption that 160 acres was necessary to support a family, and that when you only gave a person a noncontiguous additional 40, 80, or 120 acres you were doing something that you ought not to do; that you were promoting speculation, and yet since March 2, 1889, there has existed on the statute books of this Nation an additional provision with relation to 160 acres under which a person can go into any State of the Union having vacant public lands and get the additional he is rightly entitled to. No voice has ever been raised on the floor of this House to say that the act of March 2, 1889, does not work rightly and justly. No man has said that that act promoted fraud.

Then in 1904 the Kinkaid Act was passed with a proviso that permits a man to take such an amount as when added to what he theretofore had does not exceed 640 acres, and in the almost 12 years that act has been the homestead law of western Nebraska no charge has been made that that additional entry permitted fraud. I want to say to you that you are unfair to the man now on the land; you are unfair to the man who went out on the land in good faith to build up a home for himself and his family when you limit him to any given number of miles, 20 miles or whatever it may be. If this original entry was of the kind contemplated by the act, I submit that it is fair to let the man go where he may to get the additional land.

I recall that about the time the exodus of young men to Canada was at its height Congress passed the three-year homestead law, and provided that the claimant should have a right to five months of absence from the land during each residential year. Now, our residential requirement on free homesteads prior to that time had been five years, and it is apparent that many who had read the Canadian public-land laws believed that the three-year residence provision on the north side of the boundary was attracting our people that way. The three-year residence requirement and a provision requiring only six months of residence each year had, for many years, been embraced in the Dominion public-land laws. Hence the act of June 6, 1912, was by way of meeting the terms of our competitor.

I think I am safe in saying that the provisions of section 6, which section was stricken out by the committee and the committee's action agreed to by the House, were very largely borrowed from the Canadian land laws, and that where, in the period of absence permitted under the three-year law, we lacked a month a year of the Canadian provision, section 6 went the Canadian's 1 mile better than their law. In Canada, in addition to a homestead, an entryman is entitled to a preemption, but if, because there is no contiguous vacant land, he is unable to secure a preemption, he is permitted to take what is known as a purchased homestead. With reference to that additional entry, or purchased homestead as it is called, I quote you from the Canadian public-land laws the following:

> If the land entered under this section is situated within a distance of not more than 9 miles from the entrant's homestead, in a direct line, exclusive of the width of road allowances crossed in the measurement, residence upon the homestead may be accepted as residence on the quarter section.

There, gentlemen of the House, is the Canadian provision, which, in my opinion, led to the offering of section 6 in the last Congress.

For several years I was a United States commissioner in one of the land districts in the district which I now have the honor to represent in this House. Later I was receiver of the land office in that land district for nearly two years. My experiences in hearing homestead proofs that were offered before me as commissioner convinced me that we do not recognize existing conditions in many of our requirements. I recall cases where a son or a daughter would have a homestead in close proximity to the parent or where other near relatives were located close to each other. In the case of parent and child, the parent usually had a good home and the child a shack, as we call the homestead house in the West. Everyone knows that the rule of life is that, for the most part, the child would stay at the home of the parent, and yet we require the child and his or her witnesses to swear that he or she has resided on his or her homestead continuously, and if somebody with personal spite sends an anonymous letter to a land office calling attention to the fact that the child lived a portion of the time at the home of the parent a special agent of the Land Department is soon hurrying around to file charges against the homestead proof of the child. That is also true of other near relatives, and the situation that I have explained to you is not an unusual one. It is well that in this matter we should turn again to the common-sense provisions of the Canadian public-land laws—the laws that have worked such a wonderful development for the prairies of the western Dominion:

> Permanent residence by an entrant upon a farm of an area of at least 80 acres, situate within a distance of 9 miles from his homestead in a direct line, exclusive of the width of road allowances crossed in the measurement and owned solely and occupied by him, or permanent residence on a farm of that area and so situate, owned solely and occupied by his father, mother, son, daughter, brother, or sister, and, in the event of the death of such owner or occupant, continued permanent residence on such farm shall be accepted as residence upon the homestead.

Let me call your attention to another of our unreasonable requirements, which causes perjury to be committed every time a three-year proof is made. The witnesses of the claimant are required, at final proof, to testify to the particular number of acres that were planted, giving crops and the specific yields for each of the years since claimant established residence. Now, if the witnesses were required to testify of their own personal knowledge as to the aggregate number of acres that a claimant had in crop each year they could do that truthfully; but I submit to you that not one witness in a thousand can, of his own personal knowledge, testify to specific crop acreages and yields of previous years. In scores, if not hundreds of cases, I have seen the claimant and his two witnesses stand on the walk or sit down on the step in front of the building in which my office, as commissioner, was located, and the claimant carefully explain to the witnesses just what he had raised each year and the acreage. In a great many cases the claimant would prepare a statement of acreages, crops, and yields each year, and from that statement the witnesses gave their testimony. It does not stand to reason that a witness, who may live several miles from the homestead entry of a person, will have investigated and charged his memory, each year, with just the crops that the claimant planted in each of his fields, the acreage of the crops, and the yields.

I trust that before our public lands are gone we may indeed get our public-land laws and regulations on a practical working

basis, that will be fair between man and man and recognize conditions as they exist in the field.

I am very much interested in the passage of this section grazing homestead bill, and I am of the opinion that a good many hundred thousand acres of rough land in western South Dakota will be entered thereunder.

My amendment was presented in good faith, in an honest effort to provide for people who of right ought to be provided for in this bill. The Lenroot amendment is a departure from our long-established practice in permitting additional entries and ought not to be adopted. The bill in itself is good, and I may be pardoned for trying to impress you with the idea that my amendment will make it better. After this measure has been enacted into a law I am confident that, in the years to come, there will be found scattered over an exceptionally large acreage of now unappropriated public domain in the West the homes of prosperous, contented, and happy people, who will have been given the benefit of an act which recognizes existing conditions.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan permit me to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma a question?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I have been cut down now to four minutes. If I have time, I will permit it later. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee somewhat new to these matters, I have been watching them with a great deal of interest, and I have been inclined to take this bill as meaning just what has been claimed for it, and what the bill says, that the purpose of it is to attract men to homes in the West. It having been found that 160 acres or 320 acres of land of a certain character are not sufficient to maintain the family, and therefore a home, it is here proposed to grant 640 acres. That is a whole lot of land of the kind that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] picked out for his homestead, but we are told that this is to be a different kind of land. It is now proposed, as I understand it, by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. GANDY], that any entryman under a former homestead law who desires may come in now and get enough more——

Mr. GANDY. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. GANDY. Of the kind.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; of the kind. Unless the land is of the kind covered by section 1, it ought not to be granted under this act, and section 1 says that the land to be granted shall be of such a character that 640 acres are reasonably required for the support of a family. The Gandy amendment is such that a man having received 160 acres of the land covered here—I do not know what he would want of it—but having received it and given it up or sold it, he is now to be permitted to come in, having disposed of the 160 acres, be it valuable or otherwise, and get 480 acres; or, if before he has 320 acres, he is to come in now and get 320 acres of a character that 640 is necessary to support a family. What is he going to do with it? He can not support a family, because it is of that character that 640 acres is the least amount that can support a family. What will he do? Naturally he is going to abandon it and turn it over to somebody else, and if there are land barons or cattle barons in the West—and there seems to be some dispute, for my friend from Idaho [Mr. MCCRACKEN] says there are—then that is going not to make a home which you desire, but it is going to swell the acres of your land baron or your cattle baron, and I think that is the purpose of your bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. NORTON].

Mr. MANN. Let us have it reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FERRIS) there were—ayes 56, noes 10.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I now desire to offer an amendment, as I stated to the chairman of the committee at the time he limited debate. I move to amend by inserting in the Gandy amendment, after the word "acres," the words:

Provided said entryman owns and resides upon the land so formerly acquired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the Gandy amendment by inserting, after the word "acres," the following:

"Provided said entryman owns and resides upon the land so formerly acquired."

Mr. FERRIS. He can not live in two places, and we prefer him to earn a subsequent entry by living upon it.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am trying to fix it so that he will have enough land on which to maintain a family.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAMTON) there were—ayes 19, noes 37.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. NORTON] as amended by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. STAFFORD) there were—ayes 56, noes 2.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That any homestead entryman of lands of the character herein described, who has not submitted final proof upon his existing entry, shall have the right to enter, subject to the provisions of this act, such amount of contiguous lands designated for entry under the provisions of this act as shall not, together with the amount embraced in his original entry, exceed 640 acres, and residence upon the original entry shall be credited on both entries, but improvements must be made on the additional entry equal to $1.25 for each acre thereof.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. A good deal has been said in this debate about people acquiring agricultural homesteads and making a living for their families. My observation in the agricultural regions has led me to believe that the greatest difficulty the American farmer confronts to-day is finding a prompt and adequate market ready for what he raises. I am glad that the present administration is to be credited with an extension of the parcel post provisions by which the American farmer may have a little better market for his produce.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman consider that in the administration of the rural-delivery service the present practice by which a man's mail box is half a mile from the farmhouse constitutes another improvement?

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman hardly expects an answer to that.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is a serious question, if the gentleman is talking about the benefits of the parcel post on the farm.

Mr. BORLAND. I would be glad to answer that. I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read as a part of my remarks, the recent improvements in marketing farm produce, which may be of interest to these gentlemen who are interested in the establishment of homes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order, in that he is not discussing the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to proceed in order.

Mr. BORLAND. I do not know it appears I am out of order until the matter has been read, and I think it is germane to this statement.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's statement makes it out of order. I appeal to the gentleman not to introduce such extraneous matters now. We are not making progress——

Mr. BORLAND. I will say to the gentleman I do not think I am introducing extraneous matters; I think I am entirely within the limits of debate on this bill, and I have not taken a great deal of time on it. I ask unanimous consent to insert it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, let me say we have been putting in all day long on one section of this bill, and for heaven's sake let us get along, otherwise it will take us all winter to pass this one bill; and I hope that members of the committee will confine their talk at least to the bill itself——

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have no personal responsibility for the length of time taken in this debate.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. And there is a desire to get this bill through.

Mr. NORTON. Is it the gentleman's purpose to tell us how the Postmaster General is going to supply the Postal Service to all these homes?

Mr. BORLAND. I might regard that as extraneous to the debate, but I should be very glad to discuss it. I think the article can be read in less time than it takes to discuss the matter.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I will say to the gentleman that if we introduce questions with reference to the parcel post, rural free-delivery routes, we may talk on it until we are blue in the face and not get any further along. It is a very tender subject—perhaps the gentleman may not be aware of it——

Mr. BORLAND. I have no doubt it is a very tender subject. I ask unanimous consent to insert it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the Clerk may read the document in his time.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert it as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to insert the articles as part of his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The articles are as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star, Jan. 13, 1916.]

TRY A FARM-TO-TABLE PLAN—PARCEL POST WILL BRING HOUSEWIFE AND FARMER TOGETHER.

W. N. Collins, acting postmaster, has won recognition from Washington on his efforts to make the parcel post a farm-to-table servant. By special order of Postmaster General Burleson he has been given authority to become a clearing house between the farm and the city, bringing producer and consumer together.

In results it is perhaps the biggest thing the department has done since establishing the parcel-post service, Mr. Collins believes.

Here is what it will do: The farmers, most especially those within the 150-mile zone of Kansas City, will write in giving a list of the produce they have to sell. This will be printed on a list, issued at frequent intervals. The city housewife who asks for this list may have it mailed to her and she may write direct to the producer to order. The carriers will distribute these lists to the homes if the voluntary demand does not prove sufficient.

Thus consumer and producer are introduced. If the producer wishes, the product may be sent C. O. D. for an extra charge of 10 cents, and the Post Office Department will collect and return the money.

"Few persons realize how cheaply they might have fresh vegetables, fruit, butter, eggs, meat, lard, sorghum, and many other farm products direct from the farm," Mr. Collins said. "The carriage charges are very light. The rule is that within 150 miles the package is carried for just 4 cents more than the number of pounds. Thus a 10-pound ham would be carried for 14 cents. The C. O. D. charge, which insures the sender, would be the uniform one of 10 cents, thus bringing the total 10-pound cost up to 24 cents."

Mr. Collins will get a list of the farmers by bulletins sent to the country post offices. All mail for this service should be addressed:

"Postmaster, Kansas City, Mo., Farm to Table."

[From the Kansas City Star, Jan. 14, 1916.]

LINKING FARM AND TABLE—W. N. COLLINS'S PARCEL-POST PLAN BEGINS WITH A RUSH—CITY DWELLERS WILL KNOW THE DELIGHTS OF REAL COUNTRY PRODUCTS UNDER THE NEW SYSTEM, THE POSTMASTER SAYS.

W. N. Collins, acting postmaster, admitted to-day he was not entirely unselfish in his farm-to-table parcel-post bulletin service.

"Did you ever eat a real country-cured hog jowl, cooked with turnip greens?" he asked. "Or, better still, did you ever eat a piece of sugar-cured hickory-smoked ham? If you haven't, one of the joys of life is yet before you.

"You will never know real cured meat until the aroma of a hickory-smoked ham fills your home like a perfume and you have lingered over its taste. I will confess I have not known these joys as often as I would like, but if this new bulletin service proves as effective as I anticipate I will be able to speak on the authority of something more definite than a remote memory."

THE INQUIRIES COMING IN.

Mr. Collins also had something to say about the delights of country sausage made up without filler or preservative and flavored with sage.

"So, you see, we hope this service will not only reduce the cost of living, but add to its joy," he said.

The first day of the new service following the announcement in the Star brought very satisfactory results. Nine inquiries came in, five from city residents who wanted to buy and the other four from Clay Center, Osawatomie, and Topeka, Kans., and Woodland, Mo., from those offering to sell.

The first inquiry was from W. B. Laughlin, president of the National Detective Agency. Mr. Laughlin said to-day he has been buying some produce from the farm and getting it cheaper and fresher, but is not able to get all he wants from his present correspondents. He predicts that the service will fill a very definite want and aid in reducing the high cost of living, besides furnishing a market to certain farm products which are otherwise often allowed to go to waste.

A PRINTED BULLETIN SOON.

Yesterday's mail from the farms brough offers to furnish butter, eggs, dressed turkeys, hens, spring chickens, guineas, ducks, geese, and "apple juice, unfermented." One writer, from the quantities of fresh eggs he offers to furnish, evidently is a country grocer.

As soon as enough producers have written to make a good list Mr. Collins will print a bulletin for distribution to consumers in this city who ask for them. All letters should be addressed:

"Postmaster, Farm to Table, Kansas City, Mo."

[From the Kansas City Star, Jan. 15, 1916.]

BIG OPENING FOR FARMERS—THE MARKETING BY PARCEL POST PLAN BRINGS RESPONSE—IN A LETTER TO POSTMASTER COLLINS FROM HUMBOLDT, KANS., J. S. LEHMAN PROPOSES TO ORGANIZE THE WHOLE COUNTY TO SUPPLY PRODUCE.

A proposition to have a whole county take up farm-to-table marketing by parcel post has been made to W. N. Collins, acting postmaster, by J. S. Lehman, of Humboldt, Kans.

"This proposition looks good to me," Mr. Lehman writes, "as this county is well organized with farm organizations on the cooperative plan. I believe a splendid business could be built up along this line. If I can get your cooperation to start the movement, I will carry the proposition right into the farm organization."

Mr. Collins has met the suggestion very favorably. He is willing to list every farmer in the county if they request it, or he would be glad to cooperate with any organization of producers that might handle the proposition under one name, providing inspection and a guaranty of quality.

FOLLOW FRUIT GROWERS' PLAN.

The various fruit-growing associations follow the plan of requiring a certain standard and quality of product before it will be sent out, and it goes out under a standard label guaranteeing it. Such a plan as this might be adopted with poultry, eggs, butter, fruit, vegetables, and meat sold by parcel post, Mr. Collins believes.

Mr. Collins is very much pleased with the response to the announcement of the new bulletin service. Letters are arriving from producers and consumers in about equal proportions and are filed in a special filing case for the purpose.

Yesterday fruit cake and sausage were added to the list of products offered.

A LIST OUT SOON.

A printed list of all the producers and what they offer will not be issued for several days, until a sufficient number have written in. It is Mr. Collins's plan to leave the name on the list for about 30 days, and then drop it unless the producer writes in that he has not yet secured customers and wants his name continued.

Emphasis is being laid on the fact that the new service to prove a success must be based on honest and square dealing, and the farmer must offer a bargain price, otherwise the consumer will buy from the corner grocery, which is done without the trouble of writing letters and sending checks or money orders, and where replacement for poor goods can always be secured.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 22, strike out the words "lands of the character herein described" and insert "nonirrigable land which does not contain merchantable timber."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, if we want to make this bill a real benefit to the men already on the ground in the country to which it applies, we must modify the bill by striking out the words "of lands of the character herein described." The present homesteader in these States who has land of the character described in the bill adjacent to his homestead is on land which, it is true, is of a somewhat similar character, but having made entry under a 160 or 320 acre homestead law, having been able to cultivate some of his land, I think it quite likely that the Secretary will hesitate to designate such present entries, many of them at least, as coming under this act. If that be true, then this section and the following section will be of very little benefit to anyone. My amendment provides that the original entry shall not be irrigable, shall not contain merchantable timber. Now, if the original entry be not irrigable and does not contain merchantable timber, in the nature of things it must be approximately of the character of the land described in the bill, and yet it may be land some part of which the entryman is farming, and successfully farming, and therefore might not be designated. I fear that in carrying out the provisions of the act the agents of the Interior Department will hold that they can not consistently declare with regard to many of those entries upon which men are now living that it would require 640 acres of such land to support a family, although as a fact that would be in a general way entirely true. We are accomplishing by the amendment I propose what we should seek to accomplish, not to give the man who has timbered areas or irrigable lands an additional entry, but to give those who have lands of this character adjacent to their original entries an opportunity to enter without being compelled to prove that the lands they would occupy are clearly embraced in all the definitions of this bill.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of five minutes debate be closed on this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to afford additional homes in the West. That is the reason that our western friends have asked for it, but as we proceed section by section in the consideration of the bill it has become more and more evident that, as to some of them at least, it is not additional homes that they want in the West, but additional land for the men now there.

Mr. MONDELL. Might I ask my friend this question?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The provision as it stands does not make any additional homes; the gentleman knows that. My provision does not change that feature of the section at all. It simply allows a larger number of people in the country to avail themselves of the provisions of the bill. The gentleman should not be unfair in his statements.

Mr. LENROOT. I did not want to be unfair, and was not.

Mr. MONDELL. Then, when the gentleman says that we are not after additional homes, I desire to suggest to him that the section does not provide for it.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not yield further. Let us see. Under the amendment of the gentleman, if it is adopted, the land

originally entered might be 160 acres or might be 320 acres that would support not only one family, but five families—neither nonirrigable nor containing merchantable timber.

That is the only condition, and yet the gentleman would permit that kind of an entryman to get 480 acres additional or 320 acres additional. Does not that mean more land? While the purpose of the language in the bill is just this, that where there is an entryman now upon land of this character and he will not be able to stay there and live unless he has more land, then we propose to give him an additional acreage if it is contiguous, so as to enable him to stay there and support his family, while the gentleman proposes to take away from the public domain land that might be entered by home seekers and give it to one who does not need it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That persons who have submitted final proof upon, or received patent for, lands of the character herein described under the homestead laws, and who own and reside upon the land so acquired, may, subject to the provisions of this act, make additional entry for and obtain patent to contiguous lands designated for entry under the provisions of this act, which, together with the area theretofore acquired under the homestead law, shall not exceed 640 acres, on proof of the expenditure required by this act on account of permanent improvements upon the additional entry.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out of lines 7 and 8 the words "lands of the character herein described" and insert in lieu thereof "nonirrigable lands which do not contain merchantable timber."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MONDELL. It is exactly the same amendment I offered to the other section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, in lines 7 and 8, the words "lands of the character herein described" and insert "nonirrigable lands which do not contain merchantable timber."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, neither this section——

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield just a moment?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of five minutes debate close on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] asks unanimous consent that at the end of five minutes, debate be closed on this paragraph. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Neither this section nor the preceding section will make any more homes than are now established. They were not expected to; they are not intended to. But under the provisions of this section as they stand, my opinion is that there will not be one entryman out of a hundred in the region affected by this bill, now holding an entry and having lands of this character adjacent to it, that will receive the benefits of this section. Where men have gone onto lands heretofore under the 320-acre homestead law, although they are practically the same kind of land that will be entered under this law, where men have gone onto such lands in that country under the 160-acre law, although their lands may be essentially the same character of lands that are contemplated under this act, the agents of the Secretary will be very loath in the majority of such cases, in my opinion, to say that of such lands it requires 640 acres to support a family.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has said the amendment would allow a man having 160 or 320 acres of land that would support five or six families to still secure more land. The gentleman is not as familiar with the land, nonirrigable and not containing merchantable timber, that has been recently entered in this region as some of us are, and I doubt if he could find anywhere in the whole region affected by the bill a single, solitary, nonirrigable tract having lands of this character adjacent to it upon which you could support in very considerable comfort one family, much less three or four or five. My amendment is simply intended to give the opportunity which it assumes to give, which it pretends to give, which it holds out the hope of giving, and which it does not give, and which in its administration will prove to have been a false hope. Do not let gentlemen imagine they can sit here and legislate for their constituents as we are legislating in these two sections without their constituents analyzing what they do and realizing what its effect is to be.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from New Mexico?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. According to the gentleman's argument, if a man has taken up 320 acres under the act of 1909, or 160 acres, and has improved it, and developed water on his original homestead, he can not take an additional entry?

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will allow me, I will answer his question. My provision is very plain. If the land he has is not irrigable and does not contain merchantable timber, he can secure the addition. Under the provision in the bill he must further prove to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the land in his original entry will not support a family on less than 160 acres. It may be they will not, but it will be another thing to convince the department of that fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That in the event there are not contiguous lands in area sufficient to complete an entry of 640 acres, as provided for in this act, the entryman or patentee shall have the right to enter within a radius of 10 miles from his first entry, subject to the same requirements as specified for contiguous additional entries, lands in reasonably compact form which have been designated for entry under the provisions of this act, that shall, together with the first entry, not exceed 640 acres: *Provided*, That the entryman shall be required to enter all contiguous areas open to entry prior to the entry of any noncontiguous land.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 4, by striking out lines 17 to 25, inclusive, and, on page 5, by striking out lines 1, 2, and 3, inclusive, comprising section 6.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this bill was passed in the last Congress under a suspension of the rules, running over my dead body, or live body, whatever it was. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORTON. No; it is quite alive.

Mr. MANN. Now, the committee comes in with about a dozen material amendments to the bill, one of them striking out a section which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] a while ago said the department stated would be almost ruinous to the public-land interests of the country.

Here is a bill that in the last Congress might have been called up on any day when the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Appropriations did not seek the floor and it was not Calendar Wednesday. Yet the committee went along and waited until toward the end of the session, and then, by instruction of the committee, a member of it moved to suspend the rules and pass the bill with 20 minutes' debate on a side and no chance to offer an amendment.

I want to take the opportunity now of congratulating the committee and the chairman that at this time in the session they were willing to take the House into their confidence, at least to the extent of trusting the House to make amendments.

Mr. MONDELL. They can not help themselves.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Wyoming says they can not help themselves. They might have waited this time until toward the end of the session or of the Congress and then said, "Here is a bill that we must pass. It can only be done under a suspension of the rules." It would not be the first time that an able committee had worked that racket and got away with it, as this committee did the last time. This time I am glad the committee has trusted the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That any person who is the head of a family, or who has arrived at the age of 21 years and is a citizen of the United States, who has entered or acquired under the homestead laws prior to the passage hereof lands of the character described in this act the area of which is less than 640 acres, and who is unable to exercise the right of additional entry herein conferred because no lands subject to entry under this act adjoin the tract so entered or acquired or lie within the 10-mile limit provided for in this act, may, upon submitting proof that he resides upon and has not sold or encumbered the land so entered or acquired, relinquish or reconvey to the United States the land so occupied, entered, or acquired, and in lieu thereof, within the same land-office district, may enter and acquire title to 640 acres of the land subject to entry under this act, but must show compliance with all the provisions of this act respecting the new entry and with all the provisions of existing homestead laws except as modified herein: *Provided*, That the lands so relinquished or reconveyed as herein provided shall thereafter be subject to disposition only on such terms and under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Page 5, line 4, strike out the figure "7" and insert the figure "6."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 5, lines 12 and 13, by striking out the words "or lie within the ten-mile limit provided for in this act."

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, on that amendment I would like to say a word. That amendment was stricken out on the theory that section 6 should be stricken out of the bill. The Mondell amendment changed the amendment from a 10 to a 20 mile limit, and I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be disagreed to, and move——

Mr. MANN. The gentleman should move an amendment of the text.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes. I move, Mr. Chairman, an amendment of the text. On page 5, line 12, strike out the word "ten" and insert "twenty."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 12, in the matter proposed to be stricken out, strike out the word "ten" and insert the word "twenty," so that it will read "twenty-mile limit."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the committee amendment be not agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 5, line 14, by striking out the words "or encumbered."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 15, after the word "acquired," insert the words "and against which land there are no encumbrances."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. That the commutation provisions of the homestead laws shall not apply to any entries made under this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 3, strike out the figure "8" and insert the figure "7."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That any homestead entrymen or patentees who shall be entitled to additional entry under this act shall have, for 30 days after the designation of lands subject to entry under the provisions of this act and contiguous to those entered or owned and occupied by him, the preferential right to make additional entry as provided in this act: *Provided*, That where such lands contiguous to the lands of two or more entrymen or patentees entitled to additional entries under this section are not sufficient in area to enable such entrymen to secure by additional entry the maximum amounts to which they are entitled, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make an equitable division of the lands among the several entrymen or patentees, applying to exercise preferential rights, such division to be in tracts of not less than 40 acres, and so made as to equalize as nearly as possible the area which such entrymen and patentees will acquire by adding the tracts embraced in additional entries to the lands originally held or owned by them: *Provided further*, That where but one 40-acre tract of vacant land may adjoin the lands of two or more entrymen or patentees entitled to exercise preferential right hereunder, the tract in question may be entered by the person who first submits to the local land office his application to exercise said preferential right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Page 6, line 6, strike out the figure "9" and insert the figure "8."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Page 6, line 8, strike out the word "thirty" and insert the word "ninety."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Page 6, line 20, after the word "acres," insert the words "or other legal subdivision."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Page 6, line 25, strike out the words "forty acre" and insert the word "such."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, we have just inserted the words "or other legal subdivision." What does that mean—where there is a short 40 or a plus 40?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. In many places in the West they have had two or three Government surveys, and in the new plats the land is now designated by lots. These lots are not 40 acres. They may be 17.50 acres or almost any other number of acres, usually less than 40 acres, and yet they are legal subdivisions.

Mr. MANN. How much do they contain?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. They contain any amount of land from a fraction of an acre to as high as 50 acres. They are of all sizes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says they are of all sizes. Are any of them as much as 100 acres?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; I have seen a few of 80 acres, but that is very seldom.

Mr. MANN. It occurs to me that if there were two men, each entitled to take an extra piece of ground, it would be hardly fair to give one of them 80 acres and the other nothing. Originally that was provided for in the bill, but the way it reads now it is not.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Ninety-nine times out of a hundred a lot is less than 40 acres.

Mr. FERRIS. Is it not always so?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No. I have seen a case where a man's ranch has been set off to himself, where he owned all of the land, just making one big lot in one piece; but, I think, that never or very seldom occurs when it is public land.

Mr. FERRIS. These lots occur in the bends of rivers, on correction lines, on meridian lines, and on base lines, where there have been double and triple surveys.

Mr. MANN. Sometimes they do and sometimes they do not. Unfortunately I own some land, and have had some experience in that matter.

Mr. FERRIS. I think a lot is always less than 40 acres. If it is more than 40 acres, the additional acreage becomes another fractional 40.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is incorrect about that. I presume, though, it would not make very much difference.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment which has been read.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. That any person who has heretofore acquired title to land of the character designated in this act under any of the homestead laws of the United States and who is the owner and occupant of the land so acquired may purchase from the United States not exceeding 320 acres of stock-raising lands, as designated by this act, or unappropriated and unreserved lands valuable only for grazing contiguous to his said homestead, upon paying to the United States the sum of $1.25 per acre for such lands, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, which said land, together with the area theretofore acquired under the homestead laws, shall not exceed 640 acres.

The following committee amendment was read:

Page 7, line 5, strike out the figures "10," and insert the figure "9."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "land of the character designated in this act," and insert in lieu thereof the word "lands."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, this section is intended to give the homesteader an opportunity to purchase some grazing land. That opportunity should be afforded to the homesteader without regard to the character of the land on which he lives. A homesteader having 80 acres of irrigable land, or even 120 acres of irrigable land, needs pasture just as badly, and sometimes needs it worse, if he is a good farmer, than the farmer on lands of this character. The homesteader who has a little wood lot on his present holding should not be barred, by reason of the ownership of that wood lot, from buying from Uncle Sam, at all it is worth, 320 acres or less of land for pasture purposes. This is a very excellent provision of this bill. In the West there are many regions where the homesteads are in the valleys, and the rough lands of the hills have not been taken. There is nothing needed so badly as the right to secure

a little of that rough land for pasture purposes. Men buy them sometimes under the timber and stone act, but if there is considerable timber on the land the department puts a price on it that the entryman can not afford to pay. If there is no timber on the land, the department says that it does not come under the provisions of the law. So under the present laws it is difficult for the settlers to secure such land except under the bill which the gentleman from Colorado sponsored a few years ago under which settlers hoped that they would be able to get rough mountainous land not valuable for pasture purposes; but the administration under that law has been such as the gentlemen from the West know that settlers have secured very little land under it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is what I was going to ask the gentleman about. If we could induce the Interior Department to liberalize its construction of the isolated tract law, would it not relieve the situation a good deal?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; but that would not meet all of the cases, because these pasture lands are not all mountainous lands; they are often, however, broken and rocky, sometimes quite smooth.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. The purpose of the gentleman's amendment is to furnish the homesteader on irrigation projects an opportunity to get some grazing land.

Mr. MONDELL. That is one of the beneficial purposes that would be served where they are so located that they could avail themselves of it.

Mr. BORLAND. Would it not be well to limit the amendment to these irrigation projects?

Mr. MONDELL. No; that is not my purpose. While there are only one or two Government irrigation projects in a State, there are homesteaders all over these vast areas in the public-land States, and the homesteader frequently wants above all things, particularly if he has dairy cows, a little pasture; he needs it more than anything else. Many are so situated that they could not avail themselves of the homestead provisions of the bill and could make the purchase here contemplated.

Mr. BORLAND. The difficulty that the settler is laboring under is that the department has power to limit his homestead to a very small quantity, less than the average homestead, and in some cases to 40 acres. I think the policy is to limit them to 40 acres or less, and it is that homesteader that needs relief. But the homesteader under the general law is not so much in need.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, he is very much in need; I think more so than the settler on the irrigation project, because the settler on the irrigation project generally has a market, and it is not absolutely necessary that he shall have pasture land, whereas a settler on nonirrigable land, frequently a long distance away from a railroad, does need additional pasture in order to be able to turn out his work horses and in order that he may keep a few head of stock.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that all debate close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill on the whole, and I am in favor of any public-land legislation which will contribute in any way to placing upon the public lands more actual homestead settlers. I am not, however, in favor of legislation which will tend to place the ownership of more of the public lands in the hands of what we term out West "sidewalk farmers." This entire section, I believe, should be stricken out, and for this reason: As it now stands it provides that one who has acquired title to land of the character of land described in section 2 of this act, and who owns the land and occupies it—which does not mean that he resides on it, but merely has a proprietary interest in the land—may purchase for $1.25 an acre an additional amount of land, which, together with his first entry, will make not to exceed 640 acres. I am opposed to the amendment and shall later offer an amendment to strike out the section. The amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming will not contribute to the establishment of new homes on these lands. It will not in any way contribute to placing more actual settlers on these lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NORTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota moves to strike out the section.

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

SEC. 11. That all entries made and patents issued under the provisions of this act shall be subject to and contain a reservation to the United States of all the coal and other minerals in the lands so entered and patented, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same. The coal and other mineral deposits in such lands shall be subject to disposal by the United States in accordance with the provisions of the coal and mineral land laws in force at the time of such disposal. Any person qualified to locate and enter the coal or other mineral deposits, or having the right to mine and remove the same under the laws of the United States, shall have the right at all times to enter upon the lands entered or patented, as provided by this act, for the purpose of prospecting for coal or other mineral therein, provided he shall not injure, damage, or destroy the permanent improvements of the entryman or patentee, and shall be liable to and shall compensate the entryman or patentee for all damages to the crops on such lands by reason of such prospecting. Any person who has acquired from the United States the coal or other mineral deposits in any such land, or the right to mine and remove the same, may reenter and occupy so much of the surface thereof as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the coal or other minerals, first, upon securing the written consent or waiver of the homestead entryman or patentee; second, upon payment of the damages to crops or other tangible improvements to the owner thereof, where agreement may be had as to the amount thereof; or, third, in lieu of either of the foregoing provisions, upon the execution of a good and sufficient bond or undertaking to the United States for the use and benefit of the entryman or owner of the land, to secure the payment of such damages to the crops or tangible improvements of the entryman or owner, as may be determined and fixed in an action brought upon the bond or undertaking in a court of competent jurisdiction against the principal and sureties thereon, such bond or undertaking to be in form and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior and to be filed with and approved by the register and receiver of the local land office of the district wherein the land is situate, subject to appeal to the Commissioner of the General Land Office: *Provided*, That all patents issued for the coal or other mineral deposits herein reserved shall contain appropriate notations declaring them to be subject to the provisions of this act with reference to the disposition, occupancy, and use of the surface of the land.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Page 7, line 19, strike out the figures "11" and insert the figures "10."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

On page 9, lines 13 and 14, strike out the words "of the surface."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Page 9, line 14, insert after the word "land" the following: "as permitted to an entryman under this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall not offer an amendment to this section, because it is evident that no amendment offered would be adopted; but I want to call attention to the fact that under the provisions of this section the homesteader secures no pay whatever for the land that may be reentered and occupied by the mining operator. The land so reentered and occupied for mining purposes might be the major portion of his entry in some cases, and yet there is no provision in the bill for payment for the land itself. The committee has adopted in a way and to a certain extent the very carefully thought out provisions contained in the laws providing for the agricultural entry, first of coal, later of oil and phosphate land, but the committee has not followed that legislation carefully enough to preserve all of its very excellent provisions, and therefore, under the provision as it appears in the bill, part of it taken from the original bill introduced by me for the protection of those who had already gone on the land, partly taken from the bill for the agricultural entry of coal lands, and partly new, the entryman is left without any payment whatever for lands that the miner may take. I am inclined to think that the committee did not intend that, but that is the effect of the section.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, on page 7, lines 24 and 25, and on page 8 this law is made subject to all of the three surface-entry bills that we have passed, and those three laws provide for damage and everything else.

Mr. MONDELL. Where is that?

Mr. FERRIS. On page 7, lines 24 and 25:

The coal and other mineral deposits in such lands shall be subject to disposal by the United States in accordance with the provisions of the coal and mineral land laws in force at the time of such disposal.

Mr. MONDELL. Those are not the so-called limited-entry laws, affecting the limited entryman, but the laws affecting the miner.

Mr. FERRIS. The three surface-entry acts already passed. They are the laws already referred to.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is entirely mistaken, and, further, I wish he would not call the laws he refers to surface-

entry laws, for they are not. They convey fee titles. They give the owner much more than the surface; they give him all except the body of the reserved mineral.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Page 9, after line 14, insert the following as a new section:

"SEC. 11. That lands containing water holes or other bodies of water needed or used by the public for watering purposes shall not be designated under this act but may be reserved under the provisions of the act of June 25, 1910, and such lands heretofore or hereafter reserved shall be kept and held open to the public use for such purposes under such general rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, designate as stock driveways and withhold from entry under this act lands not over one-fourth mile in width needed for use in the movement of stock to summer and winter ranges or to shipping points."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill favorably with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COX, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 407) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. MCCRACKEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks on this bill in the RECORD by inserting two letters which I have.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who have spoken on the enlarged homestead bill have the right to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. GANDY] may have permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to any gentleman who wants it.

Mr. FERRIS. And I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects to the first request.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. GANDY], the gentleman from California [Mr. CHURCH], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], and myself may have permission to extend our remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. POWERS was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the following cases, no adverse reports having been made thereon:

George W. Peters (H. R. 13475, 14481), Sixty-third Congress;
N. Ellen Peters (H. R. 13476), Sixty-third Congress;
Joseph Roach (H. R. 5548), Sixty-third Congress;
William Pace (H. R. 13083), Sixty-third Congress;
Isam W. Foley (H. R. 1477), Sixty-third Congress;
William G. Pennington (H. R. 12785, 13084), Sixty-third Congress;
Owen A. Block (H. R. 5543), Sixty-third Congress;
Robert Strong (H. R. 5551), Sixty-third Congress;
Wiley T. Cook;
Nathan Blanton;
Sarah Scott (H. R. 5550), Sixty-third Congress;
Jacob G. Robinson (H. R. 20888), Sixty-third Congress;
Nathan Lawson;
James H. Buckner;
Francis M. Sexton;
J. W. Hardwick (H. R. 15887), Sixty-third Congress; and
Amos Bennett (H. R. 22505), Sixty-third Congress.

JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (H. DOC. NO. 594).

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States, which was read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the reports of the clerk and chief probation officer of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia for the two years ending June 30, 1915, together with a letter of transmittal from the judge of said court.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1916.*

The SPEAKER. Referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and the message is ordered to be printed without the accompanying documents.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. HELM was granted leave of absence on account of the death of a relative.

CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF RURAL POST ROADS.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the United States may, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction of roads.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, with Mr. RUCKER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, for the present I object.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the committee rose; the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RUCKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7617), and had directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 19, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting supplement to annual report for the fiscal year 1915, embodying a report upon the litigation over withdrawn oil lands of the United States (H. Doc. No. 593), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6241) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act amending the franchise granted to H. P. Bald-

win, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, and now held under assignment to the Island Electric Co. (Ltd.), by extending it to include the Makawao district on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, etc., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 56), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2) for the coinage of a McKinley souvenir silver dollar, in commemoration of the erection of a memorial to William McKinley, late President of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 55), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5939) for the relief of Edward H. Dennison; Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 1211) granting a pension to Anna M. Healey; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 9315) making an appropriation toward the construction of a dry dock at the Portsmouth Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 9316) authorizing the establishment of a plant at or near Toledo, Ohio, for the manufacture of munitions and implements of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WARD: A bill (H. R. 9317) providing for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a post-office building at Monticello, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9318) to establish a naval academy at some point in the State of Washington to be designated by the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9319) providing for a survey of Carolina Beach Pier, in New Hanover County, N. C., with a view to making same navigable; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9320) authorizing insurance companies and fraternal beneficiary societies to file bills of interpleader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 9321) to place on the retired list of the Army the names of the surviving officers who were mustered out under the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 15, 1870, in reduction of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 9322) for the construction of a public building at St. Johns, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9323) to regulate and control the manufacture, sale, and use of weights and measures, and to be known as the weights and measures act; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 9324) authorizing the President of the United States to commission the commanding general and the adjutant general of the militia of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 9325) providing for the re-leasing of certain lands in the Osage Indian Reservation in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 9326) to pay the balance due to the loyal Creek Indians on the award made by the Senate on the 16th day of February, 1903; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 9327) to require the Washington Terminal Co. to erect, construct, operate, and maintain booths or sheds for the comfort and convenience of the ticket inspectors or collectors employed in the Union Railroad or Terminal Station in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 9328) creating an Army reserve; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 9329) to establish rural free-delivery mail service and rural free-delivery routes, and to fix salaries of rural free-delivery carriers, and schedules of service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9330) to establish a military academy at some point in the State of Washington to be designated by the Secretary of War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 9331) to provide for storing and cleaning imported Mexican peas, known as garbanzos; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HART: A bill (H. R. 9332) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act to amend section 4 of an act entitled 'An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia,'" approved March 9, 1908; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 108) authorizing the printing of 200,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. PARK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 109) authorizing the printing of 200,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LOBECK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 110) authorizing the printing of a revised edition of Senate Document No. 10, Sixty-second Congress, first session, known as the United States bankruptcy law, with amendments to date; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CURRY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring Federal aid for indigent, nonresident tuberculous patients cared for in hospitals which conform to the hygienic standards established by the United States Treasury Department; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relating to Federal aid for indigent persons afflicted with tuberculosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 9333) for the relief of the trustees of the Chestnut Grove Church, in Morgan County, Ala.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9334) for the relief of William Moseley, administrator; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9335) for the relief of Mrs. W. E. Crawford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9336) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Shannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9337) granting an increase of pension to John Dill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9338) authorizing the Secretary of War to confer upon Frank C. King the congressional medal of honor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9339) authorizing the Secretary of War to confer upon David Davis the congressional medal of honor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: A bill (H. R. 9340) for the relief of Nellie Gumb; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9341) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Edward I. Gallagher, administrator of Charles Gallagher, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 9342) granting an increase of pension to William A. Lyster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9343) for the relief of Edward L. Bell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 9344) granting a pension to Alice Yorker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9345) granting a pension to Joseph A. George; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9346) granting an increase of pension to Maria T. Fleming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9347) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide E. Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 9348) granting a pension to John Mason Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 9349) to execute the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the heirs of William Pollock, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9350) for the relief of J. W. Anderson; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CHARLES: A bill (H. R. 9351) granting a pension to Andrew Von Steenburgh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9352) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 9353) for the relief of Ira G. Kilpatrick and Guy D. Dill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CONNELLY: A bill (H. R. 9354) granting an increase of pension to Simeon D. Chelf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 9355) granting a pension to C. Jennie Stephens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 9356) granting a pension to Ann Dolan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 9357) granting an increase of pension to Benson C. Bellamy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 9358) granting an increase of pension to Martin L. Van Buren; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 9359) for the relief of Charles H. Van Etten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 9360) granting a pension to John B. Carmon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9361) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca J. Painter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 9362) granting an increase of pension to Augusta Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 9363) granting a pension to Nancy O. Putnam; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9364) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Thomson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 9365) authorizing the President to appoint John K. Hume a first lieutenant of Cavalry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 9366) granting a pension to Hannah Seward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HART: A bill (H. R. 9367) for the relief of the Orvil Cooperative Building & Loan Association; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 9368) granting an increase of pension to Walker Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOPWOOD: A bill (H. R. 9369) for the relief of Clyde R. Altman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 9370) for the relief of the heir of James M. Carter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULBERT: A bill (H. R. 9371) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Brennan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9372) for the relief of the estate of Peter Larsen, deceased, and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 9373) for the relief of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 9374) granting a pension to Mary C. Chapin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 9375) for the relief of J. M. Potter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9376) for the relief of E. W. Lemaster; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9377) for the relief of Cyntha Ramey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9378) for the relief of Ella Slone; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 9379) granting a pension to Louis L. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 9380) granting an increase of pension to David C. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9381) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Youngs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 9382) granting a pension to John George; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9383) granting a pension to Harry L. Kepler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 9384) granting an increase of pension to Jacob C. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9385) granting a pension to Annie L. Marksbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 9386) for the relief of the Henningsen Produce Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORTH: A bill (H. R. 9387) granting an increase of pension to Julia Ann Fyock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OAKEY: A bill (H. R. 9388) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9389) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Conley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 9390) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Sexton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 9391) granting an increase of pension to William R. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9392) granting an increase of pension to Alester D. Sly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 9393) granting a pension to Hannah M. Wilhite; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9394) granting an increase of pension to Marcus C. Cory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9395) granting an increase of pension to James Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9396) granting a pension to Louis B. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9397) granting an increase of pension to Richard Hudnall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 9398) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Velma C. Williams, administratrix of the estate of Paul Curtis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 9399) granting a pension to Elisha J. Catlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 9400) granting a pension to George W. Comer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 9401) for the relief of the American Express Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9402) for the relief of Sylvester Hannan, alias Henry Edwards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9403) granting a pension to Mary E. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 9404) for the relief of J. M. Gurley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9405) for the relief of the Mission Indians in California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 9406) granting an increase of pension to Francis C. Beckman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9407) granting an increase of pension to Amanda M. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 9408) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mary A. Youree, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of labor publicity organization, favoring printing of full report of the Walsh Industrial Relations Commission; to the Committee on Printing.

Also (by request), memorial of Missouri State mutual fire insurance companies, urging that the income tax be revised in relation to insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 9239, for special relief of William A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Commercial National Bank and Coshocton National Bank, of Coshocton, Ohio, against a stamp tax on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY: Memorial of Corporal Lucien D. Woodruff, jr., Camp No. 64, Department of Pennsylvania, United Spanish War Veterans at Johnstown, Pa., favoring national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Woodsock Woolen Mills, of Waterside, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 702—dyestuffs tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorials of Religious Society of Friends of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland; and Local Union No. 1386, United Mine Workers of America, Nanty Glo, Pa., protesting against national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the American Neutrality and Peace Convention at San Francisco, Cal., relative to violation of neutrality by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE: Petitions signed by 712 merchants and business men of the second congressional district of Wisconsin, asking for the passage of House bills 270 and 712, that legislation be enacted which will compel concerns selling goods direct to consumers entirely by mail, to contribute their portion of funds in the development of the local community, the county, and the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of Union Mills of Johnsville, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 702, for dyestuffs tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLINE: Petitions of 6 tradesmen of St. Joe, 3 of Spencerville, 5 of Woodburn, 6 of New Haven, and 8 of Warnersville, all in the State of Indiana, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petitions of merchants of Racine, Kenosha, and Waukesha, all in the State of Wisconsin, favoring taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: Petitions of boards of supervisors of Sacramento, San Joaquin, Contra Costa, and other counties of California, favoring law to preserve oil industry of California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of C. M. Goethe, of Sacramento, Cal., favoring establishment of a national-park bureau and the Grand Canyon, Mount Baker, and Sequoia National Park; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petitions of sundry trades people of New Jersey, favoring passage of House bill 702, for dyestuffs tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of Manhattan Camp, No. 1, New York, favoring the Key bill, H. R. 54; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of Western Retail Implement, Vehicle, and Hardware Association of Belleville, Kans., protesting against monopoly which is being formed for purpose of controlling sisal fiber output of Yucatan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Harry E. Brown Camp, No. 11, of North Platte, Nebr., favoring passage of the Key bill, H. R. 54; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of citizens of Willow Hill, Ill., favoring manufacture of war munitions and battleships; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREEMAN: Memorial of Automobile Club of Hartford, Conn., favoring passage of House bill 208; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of United National Association of Post Office Clerks, Branch No. 35, of New Haven, Conn., and Norwich Lodge, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, No. 430, favoring passage of bill pensioning aged clerks of Government; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petitions of Riverside Woolen Mills, of Stafford, Conn.; Assawaga Co., of Killingly; Avilu Mills, of Hanover, Conn.; Glengarry Mills, of Oakland, R. I.; Angus Parks Manufacturing Co., of East Glastonbury, Conn.; Cyril Johnson Woolen Co., of Stafford Springs, Conn.; Central Worsted Co., of Central Village, Conn., favoring passage of House bill 702, for dyestuffs tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of Mazon, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Society of American Wars, urging preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of Briggs Manufacturing Co., of Voluntown, Conn.; Radcliffe Bros., of Shelton, Conn.; and Davis & Quick, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 702, the dyestuffs bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Papers to accompany House bill 9280, granting a pension to Frank E. Putnam; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of St. Louis Chapter, American Institute of Architects, protesting against House bill 743, relative to building for Department of Justice; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LENROOT: Petitions of sundry citizens of the eleventh congressional district of Wisconsin, favoring passage of a bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Ashland, Wis., favoring the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petitions of W. N. Matthews & Bro., Twinplex Sales Co., and Lohrmann & Mynders, all of St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Associated Retailers of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of 93 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of the militia-pay bill as against the continental-army bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Shepard Norwell Co., of Boston, Mass.; Electrical Supply Jobbers' Association of Chicago, Ill.; the National Cigar Leaf Tobacco Association, of New York City; the John Deere Plow Co., of Kansas City, Mo.; the American Fair Trade League of New York City; the National Association of Piano Merchants of America, of Washington, D. C., all praying for the passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of the William Schotten Coffee Co., the Gardner Advertising Co., the Adam Roth Grocery Co., the Century Electric Co., the Twinplex Sales Co., W. N. Matthews & Bro., and the Lohrmann & Mynders Drug Co., all of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of John M. Lutz, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring an embargo on arms and other war material; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of Stenographers, Typewriters, Bookkeepers and Assistants' Association of Washington, favoring legislation to prevent the employment of child labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also (by request), petition of J. M. Mueller, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Charles Hegewald, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring an embargo on all war material; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of John Glovekner, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring an embargo on all war materials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of W. C. Gundelfinger, favoring an embargo on all war materials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Edgewater Finishing Co., John Blakeley & Son, Buck Hosiery Co., and General Processing Co., all of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring bill protecting manufacturers of dyestuffs in United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Charles Russ, Frederick Stein, Henry Kock, and 28 others, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against sale, etc., of arms and munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OAKEY: Memorial of United National Association of Post Office Clerks, Branch No. 35, of New Haven, Conn., relative to pension for superannuated civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Fred W. Bullman, of Waverly, N. Y., urging the organization of a citizens' army of 5,000,000 men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Elmer Brace, of Elmira Heights, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Hon. H. N. Hoffman, mayor; Chester Howell, Boyd McDowell, Jervis Langdon, Fred Bright, L. M. Wilde, William F. Doberstein, Dr. B. O. Chapman, and Francis E. Baldwin, all of Elmira, N. Y., in favor of a Federal censorship of motion pictures in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of Knights of Columbus, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Petition of sundry citizens of Knickerbocker, Tex., protesting against national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: Petition from the Easton Silk Dyeing & Finishing Co., for the passage of effective legislation to make the United States independent of any other nation for its supply of dyestuffs in time of peace and high explosives in time of war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of Alben & Walker and other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging legislation which will enable the United States to make its own dyestuffs and munitions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *January 19, 1916.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, look down with Thy fatherly pity and care and love upon us this day. In the midst of all the strife and turmoil of life we believe there is a hand of divine providence that guides the affairs of men. We would seek fellowship with Thee that we may be seen to live in harmony with the divine plan, not against God. All men are in Thy heart. Thou dost desire the happiness, Thou dost will the prosperity, of Thy children. Thou dost stand guard over the rights of men, and there is no respect of persons with Thee.

Give to us fellowship of humanity with a sense of our obligations to men, that we may under God's direction work out a nation's place whose ministry will be the ministry of a universal brotherhood. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

THE LIVE-STOCK INDUSTRY.

Mr. SMOOT. I have a telegram from Mr. Frank J. Hagenbarth, president of the National Wool Growers' Association, that I desire to have printed in the RECORD, as it refers to pending legislation. I do not ask that it be read.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

SALT LAKE, UTAH, *January 18, 1915.*

Senator REED SMOOT,
Washington, D. C.:

We yesterday wired WALSH, WARREN, Public Lands Committee of Senate, and MONDELL and Public Lands Committee of House, as follows:

"The National Wool Growers' Association has appointed a committee to meet a similar committee from the American National Live-Stock Association for the purpose of making recommendations relative to all public-land bills now before Congress. These recommendations can not be formulated before February 1, and we therefore respectfully request that no legislation affecting our public domain shall be enacted until we have had an opportunity to present our recommendations. We are not opposed to additional legislation, but as the largest users of the public domain feel that it is our duty to make certain recommendations to Congress. Will you therefore help delay legislation until these recommendations have been made?"

We received the following reply from WALSH to-day:

"Utterly impossible for me to comply with request of your telegram. Pending public-land legislation must have attention now or never. During session military and revenue legislation with shipping measure will crowd out everything else after February 1. Suggest you get here without delay."

Stockmen are not opposed to enlarged homestead law. On contrary, they favor such enactment surrounded by proper and practical safeguards. Stockmen do not contend for any supremacy on public domain, but demand as American citizens and taxpayers having some rights as such that they be heard by Public Lands Committee of Senate on legislation which seriously affects them. Every possible effort is being made to have proper committees representative of live-stock industry appear before Senate Lands Committee. Physically impossible to have such committees reach Washington before 1st of February. In view of situation we feel that request for such necessary reasonable delay should be granted, and we appeal to you in your representative capacity to take such consistent action as may be necessary in the premises. Please advise us promptly.

NATIONAL WOOL GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
F. J. HAGENBARTH, *President.*

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of Daniel H. Sawyer, of Plymouth, N. H., praying that mediation be proposed to the European belligerents, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the memorial of John W. Fowler, of Henniker, N. H., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Concord, N. H., and a petition of Dr. and Mrs. T. M. Dillingham, of Marlboro, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. BURLEIGH) presented a petition of Local Branch, Maine State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Auburn, Me., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KENYON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Iowa, praying for the placing of an embargo on munitions of war, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of the Earl Mutual Fire Insurance Co., of Earlville, Ill., praying for the exemption of farmers' mutual insurance companies from the provisions of the income-tax law, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of the Woman Suffrage Association of Stratford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of William McKinley Camp, No. 9, United Spanish War Veterans, of Norwalk, Conn., praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of the Broad Brook Co., of Broad Brook; the Russell Manufacturing Co., of Middletown; and the Ensign-Bickford Co., of Simsbury, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of the Eureka Paper Co., of Fulton, N. Y., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1810) for the relief of Johannes T. Jensen, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 48) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 1376) for the relief of Peter McKay, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 49) thereon.

Mr. ROBINSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3357) for the relief of Thomas Coyle and Bridget Coyle and their legal representatives, submitted an adverse report (No. 50) thereon, which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. HARDING, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2231) for the relief of Alice H. Gilson, submitted an adverse report (No. 51) thereon, which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 2696) to authorize the President to award a medal of honor to Dr. John T. Nagle for conspicuous bravery at the Battle of Kernstown, Va., on July 24, 1864, while serving as an acting assistant surgeon of the United States Army, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, which was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 6) authorizing issuance of patent for certain lands to Thomas L. Griffiths, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 52) thereon.

Mr. BECKHAM, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 795) for the relief of Edward Erickson, submitted an adverse report (No. 53) thereon, which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

WITHDRAWAL OF MAPS.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. From the Committee on the Geological Survey I report favorably the following order and ask for its immediate consideration.

The order was read and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to withdraw from the files of the Senate and directed to transfer to the United States Geological Survey the following described maps:

Map of the Territory of New Mexico, made by Lieuts. J. W. Albert and W. G. Peck, 1846–47. This map was issued to accompany Lieut. Albert's report on New Mexico, of which the survey library has a copy which lacks the map.

Chart of St. Clair Flats (Mississippi River). Bureau of Topographic Engineers, 1857.

Territory of Florida from its northern boundary to Lat. 27° 30′ N., connected with delta of Mississippi. Board of Internal Improvement, February 19, 1829.

Map of Oregon and Upper California, to accompany the report of J. C. Fremont, 1848. The survey library has a copy of the report lacking the map.

D. Esteban Pichardo's geographical and topographical map of Cuba, November 27, 1873. Incomplete; 2 sheets only.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. FLETCHER. The bill (S. 3580) releasing the claim of the United States Government to lot No. 306 in the old city of Pensacola, Fla., and the bill (S. 3581) releasing the claim of the United States Government to that portion of land, being a fractional block, bounded on the north and east by Bayou Cadet, on the west by Cevallos Street, and on the south by Intendencia Street, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla., were introduced by me January 17 and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I ask that that committee be discharged from

the further consideration of the bills, and that they be referred to the Committee on Public Lands. Bills identical with these were submitted to the Public Lands Committee in the second session of the Sixty-third Congress, reported favorably, and passed the Senate March 12, 1914, but failed to pass the House. I was mistaken in asking for the reference of the bills to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING FOR THE DISTRICT COMMITTEE.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. On December 17, 1915, I reported, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, resolution No. 35, submitted by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], granting authority to print and bind certain papers and documents for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and it was placed on the calendar. The report was made through an inadvertence on my part and I ask to withdraw it, the resolution having in the first instance been referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be withdrawn.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. BURLEIGH):

A bill (S. 3686) granting an increase of pension to Gilman P. Lombard;

A bill (S. 3687) granting an increase of pension to Arthur G. Sawyer;

A bill (S. 3688) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius T. Ham;

A bill (S. 3689) granting an increase of pension to Henry Quint;

A bill (S. 3690) granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Norton;

A bill (S. 3691) granting a pension to Charles E. Williams;

A bill (S. 3692) granting a pension to Theodate S. Black;

A bill (S. 3693) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Cook;

A bill (S. 3694) granting an increase of pension to Mariner Smith;

A bill (S. 3695) granting an increase of pension to Morrison Young; and

A bill (S. 3696) granting an increase of pension to Frank A. Colcord; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 3697) for the relief of Charles V. Wells (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3698) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Applegate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 3699) to donate to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., for park purposes, the tract of land known as the powder-house lot; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARDWICK:

A bill (S. 3700) to amend an act entitled "An act to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 3701) granting a pension to William A. Bowen; and

A bill (S. 3702) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. C. Kaigler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 3703) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant permission for utilization of water power at locks and dams constructed by the Government on navigable rivers of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3704) to establish a landschaft system of rural credit in the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3705) to establish a preparatory military academy at or near Fort Douglas, Utah; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 3706) to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to create a commerce court, and to amend the act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, as heretofore amended, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1910; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 3707) granting an increase of pension to William F. Wiley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 3708) granting an increase of pension to Josephine F. Stowe (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 3709) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Shoemaker;

A bill (S. 3710) granting an increase of pension to Nathan L. Stockwell;

A bill (S. 3711) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Lockhart;

A bill (S. 3712) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Sausaman;

A bill (S. 3713) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Myers;

A bill (S. 3714) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Nash;

A bill (S. 3715) granting an increase of pension to Helen Hogan; and

A bill (S. 3716) granting a pension to Byron E. Gifford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 3717) granting an increase of pension to Bernard McNaney; and

A bill (S. 3718) granting a pension to Willie Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 3719) granting a pension to Maurice H. Myers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 3720) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to license cotton warehouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

RELATIONS WITH MEXICO.

Mr. SHERMAN. I offer a resolution, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 72) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested to inform the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interests, whether any convention, agreement, or understanding has been concluded, entered into, or arrived at with any South American or Central American Governments concerning Mexico and especially if any relations have been established or obligations assumed by the executive department on behalf of the United States that require this Government to obtain the consent or request of any such South American or Central American Governments before employing its Army and Navy to protect American citizens or other aliens in Mexico.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 73), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it hereby is, authorized, during the Sixty-fourth Congress, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to employ a stenographer at a cost not to exceed $1 per printed page to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee at any time, and to have such hearings printed for the use of the committee; that the expenses of such hearings be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of a subcommittee; and that the said committee and all subcommittees thereof may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. MYERS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 74), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized, during the Sixty-fourth Congress, to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a price not to exceed $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions of the Senate.

MARY MEYER.

Mr. HARDING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 75), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to Mary Meyer, niece of Jacob C. Donaldson, late a skilled laborer in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

LECTURE BY HENRY J. PIERCE.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I have here an address delivered by Henry J. Pierce, of Seattle, Wash., on the necessity for water-power development. It deals with a question the Senate will have under consideration very shortly, and I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. ROBINSON. What is the nature of the document?

Mr. JONES. It is an address delivered by Henry J. Pierce on the necessity for water-power development. It gives some very interesting matter.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator state where the address was delivered?

Mr. JONES. It was delivered in the auditorium of the New National Museum last evening.

Mr. ROBINSON. Has the Senator read the address?

Mr. JONES. I heard the address.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not know about the length of the address. We are putting a great many things in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which, it seems to me, ought not to go there, and it will make a very expensive publication. I was wondering whether the Senator from Washington would not be satisfied to have the address printed as a public document.

Mr. JONES. I would much rather have it printed in the RECORD than to have it printed as a document, because if printed as a document we can never find it and if printed in the RECORD we know that we can find it somewhere.

It is not a very long address. It refers to a matter that will be pending before the Senate very shortly. I am no more in favor of cumbering the RECORD with many things than is the Senator, and I do not think I do it, but this is one thing that I think is useful and will be useful to Senators.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield to me for just a statement?

Mr. JONES. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. I am informed by the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands that the address is a valuable one, and I am inclined to think from the information I have obtained that it ought to be printed.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think myself it is all right to have it available. The question in my mind is about cumbering the RECORD. I see no difficulty about getting access to it if it is printed as a Senate document. A certain number of those documents go to each Senator, and they are available undoubtedly. The address is on an important subject; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. WEEKS. I hope the Senator from Florida will not object to the printing of this address in the RECORD. It has a direct bearing on an important subject which is coming before Congress. I am familiar with the address; it is not long, and I think if it could be read by the Senator he would not object to its being printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will not object further, Mr. President, under the circumstances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

The address is as follows:

THE NECESSITY FOR WATER POWER DEVELOPMENT.

[By Henry J. Pierce.]

It is a strange fact that the proportion of our total available water power thus far developed is only about the same as was the proportion of our agricultural lands under cultivation 100 years ago, at which time the development of our natural resources had not been commenced. To-day, while practically all the farming lands of the United States with the exception of the arid portions of the West have been brought under cultivation, and while such great natural resources as coal, oil, phosphate, and minerals have been developed as rapidly as necessity required, yet but 10 per cent of our available water power has been utilized.

Up to 1885, when electricity first came into use for practical purposes, the use of water power was limited to the turning of wheels for operation of a few grist mills and other manufacturing establishments. During the 30-year period between 1885 and 1915, 6,000,000 horsepower was developed out of a total available amount of 61,678,000 horsepower. As the principal use for electric energy has been the operation of public utilities, the water powers thus far utilized have been those located at points nearest large centers of population, though in some instances power is being economically transmitted in large quantities for distances of from 150 to 200 miles.

The United States Geological Survey estimates that 44,049,000 horsepower, or 71 per cent of the total potential available horsepower in the United States, is contained within the States of Washington, Oregon, California, Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Colorado, Utah, and Nevada, and of this vast amount but 1,622,021 horsepower, or 3.68 per cent, is now being utilized.

The total available water power of all countries of Europe combined is 35,965,000 horsepower, the development of which is rapidly progressing.

Three great principal uses for electric energy await the development of our water powers: The operation of pumping plants in connection with irrigation projects; the electrification of railroads; for manufacturing purposes in production of fertilizers, explosives, and electrochemicals, wood pulp, paper, iron, steel, etc.

IRRIGATION.

It is estimated that there are at least 10,000,000 acres of arid lands located in the far Western States, lying above the reach of gravity water, that can only be reclaimed through water raised by pumps operated by the cheap hydroelectric power now latent and wasting in the various streams from which the water would be pumped. Thus the land, and at a lower level the water to irrigate it, and the power to raise the water to the land are often all assembled at one point. Given water, these lands will produce every fruit, vegetable, and grain that is native to the Temperate Zone, and are capable of supporting a population of 2,000,000 people. If capital can be safeguarded, it is safe to say that hundreds of thousands of water horsepower will be utilized within the next 10 years in connection with the reclamation of arid lands, and that, in addition to what the Government service will accomplish, hundreds of millions of dollars of private capital will be used for the establishment of reclamation projects in connection with pumping plants. Lands are being irrigated in 27 States, and as far east as New Jersey and Florida, and two Western States have now nearly 5,000,000 acres of land under irrigation.

ELECTRIFICATION OF RAILROADS.

Four hundred and fifty miles of the main line of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad, being the portion between Harlowton, Mont., and Avery, Idaho, is now being equipped for operation by electricity. Quoting from the testimony given before the Senate Public Lands Committee in 1914 by John D. Ryan, a director of the Milwaukee Railroad, and also president of the Montana Power Co., which will furnish the power:

"The railroad will pay under the contract for power delivered over 450 miles of its road something like $550,000 a year. It is paying now for coal to operate its steam trains over the same line approximately $1,750,000, and they furnish their own coal from mines on their own road, and one-third of their equipment is used in hauling coal to themselves, whereas with electric power there is not any such waste. It will save coal in the ground and an enormous amount of money, and will be utilizing an absolutely waste product."

Mr. Ryan testified that the Butte, Anaconda & Pacific Railroad is paying $96,000 per year for electric energy to operate 80 miles of road, as against a former cost for coal of $270,000, a saving of $174,000 annually.

In view of the great and apparently sure economical success of the electrification of 450 miles of the Milwaukee line, it is almost certain that within the next 10 years a majority of the railroads operating through the mountainous country of the far West, where hydroelectric power can be developed cheaply, will adopt electricity as motive power. Forty-eight thousand seven hundred miles of railroad are now being operated in the States of Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Arizona, Colorado, and Nevada. It is estimated that 10,000 horsepower is needed to operate 100 miles of single track, and therefore it will require 4,870,000 horsepower to electrify all of the railroads of these States, or one-ninth of the total hydroelectric power possible to develop in the territory traversed by these railroads. A great portion of the trackage is over mountain divisions, and the use of electricity in place of coal will result in great economy of operation, obviate the danger of forest fires, and by elimination of noise and smoke and through a more generous ventilation, which will be possible when the flying cinder need no longer be taken into account, will make travel far more comfortable than at present. As the railroads consume 20 per cent of the total coal used for all purposes, the substitution of electricity for coal as motive power will conserve this enormous amount of fuel for future use and water power wasted from the beginning of time will be utilized.

PRODUCTION OF FIXED NITROGEN.

The greatest need for the development of our water powers is the imperative necessity, and it is a national necessity, that sufficient fixed nitrogen should be produced within the boundaries of the United States to meet its requirements. Nitrogen comprises four-fifths of the atmosphere and is a constituent of all organized life and tissues. It is a colorless, tasteless, odorless, gaseous, nonmetallic element. We live in it, we breathe it, we eat it, and it constitutes a portion of our human frame. It is absolutely necessary to the existence of animal and plant life. Without fixed nitrogen the earth would soon become an uninhabited desert waste. While the atmosphere contains an exhaustless supply of nitrogen, it being estimated that 20,000,000 tons exist above each square mile of the earth's surface, yet 90 per cent of the plant life that lives in it does not absorb it, and the remaining 10 per cent absorbs but a small proportion of that which it requires. The world has been dependent for most of its supplies of fixed nitrogen upon the nitrate of soda beds of Chile, where, during some convulsion of nature at some remote past time, the soda absorbed quantities of nitrogen from the air. During 1913 the United States imported

625,000 tons of Chilean nitrates, valued at $21,000,000, upon which the Chilean export duty was 60 per cent. We thus paid to the Chilean Government $12,600,000, which may be considered merely a part of the amount which the people of the United States pay for its policy of water-power stagnation. In other words, the people of this country would be quite as well off as they now are if they granted a subsidy or bonus of $12,600,000 per annum for the establishment of the water-power nitrogen industry in the United States. The richest nitrate beds of Chile, however, will be practically exhausted by 1923; and were it not for the discovery of processes whereby it is now possible, with the aid of electric energy, to obtain supplies of fixed nitrogen from the atmosphere, the world would stand in imminent deadly peril and the perpetuation of the human race would be endangered. It is a wonderful providence that perpetual and inexhaustible supplies of nitrogen may be obtained from the atmosphere by the use of electric energy obtained from our water powers whose flow is also everlasting, and that thus the limited supplies of coal and other fuels laid aside by nature may be conserved for other uses.

The governmental paralysis imposed seven years ago upon the development of water powers in the United States through the restrictive interpretation of Federal laws still continues, but that period has been one of great hydroelectric development in Europe, where over 1,200,000 water horsepower has been utilized for the extraction of nitrogen from the atmosphere, while the United States out of 61,000,000 horsepower is not using a single horsepower for that purpose. Hydroelectric nitrogen plants have been established in Norway, Sweden, Germany, Australia, Italy, Switzerland, France, Spain, Japan, and Canada, but none in the United States. The nitrogen industry of Europe represents an aggregate investment of over $300,000,000, employs 50,000 people, and the annual value of its products and derivatives is upward of $220,000,000. In Germany, where practically all the water powers have been developed, a nitrogen plant is being built which will use 100,000 horsepower, to be produced from cheap coal. England is seriously considering the development of 1,000,000 water horsepower in Iceland to provide for her future supplies of nitrogen. Thus, with a foresight that is a reproach to our intelligence and enterprise, these other countries are insuring their requirements of this great human necessity against the time when it will be no longer possible to obtain supplies from Chile. It seems incredible that nothing has been done thus far toward the establishment of the nitrogen industry in the United States. Several years ago an effort was made to locate an atmospheric nitrogen plant upon the Coosa River in Alabama, where a large water power would have been developed, and near which were ample supplies of the necessary raw materials—high-grade limestones and cheaply mined coking coal. The plant, moreover, would have been located in the center of the cotton belt, where the most of its product would have been marketed in the form of fertilizer. As development capital could not be obtained under our restrictive Federal water-power laws, a bill was introduced in Congress to meet the requirements of the case, but failed to become a law, and, as a result, the plant was established at Niagara Falls, Canada, where a contract was obtained for electric energy at a low figure. As a result, the United States has lost and Canada gained a great manufacturing institution, covering an investment of millions of dollars, and the farmers of Alabama are paying the freight on its product from Canada to their cotton fields. In anticipation of a change in our Federal water-power laws a company was projected during the winter of 1914–15 which expected to build nitrogen plants in the South and on the Pacific coast which would have cost upward of $35,000,000, but owing to the failure of the Sixty-third Congress to enact practical legislation the attention of the organizers has been turned toward the development of Canadian water powers. It is estimated that an investment of $860,000,000 would be necessary to produce mechanically from the atmosphere as much nitrogen as Chile's nitrate deposits yield every year, and this shows the enormous possibilities for the future contained in the establishment of this entirely new industry in the United States.

The two largest and most necessary uses for nitrogen are in connection with the manufacture of fertilizers and explosives. Seven million tons of fertilizer, valued at $170,000,000, were sold in the United States during 1913, and for its manufacture over $40,000,000 of nitrogenous and other material was imported, most of which could have been made in this country, with the aid of electricity. The average amount of fertilizer used in the United States is 28 pounds per acre of cultivated lands, against 200 pounds per acre in Europe, with the following results:

Comparison of average yield per acre in bushels of crops in the United States and Europe:

	Wheat.	Oats.	Barley.	Rye.	Potatoes.
Europe	32	47	38	30	158
United States	15	29	25	16	96

If our use of fertilizer had been equal to one-half of that of Europe per acre in 1913, 24,000,000 tons would have been required, of the value of $580,000,000, and in the production of which 12,000,000 water horsepower must have been utilized, and the resultant increase of crop value would have exceeded $2,000,000,000.

Careful and extensive experiments made in Germany have shown that by the addition annually of 150 pounds of nitrogen per acre, crops of rye, wheat, oats, barley, and potatoes are more than doubled, and the reports of the German agricultural department show that, as the result of feeding the soil with 2,000,000 tons of nitrates, the increase of crops amounted to 63,000,000 tons. These figures show how important is the role actually played by nitrogen in the cereal production of Europe. The German farmer practically uses his land as an agent for transforming fertilizer into products, while the American farmer tries to get products out of his starving land without feeding it sufficient plant food. European nations waste nothing, and in many clever ways create values out of what we discard as worthless. Our comparatively young country is wasting its resources with terrible profligacy, as is evidenced by our using up our stores of coal and oil instead of utilizing our wasting water powers.

The crops harvested annually in the United States abstract over 3,000,000 tons of nitrogen from the soil, and as the world's supply of combined nitrogen is increased only slowly and in small degrees by nature, the soil of farmed lands is entirely dependent upon fertilizer for replenishment of the stock of nitrogen which it gives up in its yield of crops.

At the agricultural station at Rothamsted, England, wheat has been grown year after year on the same land for 63 seasons without fertilizer, with an average crop return of 12 bushels per acre, while during 10 years the average crop on adjacent plats of ground receiving plant food each year was 40 bushels per acre.

The present method of manufacture produces a finished product containing but 12 per cent of active fertilizer and 88 per cent of utterly useless material on which freight and haulage must be paid by the farmer, whereas the electrofertilizer product contains 60 per cent of fertilizing material. By the electric process not only is nitrogen obtained from the atmosphere, but phosphate rock may now be treated by electricity instead of sulphuric acid for extraction of phosphoric acid.

The use of fertilizer has a most intimate relation to the cost of living, which has increased in this country at a much more rapid rate than it has abroad. The extraordinary increase in the cost of living in the United States has been principally in the cost of food products, while other items than foods have increased at only the general rate prevailing throughout the world. From 1900 to 1910 the cost of foods in the United States increased 35 per cent and abroad only 15 per cent. While our population increased 21 per cent during those 10 years, crop production increased only 10 per cent. The rapid increase in food cost in this country can only be checked by increased crop production, just as food prices are held down in Europe through increase in yields per acre. The countries of highest agricultural development are the largest consumers of fertilizers.

The mutterings of strife for commercial supremacy between England and Germany were heard as far back as early in the nineteenth century; when the value of bones as a plant food becoming realized, the great German chemist, Liebig, was moved to say:

"England is robbing all other countries of their fertility. Already in her eagerness for bones she has turned up the battle fields of Leipsic, of Waterloo, and Crimea. Already from the catacombs of Sicily she has carried away the skeletons of many successive generations. Annually she removes from the shores of other countries to her own the manurial equivalent of three and one-half millions of men."

EXPLOSIVES.

Nitrogen, in the form of nitric acid, is the principal constituent of explosives, such as guncotton, dynamite, and smokeless powder. We are annually producing about 250,000 tons of explosives, valued at $40,000,000, and we pay $23,000,000 for the raw materials that enter into them, most of which are imported. Had it not been for the discovery of the nitrate fields of Chile, the explosive industry, as it is known to-day, would have been impossible, and as coal and minerals could not have been mined without the use of explosives the development in mining and transportation which has characterized the last half century could not have been made.

In case of war we would be almost entirely dependent upon foreign nations for our supply of nitrogen for manufacture of powder, and would be practically defenseless unless we could obtain it from other nations. If the country with whom we were at war should be strong enough to seize the nitrate deposits of Chile, or to prevent shipments to this country, it would leave us helpless, in spite of our 100,000,000 of people and our Army and Navy. We would be forced to commandeer all sources of nitrogen, including fertilizer, and it might come about that some of our agricultural regions could no longer be devoted to food production, even though the scene of conflict never penetrated to them. The War Department is greatly concerned over this weak point in our national defense, and writers who are authorities upon the subject from the military standpoint urge the immediate development of our water powers, and establishment of atmospheric nitrogen plants, in order to insure the production of our requirements of nitrogen within the borders of our own country; and they strongly recommend that the nitrogen plants be so strategically located throughout the country as to be reasonably well protected against attack in case of foreign invasion. Lindley M. Garrison, Secretary of War, in his last annual report said in vigorous language:

"Our only present source of supply (of nitrogen) is the natural nitrate beds of Chile, which in time of war might be shut off from us. Obviously in the matter of munitions, especially where the source is so limited and localized, we should neglect no provision so easily available as this to make the country self-sustaining. Plants producing nitrogen for industrial purposes in time of peace would be a great national asset in view of their availability to supply us with the necessary nitrogen in time of war."

Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, in his last annual report, under the poetic and beautiful caption "Turning water into power," says:

"Then, too, there is that mystifying miracle of drawing nitrogen from the air for chemical use, which can be done only with great power, but is being done in Germany, Norway, Sweden, France, Switzerland, and elsewhere, by which an inexhaustible substitute for the almost exhausted nitrates of Chile has been found. To increase the yield of our farms and to give us an independent and adequate supply of nitrogen for the explosives used in war, we must set water wheels at work that will fix nitrogen in lime."

Gen. William Crozier, Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, recently said:

"We are dependent upon foreign sources for nitrogen. Our problem of defense would be greatly simplified if we only possessed our own nitrogen supply."

A recent statement showed that the stock of powder for small arms in possession of the War Department amounted to 200,000,000 pounds, which would only be sufficient in time of battle to last an army of 500,000 men eight days; further, that there is only sufficient ammunition on hand to fire all of our coast defense guns forty times, or continuously for about one hour. The War Department has, for some time, been accumulating a stock of Chilean nitrate to provide for emergencies; but in time of war it would produce only sufficient explosives to last for a short period of time. Germany is shut off from supplies of Chilean nitrate for powder making, and if she had not developed her water powers for the purpose of obtaining nitrogen from the air the European war would be ended to-day and Germany beaten. But the German Government has taken over all nitrogen fixation plants and is operating them on a war basis and thus is enabled to manufacture a plentiful supply of ammunition.

MANUFACTURE OF PAPER AND WOOD PULP.

One-third of the cost of manufacturing wood pulp and paper consists of the cost of power. The imports of these articles into the United States are growing at an enormous rate. Sweden and Canada have been developing their water powers, and hence it is interesting to note

the exports of wood pulp and paper from those countries to the United States:

	1911	1912	1913
	Tons.	*Tons.*	*Tons.*
From Sweden	84,378	107,884	130,693
From Canada	83,856	131,412	281,586

With the production of cheap electric energy, through the development of our water powers, the pulp and paper industry will come back to its own in the United States. It is inevitable that the industry must spread westward, and that through the utilization of the water powers and the forests of the Northwest, these imports of wood pulp and paper will be displaced with products made in our own country.

MANUFACTURE OF ELECTROMETALLURGICAL PRODUCTS.

While coal, coke, and gas are principally used in the smelting and refining of iron and steel, and while one-fourth of the entire world's output of coal is used for that purpose, yet in 1913, 668,000 tons of steel were produced in Europe and 165,000 tons in the United States, through the use of the electric furnace. In Alabama and Tennessee practically inexhaustible deposits of iron ore and limestone are located in the vicinity of great undeveloped water powers, and when the problem of making pig iron through the use of cheap electricity is solved, in an economical way, the South will become the center of the metallurgical industry. Students of the question believe that the use of cheap hydroelectric power, in the making of iron, will eventually bring about a commercial revolution in the leading nations. The United States, Germany, and England produce seven-eighths of the world's iron. Germany has already developed practically all of her water powers, England has but few, and the production of iron would, therefore, under these circumstances, pass into the hands of the United States because of its water powers and it would become omnipotent in the production of iron and steel. In fact, these authorities believe that all industries which consume large amounts of mechanical energy will be forced to emigrate to countries where water power is abundant.

MANUFACTURE OF CALCIUM CARBIDE.

Over 200,000 homes are lighted by acetylene gas, produced from calcium carbide, in the manufacture of which, at Niagara Falls, great quantities of hydroelectric energy are used. Because of our restrictive water-power laws the American Carbide Co. could not increase its production in this country, and is now building a plant on the seacoast of Norway, where it has contracted for the delivery of 80,000 horsepower developed from water power, and expects to ship most of its product to the United States.

Electrochemical products were reported by the last census to be made in 34 establishments at Niagara Falls of a value of $18,460,000, consisting of abrasives, electrodes, calcium carbide, caustic soda, chlorates, and such metals and alloys as aluminum, silicon, ferrovanadium, etc.

If all the water at Niagara Falls were utilized it would be possible to generate 5,000,000 horsepower. The American and Canadian Governments permit the use of sufficient water to generate 400,000 horsepower, all of which is in use, and an 80,000 horsepower steam plant, to be operated by coal, is being built on the shores of the Niagara River to provide for further demands for power.

There are many other large and constantly increasing uses for hydroelectric power which can not be enumerated here for lack of time.

With the abolition of our present faulty laws, and the enactment of practical legislation, great water-power developments which have been held back for years would be undertaken on the Connecticut River, where the power would be used in operating the mills of New England; on the Tennessee and Coosa Rivers of the South, in connection with the manufacture of fertilizers, iron, and steel; on the upper reaches of the Mississippi for public-utility uses; and on the Columbia, Snake, and Pend d'Oreille Rivers of the Northwest for irrigation and manufacturing purposes. Through installation of power dams and of locks these rivers will be made navigable for an aggregate of hundreds of miles further into the interior of the country, and it would be accomplished by private capital, without a cent of cost to the people, through Government taxation.

But while an enormous amount of water power is latent in our navigable rivers a far greater amount exists in the nonnavigable streams flowing through the public lands and Federal reserves located in the far Western States. Here nature has segregated her natural resources; the thirsty land awaiting irrigation with the water containing the latent water power washing its shores; the forests necessary to manufacture of wood pulp and paper lining the banks of the falling water; the limestone and phosphate needed for fertilizers and explosives located contiguous to wasting water powers.

It seems almost unbelievable that an enlightened Government like ours should not only fail to encourage, but should blindly bar the way to the development of a great natural resource so important to the farming and manufacturing interests of the country and so necessary to national safety. The fault, however, is not with private enterprise. As has been shown, Americans have repeatedly tried, but in vain, to get the right from our Government to establish hydroelectric plants upon navigable streams or within the Government domain upon fair and equitable terms that would justify the risk and the large expenditure of time and money involved while fully protecting the public interest.

They have been met by impracticable conditions which no prudent man could agree to. Prevented by the laws and policy of their own country from engaging in developing a great natural resource of incalculable value to any country possessing it, they found in other lands the welcome for their enterprise and capital denied to them at home. And so Canada and Norway are now enjoying the advantages of American energy, enterprise, and capital in the successful establishment and operation of great manufacturing plants involving an expenditure of many millions of dollars and giving steady employment to thousands of men.

Backed by the necessary capital, men of business and of technical and scientific experience who have made hydroelectric development their life work, as well as manufacturers of all of the great products for which the hydroelectric energy would be used, stand ready to undertake the development of our now wasting water powers and the other vast commercial features connected with it as soon as our present impossible Federal laws are corrected to a fair business basis, under which practical men will give their time and capital will invest.

Reasonable, sensible, practical regulation safeguarding the public interest no one objects to. But the present situation is not one of regulation, but of strangulation. The trouble is that the Federal policy covering the use of water power is so narrow, so full of restrictions, so loaded down with conditions that no prudent man will venture to embark in the business. It is the case of the would-be banker who mistakes the safety-deposit business for banking and locks up all the money in the vaults and keeps it there unused to the detriment of both the depositors and the public. A natural resource which may not be used might as well not exist.

The belief that any law that Congress may enact will be eagerly accepted by would-be water-power developers and the investors upon whom they are dependent for the means of developing is a delusion, and the sooner it is abandoned the better will be the opportunity for obtaining legislation based upon business principles and business experience. Theories of ideal legislation must be abandoned and some practical measure enacted or hydroelectric development will prove but a dream of the present generation. The investor must know in advance the conditions under which he is to conduct his business, and Federal water-power laws should specifically define the terms and conditions under which permits for use of Government property necessary to the development of water powers shall be issued. This is just as necessary to the guidance of ever-changing heads of Government bureaus in conducting the affairs of their departments as it is to those who would invest their money in the development of our water powers. Little advancement can be expected unless men of ability, experience, and character, and who possess the highest order of technical skill and acumen and organizing, financial, and executive ability can be attracted to and retained in the industry.

To be of effect, Federal legislation governing water-power development must be of a nature to protect the public interest, be fair and businesslike toward capital, and place not a featherweight more burden on the operation of water powers located within the public domain than is borne by competing hydroelectric developments operating outside the Federal reserves. There is no reason why these things should not be so coordinated upon a solid business basis as to protect every interest and bring results.

It is apparent that there is vital and imperatively urgent necessity for the enactment of practical Federal water-power legislation of a character which will promote and encourage in every way the development and utilization of the enormous quantity of energy latent in our streams and now wasting to the sea, a necessity in no way local but national. It is necessary for the manufacture of ammunition for the national defense; necessary for the manufacture of fertilizers, that the cost of living may be decreased through increase of crops; necessary for the electrification of railroads for the cheap carrying of freight and to provide a means of rapid and comfortable transportation for the people; necessary to the irrigation of vast tracts of lands, meaning the building of thousands of homes on lands now silent; necessary to the establishment of great and entirely new industries in the United States, meaning the investment of hundreds of millions of dollars, the building of new cities and towns, and the employment of thousands of men and women; necessary if we are to maintain our commercial standing among the manufacturing nations of the earth; and, finally, of vital necessity toward promoting the safety, the comfort, the welfare, and the prosperity of every citizen of the United States.

MINING AND METALLURGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA (S. DOC. NO. 233.)

Mr. SMOOT. The Senate ordered printed as a Senate document excerpts of the minutes of the meeting of the Mining and Metallurgical Society of America. We notice that there are a couple of illustrations, and I therefore ask that those illustrations be printed as a part of the document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY HENRY W. FARNAM.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have a copy of an address by Henry W. Farnam, professor of political economy at Yale University, delivered at the ninth annual meeting of the American Association for Labor Legislation, at Washington, D. C., December 28, 1915, upon the seaman's law of 1915. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing, with the request that it be published as a Senate document. I understand that it is the practice that it shall go to the Committee on Printing for action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paper will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

REPORTS OF ALASKAN ENGINEERING COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 610).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, in two volumes, for the period from March 12, 1914, the date of the approval of the Alaskan Railroad act (38 Stat., 305), to December 31, 1915, inclusive, together with accompanying maps, charts, and profiles.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 19, 1916.*

NOTE.—Reports and maps accompanied similar message to the House of Representatives.

ADMIRAL FLETCHER'S REPORT.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a copy of this morning's Washington Herald, with a paragraph marked, which I wish to have read. It purports to give statements from Admiral Fletcher's report to the Secretary of the Navy, and

there is just enough truth in it to make it false in all essential particulars. The report was sent to the Senate by the Secretary of the Navy, with only such parts left out as, in his opinion, foreigners ought not to know. The Secretary's letter, sent to me and which I have asked to have printed along with it, goes into full details concerning all these matters, and so far from the Democrats of the Senate having suppressed it, we are perfectly willing to have the whole report made public. Indeed, I expected it to be made public, and was surprised when Senator LODGE asked for it to be printed in confidence for use of the Naval Committee. Tennyson tells us—

That a lie which is half a truth is ever the blackest of lies.

Inasmuch as garbled and misleading extracts from Admiral Fletcher's report are leaking into the press, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed and that the executive document containing both of Admiral Fletcher's reports and the letter of the Secretary of the Navy to the chairman of the Naval Committee, which was ordered to be printed for the confidential use of the Naval Committee, be given to the press.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I made the request that this report be printed in confidence, but I made it under a misapprehension. I thought that was the desire of the department. I now think there is no possible reason for it being held in confidence, and I join with the Senator from South Carolina in asking that the injunction of secrecy be removed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; the injunction of secrecy is removed, and the document is a public document.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask the Secretary to read the statement which I have sent to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested, if there is no objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the Washington Herald, Jan. 19, 1916.]

MINOR OFFICERS HANDLE TURRETS—ADMIRAL FLETCHER'S REPORT COMPLAINS OF CONDITIONS IN UNITED STATES NAVY.

Sweeping indictment of the shortcomings of the American Navy are set forth in the annual report of Admiral F. F. Fletcher, commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet, which the Democrats of the Senate have suppressed.

The admiral states that at the June inspection one division alone of the fleet was short 1,350 men. Mine-laying ships, he declares, are 25 per cent below the number of men necessary for their proper operation, and he complains that the department has reduced the complement of the destroyers by 25 per cent.

He states that during the "battle efficiency inspection" of the battleship *Utah*, a chief petty officer was in charge of one turret and an ensign was in charge of another. A pay clerk and a yeoman were in charge of the plotting room on one dreadnaught, doing work of experienced commissioned officers.

MUNITIONS OF WAR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further resolutions, morning business is closed.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I ask that Senate resolution No. 20 be taken from the table and laid before the Senate for two purposes only: First, that I may submit some observations on it; and, second, that it may be properly referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution referred to by the Senator from Iowa will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 20) submitted by Mr. CUMMINS on December 10, 1915, as follows:

Whereas the profit incident to the manufacture and sale of arms, armament, and munitions of war has a tendency to corrupt public opinion, disturb international peace, and prevent a peaceful settlement of disputes between nations; and inasmuch as it ought to be made impossible for any person or corporation to make money out of war; and inasmuch as the Government should, for its own safety and protection, manufacture all arms, armament, and munitions of war for the equipment, construction, and use of the Army and Navy to the end that it may be independent of individual or corporate interests: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there shall be appointed by the President of the Senate a committee of five Senators to examine the following matters, to wit:

First. The most feasible plan of acquiring or constructing manufacturing plants of sufficient capacity to supply the Army and Navy with all arms, armament, and munitions of war, including ships and their equipment.

Second. The probable cost of such manufacturing plants, taking into account both present and future military needs.

Third. The proper locations for such manufacturing plants.

Fourth. The necessary legislation to prevent either persons or corporations from engaging or continuing in such manufacture and when such legislation should take effect.

The committee shall take testimony, have the power to administer oaths and to send for persons and papers. The hearings shall be open to the public, and all oral evidence submitted shall be taken down in shorthand and the notes transcribed and made a part of the record of the committee. The expenses of such hearings shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not often address the Senate upon a subject that is not under immediate consideration. I now depart from my usual custom in this respect, because the resolution which I have offered is involved in a great variety of measures that must command the attention of the Senate at this session, and it deeply concerns, as I believe, the welfare of the peace-loving, patriotic men and women of America.

Under the rules of the Senate the resolution just read must be referred to the committee which audits and controls contingent expenses, but I desire to have it known that upon the report of that committee, whether favorable or unfavorable, I will move its adoption without reference to any other committee. This course will be taken for the reason that there is no single committee of appropriate jurisdiction, and the policy involved is so vital and fundamental that the recommendation of a committe would be of little or no value.

If the resolution shall be adopted it will constitute a declaration by this body against the manufacture and sale of arms and munitions of war by any private interest. It will be a clear and emphatic announcement to the country, and to the world, that the Senate of the United States believes that commerce in the instrumentalities used only in warefare, whether for our own or foreign purposes, is exclusively a governmental function, a function which under no ordinary circumstances should be performed by the individual or the corporate citizen. It will initiate an American policy upon a subject which lies closer to the hearts of our people than any other now under consideration.

The inquiry which the resolution proposes is the natural sequence of the policy affirmed, and relates only to the plan, place, time, and cost of assuming the function.

Let it be at once understood that the resolution has nothing whatsoever to do with the number or character of the ships of which our Navy is, or ought to be, made up. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the adequacy or inadequacy of our Regular Army. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the controversy respecting the best method of creating and maintaining a body of military reserves. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the kind or competency of our coast fortifications. All these things are vastly important, but they are not brought under examination in the resolution which I have offered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether, if the manufacture of all sorts of munitions is taken over by the Government and exclusively confined to Government institutions, it would not go a very great way toward destroying that spirit of military activity and naval expansion which is now abroad in the land?

Mr. CUMMINS. I believe, Mr. President, that it would, and it is for the purpose of demonstrating the truth of the suggestion just made by the Senator from Colorado that I am entering upon these observations.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I believe that the Senator's conclusion stated just before my interruption might not be as accurate as outlined in the Senator's address. I am in sympathy with the belief that the acquisition by the Government of our munitions plants, or the construction of its own, and the manufacture of its munitions and equipment by itself are very desirable things, but I do believe that the proposal does affect the question of so-called military preparedness, 50 per cent of which, in my judgment, is based upon the desire of munitions plants people, who are to-day reaping enormous fortunes out of the misery and agony of Europe, to continue their manufacture for the United States.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado is right in one sense, but the statement I have made is, nevertheless, perfectly accurate, because the policy which I desire to sustain, if I can, applies with equal force to a large navy or a small navy, a large army or a small army, and it is therefore, I think, true, as I have stated, that the resolution in and of itself has nothing whatsoever to do with these things. It matters not how strong we are in military affairs or how strong we should be or how weak it is safe to be, the course suggested in the resolution is the only course that can be pursued with honor to the Nation and with due regard to the civilization we are trying to protect.

I am conscious that it will be difficult to disassociate completely the subject proposed in the resolution from the somewhat acrimonious dispute now sweeping over the country with regard to preparedness for war, and to differentiate it from the discussion concerning an embargo upon the export of arms and munitions; but I reiterate that it is wholly removed from either, and I sincerely hope that in its consideration the Senate will bear constantly in mind that it is entirely independent of both.

What I am about to say is, of course, directed to those who believe that the United States ought to have an Army and Navy, and that it may unfortunately happen that they will be called into service to preserve free institutions and protect the lives, liberties, and privileges of our people, for the resolution is meaningless to those who believe we should stand defenseless before the world.

I have not hesitated to express my views with respect to the character, extent, and strength of the military armament which the honor and safety of this country requires, and I shall express them again when the measures which involve the question are before the Senate. In the meanwhile it is sufficient to suggest that somewhere between the armed camp of William of Germany and the open dovecote of William of Nebraska [laughter] there must be an honorable abiding place for a great nation which is prepared to lead the world toward peace, but will not submit to injustice or indignity; that somewhere between the ambition which always looks toward war, and the folly which would turn courage into cowardice, there must be a region of patriotism, wisdom, and sanity in which all good citizens can labor in harmony, not alone for our own welfare, but for the good of all humanity. Of all these things, vital as they are, I will speak at another time. The resolution I have offered assumes that we will have an Army and Navy of some kind, and that we may have war, and it propounds this question, Shall we continue to buy the armament and munitions which can be used only, first, to train, and then to kill, from private manufactories or shall the Government make them? It is a plain, direct question which, in my judgment, involves, in great measure, the peace of the world in the first instance, and then, if we must fight, the safety of the Nation. It ought to be taken for granted—and I will take it for granted—that the overwhelming proportion of the people want international peace, and believe that the paramount duty of this country is to do everything within its power to so influence the affairs of the world that disputes which have heretofore brought war may hereafter be settled righteously and peacefully in the forum of reason and justice and not in the field of brute force and inflamed passion. In modern times, at least, all right-minded men and women have hated war, but no generation has ever abhorred it as the generation now witnessing the heart-breaking soul-shocking scenes of Europe. In former days there was a chivalry and fascination about camps and battle fields which fascinated the imagination and tinted the achievements of the military profession with beautiful colors; which turned battles into a sort of romantic and honorable engagement between gentlemen of high distinction. I admit that all this was nothing more than a brilliant cloak for the baser business, but, nevertheless, it did hide some of the degradation inseparable from war. The gaudy cloak, whatever may have been its value, has now been thrown contemptuously aside and the belligerents of Europe have returned to the primitive age of undisguised brutality and ferocity; to the age of the poisoned steel; to the age which knew no difference between the combatant and the noncombatant; to the age when the rights of neutral powers were unnoticed and unknown.

War is now openly what it always has been, though disguised by stilted ceremonies—the killing of the enemy, armed or unarmed, in any possible way, just as quickly as it can be done. It matters not whether they are shot, drowned, buried alive, or starved, the object is to kill them; if not all, then so many of them that the remainder will surrender.

Science has contributed its cruel knowledge to the slaughter, and it may well be that those who are now living may see a murderous discovery that will enable a death engineer to extinguish the life of a whole community or country in the twinkling of an eye.

I see no difference in ethics between an airship dropping explosives upon the inhabitants of an unarmed city or town and poisoning the water which they must drink or the bread which they must eat.

I am not inflicting this ghastly description upon you for the purpose of criticizing the modern methods of warfare, as such, for they are strictly logical and inevitable. When one nation makes war upon another its object is to kill or maim or starve just as many as it can, and as speedily as it can, until there is submission to the demand, whatever it may be. Do not understand me to imply that a nation unjustly attacked is not to fight. It must fight or lose its place in the world and the manhood of its citizens, but that eternal fact does not modify the awful horrors of war; it simply emphasizes the everlasting truth that the nation responsible for unjust and unnecessary war will, in the final judgment day, be adjudged guilty of deliberate murder.

In view of the frightful consequences of war, the burdens, sorrows, and desolation which always attend it, it must be true that the relation which one nation bears to another, the controversies which necessarily spring up between them, their attitude toward each other, should be considered and determined in the purest light that can be shed upon human motive and human action. It must be true that all the mainsprings of movement in such crises should be patriotic and unselfish. It must be true that those who are guiding public affairs should be free from any influence, conscious or unconscious, that would tend to warp the judgment or obscure the vision.

The love of money, the passion for profit, are planted deeply in the human heart, and when properly directed they are the fruitful sources and potent factors in the growth, development, and success of any people.

These observations bring me to the application of the resolution to the policy of the United States. Our people will in the future, even more than in the past, be in constant contact with all the powers of the earth. Unquestionably there will be controversies of all degrees of importance. Some will be vital, some will be trivial; but they must be settled either by conference, mediation, arbitration, or war. In the management of these ever-recurring difficulties our Government will need not only the highest statesmanship but, behind it and impelling it, a public opinion untainted and uncorrupted by the selfish influences, seen or unseen, of the business profit which will come from war. The men who die and the women who mourn in war have the God-given right to a public sentiment, untouched and unmodified by those whose coffers are filled with the bloody gold of traffic in war..

I agree that war may come, but if it comes it must be the result of the calm, dispassionate, loyal purpose to meet the awful scourge, because there is no other way of defending our civilization, our institutions, and our honor.

I do not assert that every person or corporation which may profit from war would incite war, but I do assert that all such persons and associations are not competent to judge the controversies which may lead to conflict, and inasmuch as they can not be removed from the great panel of the Republic, they ought to be removed from the business out of which the interest grows. It ought to be made impossible, so far as the power of the Government can be exerted, for any man or corporation to make money out of war. It ought to be true that when we invoke trial by battle no man shall be the gainer, except as he may share with all his fellow countrymen in the ultimate advantages of victory.

We need just now above all other things a rebaptism in Americanism. To me Americanism means fidelity to American interests, loyalty to American institutions, pride in our past, and confidence in our future. It means an understanding of our place in the affairs of the world, and of the rights and privileges of our citizens. It means sympathy in the struggle for liberty and justice wherever it is taking place. It means a comprehension of wrongs at home as well as wrongs abroad. It means a spirit that commands men to live for their country, and, if necessary, to die for it; but I, for one, am not willing that Americanism shall be defined and standardized by millionaire-munition makers or by the brokers, bankers, or backers who share their blood-stained profits.

I have not even intimated that any great portion of the men who are interested in manufacturing arms and munitions of war would consciously or maliciously precipitate a war, but in the very nature of things they can not look upon war with the feeling that animates the great body of the people. Men engaged in business necessarily desire that it shall be a successful business, and the business to which I have referred can not be in the highest degree successful unless the country is at war or is preparing for war.

Moreover, the evil influence is not confined to the comparatively few men who are directly engaged in such manufacture. It extends to all their commercial associates. It ramifies throughout the whole structure of industrial and financial society, and finally binds so many men together that its effect can hardly be overestimated.

I come now to the question suggested by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS].

The present situation illustrates my thought in a startling way. We are considering the problem of preparedness. It is a grave, serious problem and demands the dispassionate and patriotic judgment of the people of the Nation. We ought to determine the subject in the most unselfish, farsighted, courageous spirit. In this critical moment what is the attitude of the makers of arms and munitions? Without exception, so far as I know, they are insisting upon the most comprehensive program which it is possible to conceive, and they are employing, through all the channels and all the instrumentalities which mold public thought, all the forces at their command for a completeness

of preparation that would turn this country into a military camp, and practically destroy all ambition, save the ambition to overcome by force of arms the entire world. This is a perfectly natural course for them to pursue, and I would be astonished if they were to pursue any other. Their business is to supply material for war, and it is not in mortal man to escape the temptations of gain in the enterprises in which they are engaged.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. COLT. I wish to ask the Senator a question. If the Government enters into the arms business, whether it would not follow that the Government itself could not export any arms in time of war to any belligerent nation, because that would be an unneutral act? And if all nations adopted this policy of the manufacture of their arms, whether it would not necessarily follow that each nation must rely upon itself to supply its own arms in time of war, because all other nations would be forbidden from exporting arms?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I shall come presently to the consideration of that aspect of the subject; but lest I might overlook it, I desire to say now that in my opinion the people of the United States ought not to supply any other nation or any other people with arms unless the Government itself is willing to assume the obligation of war and participate in the conflict, whatever it may be. I do not say that there are not circumstances under which it would become the highest moral obligation for the Government of the United States to aid a people struggling against injustice and oppression.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. Since the Senator has been interrupted, I desire to ask him if he does not consider it true that a belligerent nation may be as much aided by furnishing it with food supplies, for example, as with arms and ammunition; and, if that be true, if it is any more reprehensible to supply arms or ammunition or anything pertaining to that subject than it is to supply such a nation with food?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I answer the question very willingly. It is true that there are times and circumstances under which food is as necessary to a belligerent as are munitions of war or arms; but it is not true that the same policy which would require the Government to manufacture implements or instrumentalities that are usable only in war should be applied to the production of grain and cattle and foodstuffs and clothing, products which are used not alone in war but in peace as well.

To emphasize the effect of the private manufacture of arms and munitions, I beg the attention of the Senate to some things that have happened in the markets of the country since the beginning of the war in Europe. I have before me some information furnished by the Legislative Reference Division in the Library of Congress indicating the growth and profit of the business.

After the commencement of the war and prior to October 26, 1915, there were organized in the United States 174 new corporations for the purpose of manufacturing munitions of war. I am not now referring to those corporations in which the capitalization has been increased. I am referring to the extraordinary fact that 174 new corporations, some of them immensely large, some of them of lesser magnitude, have been organized in our country for no other purpose than to furnish munitions of war to Europe.

It would consume time unnecessarily, even if I had the statistics, to describe the capitalization of these corporations or the war contracts which they have undertaken. It will serve my purpose to lay before you the fact that in 15 months—that is to say, from August 1, 1914, to November 1, 1915, a period of 15 months—there were exported from this country to Europe ammunition and firearms to the value of $161,964,276, and the exports are increasing month by month.

I submit the estimated amount of war contracts with a limited number of the large corporations:

American Car & Foundry	$35,000,000
American Locomotive	66,000,000
American Steel Foundries	15,000,000
Baldwin Locomotive Works	100,000,000

Bethlehem Steel Co., 11,000 shells per day, together with field guns and other like arms.

Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., 35,000 tons of steel rounds.

Crucible Steel of America	$10,500,000
General Electric	68,000,000
New York Air Brake	20,242,000
Westinghouse Air Brake	20,000,000
Westinghouse Manufacturing Co	100,000,000

This does not include the contracts of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. of shrapnel shells, or the Du Pont Powder Co. of explosives, or the Electric Storage Battery Co., or the General Chemical Co., or of the General Motors Co., or of the Lackawanna Steel Co., or of the Tennessee Copper Co., all of which are immense concerns and have been largely engaged in the same general business.

The most striking illustration, probably, of the effect upon these large corporations of the manufacture of arms and munitions is found in the unparalleled increase in the market value of their stocks. I instance some of them: Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., the value of the stock increased from 10 to 43¾; of another class of stock, from 43 to 74½.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. WEEKS. I hope it will not interrupt the Senator for me to make the suggestion that all the securities which I presume he is going to read were at abnormal prices at the beginning of the war on account of the depressed condition of business which existed at that time.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think, Mr. President, that the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts is at least measurably true. I do not assert, as I shall presently explain, that the entire increase in the value of the capitalization is due to war contracts; but the comparison is so striking that I could not forbear putting it before the Senate.

American Car & Foundry, from 50⅜ to 86¼, common.

American Locomotive, from 28 to 71.

American Steel Foundries, from 29½ to 70¾.

Baldwin Locomotive Works, from 43 to 112½.

Bethlehem Steel Co., from 41½ to 583, common; 82¾ to 166, preferred.

Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., from 25¾ to 59.

Crucible Steel of America, from 16¾ to 92.

Du Pont Powder Co., from 58½ to 104.

Electric Storage Battery Co., from 51 to 71⅜.

General Electric Co., from 146¼ to 177.

General Chemical Co., from 168 to 348.

General Motors Co., from 90 to 364.

Lackawanna Steel Co., from 32 to 85½.

New York Air Brake, from 66 to 148.

Pennsylvania Steel Co., from 62½ to 96.

Tennessee Copper, from 38⅛ to 63½.

Westinghouse Air Brake, from 129½ to 143½.

Without reckoning the effect upon any of the thousands of other corporations which have engaged in the business, the added value of the stocks of the corporations which I have quoted amounts in the aggregate to the appalling sum of $432,056,500.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. I will yield in just a moment. I ought to say in this connection that I may be in error with respect to this aggregate. It may be that the statement furnished me by the authorities is not computed upon the basis stated in it. I have computed this sum upon the assumption that in the statement furnished all the capitalization has been reduced to the basis of $100 per share. There are some of these corporations in which the par value of the share is less than $100, and if the person who made the computation did not take that into account the sum that I have last stated ought to be reduced about $50,000,000. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I interrupt the Senator merely to add to his statement that which I saw upon the same subject some two months ago in the columns of the World Work Magazine. In the article to which I refer it was stated that the increase in the stock value of the institutions engaged in furnishing supplies to the allies was greater than the total sum of their contracts, and my recollection is that the latter was then given at $750,000,000. Upon that assumption the increase at that time must have been over three quarters of a billion dollars.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, just a moment. I do not know about that; I can neither affirm it nor deny it; but I do know—at least it was related to me by one who was interested in the organization—of a company being organized with a capital of $200,000 receiving a contract for arms and munitions at a price that would enable the company in the execution of that single contract to return the entire capitalization of the company, assuming that it was but a temporary affair, and not only

so, but to award a profit in the undertaking of more than $200,000.

Mr. WEEKS rose.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. I wish to ask the Senator if he has had any inquiry made or has made any investigation of the probable increase which those who have produced food products or those who have had horses and mules and other animals for sale, have made on account of or as a result of the war.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have not made any such inquiry because the inquiry is not pertinent to the subject I am discussing. I assume that the Government of the United States is not about to enter upon the production of all things that are used by the people of the world both in war and peace. I am limiting my proposition to those things that are used only in war, and the whole basis of it is that the influence of profit ought to be eliminated, in so far as it can be, from the minds of the people when they come to determine whether they will have war or peace.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, one more question. Would it be the purpose of the Senator, in case we are engaged in war, to prevent the manufacture of arms and ammunition to be sold to our Government at a greater price than cost?

Mr. CUMMINS. Not at all. I hope that all the countries of the world will adopt this policy. A good many of them have; that is, they have made great strides in that direction. But if there is to be an interchange in arms it ought to be a governmental interchange and not a private interchange. That is my view of the subject.

Mr. WEEKS. But the Senator from Colorado suggested that that could not be done without a violation of neutrality; at least I do not see any way in which it could be done. What I am trying to get at is this: How would we, in time of stress, obtain our supplies unless we allowed some one to make a profit out of the arms and ammunition which were going to be manufactured? Certainly it is not the purpose of the Senator that the Government shall have a plant sufficient to supply our needs in time of war.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is, Mr. President, my purpose.

Mr. WEEKS. I have not the figures before me, but it would require a plant that would cover the whole District of Columbia and probably the employment of 200,000 men.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the Senator is very greatly in error about that, but if the assumption of this function by the Government will tend to prevent war and secure the adjustment of international controversies through peaceful methods, this Government can well afford to own and maintain a plant that will be idle a part of the time. Of course, if we are so unfortunate as to get into war and the Government plant or plants are insufficient to furnish the war material, we can convert private institutions that are now engaged in making commodities for peaceful industry into war factories. We have done it, or it has been done by private owners already.

Mr. President, there is an automobile factory not very far from my own home. It has ceased to manufacture automobiles and is now turning out day after day great quantities of casings for shrapnel shells, and I was told that the expense of converting the factory from one intended to manufacture motor cars to one turning out shrapnel shells was negligible. There are a thousand ways in which the Government can supplement the inadequacy of its plants if we shall unfortunately engage in war.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. OWEN. I will venture to suggest that the Government of the United States could, with perfect facility, from one set of good models, furnish the country with the jigs which would be necessary to turn out any of these munitions, and when the occasion arose furnish these jigs without delay, without additional expense, and put these plants to work throughout the country with ease.

Mr. CUMMINS. Practically there is no difficulty at all in that phase of the matter.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. May I not suggest to the Senator that that difficulty, whatever it might be, is a difficulty which exists at the present time and always has existed when private parties made these munitions, and it could not be increased or made more difficult by the Government doing it.

Mr. CUMMINS. A very appropriate answer is that our facilities in the manufacture of arms and munitions, I suppose, have multiplied ten times since the war in Europe began. Possibly I am understating the comparison rather than overstating it.

The magnitude of the business may be further shown by reference to the disbursements of the United States for the preparation that we have already made. During the 10 years beginning with 1906 and ending in 1915 we have expended in ordnance, engineering, and naval construction $650,028,630, and for all military purposes $2,414,291,255. I have not been able to ascertain just how much of these amounts has been paid to private manufacturers, nor is the exact proportion necessary to emphasize the thought I am endeavoring to impress upon you. It is well known that a large part of it has gone to those whose business it has been to furnish the United States with armament and munitions.

May I read in this connection very briefly from a letter I have just received, bearing date this morning, from the Navy Department? I do it simply to indicate how great the business is:

January 19, 1916—

This is inclosed in a letter to me from the Secretary of the Navy—

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS,
January 19, 1916.

Amount paid to manufacturers for arms, armament, munitions, and raw material for same, 1911–1915, inclusive (impracticable to furnish from 1906, as prior to 1911 ordnance materials were not separately accounted for)		$46,721,170.56
Amount expended for manufacture of arms, armament, and munitions by the Government, 1911–1915, inclusive (impracticable to furnish from 1906, as prior to 1911 ordnance materials were not separately accounted for; a portion of the material charge is a duplication of amounts shown as paid to manufacturers, as the raw material purchased was subsequently used in manufacture):		
Labor	$9,011,679.09	
Indirect	1,705,695.08	
Material	47,084,722.23	
		58,084,722.23
Amount paid by Government for stores other than ordnance material, 1911–1915 (impracticable to furnish from 1906, as prior to 1911 ordnance materials were not separately accounted for)		83,066,011.52
Amount expended at navy yards for manufacture of ships' equipage and supplies, 1906–1915, inclusive (impracticable to furnish from 1906, as prior to 1911 ordnance materials were not separately accounted for; a portion of the material charge is a duplication of amounts shown as paid to manufacturers, as the raw material purchased was subsequently used in manufacture):		
Labor	$9,525,352.34	
Indirect	2,215,460.56	
Material	24,529,950.72	
		36,270,763.62
Amount paid by Government to private contractors for construction of vessels, 1906–1915		203,996,336.65
Amount expended at navy yards for construction of vessels, 1906–1915		37,548,045.33

COMPARATIVE COST OF SISTER SHIPS, CONTRACT AND GOVERNMENT BUILT (HULL, MACHINERY, AND ARMOR).

Contract.		*Government.*	
Louisiana	$6,065,531.19	Connecticut	$6,394,757.77
Utah	7,002,295.02	Florida	8,983,755.46
Texas	9,476,937.31	New York	9,757,749.07
	22,544,763.52		25,136,262.30

I dare not consume the time to fully describe the present situation with respect to the manufacture of arms and munitions. It would not be far from the truth if I were to say that every machine shop in the country that has a lathe in it and that is willing to accept an order from one of the belligerents is engaged in turning out shells of some description. Big foundries and little foundries are casting for war; gunmakers are working day and night, and all these in the less-important industries scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

May I lay before you a rather interesting article that I saw in the New York Times of last Sunday? It is headed "Our greatest arms plant," and reads:

Remington-Union cartridge factory at Bridgeport an Aladdin's castle; industrial army of 50,000 organized by one man.

I will read a paragraph from the body of the article:

Twelve million dollars spent in less than a year have brought into being what will probably be the greatest small-arms and ammunition plant in the world—that of the Remington Arms and Union Metallic Cartridge factories at Bridgeport, Conn. When it is in full operation it will call for the services of from 34,000 to 36,000 employees, bringing the total of the industrial army employed in various places by these companies to 50,000. The Bridgeport plant covers hundreds of acres and is the latest word in factory construction, and yet in its present form it may be said to have actually sprung into existence, to have come before the eyes of Bridgeport, in a moment.

The enormous plant of the Remington Arms Co. was not in existence last March. It was turned over to the company by the contractors in November; so that this immense creation was completed in less than eight months, and even as far back as last August it was so far completed that outwardly it looked as it does to-day.

It has made such a revolution in Bridgeport that the company has been obliged to build practically another city within the city for the accommodation of the thousands of men who are coming from all parts of New England to form a new colony; it has gone into the work of sewering and grading, and is now about to turn its attention to the question of schooling for the children of its subcity. Eighteen thousand men and women in the employ of the Remington Arms, 16,000 more in that of the Union Metallic Cartridge Co., will form the subcity, and with them will come their families. The company is now taking them on at the rate, in the Remington plant alone, of 2,000 a month.

Concerning the same enterprise, I saw an article in one of the New York papers, possibly the New York Tribune, relating to the capitalization of the organization. It is a consolidation, Mr. President, and this is the way it is described in the paper to which I refer:

$60,000,000 MUNITION COMPANY CHARTERED—REMINGTON AND UNION METALLIC COMBINATION AT BRIDGEPORT FORMED.

HARTFORD, *January 15.*

Connecticut's biggest war baby—

What irony there is in that description! The article continues—

a $60,000,000 corporation for the manufacture and sale of arms and munitions, was launched to-day when papers incorporating the Remington Arms-Union Metallic Cartridge Corporation, of Bridgeport, were filed in the office of the State secretary.

The purpose of the new corporation is to acquire the stock and to take over and carry on the business of the Remington Arms & Ammunition Co. of Bridgeport, incorporated under the laws of New York, and the Union Metallic Cartridge Co., also of Bridgeport, and incorporated under the laws of Connecticut. It is further stated in the papers that the purposes are to make, manufacture, purchase, and sell firearms, projectiles, and ammunition, and to build and construct plants for the manufacture of such articles.

And the article proceeds with a graphic description of the efficiency which this corporation is shortly to reach.

I also read a very few words from a most interesting article published in the Chicago Tribune of Monday last, I believe, written by Mr. Gus C. Roeder, a correspondent now in Germany——

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I want to inquire of the Senator from Iowa whether he has anywhere been able to ascertain the amount of capital actually invested in the Remington-Union Metallic enterprise?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have not. I have not looked into that phase of it at all.

Mr. THOMAS. I have no doubt the Senator will agree with me that it is very much less than the capitalization of $60,000,000, as announced.

Mr. CUMMINS. Unquestionably. Nearly all these corporations are overcapitalized, I think. I am reading from a description by this very graphic writer of Berlin. He says:

WAR MAKES MANY RICH.

Because money is so plentiful, prices have gone up considerably. This applies to nearly every article. Men in the field and officers are receiving war salary, which is double the amount paid to the military in time of peace. Besides, the firms which formerly employed the men now serving the colors are paying half salary to their former employees. This continues until the end of the war. This money is usually paid direct to the families at home.

Then, again, so many people have suddenly become immensely rich since the beginning of the war. This applies mostly to those who are employed in furnishing material used in connection with the war. There are so many get-rich-quick families that some Germans are wishing that the war may continue for many more years to come—

And so on in like fashion throughout a half column.

It may be that circumstances will arise which can be met only by war; when honor, safety, liberty, and conscience will all demand armed resistance. I am hoping that these conditions will not confront us, but if there comes a time at which we must decide for war or against war, the men and boys who must die in the struggle which we may enter, the homes that will be made desolate, and the sorrow which will fill the land have a right to insist that the question touching our honor, safety, and institutions shall be decided in a forum uncorrupted and undisturbed by love of money or the opportunity which business may see of reaping profit from the slaughter of the human kind.

Mr. President, if it is good policy to permit the private manufacture of arms and munitions of war, why is it not good policy to allow men to recruit armies and to sell them to the Government which is to employ armies? It has not been long since that was the practice of many governments. It has been but little more than a hundred years since it was regarded as entirely consistent with the highest morality and the most exalted ethics for a government to farm out the enlistment and the training of its armies. The civilized sense of mankind overturned so brutal and so dangerous a policy, and it will not be long until that same sense which takes into account the dearest possessions of civilized man, will drive out this source of profit from the great court which finally determines whether we shall be at peace or whether we shall be at war.

If the reasons I have given for the Government manufacture of all such things were the only reasons pertinent to the inquiry, I would confidently submit them, not only as conclusive, but as overwhelming. There are, however, other considerations which lead to the same result. In the event of war there must be a source for the supply of arms and munitions constant and dependable. So long as private corporations are the source the manufactories will be established at those places most convenient to the manufacturers and most profitable in operation, and the Government must depend upon their production or go unsupplied. There are some very worthy people who sincerely believe that we are in grave danger of invasion, and the officers of the Army are practically a unit now in the conclusion that if one of the great powers of Europe were to make war upon us the entire territory east of the Allegheny Mountains would speedily, if not at once, fall into the hands of the enemy. If you will draw a line parallel to our eastern sea coast and 100 miles inland, substantially every plant capable of producing arms and munitions in any considerable quantities will be found between that line and the Atlantic seaboard; and, as I remember it, every factory permanently engaged in such work, save one, is east of the Allegheny Mountains. If, therefore, the fears of those students of international affairs who anticipate the capture and subjection of the eastern part of our country are well founded, the United States is criminally negligent in permitting the continuance of a condition which, when that unhappy day shall come, leaves it helpless and hopeless.

It must be perfectly obvious to every thoughtful man who believes that we should prepare for war that the manufactories which are to produce the implements of war should be distributed throughout the country between the Allegheny and the Rocky Mountains. It must be equally obvious that private enterprise will never locate them in that part of the country, and that if we are to pursue the path of safety nothing remains but the assumption of such work by the Government itself, and the establishment of the governmental factories in those localities least accessible to an invading force.

The subject in most of its phases has been under discussion for a long time. It has never received serious attention, simply because there has been a sense of security against foreign armies and navies that made such protection unnecessary. It is not so now, for whether we are in danger or not the people have been compelled to think about war and to carefully study the American situation. It can not be doubted that, divergent as we are upon the extent of preparation reasonable or necessary, there is little difference of opinion respecting the subject I am discussing.

There is another aspect of the matter worthy of a moment's reference: The neutrality of the United States in the European war is gravely questioned, and the country is full of bitter animosities on account of the export of arms and munitions to some of the belligerent powers, while others are, by the condition of the war, denied access to our markets. This is not the time to discuss the proper relation of the United States toward Europe. It is sufficient to say that we have proclaimed neutrality. How faithfully we have observed the obligations of neutrality is open to dispute; but, assuming that as an organized Government we have been neutral, it is the only respect in which we have been neutral. Individually we are on one side or the other. Industrially, commercially, and financially we are not neutral. The consequence is that we are torn with dissensions and constantly confronted with the most perplexing questions we have ever met.

I now come to a more direct answer to the inquiry propounded by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS].

If the manufacture of arms and munitions had been at the beginning of the war a governmental function alone, then we would have been compelled to have decided promptly and effectively whether the United States, as a Government, would furnish any or all of the belligerents with arms and munitions, and the decision of that question would either have made us participants in the war or insured a neutrality not open to controversy.

It is not for me at this time to discuss the great, broad inquiry as to our policy toward Europe; it is not for me to ask whether, in obedience to the commands of civilization, we ought to have protested by force of arms against the invasion of Belgium. I express no opinion upon the subject; but I say that if it was our duty and if the Government had been the sole manufacturer of arms and munitions, then, if we continued to supply the allies with arms we would have declared for the allies, and if it was, in the opinion of the people the wiser, the better, the more Christian course to remain neutral, then neither of the belligerents would have received arms and

munitions from the borders of the United States. For one, I believe that the course of the United States should be open; I believe it should be bold and courageous; it should be either for a belligerent or neutral as between the belligerents, and I have never been persuaded that the divorce between the Government as an organization and the action and conduct of its citizens can be very successfully observed or established.

The objection to the system proposed in the resolution, so far as I have heard, is one of cost entirely. It is said that if the Government undertakes to manufacture all the arms and munitions for the equipment and use of the Army and Navy the expense will be greater, first, because as a general rule the cost of Government manufacture is larger than the cost of private manufacture; second, because to meet the emergencies of war the Government would be compelled to construct and maintain plants with a capacity greatly in excess of the ordinary requirements.

My reply is twofold. If I have fairly perceived and correctly expressed the evil influence of private profit in such things, the matter of cost in manufacture shrinks into insignificance; second, while I am ready to admit that ordinarily a private corporation can produce an article at lower cost than a Government establishment, it never has been true, and it is not true now, that the private corporation will sell to the Government the article at a lower price than the cost to the Government in making it.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. OWEN. I wish to call the attention of the Senator and the Senate to the fact that the Government of the United States is now making its own powder at about 25 cents a pound, while these foreign Governments are paying for it three or four times as much.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have with me here a great mass of proof with respect to the question I have just stated; that is, with respect to the comparative cost to the Government of making war material and the price paid for similar material to private manufacturers. I do not intend to consume the time of the Senate by reading it. It is the history of the last 10 years. If there is any one thing conclusively shown in the records of Congress and of the department, it is that, with here and there an exception, the Government has always made for itself these instrumentalities at a cost far below the price it has been compelled to pay when it has purchased them.

It will not, of course, be understood that my resolution contemplates an instantaneous change in our policy. With every effort strained in that direction it will require years to accomplish it, but it will never be accomplished unless we begin the movement. Nor must it be forgotten that if, after having provided ourselves with all reasonable facilities for manufacturing war material, we become engaged in war and our plants are insufficient, we can either contract with private concerns, which, with little change in their machinery, can make most of the articles necessary in warfare, or we can do as they have done abroad—take possession of them and operate them for the time being.

I bring the discussion to a close. I recognize that the policy I advocate is a revolution in our system, but that it is sound and will promote peace, safety, and honor, I have no doubt whatsoever. We have so long indulged the hope that all our international controversies could be adjusted without the intervention of arms that we have not examined carefully the causes of war. Now, that we are witnessing the most terrifying and devastating conflict of all time; now, that we can comprehend the irretrievable disaster which war inflicts; now, that we are urged to put ourselves in readiness to successfully engage in such a struggle, it becomes our bounden duty to do all that is within human power to expel from our national life everything that will interfere with the highest, purest mortal judgment, and remove every temptation that will lead us into war. If war must come, let it come when honorable peace is impossible and at the command of influences springing from love of liberty, love of country, love of humanity, and not from passion inflamed by the sordid hope of gain.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 60, being Order of Business No. 33. It is the joint resolution providing for an investigation of the subject of transportation by a joint committee of the Senate and House. It has been unanimously reported by the Interstate Commerce Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, before the request is acted upon, may I be permitted to secure some information? I should like to ask, conceding that I have not been able to be before the Interstate Commerce Committee, when this joint resolution received the consideration of the committee?

Mr. NEWLANDS. It received the consideration of the committee at the meeting held before the last one. I will say to the Senator that it was fully considered at that time and unanimously approved, the question of certain phraseology being left to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and myself. We agreed upon that phraseology, and we have reported the joint resolution to the Senate.

Mr. LEWIS. May I ask the Senator what expense it is estimated this commission will entail upon the Government?

Mr. NEWLANDS. We have put the expense at $25,000. I assume that that amount will cover it. The committee will inquire into the whole subject of transportation, just as the National Monetary Commission inquired into the question of banking and currency and our financial conditions. The resolution follows the recommendation of the President of the United States in his last message.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I desire to say, expressing my own personal view, that I am not disposed to the increase and multiplication of these different forms of commissions, which invariably have resulted in accomplishing nothing more than earning their own commissions. But in this case——

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator permit me to make a suggestion there?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The joint resolution does not provide for a commission but simply provides for a joint committee of the Senate and House, composed of members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House and the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate.

Mr. LEWIS. The information is satisfactory, Mr. President, removing one of the objections I have; and since the Interstate Commerce Committee has, as the Senator says, unanimously recommended it—I take it upon proper information—I shall not urge any objection at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I was not able to hear what the Senator from Nevada said.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 60, being Order of Business No. 33. It is a joint resolution providing for a general investigation of the subject of transportation by a joint committee of Members of the Senate and House, with a view to reporting as soon as practicable; but the report probably will not be submitted until the next session of Congress.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator what is the necessity of this commission? Has the committee determined that there is a necessity for it?

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is not a commission. This is a joint committee of the Senate and House, composed of members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House and the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it is so near 2 o'clock that I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made to the request for unanimous consent.

SAN ANTONIO BICENTENNIAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to take up Senate joint resolution No. 72, referring to the San Antonio Bicentennial Exposition. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], when it was called up a day or two ago, desired to look further into the matter, and it was laid over for that purpose. I trust the Senator is satisfied as a result of his examination.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the information I have compels me to oppose the resolution; and at this time I shall object to its consideration, because I have not the time between now and 2 o'clock to tell the Senate the reason why I object.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President——

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order—the consideration of the calendar.

THE CALENDAR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is the consideration of bills on the calendar under Rule VIII. The Secretary will state the first bill.

The first bill on the calendar was the bill (S. 2520) granting to the State of Nevada 7,000,000 acres of land in said State for the use and benefit of the public schools of Nevada and the State University of the State of Nevada.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take up Order of Business No. 33, being Senate joint resolution No. 60.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 33—Senate joint resolution No. 60. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. GALLINGER. That would displace the unfinished business.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, is that motion debatable at this time?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I did not hear what the Senator from Michigan said.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wanted to say a word to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to the effect that it occurs to me that it is not wise to take up this matter and dispose of it in 10 minutes. With the general purposes of the resolution I am in accord. I was present during the very few minutes that the committee considered this great question. I know that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has expressed his desire to offer an amendment to the resolution. Anyway, it seems to me, Mr. President——

Mr. NEWLANDS. Upon the statement of my colleague on the Interstate Commerce Committee——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The attention of the Chair has been called to the fact that prior to 2 o'clock a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill is not subject to debate.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Upon the statement of my colleague on the Interstate Commerce Committee that he would like this matter to go over, of course I yield to the suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is withdrawn, then.

RENÉ W. PINTÓ Y WENTWORTH.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I have two joint resolutions which I wish to report from the Committee on Foreign Relations. One of them authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis a certain young gentleman whose name is given, a citizen of Cuba, to be educated at that school at the expense of the Cuban Government. The other is a like joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to receive another gentleman into the academy at West Point, to be educated at the expense of the Cuban Government. I shall be glad if the joint resolutions could be considered at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Are the joint resolutions unanimously reported by the committee?

Mr. STONE. The joint resolutions are unanimously reported; and if they could be considered at this time, I should like to have it done. I therefore report back favorably from the Committee on Foreign Relations the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 80) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy, at West Point, René W. Pintó y Wentworth, a citizen of Cuba, and I submit a report (No. 54) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

It authorizes the Secretary of War to permit René W. Pintó y Wentworth, a citizen of Cuba, to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, provided that no expense shall be caused to the United States thereby, and that he shall agree to comply with all regulations for the police and discipline of the academy, to be studious, and to give his utmost efforts to accomplish the course in the various departments of instruction, and that he shall not be admitted to the academy until he shall have passed the mental and physical examinations prescribed for candidates from the United States, and that he shall be immediately withdrawn if deficient in studies or conduct and so recommended by the academic board; and also that in the case of René W. Pintó y Wentworth the provisions of sections 1320 and 1321 of the Revised Statutes shall be suspended.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARLOS HEVIA Y REYES GAVILÁN.

Mr. STONE. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 81) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy, at Annapolis, Mr. Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán, a citizen of Cuba, and I submit a report (No. 55) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The Secretary read the joint resolution; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

It authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to permit Mr. Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán, a citizen of Cuba, to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, provided that no expense shall be caused to the United States thereby, and that he shall agree to comply with all regulations for the police and discipline of the academy, to be studious, and to give his utmost efforts to accomplish the course in the various departments of instruction, and that he shall not be admitted to the academy until he shall have passed the mental and physical examinations prescribed for candidates from the United States, and that he shall be immediately withdrawn if deficient in studies or conduct and so recommended by the academic board.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE CALENDAR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next bill on the calendar.

The next bill on the calendar was the bill (S. 1053) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes.

Mr. STERLING. I ask that that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

NEWSPAPER PUBLICATION OF LAND-OFFICE NOTICES.

The bill (S. 1062) relating to the duties of registers of United States land offices and the publication in newspapers of official land-office notices was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. After the word "him," in line 5, on page 1, the Senator from New Mexico proposes to insert a comma and the words "or, in case of a public-land entry, by the entryman,".

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from New Mexico desires to speak upon that amendment. He is out of the Chamber. For that reason I ask that it go over. I am perfectly willing to vote upon it, personally.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator from New Mexico has already discussed the matter quite extensively.

Mr. CATRON. Mr. President, I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. FALL] is unavoidably absent, on account of sickness, and will not be here to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 381.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] now desires to present a very radical and a very far-reaching and important amendment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hughes	Myers	Smoot
Beckham	Husting	Nelson	Sterling
Catron	James	Oliver	Stone
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	Overman	Sutherland
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Page	Swanson
Colt	Kenyon	Pittman	Thomas
Curtis	Kern	Poindexter	Tillman
du Pont	La Follette	Pomerene	Underwood
Fletcher	Lane	Ransdell	Vardaman
Gallinger	Lea, Tenn.	Robinson	Warren
Gore	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Weeks
Gronna	Lewis	Sheppard	Williams
Hardwick	Lippitt	Sherman	Works
Hitchcock	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	
Hollis	Martine	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I beg to state that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] is detained at home on account of illness.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] has been called to his home and is unable to attend the session of the Senate to-day.

Mr. STERLING. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota]. I should like to have this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. PAGE. I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. DILLINGHAM] on important business. He is paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I wish this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. STONE. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. REED] is unavoidably absent from the Senate and will not be able to attend the session to-day.

Mr. SWANSON. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. MARTIN of Virginia] has been detained from the Senate yesterday and to-day on account of sickness in his family. I desire this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], who has been called to New York. He has a pair recorded.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I desire to state that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] is absent. He is engaged on official business and is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL].

Mr. STONE. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is detained from the Senate by illness. He is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). Fifty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to section 30, page 29, being the section to which I called the attention of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] yesterday. I have written the proposed amendment somewhat hurriedly, and as I fear the Clerk may not be able to read it I will read it myself.

On page 29, line 20, before the word "treaty," insert the word "or"; strike out all of line 21 and in lieu thereof insert:

Of the United States is involved or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is claimed under the Constitution, treaties, or laws of or commission held or authority exercised under the United States and the decision is against the title, right, privilege, or immunity especially set up or claimed by either party under such Constitution, treaty, statute, commission, or authority.

So that the section as amended will read:

SEC. 30. That the Supreme Court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to review, revise, reverse, modify, or affirm the final judgments and decrees of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands in all actions, cases, causes, and proceedings now pending therein or hereafter determined thereby in which the Constitution or any statute or treaty of the United States is involved or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is claimed under the Constitution, treaties, or laws of or commission held or authority exercised under the United States and the decision is against the title, right, privilege, or immunity especially set up or claimed by either party under such Constitution, treaty, statute, commission, or authority, and such final judgments or decrees may and can be reviewed, revised, reversed, modified, or affirmed by said Supreme Court of the United States on appeal or writ of error by the party aggrieved within the same time, in the same manner, under the same regulations, and by the same procedure, as far as applicable, as the final judgments and decrees of the district courts of the United States.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Would the Senator from Utah object to having his amendment printed and lie over until to-morrow?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have no objection.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is rather complicated, and the section as it appears in the bill is the existing law. If the Senator will have it printed and lie over until to-morrow, possibly we can agree upon the acceptance of it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have no objection to that course being taken, but I should like to say just a word in reference to it, so that what I say may be considered in connection with the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie over. The Senator from Utah will proceed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the provision embraced in section 30, and which is now included in the organic act, as the Senator from Nebraska has said, provides that jurisdiction of the Supreme Court shall extend to cases in which the Constitution or any statute, treaty, title, right, or privilege of the United States is involved. I think the latter part of that provision was inserted under some sort of a misapprehension. Certainly it could not have been intended to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States to a case where the title, right, or privilege was only that of the United States, but what was evidently intended to be covered was a case where the title or right or privilege was that of some person or corporation claimed under the United States or under the Constitution or a statute or a treaty of the United States. That language has been in the statutes of the United States, with reference to appeals from the State courts, for a great many years, and it is perfectly understood and has received judicial construction over and over again. The language which now appears in the Philippine bill, so far as I know, never has occurred anywhere else, and, as it seems to me, it is wholly inapplicable to what we want to accomplish.

Therefore the amendment which I have offered, in so far as it relates to the question of title, right, or privilege, has adopted the language which is now found in the statute with reference to appeals from the State courts; and I have also inserted the word "immunity," which seems by inadvertence to have been omitted from the organic act.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator from Georgia permit the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to be offered?

Mr. HARDWICK. I thought that had been done.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I supposed the amendment had been offered, otherwise I would have presented it. I offer it now formally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert at the end of the bill the following additonal section:

SEC. —. The President is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippines, and he shall on behalf of the United States fully recognize the independence of the said Philippines as a separate and self-governing nation and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the government instituted by the people thereof. This transfer of possession, sovereignty, and governmental control shall be completed and become absolute within two years from the date of the approval of this act, under the terms and in the manner hereinafter prescribed. For the purpose of a complete and prompt compliance with this direction, the President is hereby invested with full power and authority to make such orders and regulations and to enter into such negotiations with the authorities of said Philippines or others as may be necessary to finally settle and adjust all property rights and other relations as between the United States and the said Philippines, and to cause to be acknowledged, respected, and safeguarded all of the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States resident or engaged in business in said Philippines or having property interests therein. In any such settlement or adjustment so made in respect to the rights and property of the United States as against the said Philippines the President shall reserve or acquire such lands and rights and privileges appurtenant thereto as may, in his judgment, be required by the United States for naval bases and coaling stations within the territory of said Philippines.

Immediately after the passage of this Act, the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located, for the purpose and to the end that the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves, in the form of a treaty or other binding agreement, to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines, and also to mutually obligate themselves, equally and not one primarily nor to any greater extent than another, to maintain as against external force the sovereignty of said Philippines for the period of five years from the taking effect of such treaty or agreement. If any of the nations so invited to join the United States in such undertaking shall decline to do so, then the President shall include as parties to such convention or agreement such nations as may be willing to join therein and to assume such obligations; and if none are willing to so unite therein, then the President is authorized to give such guaranty on behalf of the United States alone.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] that the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas is of far-reaching importance. Indeed, the bill proposed by the Senator from Nebraska, while important in a way and admirable in a way, is of very little significance when compared with the proposition advanced by the Senator from Arkansas. The bill proposes some changes which seem to make for a more liberal participation on the part of the Filipinos in their own government. On the other hand, the amendment suggested by the Senator from Arkansas proposes that in a definite time, within a reasonable time I think, a step shall be taken that this Government, in my judgment, ought to take, and to the necessity and propriety of our taking that step, either in the manner proposed by the Senator from Arkansas or in some similar manner, I now wish to especially invite the attention of my Democratic colleagues.

If it be not old fashioned to call attention to Democratic pledges on this floor, and if it be not unusual to expect Democratic compliance with those pledges, then the proposition advanced by the Senator from Arkansas is not without force as a party proposition, for it seems to me that if there is any one thing upon which the Democratic Party has been absolutely consistent, uniformly so, since the acquisition of the Philippines, it has been in regard to our position with reference to the acquisition and retention of those islands.

I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to several platform utterances on that question. First, in 1900, at the first

national convention we had after the acquisition of those islands, we used this language:

THE PHILIPPINES.

We condemn and denounce the Philippine policy of the present administration. It has involved the Republic in unnecessary war, sacrificed the lives of many of our noblest sons, and placed the United States, previously known and applauded throughout the world as the champion of freedom, in the false and un-American position of crushing with military force the efforts of our former allies to achieve liberty and self-government. The Filipinos can not be citizens without endangering our civilization; they can not be subjects without imperiling our form of government; and as we are not willing to surrender our civilization nor to convert the Republic into an empire we favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to give the Filipinos, first, a stable form of government; second, independence; and, third, protection from outside interference, such as has been given for nearly a century to the Republics of Central and South America.

The greedy commercialism which dictated the Philippine policy of the Republican administration attempts to justify it with the plea that it will pay; but even this sordid and unworthy plea fails when brought to the test of facts. The war of criminal aggression against the Filipinos, entailing an annual expense of many millions, has already cost more than any possible profit that could accrue from the entire Philippine trade for years to come. Furthermore, when trade is extended at the expense of liberty, the price is always too high.

Again, in 1904, the Democratic Party in national convention, used this language:

FILIPINOS AND CUBANS.

We insist that we ought to do for the Filipinos what we have done already for the Cubans, and it is our duty to make that promise now and upon suitable guaranties of protection to citizens of our own and other countries resident there at the time of our withdrawal, set the Filipino people upon their feet, free and independent to work out their own destiny.

The endeavor of the Secretary of War, by pledging the Government's indorsement for "promoters" in the Philippine Islands, to make the United States a partner in speculative legislation of the archipelago, which was only temporarily held up by the opposition of the Democratic Senators in the last session, will, if successful, lead to entanglements from which it will be difficult to escape.

Again, in 1908 our party used this language:

THE PHILIPPINES.

We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder which has involved us in enormous expenses, brought us weakness instead of strength, and laid our Nation open to the charge of abandoning a fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us as we guarantee the independence of Cuba, until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers. In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our Government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases.

In the platform of 1912, on which the last campaign was fought, we find this pledge:

THE PHILIPPINES.

We reaffirm the position thrice announced by the Democracy in national convention assembled against a policy of imperialism and colonial exploitation in the Philippines or elsewhere. We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder, which has involved us in enormous expenses, brought us weakness instead of strength, and laid our Nation open to the charge of abandonment of the fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers.

In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our Government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases.

Mr. President, it is evident from these declarations of our party in national convention assembled that Senators on this side of the aisle at least are pledged, so far as they can be pledged, by four successive platforms in the party to grant to the Philippine Islands independence as soon as a stable form of government can be established in those islands, and to guarantee that independence until a treaty of neutrality can be negotiated with the other nations of the earth.

There may be raised by Senators on this side the question of fact as to whether or not a stable government can be established in the Philippine Islands now, or if not now within what length of time such a government may be established. I take it, Mr. President and Senators, that the Democratic national convention, when they used the expression "a stable form of government," did not mean a form of government such as could be and would be maintained among the English-speaking and Anglo-Saxon peoples, because the probability is that the people of the Philippine Islands might not attain that standard in many, many years, not even in hundreds of years. So the expression, giving it a fair construction, must have meant as soon as those people were capable of maintaining a stable form of government according to their own standards, according to their own environment, according to their own location, and among nations in that part of the world.

If that be true, and I do not think any Senator on either side will take issue with the reasonableness of that statement, either the legislation so ably championed by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska rests on a false basis and is unworthy of support, or those people are almost if not quite at the point when they are capable of self-government according to the standards of their own people and their own kind of people.

The Senator from Nebraska, by the bill that he reports, would give to those people a large measure of self-government. If the bill that he champions shall become the law, and I want to say I favor it whether this amendment is agreed to or not, those people will be intrusted with a still larger measure of self-government than they have been allowed even since the beginning of this administration.

My only objection to the legislation is that it does not go far enough, because if those people are entitled to and are worthy of the amount of self-government the Senator proposes to give them in this legislation, then undoubtedly a stable form of government within the meaning of our Democratic platforms at least can be speedily established there.

So the Senator from Arkansas by his amendment proposes that within two years after all of the machinery which the pending legislation seeks to set up and establish can be put in operation, within two years from that time, when the people of the Philippine Islands will be practically intrusted with all the essentials of self-government, we shall say that now we will carry out the pledges of our party, carry out our duty to the Philippine people, and allow them to depart in peace and to set up their own government among the nations of the world.

I do not know, Mr. President, to what extent the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators who oppose this amendment are prepared to take issue on the question of fact as to whether or not those people are now capable or will be capable within two years of maintaining a stable form of government. We have heard eloquent Senators on this floor, members of this committee, describe in terms of general accuracy and with thorough detail the amount and the general diffusion of education that there is among those people. We have heard the fact adverted to more than once, and with increasing eloquence every time, by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] that those people are maintaining a local legislative assembly in which every single member is a college graduate. Of course that might be of somewhat doubtful value, but the fact has been asserted, and I suppose it must be true.

We hear that there are 500,000 children in the schools of those islands. I venture the statement—and I do not know whether any Senator here is prepared to take issue with it or not; I doubt it—from what I have heard on this floor and from what I have read in the hearings it is doubtful whether there are many peoples in Central or South America, and certainly there are few in Asia or Africa, that have more capacity for setting up, establishing, and maintaining a stable form of government, such as is adapted to them and their needs, than have the people of the Philippine Islands. If so, no Democratic Senator who sits on this side of the Chamber and who believes in the declarations of his party, who believes that these pledges were made for some other purpose than to get into office on, who believes that campaign pledges in a platform ought to be something more than mere rhetoric, ought to hesitate to take whatever steps are necessary to give to those islands within a reasonable time that independence which we have insisted ought to be given to them ever since they were acquired by this country.

Mr. President, I am going to take up this question briefly—because I am not proposing to make an extensive argument on it—from another standpoint, a standpoint that appeals, or ought to appeal, to every Senator without regard to his party alliance, and that is from the standpoint of common sense. Does the possession of those islands profit us? Does it strengthen our position nationally or internationally? Does it pay either commercially or from any other standpoint? Senators, there is no dispute over the fact that since we have had those islands they have cost the American people many millions of dollars. It was estimated on this floor yesterday by a distinguished Senator of long and honorable service here, that the increase in military and naval expenditures in our establishment, because of our possession of these islands, had averaged $25,000,000 a year for the 18 years during which we have held possession of them. That same Senator estimated that, leaving out the expenses of the great Filipino insurrection, the possession of those islands during that period of time had cost the United States of America not less than $600,000,000.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not care to interrupt the Senator unless he is willing that I shall do so.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. LIPPITT. In regard to the statement of Senators that these islands have cost us, and are costing us, $25,000,000 a year, I am aware that that statement has been made on this floor two or three times. During the hearings before the committee Gen. McIntyre, the chief of the Insular Bureau, War Department, was asked to compile for the committee a statement of the actual cost to the United States of the Philippines over and above what it would cost the United States without them. He put a very elaborate statement into the record. That statement shows that the Philippine Islands have cost us—I think it is for the years since 1903 to and including the year 1914—$119,000,000, or at the rate of $9,475,000 a year.

If the Senator from Georgia will take that statement and examine the figures for the year 1914, instead of taking the average of the whole number of years as the annual expense, he will find that those islands are now costing the United States $7,692,000 annually; or, in other words, the cost to the United States of the Philippine Islands is practically to-day $7,700,000 annually.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does the Senator from Rhode Island himself really believe that those figures are accurate?

Mr. LIPPITT. I do. I have no reason to doubt them.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator is doubtless familiar with an earlier report that this same gentleman, Gen. McIntyre, rendered to President Taft, in which he stated that it was absolutely impossible to estimate such expenditures by the year——

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, that may have been so. I am not familiar with the report to which the Senator refers.

Mr. HARDWICK. That it was a matter of speculation and guesswork to such a large extent, and that he could not estimate these expenditures.

Mr. LIPPITT. May I ask where the Senator from Georgia gets his figures of $25,000,000 as the annual cost of the Philippines? The only figures which we have, of which I know, from any authoritative source are these figures. They were put in as the result of a very careful compilation, I presume, though it may be in some cases they are estimates.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator from Rhode Island will pardon me just a moment, I will say that I was quoting from the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], who yesterday made a statement in reference to this matter on the floor. Of course, the Senator knew when he made it, and understood at the time, that it was a mere statement of his opinion after considerable investigation of the subject; and while, of course, Gen. McIntyre also has a right to his opinion, it is well known how these officers of the Insular Bureau feel toward the retention of the Philippines. It is well known that in their reports they have insisted under other administrations that it was practically impossible to estimate how much of the Army and Navy expenditures of the United States could be really fairly charged to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. LIPPITT. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that Gen. McIntyre has given these figures in great detail.

Mr. HARDWICK. I have read them.

Mr. LIPPITT. The statement that the Senator from Nevada made is a statement that has been heretofore made on the floor of the Senate two or three times.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes, sir; it has been repeatedly made.

Mr. LIPPITT. They are estimates made by different Senators. I myself do not know where those figures come from.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not want to take the time of the Senator from Georgia if he objects.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is all right. It does not make any difference.

Mr. LIPPITT. On the other side of the proposition we have the fact that the trade of the United States with the Philippine Islands has gone ahead in a very remarkable manner. In 1900 the exports from the United States to the Philippine Islands were $3,500,000, in 1909 they were $10,000,000, and in 1914 they had gone to $22,000,000. To-day practically the exports from this country to the Philippine Islands amount to $25,000,000.

Mr. HARDWICK. And in my judgment it is costing us more than the total amount of our export trade with those islands to keep them.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator from Georgia has any figures which justify his estimate, I would like to hear them.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will be glad to give the Senator from Rhode Island the reasons for my statement.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. I was just going to suggest that I thought the controversy, as is nearly always the case in a controversy, is because two propositions are involved. Gen. McIntyre assumes in his statement to give what the records say is the actual cost of maintaining our Army and transport fleet with reference to the Philippine Islands, while on the other hand, as I understood the Senator from Georgia (Mr. HARDWICK), when he first touched on this subject, he was discussing the probable additional cost to the United States flowing out of the fact that every time we talk of the Army or Navy we have in mind the necessity of an enlarged proposition because of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. HARDWICK. And the figures which Gen. McIntyre furnished us, if the Senator will pardon me for just a moment, are probably for the maintenance, the actual expenses of the forces that are stationed in the Philippines, and take no account whatever of the many battleships that have probably been constructed, properly and necessarily, because of our occupancy of the Philippines, and because of our duties and obligations and dangers there, and of the increase in naval armament for the same reasons.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if the head of his party, who now occupies executive offices in the White House, is not urging upon his supporters in this body to very largely increase both the size of the Navy that we have and the size of the Army that we have, and whether that is based upon the necessity of holding the Philippine Islands? As a matter of fact, the Senator knows that there is an enormous movement all over this country for the purpose of very largely increasing both the Army and the Navy utterly independent of whether or not we hold the Philippines. Under those circumstances, it seems to me, it is scarcely fair to try to charge up against those islands a few additional battleships and a few soldiers when we have not enough even including those. However, that is a matter of opinion, I will admit, which Senators can figure in ways to suit themselves, only I should like to have it on its proper basis.

Now, if the Senator will allow me just to put in the other side of the question and to call it to his attention, I shall not further interrupt him.

Mr. HARDWICK. That does not make any difference. I am glad to yield to the Senator at any time.

Mr. LIPPITT. I wanted to say that in regard to our exports to the Philippine Islands, which are now estimated at about $25,000,000 annually, it has been stated in the Senate that the outside possible benefit to this country of those exports was perhaps 10 per cent, that being the amount that capital might make in the form of dividends or profits out of that business.

Mr. President, I do not myself know exactly a scientific method of figuring the value to this country of $25,000,000 of exports, but I believe that it will be manifest to anybody who will think the proposition over for a minute that the profit is very much larger than any profit that capital may receive from the amount of business that is done in that way. Of course labor is always very largely employed in the production of those articles of export, and the value to this country of employing its labor is quite as much as the value of employing its capital. Further than that, the actual capital that is invested in a manufactory, for instance, for making boots and shoes, assuming that it may be a million dollars, for the purpose of exporting its product to the Philippine Islands is expended in giving employment in a very large way to the lumber industry, to the iron industry, and to a very large number of other industries in the United States, the products of which are necessary to build such a factory. So I say that I think it is a very difficult matter to accurately estimate the value of an export business of $25,000,000. I am very sure that it is very largely in excess of any possible sum that could be considered as a profit of the capital immediately engaged in producing the articles that are exported. I merely wanted to suggest the two sides of this proposition to the Senator.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question before he takes his seat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I desire to ask the Senator from Rhode Island if he thinks the question of profits to be derived by private enterprise should have any material weight in determining the moral and legal questions involved in this controversy? Has the United States any right to hold those people, if it should be shown that they are able to maintain a government of their own, because it happens to be profitable to a few manufacturers? Does the Senator think that that ought to cut any figure at all?

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I have not at any time based my position in regard to this matter on the question of the value of the business that the United States might derive from those islands; but I do think that it is a matter that is entitled to reasonable consideration. The entire policy of the United States has been that they were going to hold and govern those islands for the benefit of the Filipino people. With that policy distinctly stated it would be manifestly improper for the United States to have their conduct controlled or largely influenced by the question of profit to themselves; but when Senators on the other side bring up the question of the cost of maintenance of those islands to this country it is manifestly fair that both sides of the ledger should be stated, and it was for that purpose, with that thought in my mind, which I think is distinctly proper, that I made the suggestion.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state to the Senator from Rhode Island that last June ex-President Taft, in the Saturday Evening Post, stated that when he was Secretary of War the maintenance of 60,000 troops cost the Government $72,000,000; in other words, about $1,200 for each soldier. There never have been in the Philippine Islands less than 12,000 American troops, and there were between the dates mentioned by the Senator as high as 40,000 American troops in the islands. I can not see how you can arrive at any other conclusion than that the estimate which has been made by the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House, namely, $26,000,000, is about the correct amount.

Now, with relation to the other matter—because the Senator evidently referred to my speech when he said that I had assumed that 10 per cent was what the exporter from the United States made in his commerce with the Philippines—I want to say that 10 per cent profit on $24,000,000 of exports which we send to the Philippines amounts only to $2,400,000. The Senator himself stated that he did not think it was that high. If it is less, then the profit which would come to the exporters of this country will be correspondingly less. As I asked in my previous remarks, is it possible that the United States will continue to spend this large amount of money—whether it is $26,000,000 or even $7,000,000—when the profit which comes to the exporters in the United States would be only $2,400,000 a year? Shall we continue this policy when in other ways we are spending four, five, six, seven, or eight times that amount to maintain an establishment there with a profit to our people of one-seventh or one-sixth or one-fifth of the amount we expend?

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado if he thinks the total value to this country of an export business of $25,000,000 is only two and a half million dollars? Does he not himself acknowledge that the benefit of having labor employed is quite as large to the country as in having its capital employed?

Mr. SHAFROTH. That is an element; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. LIPPITT. Then, how much would the Senator add to the two and a half million dollars as a benefit to the labor of this country? The amount paid to labor is generally two, three, four, or five times in the cost of manufacture greater than the amount paid in dividends. It would be reasonable to say that of that $25,000,000 not less than 40 per cent of it is directly paid to labor actually engaged in the production of the articles which are being exported. Will the Senator not add that to the benefits derived on account of that export business by the United States?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I would not add it to that extent; but even if it were 40 per cent—take the Senator's own figures—40 per cent of $24,000,000 is only $10,000,000, and we are spending $26,000,000 a year in order to maintain an establishment there, where by the remotest possibility, according to the figures given by the Senator himself, the benefit could only amount to $10,000,000.

Mr. LIPPITT. Now we have got the Senator up to admitting that there are $10,000,000 of benefit to labor.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I do not admit it. I stated that I did not admit it to the extent that the Senator said. I said that even if what the Senator claimed be true——

Mr. LIPPITT. What will the Senator admit? How much will he admit? Is it 30 per cent?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I will not say that.

Mr. LIPPITT. Is it 20 per cent?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Evidently we would not undertake to manufacture things at a loss, and there are some incidental advantages; but I have never heard a Senator attempt to figure the profit to the country. What are the profits to the Government? Not a cent goes to the Government.

Mr. LIPPITT. Oh, well, Mr. President——

Mr. SHAFROTH. These profits all go to some one else.

Mr. LIPPITT. Let us discuss one phase of the question at a time.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia further yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. If Senators think they have about exhausted that branch of the controversy, I believe I will proceed.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I think the theory which I sought to establish, the idea which I wanted to put into the mind of the Senator, has been made clear.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think it has found lodgement, and I will be glad to answer both of the Senators' points. In the first place, I think it is very apparent from this that what the Philippine Islands are actually costing us is by no means reflected in the report to which the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island refers. Evidently Gen. McIntyre—and I have read his report casually, not with a great deal of care, I will admit—was figuring only on the cost of the troops within the Philippine Islands, and he did not figure the cost of the many extra battleships we may have provided, of the thousands more of soldiers we may have added to our Army, nor did he consider how many more it may be necessary in the future to add both to the Army and the Navy in the way of battleships and of soldiers if we are to keep those islands.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island suggests that the present distinguished Chief Executive is now urging upon members of his own party and upon the members of both parties and upon the country—because it is a nonpartisan matter—the necessity, in view of present conditions, for some larger armament. The President of the United States, as I understand it—although I do not assume to speak for him on this floor or elsewhere—is not advocating and will never advocate anything like a military system for the sake of militarism. He is advocating some increase in our Navy and some increase in our Army because present disturbed world-wide conditions seem to indicate that there may be a necessity some day for defensive purposes for us to have a larger Army and a larger Navy than we now have; but I do not think that the Senator from Rhode Island or any other Senator can dispute the proposition that, however much we may add to the Army and to the Navy of the United States, we will always have to add some more to both if we are to keep the Philippine Islands permanently.

There are many thoughtful people in this country, Mr. President, who believe that the possession of the Philippine Islands is not only a source of great national weakness to this country, but is a source of ever-present and ever-increasing danger, and that if foreign complications are ever to come to this country from the East they will come because of our possession of the Philippine Islands or because of some question connected therewith, and that if such complications are to arise it will be almost, if not quite, impossible to defend the Philippine Islands successfully against any considerable oriental power. As long as we do stay there, or try to stay there, we are not to be run off by any people on the face of the earth—white, black, or yellow—but we must hold those islands, or, if we lose them, we will be in honor bound forced to retake them if it is possibly in our power to do so. So that the continued permanent possession of these islands, in my judgment, not only increases the danger that this country is in of trouble with foreign powers, but it infinitely and almost indescribably weakens our strong position of isolation from other powers and our strong defensive position against possible aggression from any quarter.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. CLAPP. The fact being that those islands are so far from our shores that we can not easily protect them, is it not also true, in addition to what the Senator has urged, that they are a menace to us, that our sovereignty over them is a menace to them, subjecting them to attacks, if we are in danger of war ourselves, that they would not be subjected to if they were an independent sovereignty of their own?

Mr. HARDWICK. Undoubtedly the Senator's observation is correct; and to that extent it creates a situation that is unfair to those people. If we become involved in war with powers that are able to strike us at our weakest point, namely, the Philippine Islands, the Filipino people themselves will be the first

helpless victims of this yoke that we insist upon keeping around their necks.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. WARREN. I listened with interest to the reading of several platform declarations of the party of which the Senator is a distinguished member. I notice that in those declarations the United States was to guarantee the Philippine Islands a stable government and complete independence, while in the amendment now pending the United States is authorized only—

to give guaranty on behalf of the United States alone—

And that only for five years.

In other words, if other nations do not enter into this proposed treaty, to which we have not invited their attention, as I understand, and concerning which we have no promise that they will accede to our desire, then we alone will guarantee the sovereignty of the islands.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; but if the Senator will pardon me——

Mr. WARREN. Just a moment; let me finish the question.

Mr. HARDWICK. Very well.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator believe that we shall have to have either troops or battleships to make that guaranty good, or does he think that we could then do away with the desire of the country and of his party for battleships and troops, for a stronger Navy and a stronger and more efficient Army? How would he enforce this guaranty?

Mr. HARDWICK. I will answer the Senator very frankly. If the Senator would read all the amendment, he would find that the guaranty is only for a very limited period of time—for a period of five years.

Mr. WARREN. That is enough time in which to destroy that country or impoverish this—perhaps both—in order to make that guaranty good.

Mr. HARDWICK. We have the same hazard now, and we should be subject to it in perpetuo, according to the Senator's view, if he takes the other view, whereas under the amendment we would only be subject to it for five years.

Mr. WARREN. I have no such view. The bill proposes, and I hear no argument against it, that there shall be established an independent government in the Philippines; but the proposition now is that two years from now they shall have their complete independence. I believe the time will arrive when such a proposal as this might be advisable, but I think that now is not the time to decide it.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator is in error in respect to that statement. The bill does not so provide. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, which I am advocating, does so provide. The bill itself contains no provision for Philippine independence at any time.

Mr. WARREN. It does provide for independence in two years.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. Perhaps I made a misstatement. I understand the matter perfectly; I have read both the bill and the amendment. I say that the bill itself aims at the complete independence for the islands in time, without naming a particular time, while the amendment proposes to name the time, and a very short one at that. Without having consulted with other nations, we proceed to guarantee for five years the government and put ourselves in the same position in which we are now, and yet the Senator would like to dispose of the matter of having further battleships and a larger Army because we will have relinquished our responsibility toward them. This is I think hardly consistent.

Mr. HARDWICK. I still, with all deference to the Senator's judgment, do not see how the Senator can believe that we will not be gaining if we have to do that for only five years, instead of keeping it up indefinitely, as we will have to do permanently, if we do not turn them loose at all.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator from Georgia favor limiting our guaranty to five years?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Would that not be violating the platform which he has read?

Mr. HARDWICK. No, sir.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will he read it, please?

Mr. HARDWICK. It is as follows:

We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator now is advocating limiting our guaranty to five years. If at the end of five years we have not secured a treaty, then we are to abandon the Philippines to their fate, violating the Democratic platform.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does the Senator from Nebraska contend that the Democratic platform has ever proposed that we were to set the islands free and to continue to guarantee to the end of time and through all eternity their independence against any external force? Is that how he construes the Democratic platform?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not now construing the Democratic platform.

Mr. HARDWICK. I thought the Senator was.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the bill construes the Democratic platform. The Senator is contending here for a literal and technical construction of that platform. That platform provides that we shall guarantee the independence of the islands until we can have an agreement with the other nations of the world to neutralize the islands, yet he stands here advocating limiting that guaranty to five years. Is he living up to the letter of the Democratic platform in so doing?

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, the Senator can judge of that as well as I can. My own judgment is that we will be able to conclude the treaties that are necessary within a far less period of time than five years; I do not think we will need even 12 months to do that; but in any event, according to the way I construe the Democratic platforms—and there is more than one platform utterance on this question—and I have said that for a limited time after we established their independence we would guarantee it——

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to a suggestion there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The purpose of that pledge, as I understand, was that the islands should be protected by the United States Government until they were able to form and establish their own government. It seems to me a very strained construction that the Senator from Nebraska would put upon it, that this Government is called upon, under the terms of that platform promise, to maintain control over the islands, as the Senator from Georgia said a moment ago, throughout eternity. The promise was only to protect them during the formative stage of their national existence until they were able as a nation to stand alone.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I do not think there can be a shadow of a doubt on that question. Otherwise, language means nothing. Does the Senator from Nebraska or any other Senator contend that the meaning of this was that we should guarantee the independence of these people through all time and under all circumstances?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As the Senator asks me a question, I will give him an answer.

Mr. HARDWICK. All right; I wanted an answer.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is not what the platform says; but the platform does say in plain English, if the Senator proposes to live up to the letter of it, that we shall guarantee their independence until we are able to neutralize them by treaty with other nations. That is what it says.

Mr. HARDWICK. Suppose we can not secure such a treaty; would the Senator contend——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am talking about living up to the technical letter of the platform, for which the Senator is contending.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Sentor from Georgia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. BORAH. I am simply an "onlooker in Venice" so far as the Democratic platform is concerned; but is the Senator referring to the platform of 1912 or the platform of 1908?

Mr. HARDWICK. I read from the platform of 1912.

Mr. BORAH. The platform of 1904 and 1908 are even more specific, and were interpreted by the leader of Democracy in

this country, Mr. Bryan, in such a way that there can be no mistake as to what he supposed the meaning to be.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; the language is a little different; but I have put them all in the RECORD and the Senator from Nebraska can weigh them all. My judgment is that none of those platforms meant to pledge us to an eternal guarantee of the independence of the islands, but, simply as a matter of reason and common sense, that when we undertook to set up a government for them, a free and independent government that we thought they could maintain, we should, for a reasonable time, while they were getting it started, protect them from outside interference, and not through all the centuries that were to come after they did get on their feet.

Mr. President, there is very little more that I want to say about this amendment. It not only expresses my idea of what the Democratic policy and the Democratic pledge has been through four successive campaigns, but it expresses my idea of what is right and proper for this country from the commonsense, practical standpoint. These islands have cost us not less than $25,000,000 a year—the figures employed and used on this floor yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Nevada—and those figures are $1,000,000 a year less than the figures used by the House committee after a careful and exhaustive investigation of this subject. That great cost has been incurred for a trade that has not increased as rapidly as our foreign trade has increased in the same period of time with many a country over which our flag does not fly. So I contend that there is no sense in it from the standpoint of the commercial interests of this country. As a business proposition it has not paid, and, as far as we can judge, it never will pay. It by no means follows that if we do establish a stable and independent government in the Philippine Islands we will not therefore be able to trade with them and to send our exports to them just as we do now. I think the very contrary is true. I can see no reasonable ground for supposing that because we do give them a free and independent government they will immediately quit trading with our merchants and our manufacturers.

Not only that, Mr. President, but it does not seem to me that any Senator on this side of the Chamber, or any considerable number of people in this country, can seriously doubt the proposition that the possession and retention and the necessity for defense of these far-flung islands of the sea, 7,000 miles and more away from our Pacific coast, is a source of constant, of irritating, and of almost incalculable weakness in our system of national defense against any possible danger; that it is a source of constant and growing irritation, so far as our relations or possible relations with foreign powers are concerned. Besides that, it seems to me——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator kindly specify some of the causes of irritation which have grown out of the possession of the Philippine Islands?

Mr. HARDWICK. I could undertake to do that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to hear the Senator specify them.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will reply to the Senator in the form of an interrogatory. Does he think that the possession of those islands adds to our chances for continuing peaceable relations, friendly relations, with the Empire of Japan?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will answer that question, but of course the Senator is not answering mine.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am answering the Senator's question by asking him one of my own.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am very confident, from my investigations, that our possession of the Philippine Islands is entirely satisfactory to Japan; and when I come to speak I shall give my reasons for it.

Mr. HARDWICK. I shall be glad to hear them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But the Senator stated that they have been a cause of constant irritation in our foreign relations, and I now ask him to specify.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will specify. I have asked the Senator a question which indicated what my own mind is on that question. I have always understood in a general way, I admit without special investigation of the question—if the Senator has investigated it, of course he has the advantage of me in that particular—and it is common belief in this country, in many parts of it, at least, and among many people, that the possession of these islands does not help us either to get or to keep on more friendly terms with Japan.

If the Senator can convince us that we are mistaken about that, so far as that source of irritation is concerned I shall undoubtedly be in error, and shall be glad to be corrected by him. I do not believe, however, and I do not think the Senator believes, or that any Senator believes, that the possession of land in Asiatic waters, in another continent, by a power which insists on the inviolability of American soil, and which insists that no other power on earth shall lay its hand upon any country in this hemisphere, is an act that will be very readily, very easily, very pleasantly received by other powers who yield to our pretentions and contentions with respect to American countries. That is what I mean by a constant source of irritation.

Another thing: How can a Government that maintains the Monroe doctrine, that says to all the powers of this earth: "You shall not lay the weight of your little finger on one of the American countries; this hemisphere is dedicated to liberty and to American liberty and to independence and to American independence," go to Asia and take a country and hold it in subjection, possibly and probably against the will of its people, and violate there the very policy she insists upon other nations not violating here in this hemisphere?

That is another answer to the Senator who wants to know why I think our possession of the Philippines is a source of irritation in our foreign relations.

One more observation, and I will leave the discussion of this amendment to other Senators.

I do not think, no matter how old-fashioned others may regard it, that the principles for which our forefathers fought are unimportant now. I do not think that the right of a people to govern themselves according to their own judgment, according to their own will, according to their own prejudices, if you please, ought to be taken away from them; nor do I think an alien people should be held in subjection against their will by the people of another land. It is contrary to the very genius of American liberty. In the eloquent language of the Democratic platform, we can not occupy such a position without doing violence to the very spirit of American liberty.

I do not want to do anything rash. I do not want to rush pell-mell into foreign entanglements. I would not for a moment imperil American interests in those islands by a precipitate withdrawal. I would not for a moment leave those islands helpless and alone, without reasonable provision for the establishment of a stable form of government, such as they can and probably will maintain.

The amendment offered by my friend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas makes full and ample provision for all that. It gives us a period of two years within which to work out this thing. Within that period every reform suggested by the bill of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska can be carried out, and the government that he suggests in this bill can be set up and established. Within that period the President can secure every American right, property and otherwise, by Executive action, authorized and required under the provisions of this amendment. Within that time ample opportunity will be given for negotiations with the other powers in order that we may make an effort, at least, to secure the neutralization of the islands by the different Governments most interested in the question; and if the distinguished Senator from Nebraska is right, and the great island Empire of the East does not covet the possession of these islands, probably we shall not have the slightest difficulty in negotiating such a treaty.

So, Mr. President, from every standpoint—from the standpoint of Democracy, from the standpoint of Americanism, from the standpoint of the real business interests of this country, from the standpoint of its defense in time of war if danger should ever threaten it, from the standpoint of national strength, from the standpoint of national interest—I believe that we ought to move forward in this matter in a somewhat more rapid manner than is proposed by the bill of my good friend from Nebraska, Mr. HITCHCOCK. Although I think his bill is good, as far as it goes, I favor the amendment because I think the amendment is much better and that it is not either rash, ill-considered, or hastily thought out. I hope the Senate may adopt it.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, in considering the bill now before the Senate, and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], we are dealing with the destinies, the liberty, the independence, and the future happiness and prosperity of a dependent people, made dependent upon us against their will, and by force of arms.

I wish we might for just a little while forget all about politics, forget all about commercial advantages to our own country in dollars and cents, and place this investigation upon higher grounds. I hope the rights of the Filipino people, if they have any rights, are not going to depend upon a Democratic construction of a Democratic platform. We have these people now under

complete subjection. We can do with them what we will. We can turn over to them their government without conditions or qualifications, and leave them to bear the burdens of establishing a government for themselves and maintaining it if they can.

If this were a question of the interests of the people of the United States alone, I should say that the original entry into the Philippines was a colossal mistake, and I should hope we might get out of that country just as soon as possible. But we owe a duty to the Filipino people. We have, without their consent, made ourselves the guardians of that whole nation.

I have been very much concerned myself, Mr. President, to know what is the duty of this Government under the circumstances. Since we entered the islands we have constantly held out to the Filipino people the hope that at some time we would restore to them their own country, and grant them absolute independence and self-government. The question that appeals to me more than anything else is whether we can do that now with safety to the Filipino people.

It has been said here by Senators who have investigated the situation over there much more carefully than I have, Senators who have visited the islands and studied the situation and the people of the islands, that they are now capable of self-government and could take care of their own affairs. If that be so, Mr. President, then I insist that it is the duty of the Government of the United States and of Congress to see that their government is restored to them without any unnecessary delay.

On the other hand, it is claimed by other Senators, who may be equally well informed, that these people are not fit for self-government, and that if we should turn over their government to them to-day or to-morrow, they would become the prey of other nations. If that be so, then it is just as much the duty of the United States to maintain its guardianship over the people of the islands and protect them until they are fit for self-government.

Looking at it from the point of view of the Filipino people, I think it was a great blessing to them that the United States, even by force, took possession of their country and has cared for them in the way it has down to the present time. We have rendered them a great service. We have established a government for them. We have taught them the way of governmental affairs. We have educated their children. We have improved their islands in every possible material way.

Mr. President, I wish this Government might render the same great service to the Mexican people. There are a hundred times greater reason why this Nation should intervene in Mexico and care for its people and establish for them a government than there was for intervening either in Cuba or in the Philippines. We went into the Philippine Islands not for the purpose of conquest or advantage to the United States, I hope. We should go into Mexico with the same object and purpose—not with the idea of conquest, not for the purpose of visiting vengeance upon the people of Mexico for the wrongs they have committed against our own people, but for the purpose of doing for that unfortunate and stricken people just what we have done for the Philippines, and, beyond that, to protect in Mexico the rights, the liberties, and the privileges of our own people residing there.

I am going to support this bill, not because I think it is going to constitute any great advance toward the restoration of independence to the people of the Philippines—it goes a very short way in that direction—but because I think it is a step in the right direction, and because it is another declaration on the part of the American people that they do at some time intend to restore to these people independence and self-government. But, sir, I should much rather see a definite time fixed when we shall return this government to the people of the Philippine Islands, whether it be 1 year or 2 years, 5 years or 10 years, so that they may understand definitely what the purpose of this Government is.

For that reason, although there is one clause in the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas that I do not like, I shall first support that amendment. I believe it is right in fixing a time when the Government of the United States shall surrender the Philippine Islands to their people. I think the clause in the amendment which provides for treaties between this Government and other nations, and which guarantees on the part of the Government of the United States the protection of the islands against other nations after we shall have turned them over to the people of the islands, is a very dangerous provision. I should be very sorry to see any treaties made with other nations that would involve us in any obligation, in case of war, to protect the Philippine Islands after we had surrendered them to the people of the islands.

We have had reason to know within the past months that a treaty between nations amounts to practically nothing in time of war. If we could make a treaty of that kind with the nations that might be interested in the Philippines, if war should come those treaties would be entirely disregarded, and if we should attempt to enforce them it would mean war.

I have been accused of being belligerent respecting our relations with Mexico. I hope I am not. My attitude toward the people of Mexico is friendly and not hostile. I would intervene only for their good and the protection of our own citizens. I am very much opposed to laying the foundation for controversy with other nations by such a provision as is contained in the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas. I am in complete sympathy with the object of the amendment to fix a time when the government of the Philippine Islands shall be turned over to their people. I should rather see the clause that I have mentioned eliminated from the amendment. Notwithstanding that and my objections to it, I feel disposed to support the amendment in the first instance, and to support the bill finally, for the reason that I have stated—not because I think it is granting independence now or will amount to the granting of independence in the near future to the Filipino people. It must be a mere semblance of independence in those islands so long as we maintain troops there, and so long as we reserve to the President of the United States the power to veto any legislation that may be enacted, whether the power of legislation is granted wholly to the Filipino people or in part to them and in part to American citizens. That is not independence. It is not self-government.

The immediate effect of the bill is going to be of but little consequence to the Filipino people, in my judgment. The preamble promises nothing. Whenever the question of granting independence and self-government to the Filipino people shall be presented hereafter, whether it be 5 years or 10 years or 50 years hence, precisely the same question will be presented that is confronting us now, namely, whether, in the judgment of the American people, the Filipinos have attained such a degree of intelligence and ability that they can take care of their own government.

So it does not amount to very much. There will be Members of this body when that question arises again who will assume precisely the same attitude toward it that Senators do to-day—that the people of the islands are not fit and qualified for self-government. Some will be found to say, I have no doubt, that they never can reach that stage of intelligence and ability where it is safe to turn over to them the government of their own islands.

I know that there are Members of this body who have swept aside all of these questions, and have considered the question solely from the standpoint of the interest of our own Nation, insisting that we need these islands for our own uses and purposes; that we are building up a great commercial city there that will be of benefit to us in the future; that our trade with the Philippine Islands is increasing from year to year; that we can make profit to our people by maintaining the control of the islands. I am not going to discuss that phase of the question. I have no sympathy with it. I think the United States Government and its people owe it to the Filipinos, under the promises and declarations we have made time after time, to surrender their islands when they are capable of taking charge of them and establishing and maintaining a government; and I am not disposed to go beyond that. I am satisfied that they have now reached the stage where it is incumbent upon us to fix a time when we shall turn over to them the government of their islands, giving us time enough to arrange matters in such a way as to turn over the government to them without complications, leaving them a free hand to control their own affairs.

It is for these reasons, Mr. President, which I desired to explain briefly, that I am going to support this measure.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, there are a few observations I desire to submit respecting this bill looking to the relief of the Philippine Islands, and to tender some views I have concerning the amendment tendered by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. President, it is reported that Lord Thurlow delighted to defeat both litigants in a lawsuit, and enjoyed the humor of having confused all the lawyers on each side of the cause. I find myself opposed to many provisions in the bill, and much that is in the amendment tendered by the Senator from Arkansas. Some of both heartily meets my approval, much of both my dissent.

But, Mr. President, I approach the consideration of this measure from a little different standpoint than that suggested by any of the Senators whom I have heard. There is in this country the great cry and claimed necessity for preparedness. There is a belief in certain quarters of this Republic that we are surrounded with conditions that at any time may mean conflict

for the United States. It is urged that we should prepare for this by adding to our Army and Navy such reenforcements as will make that preparation appropriate and fitting.

But the very first question is, What is preparedness? Before we can decide it we have to decide what country we are to prepare for. Before this Nation can enter upon the era of preparedness of the United States there must first be determined what are the limits of your Nation, what country have you to prepare for, what particular part of your country is now to be excluded from the expense and obligation of preparation. When that is ascertained, we then know the limit of the country for which we are to provide.

If the Philippine Islands are to remain a part of this Government, then, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] has aptly pointed out, we must anticipate the relation they bear to the military necessities of the Nation and prepare for them, extending our fortifications 7,000 miles away, with great seas between, increasing our Navy proportionately, adding to our Army reenforcements sufficient and such other burdens as are incident to an island possession bearing the relation which the Philippine Islands do to this Republic.

On the other hand, if these islands are not to continue any longer an integral part of the Republic, and our responsibility is to cease, then that much in the calculation of preparedness has been solved by having that particular feature of the problem eliminated and that particular element of expense deducted.

Consequently, we must observe that the very first question at the threshold of preparedness is for what country, and that the very first question in this discussion is whether we shall retain the Philippine Islands or not, with a view of arriving successfully, at least to ourselves, to a calculation as to what country we shall prepare to defend against.

Mr. President, I have held views concerning the Philippine Islands not in accord with my party. I have been greatly at variance with the party of my honorable opponents. I feel and have felt that we have never viewed to the full extent what the holding of these islands really meant.

Senators, it may interest you, a mere passing matter of political history, that I confess to you I was defeated for reelection to Congress upon this issue. After having been a Member of Congress and an officer in the Spanish-American War, returning to Congress again, I opened warfare upon the policy pursued with respect to acquiring the Philippine Islands. Then, returning to the State where I lived, the State of Washington, lying upon the Pacific coast—its citizens feeling a financial interest in the acquisition of the islands—I opposed the acquisition. I was opposed by my own political party at home, where I then lived, and of course I was opposed by my Republican opponents who were supporting the policy of the then President and distinguished citizen of the Republic, William McKinley.

Mr. President, I see around me many eminent Republicans who to-day are conceding the weakness of ever taking the Philippine Islands, and who admit the general danger this possession now forebodes to this Republic; but I recall how many of these eminent gentlemen held the Democracy up to the derision of the country because they sought to remain by the text of the fathers of the Republic and avoid the acquisition, with all the dangers that it promises.

Mr. President, it is not popular in certain branches of public assemblages to refer to the name of William J. Bryan. Certain Senators and Representatives shrink from further reference to that distinguished leader, lest by making reference to him at all they would be regarded as approving or appear to be in opposition to a certain program of the administration. I delight to advert to vindication time has given him. For myself, I oppose Mr. Bryan's opposition to appropriate preparedness in the anticipation of difficulties which any true American must view if he but puts his head out of the portals of his habitation and contemplates the passing procession of the world. But I must do him the justice to call attention to the fact that he was of the earliest statesmen of the Democracy to announce the evil that would be put upon this Republic by the incorporation of the Philippine Islands in our Government, and though condemned as he was as being "unpatriotic," and, with the Democratic Party, criticized as lacking fealty to the President, or, to use that famous expression of the then Republican political cry, "scuttling the ship," it is interesting to recall that his opposition has been justified by time and the attitude of the Democracy has been vindicated by events. Will you not give this just credit to this leader of our times and admit that had we obeyed Mr. Bryan's warning we would not now have this burden and danger upon us? The position of the Democracy in 1900 was then aided by certain Republicans of New England, that the better theory for this Government was to adhere to the teachings of the fathers who laid the foundations of our Nation and to avoid those violations which have brought ever upon other countries recorded in history the evils from which we now seek to flee.

It is an interesting bit of legend, Mr. President, that when Guizot, the famous French savant, visited England, while James Russell Lowell was our minister to that country, Guizot is alleged to have said to Mr. Lowell: "Mr. Lowell, how long do you think the institutions of America will remain as they are founded?" Mr. Lowell replied: "Just so long, sire, as the sons shall be true to the ideals of the fathers." It was to that ideal the students of government, the disciples of Democracy, sought in 1900 to point to the people of this Republic.

Mr. Gladstone previous to his death, in a very celebrated discussion in public life, turned apart from the subject of his oration to make an apostrophe to America. He called the attention of his own nation to the splendid attitude we held in what he termed to be our self-protection. He alluded to the isolation we bore, the protection of the seas on either side, and added that so long as we adhered to the limits of our own Republic, as had been our course, none of the dangers would beset us which had afflicted his own country.

However, Mr. President, the sons of our fathers some generations removed were not particularly influenced by the advice of Washington, the wisdom of Hamilton, the admonitions of Jefferson, or the traditions of the Republic, but under those peculiar influences that ever attend opportunity, where commercial benefit may follow the fawning upon political administrations, under all political parties, in every change, we were induced to remain in those islands, producing a menace to the Government and an injury to its occupants.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] took issue with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] in his observations that the islands were an irritation to this Republic. My able friend, the Senator from Nebraska, asked the Senator from Georgia in what detail would he say those islands were a menace and irritation, and the Senator from Nebraska gave us the assurance that he had it from those in whom he confided, being officials of Japan, that our holding the islands was not disagreeable to Japan, or, if I may use the expression of my able friend, that they had no opposition to such.

But I invite the attention of the Senate to some history. First, my mind reverts to a splendid little brochure written in England by Sir Henry Wottan. It is upon diplomacy. He opens his little treatise with this observation: "A diplomat is a man selected to lie abroad for the benefit of his country," and then, apropos of the oriental diplomacy, he says: "Of all diplomacy that which is designated oriental is the most intricate; its first text is always to say that which pleases the situation then in hand."

That the able Senator from Nebraska may have had from those representing oriental diplomacy representations that may please the situation in hand I have never a doubt, but I ask his statesmanship, Does he feel that under any conditions through which we could remain in those islands for any length of time and still execute our doctrine of exclusion of Japanese and Chinese in the Philippine Islands or the mainland without protest from Japan and China? Then does my able friend answer that Japan nor China would allow us leave to keep their people out of the Asiatic zone? When we had entered into their zone in direct violation of our theory of the Western Hemisphere for the western people, it is such that gives the irritation now existing.

I recall to the Senator from Georgia, without injecting anything interfering with his speech—I could recall to his memory some history, and to my friend from Nebraska I beg to revive it: When we took possession of those islands and issued the manifesto assuming civil government, we sought to spread, as it were, and enforce the doctrine of the exclusion of Chinese and Japanese. Promptly upon doing so both Governments of China and Japan made such protest that it became necessary for this Government at once to make negotiations with Gen. Otis, then in command, and to withdraw the assertion by America that only Americans were to enter into the new American territory.

Later when Japan made her protest against separate schools in California, as the able Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] will probably recall, and when we were not in a condition that would particularly authorize us at that time to enter into a conflict with any people, what was it that Japan did? Japan made a protest to this country against what she felt was the humiliation of her people. So serious was the situation, in view of legislation threatened by the legislatures then of Washington, Oregon, and even New York, that the two oriental Governments

ments took such exception to our attitude as to manifest it by a temper far from serene.

Conscious of my place, Mr. President, I am forbidden here to use expressions which otherwise I would employ applicable to their attitude at that time. Suffice it to say to the verities of history, President Roosevelt, with whom I have been from time to time in much opposition and whose views I have not always concurred in, yet concede as a patriot, realized as a historian the true condition of this Republic. He recognized that the protest of Japan was based upon the theory of either reciprocity or retaliation. We could not go into their country and demand protection for Americans to the same extent that the Japanese were protected in Asia and yet decline to the Japanese in this country the protection that we gave to Americans. As we could not grant reciprocity without the destruction of labor and serious assaults upon the domestic institutions of America, retaliation became necessary and natural from the orientals, not because those in the governmental administration desired war, because, Senators, we recognize in history that it is not administrations in power that bring on war, save perchance the case of Napoleon III, which arises in our mind as an exception—but it is the party out of power against the party in power which holds against the party in power that they have allowed the Government which they presumed to represent to be humiliated by being presented in a light wherein it is discriminated against on the one hand or its people insulted on the other. This forces the conflict. Consequently it is the man in the street, not the woman in the house, who makes war. Japan was in this interesting situation. She had lately come out of a successful war with Russia. Figuratively speaking, her galleons were smoking at cannon mouth, and black lipped, hovering in their harbors. Her soldiers still carried upon their shoulders knapsacks triumphant and ready for war, and their guns were well trained.

That President Roosevelt, a soldier, would understand the situation we will not deny. Senators who were here in 1906, may I invite you to something of your history? An American President of the United States sent a message to the Houses of Congress in which he recommended that the Army and Navy be put at his service and that he should execute by aid of them the treaties; meaning that treaty with Japan which he then insisted gave her reciprocal rights against the States. To that message, Senators, he appended that remarkable utterance which has not been quoted before the country and out of patriotism of the public press has been suppressed. President Roosevelt recommended the naturalization of the Japanese by law in America, to have done which would have readily put enough votes in the hands of several States on the Pacific coast at any election involving Representatives and Senators to have overturned the Republic in all its vast principles, in all its theories, because there would have been a sufficient number of Japanese alone in certain States of this Union to have controlled the majority vote, and the balance of power would have made Representatives and Senators dependent upon their political power.

Do you think that President Roosevelt really meant that message? I could never believe that he ever meant it. Do you fancy that he would have ever expected the American Senate and the American Congress to have passed a law naturalizing the Japanese, placing them in all respects upon an equality with the workers of America?

Apart from the natural fear of the inheritance of a political result of such a condition, his patriotism, let us believe, would never have indulged him to do it and never would have justified such a consequence. What was in his mind? It was to propitiate the threatened hour that was upon this country then, which clearly was this, I may say to the junior Senator from Georgia in connection with his response to the able chairman of the committee.

You hear much of gentlemen who say, should we have a quarrel with China or Japan, a million men would rise in this community here and there and march to the Pacific coast to meet the advance of the enemy. Do you think the enemy would advance to you when you have put an insult upon her citizens and refused them recognition in the Republic, denied them equality with what you demanded for Americans in Asia, and awakened their affront? Do you think they will come to the Pacific coast to assail you? You taught them better. When you had a grievance against Spain did you go to Madrid or Barcelona or Cadiz? No; you seized Cuba at the door and told Spain to come and get it. Your oriental foes would seize the Philippine Islands and say to you, "Gentlemen of America, come and get them."

With your present conditions of shipping, excepting the registry now being used for ordinary shipping purposes, without a military commandeering by your Government, it would take you two years to land 50,000 men in the Philippine Islands, and with every available ship commandeered from the registry as now permitted it would take you six months. In the meantime your vessels would be met by the active and energetic navy of your opponents off Hawaii, with result easy to contemplate. Then I say to the able Senator from Nebraska that the remark of the Senator from Georgia that these islands were a constant irritation is borne out by every experience of history with which we have to deal or with which we have in the past dealt concerning them.

Mr. President, I am addressing myself, you see, to what I said at the outset was a necessary consideration of that thing called preparedness. If we are to have preparedness, the first question is, What country are you to prepare for? Where shall be the limit of your country? What shall be the defense of it? What shall be its extensions, and then what area are you called upon to prepare?

It becomes necessary, therefore, to consider in this question the expense. The Senator from Georgia evidently in his observations here this morning did not have in his hand a report accessible which discloses, apart from what will be $26,000,000 expenditures for Army and Navy, the civil expenditures in the Philippine Islands which the Government was compelled to advance from time to time. That would have equaled the sum of $5,000,000 and $10,000,000 a year in addition.

Therefore, I call your attention respectfully to the average of only the military, $25,000,000 a year. In 10 years we will have expended $250,000,000. Then, by releasing the burden of the Philippine Islands, we save the full sum that is essential for the completest Navy that has been suggested for our immediate and modern necessities. Then, without a dollar we have builded a Navy in what is saved in the expense of the Philippine Islands, and we will, then, in 10 years be in the exact position where we would in expense have been had we kept the Philippine Islands and made no addition to the American Navy.

Now, Mr. President, as to the amendment of my eminent friend from Arkansas, having to myself made clear that the islands from a political defense of this Nation should not any longer be held, that they will, if they are held by us, awaken opposition from these countries in Asia, and which I beg to say to you should be viewed, Mr. President, in a different light, I may tender an added light to that which Senators have offered on this floor. It is this, sir: Do you fancy, my brother Senators, that when this war is over Japan and China will not be in a different position than they have ever been in the history of our public lives? If in the past there has ever been any diffidence on the part of those nations to resent what they thought was an affront to their people either from weakness on the part of one oriental nation or the inappropriateness of another, do you feel that the future will leave them in that position?

The able Senator from California a moment ago remarked that we have had occasion to see how treaties were of no value whenever the defeat of them or their destruction would avail the present hour of any necessities. Particularly is this true in military conquest. On the other hand, I likewise invite your attention to what is meant by the word "alliance." Let us view for just a moment one real situation, Senators. No alliance is ever made by any country except with a hope of an advantage to itself, however much the advantage may appear to others at the time. When this war is concluded and Japan shall have had a grievance against the United States of any nature, what do you think she will do? Do you not know that Japan will say to England and to France, "Gentlemen, when you were in trouble I entered into an alliance and gave my support to you. Now, I demand that you shall, as against America, in reciprocity for the support I have given you in your war with Germany, join me, Japan, in a demand on America that she grant to the Asiatics the same right in America that she is granting to the Englishman and the Frenchman." What will France and England do? And then Russia, likewise the same demand upon her, what will Russia do? Do you fancy, Senators, that they will be in any position to aid us. Where is that citizen of our community who indulges in the dream that we can look to England for aid in the event of any quarrel or dispute with any nation in the world?

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois permit an interruption?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. LEWIS. Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it not true that Canada has taken the same position with reference to Asiatics as we have, and that

Australia also has done so? I am not clear on that subject, but it seems to me that I have read something to that effect.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from New Jersey that I am unable to reply that those countries have taken the same position, because I do not know their exact position; but this much can be said, that Canada has lately enforced exclusion by keeping out even the Hindus of India from British Columbia. Australia has also passed a law against Asiatics. It is safe to assume that their position is so akin to ours that the Senator from New Jersey is not far afield in the observation he has made.

Mr. President, therefore, let me conclude, and call attention then, as you will observe, that France and England would be in no position to do otherwise than to yield to Japan. Why? In the first place, they would be in debt to Japan for service which Japan had rendered them in her alliance against Germany; and, in the second place, if they should decline to render America any aid whatsoever they themselves would be the subject of retaliation on the part of Japan by driving England out of Japan, as Japan has driven Germany out of China. After the war England would hardly be in a position to oppose or defend, under such conditions, any more than was Germany.

France would not dare to lend us any aid, however much her spirit of kindliness or I may say comity, because of her large interests in China. China would be brought in by Japan on the ground of common interest and common welfare, and either by the same force that England now exercises over Egypt and India, to go in with Japan against America, or out of a common cause of grievance. Think you, Senators, that if we continue, therefore, our position in the Asiatic sphere we would not visit upon us those very evils which you now see visited upon England, France, and Germany in their conquested colonial possessions?

It must be then apparent that before we proceed upon the program of preparedness this question as to the Philippine Islands must first be determined in one way or the other—that we either keep them and fortify the Navy sufficiently in its doubling capacity to maintain them as against every assault, or that we should get out of there, return to the confines of our own Republic, and prepare our defense for our own country in the splendid isolation to which the great Gladstone aptly referred.

Mr. President, there is one feature in the pending bill which gives me great concern.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Illinois has evidently given a great deal of consideration to this matter, and I should like to submit this situation to him: As I understand, we do not exclude the Japanese or the Chinese from the Philippine Islands, but we do, of course, exclude and place a limitation upon the immigration of people of those nationalities into this country. Would it not be true that the same preparedness would be necessary in a sense even if we should give up the Philippine Islands? In other words, after the war would not Japan feel just as strongly that her people should be placed upon a level with the other immigrants to this country should we give up the Philippine Islands as if we should hold them?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the inquiry of the Senator from Idaho is interesting, because it suggests a thought which it is well to dwell upon at this juncture. It is this: So long as we remain in the Philippine Islands, we are then in Asia. The right of Asia to demand reciprocity to come into America appears to be equitable, and the right to exact or enforce retaliation if we could not yield that reciprocity would likewise appear to be justice. The foreign nations of the world could be appealed to by Japan for it on the ground that we were remaining in Asia and yet refused to let their people come to America. The foreign nations of the world, the European nations, therefore, would have that argument against us and in their favor for declining either to aid us or as a justification of their cooperation with Japan; but when we got out of Asia, and Japan no longer had the equity to demand reciprocity upon us or to threaten retaliation, then there would be no justification for Japan demanding of the foreign countries cooperation in her behalf actively or for sympathy against us positively. To that extent we remove the righteousness or the equity of the claim of Japan for her people to come into our country and we remit her—I would say to the learned Senator from Idaho—to the single right of merely basing it upon a mere desire to be equal to that which citizens of other nations enjoy. To that we could answer that our opposition was based on the theory of the Anglo-Saxon unity—the Caucasian exclusion—as distinguished from that of the Asiatic, whereas in the other event, when we went into Asia, we foreclosed ourselves from taking the position of "Asia for Asiatics; America for Americans." That, I would say to the able Senator from Idaho, is the distinction I make.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. COLT. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if he would give independence to the Filipinos in two years simply because this Nation stood in fear of Japan?

Mr. LEWIS. Has the Senator concluded his inquiry?

Mr. COLT. Might I further say that I do not fully agree with the Senator from Illinois as to the danger of this Republic possessing a colony in the Far East. I appeal to history. The Netherlands have held Java for several centuries; the French have far eastern colonies whose population amounts to 30,000,000; the colonies which the British Empire has held for generations comprise nearly one-fifth of the globe. Now, shall we change our policy toward the Philippines because we are in fear of Japan, whose population does not exceed fifty-five or sixty millions, and who is now burdened with a heavy debt and excessive taxation?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, no man more than I respects the juridical learning of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, lately honoring the bench, and recognizing his historical information, I likewise pay tribute to it; but I would have the able Senator understand, in the first place, no one here says we stand in fear of Japan. America fears no nation. She seeks to avoid any conflict from unnecessary danger to herself. As to Java, that Java is a possession maintained, it is true, by the Netherlands, or Holland. It has been maintained at great expense; sometimes Java has managed to pay its own expenses, but the colony possession is the theory of kingly governments, not republics. I may say to my learned friend likewise so New York, once New Amsterdam, was also the property of Holland. By going out into these possessions Holland ran the risk of losing them. She is every hour now in tremulous difficulty and serious apprehension that she will be involved in the present European war, and in her struggles of neutrality she is menaced with the fear of Java being seized and herself forced to the violation of that neutrality which she so seriously is seeking to maintain—and declare war. So Holland can not be held out as a precedent to us, nor that because others have not been able to avoid trouble as a result of their policy that we should enter upon a similar course.

On the other hand, it is true, the Senator says, as to France, that France has maintained foreign possessions, and I invite the attention of my learned and able friend to the fact that her possessions in Morocco have been the subject of such warfare and expense as to bring about five civil revolutions at the ballot box in France and the overturning of three French premiers. Her movement in Madagascar brought about a massacre of her people and troubles to an extent serious beyond calculation. This very European war to-day, I say to the able Senator, that is splashing the very stars with blood, is the result of the movement of France into Morocco. If it had not been for the incident at Agadir, Morocco, where France sought to extend her possessions in Morocco over that which Germany contended she had a right to enjoy, and had not England joined France in this matter against Germany to preserve colonial possessions in Morocco, there would have been no concerted movement upon the part of Germany to avenge what at a later time she has—as the present war discloses—endeavored to.

This world war in Europe is the result of the colonial conquests of France and England in Morocco. Shall we emulate these examples, I may ask my learned friend; shall we bring upon ourselves likewise the inheritances which all of these nations to which the eminent Senator alludes have brought upon themselves? Let us pray, never! Therefore, I am unable to see the parallel, save that it is interesting as history, and, of course, is true, as it is established in mistaken statesmanship and in the experiences of those to whom he has alluded.

Mr. President, I come, therefore, to the conclusion of my remarks—I did not expect to take so much time from my colleagues—what, then, shall be the disposition? This bill has been adroitly prepared; of course, it has been industriously prepared. It is impossible for a bill of this nature to comprehend the desires of all. In the Philippine Islands there are many Americans who desire to remain there and who desire that the islands shall remain American. There are other interests that fear our getting out, lest their interests shall be jeopardized,

There are conflicting associations in the islands of race, religion, different political cults and creeds, which make very embarrassing the adjustment. I may cite one of my own experiences.

In my own travels through the islands I was interested to note that in one place I was unable to ask for my ordinary food through my interpreter, as he could not speak the language which was spoken there, and that was 700 miles from the place whence he had gone. It is interesting to note how little really the Filipinos understand in many of those islands the theories of our Saxon civilization. I may interest you in an incident more humorous than important. It had gone out from military headquarters that the people must cease to have celebrations when American officials arrived, as it was exhausting the revenues of these poor people to provide such entertainment. It went out to the underalcaldes that there should be no further contributions to entertain such visitors, except as voluntarily given; that there should be no more enforced or suggested contributions on the part of the people or the petty officials. Then there went out from the Filipino underofficials an announcement in the following form: "Hereafter whenever American officials visit the islands there shall be no more contributions to entertain them, except voluntarily, but those who do not volunteer shall be fined 5 pesos." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, therefore, as the Senator from Nebraska said yesterday, observing to the Senator from Rhode Island, the bill is essentially a compromise. It had, of course, to consider the interests brought before the committee that are equitable, and in many instances I fancy there are provisions which, if left to the committee, to their own consideration, would not now be contained in the bill, yet there are provisions in the bill which, to my mind, seem wholly unserving to the objects to which they are addressed.

I am unable to see under the bill how we shall escape serious difficulties of responsibility and yet exercise, within the time provided in the bill, no power. I fear the responsibility we assume under the bill will entail upon us both expense and injury, leaving us, however, no voice whatever by which we could, within the length of time provided in the bill, have corrected the evils which we may see at the time were being put upon us.

The Senator from Arkansas, anticipating some of these difficulties, has proposed an amendment, in some respects appealing much to my judgment, in other respects inviting my apprehension of danger. I invite his consideration, knowing him to be an able constitutional lawyer, to this point: I ask him, as a test of his proposed policy, in what manner would the United States be able to enforce any arrangement contemplated with foreign nations by the amendment tendered by him? I suggest to him the difficulty that is in my mind. I have no doubt he has pondered over it, knowing the studious consideration he gives to everything he presents. We can only make an alliance respecting any guaranty provided in his amendment either with Japan, under an Emperor, or China, under one that it is now proposed, or we must make it with countries having interests in the Orient in order to have it effective at all, which must be Great Britain, under an Emperor, or Germany, under an Emperor, unless we conclude that France has enough interest. Then, we have an agreement with these nations, we will say, under the amendment, and they agree with us that they shall maintain what would be called the neutrality of the Philippine Islands for the stated length of time. I ask the Senator, should there arise reasons, military or commercial, which because of the nations with which we contract they desired to extricate themselves from the responsibility and turn against us and oppose our interests, in what way does the able Senator feel we could at all enforce the contract or continue it?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, if the nations should enter into a reciprocal convention to protect the neutrality and independence of the Philippine Islands for a given period of time, and any one of them should subsequently desire to withdraw from that engagement, it would be a matter for consideration by the signatory powers. I do not know just exactly how it would originate in any particular case. The amendment I have offered provides that the guaranty of sovereignty of the Philippine Islands shall be a mutual guaranty, neither one standing as sponsor for the other. The guaranty would be made not by one primarily, nor for another, but by each nation for itself. If occasion should unhappily arise where it was necessary to maintain that guaranty against one of the signatory powers, I presume the usual methods would be resorted to to do that. It would either be the subject of further diplomatic consideration or, if it were a matter of sufficient importance and the occasion justified it, the last word in international controversies, which is war, would be the inevitable result.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the Senator has anticipated the very danger that I felt his amendment would suggest.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska, at this moment, who desires to propound an inquiry.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas if he contemplates by that idea some such joint treaty as was entered into by certain of the European powers to guarantee the independence of Greece in view of the present condition of Greece under that guaranty?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That matter is not foreclosed by the amendment down to the last element of detail. That could be left to the representatives of the governments who negotiate the convention or treaty. If the necessity for assuming more responsibility than some Senators would now suggest should arise and be justified, and it should be agreed to by the President and ratified by the Senate, I presume the nations would live up to whatever obligations they assumed in that connection.

I am not prepared at this particular time to forecast just exactly what should be the ultimate terms in which the negotiations should be expressed, and no one else is. I take it for granted that if other nations joined us in that guaranty of independence to those people, who in themselves are innocent because they have no wide international connections that would jeopardize the peace and happiness of any other country, they would expect in good faith to live up to it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator from Illinois permit me one more interruption?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want to suggest not only the fate of Greece under such a guaranty, but the fate of Belgium under a similar international guaranty.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The fate of a nation only concerns the particular nation. Each one works out its own future in the light of the circumstances that exist at the time these exigencies occur.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. VARDAMAN. If the Senator from Illinois will permit me just a moment——

Mr. COLT. Mr. President——

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should like to suggest——

Mr. LEWIS. I will yield to the Senator from Mississippi for a moment, and then I will yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has some rights. The Chair asked the Senator from Illinois whether he yielded to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LEWIS. Did the Chair ask whether I yielded to the Senator from Rhode Island?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. COLT. If the Senator from Illinois yields to me, I desire to ask the Senator from Arkansas a question.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I shall be very glad to answer, if I can, any question the Senator may see proper to propound.

Mr. COLT. The amendment under consideration provides that we shall transfer the sovereignty of the Philippine Islands in two years from the date of the passage of this bill.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLT. It further provides that the President shall enter into immediate negotiations with the powers for the purpose of securing the neutralization of or a guaranty of the independence of the Philippine Islands. Now, Europe is in a state of war. The war may last two years. This amendment is imperative; we must at the end of two years transfer our sovereignty over the Philippine Islands. Suppose the President should find that it was impossible during this crisis in the world's history to carry on these negotiations, would we not be in a very embarrassing position arising from this two-year limitation?

I know the Senator has looked into the subject, but my idea is that the guaranteeing of the independence or neutralization of another nation by a convention of the powers is a very serious and difficult matter, and the point I wanted to raise was whether it would do to have this limitation of two years in view of the present conditions in Europe?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The limit of two years was named because it seemed to be a reasonable one, under all the circumstances. If the refusal on the part of the governments interested in the affairs of that part of the world to enter into the agreement should be based upon a refusal to assume any bur-

dens in connection with the Philippine Islands, two years is an ample period. If it should turn out that their own affairs were in such condition that they were scarcely able at that time to say what they would be able to do in connection with a matter so completely dissociated from their local affairs as that would be, it would furnish proper occasion for the President to communicate to Congress a statement of the fact that by reason of the upheaval in the world the time was inopportune for the undertaking and that an enlargement of time would be necessary. Congress will be in session almost continuously during the next two years, and there can be no difficulty whatever in the face of a representation of that character, in securing from Congress such enlargement of time as the exigencies of the situation as then disclosed might make necessary.

Things move quite rapidly in this day and time; two years is a long period in the history of the world now, when it comes to a matter of avoiding friction and causes of conflict. Governments do not wait long now when they find themselves confronted by a situation that involves their existence or seriously impairs their rights, and I think the period of two years is sufficient; but it is not yet written into the law. If the combined wisdom of the Senate thinks that a longer period than that is required, it is a matter of form to have it enlarged now. I happened to write that amendment, and it occurred to me that two years was sufficient in the light of the conditions as they presented themselves to my understanding. It was not intended even to commit myself unalterably to two years; and, if the full discussion that should take place here about the matter should disclose the necessity for a longer period of time, there would be no opposition, on my part at least, to adopting any other reasonable period that might appear to be necessary.

Mr. LIPPITT. With the permission of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, may I ask a question of the Senator from Arkansas?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I will be glad to answer the Senator from Rhode Island, but I dislike very much to trespass upon the courtesy of the Senator from Illinois to answer questions that I may be able to answer later in my own time.

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator has been very explicit in his answer to the question of my colleague in saying that if it took longer than two years to get the consent of other nations the time could be extended. What would the Senator do in case those nations refused to enter into such an agreement?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Then any extension of time would be wholly futile; there would be no occasion for asking for any length of time. We would do as the amendment says the Government should do. I would let the Government of the United States extend its present existing responsibility for five years longer. I would not take upon myself any additional obligation, but would simply extend the already existing obligation to protect their sovereignty and peace, and at the end of five years, I take it for granted, there will be a Senate and a House of Representatives here composed of Members who will be just as patriotic as we are and just as capable of dealing with the problems of that day as we think we are of dealing with the problems of to-day.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want it understood that I did not intend a moment ago, when I rose to ask the Senator from Illinois a question, to trespass upon the rights of the Chair.

Mr. President, I want to suggest, in connection with the question which was propounded to the Senator from Arkansas, that it strikes me that in forming the proposed governmental alliance for the protection of the integrity of the Philippine Islands after independence shall be given them, or, in other words, after the rights which the American Government has usurped in the Philippine Islands shall be restored to the citizens of the Philippine Islands, we are to indulge the same presumption that the nations are going to live up to their obligations that we do in all other matters of treaty. If you can not trust them in this instance, how can you trust them in any other?

Furthermore, as the Senator from Arkansas says, it is a matter that has to be dealt with when it arises. If it should be to the interest of any of the nations to withdraw from the agreement, if they should impair their own integrity or their own welfare by their adherence to it, they might be able to withdraw from the compact with honor; but that is a bridge to be crossed when we reach it. I repeat that it is entirely reasonable to indulge the presumption that the nations are going to live up to their contracts, and the suggestion to the contrary is no valid objection to the proposition embodied in the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I should like to indulge that my humane friend the able Senator from Mississippi confides, and that is that a treaty gave such assurance that the mere making meant the obedience; but late events have brought to my attention the fact that the strength of treaties seems to be no more than that of a decree written by a sunbeam upon a snow bank. The very first blaze that bursts upon it melts it into nothingness—or the history of the later months all around us means nothing.

The able Senator from Arkansas, with the frankness that characterizes his course on this floor and elsewhere, has conceded the very danger that my apprehension admonishes me would follow a provision that is in his tendered amendment. First, Mr. President, we could only enter into agreements under this amendment with monarchical countries; and the very moment we enter into an agreement with Japan, or with China and Japan, we make them partners with us in a common enterprise in Asia. We have then violated the very first admonition of the first father of the Republic. We have entered into "foreign entanglements." Second, we have entered into a contract with those with whom we could not enforce it except by giving to them that which we would not yield. When we ask them to protect our property or our interests, they have a right in turn to ask us that which we could not give, perchance—the recognition of their citizens in our country upon equal terms with Americans. That would be their first demand. Second, the very first time there came the slightest friction in the then government of the Philippine Islands that did not harmonize with the interests of either one of these contracting parties they would either withdraw or visit penalty upon those who violated what they thought right. This would be conflict. What would be our attitude? As the able Senator admirably says with commendable frankness, it would be to protest. We would stand on our rights; and then, if we found a difference, finally it would reach to the sure conclusion that we would be compelled by force of arms to enforce the contract or punish its violation, and that would mean war, when we are seeking now to do a thing to get us out of the prospect of war.

When I advise my able friend from Arkansas that one of the distinguished citizens of the Republic, who was formerly President of the United States, is monthly addressing himself to his countrymen in articles against what he calls the evil of his Republic, the crime of supine America, and the offense of a cowardly President, because we did not go into war in behalf of Belgium, giving as a reason that there was a compact on the part of America, made at The Hague, which made us a party inferentially and sentimentally, sympathetically, at least, with what was called the neutrality of Belgium, and the able ex-President of the United States, a scholar of history, absolutely urges that it was our duty to have avoided what he calls the "brutalizing of Belgium" by going into war—in the European war—the able Senator will realize, I am sure, that the same logic would apply in this instance, that if we entered into a partnership with these foreign countries to protect possessions or property of ours or citizens of ours, nationals of ours, we would be in the position where if it was violated, or where we would be called on to enforce it, war must follow. If we enter into a contract we can not enforce, that seems an idle performance. To enter into one we expect to enforce, when the only enforcement must essentially mean, in the final analysis, war—war to the death—would mean to have the islands involved in turmoil, ourselves in conflict, the very thing we hope to extricate them from and rescue ourselves from.

For that reason I am unable to see the wisdom of that part of the amendment of the able Senator. I see what I think the dangers of it, and I point him out that I feel it violates all the cardinal doctrine of the Republic in other respects. There are many suggestions in other parts of his amendment that can be considered with propriety, and I trust with profit, by the committee. I shall offer amendments to correct the objections as I see them. It is the main principle for which I speak—the returning to America by America, and getting out of the Government business in Asia.

Mr. President, that we should get out of the islands is apparent. That it is profitable to do so, no man will deny. That it is justice to those in the islands as well as to ourselves, all will admit. We are now seeking, at a late day, to execute justice that we long promised and we long delayed. We can, in its exercise before the world, again prove that altruistic spirit that is really ours, by which we seek to do justice to all

mankind wherever opportunity affords. We will do no injustice to ourselves in doing so; but in executing this agreement we have made with civilization to give freedom to the Philippines we will again invite a new confidence and inspire a new faith on the part of those nations to the south to whom we are offering further hope that their association with us will be profitable and will be with justice and profit to them and with no injustice to ourselves.

I feel that the bill should pass, with such amendments as no doubt will be considered later; and I recommend it to its passage, feeling that while, as one of the able Senators has well said, we may not live to see all the blessings that will arise from the example we are setting, and we will not see all the benefits enjoyed, we will, at least, have the consciousness that the great Greek had when he wrote upon the gates of Sparta, as he bade it good-by, the famous admonition:

I am but a mortal, and, like my fathers, must die; but liberty and justice by our words and deeds may live for our children and our country forever.

I thank the Senate for its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if I can get the attention of the Senator from Missouri, I anticipate that he is about to make a motion that the Senate go into executive session. Is that correct?

Mr. STONE. It is.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment at this point. I do not intend to discuss it this evening, but I wish to offer a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, and I should like to offer it now, so that it may be read and printed.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I was going to ask the Senator if he would not have it read and printed, so that we may consider it to-morrow.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what I rose to do. I send it to the desk, and I will ask that the Secretary read it, and then that it be printed. I offer it as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from Nebraska proposes to insert the following:

Within two years after the passage of this act the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located, for the purpose and to the end that the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves, in the form of a treaty or other binding agreement, to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines, and also to mutually obligate themselves, equally and not one primarily nor to any greater extent than another, to maintain as against external force the sovereignty of said Philippines for the period of not less than five years from the taking effect of such treaty or agreement. Within one year after the taking effect of such treaty or agreement the President is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippines.

Mr. STONE. Does the Senator from Nebraska desire to proceed further with the bill tonight?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No.

Mr. STONE. Then I ask that the bill be laid aside.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask unanimous consent that the Philippine bill be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is ordered.

SALE OF FUR-SEAL SKINS.

Mr. STONE. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to report back favorably the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 47) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to sell skins taken from fur seals killed on the Pribilof Islands for food purposes, and I submit a report (No. 56) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Florida (Mr. FLETCHER) to the joint resolution.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the joint resolution be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in the Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

It authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to sell all skins taken from seals killed on the Pribilof Islands for food purposes under section 11 of the act of August 24, 1912, in such market at such times and in such manner as he may deem most advantageous, and the proceeds of such sale or sales shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 20, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 19, 1916.

POSTMASTERS.

IOWA.

W. D. Jamieson, Shenandoah.
J. B. Lower, Scranton.
George P. Martin, Peterson.
William H. Moore, Shelby.

MISSOURI.

Zachariah T. Casebolt, Miami.
James J. Davis, jr., St. Marys.
William B. Ellis, Elsberry.
Bristol French, Piedmont.
Almae C. Hall, Blue Springs.
James E. Harris, Conway.
Ernest M. Moore, Corder.
L. R. McNatt, Purdy.
William T. Murphy, Parma.
William L. Peoples, Shelbyville.

NEW YORK.

August P. Bolender, Collins.

NORTH DAKOTA.

George L. Barrett, Lakota.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William H. Cooper, Oakmont.
William F. Elgin, Glen Olden.
C. L. Gibbs, Titusville.
William K. Reed, Eddystone.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Richard T. King, jr., Georgetown.
Albert C. Ligon, Orangeburg.
M. J. Spears, Lamar.

WASHINGTON.

Eugene J. Edson, Coulee City.
J. T. Harris, Ridgefield.
U. Kirby Lail, Sunnyside.
Thomas McIntyre, Burlington.
Cleora Steele, Hartline.

WEST VIRGINIA.

John L. Evans, Summersville.
Thomas W. Gocke, Piedmont.
Walter E. Reeves, Bethany.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *January 19, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We lift up our hearts in gratitude and praise to Thee, O God our heavenly Father, for all the pure, noble, God-like qualities of mind and soul with which Thou hast endowed Thy children, and we most earnestly pray that amid the untoward circumstances of life, the perplexing problems which confront us, and the temptations which assail us we may be able to make dominant in our lives those qualities and develop a character like unto that of the world's great Exemplar, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CHANGES OF REFERENCES—HARBOR COMMISSIONERS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. OGLESBY. To make a privileged request. I ask that reference of the bill H. R. 3042 be changed from the Union Calendar to House Calendar nunc pro tunc.

The SPEAKER. What is it about?

Mr. OGLESBY. It is a bill which confers certain jurisdiction on the harbor commissioners of the Territory of Hawaii. It does not provide for the raising of any money or the spending of any money.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

There was no objection.

POST OFFICE AT SAN BERNARDINO, CAL.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. CLARK of Florida, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads was discharged from further consideration of the bill H. R. 521, providing for a post office and other purposes at San Bernardino, Cal., and the same was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

MEXICO.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like unanimous consent for five minutes that I may read a letter I have.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, following the newspaper accounts of the horrible outrages across the Mexican border, I telegraphed a personal and old-time friend of mine residing on the border for first-hand information. I have received a reply from him. I first received a reply by wire saying he could not answer me by wire, but would write. I think the nature of the letter is such that it can well be heard from this floor. I will first read my telegram to this gentleman and his reply. They are as follows:

JANUARY 14, 1916.

Mr. ——— ———,
——— ———:

Much interest here in Mexican situation. Will you wire me, collect, full particulars of feeling among the people, and consensus of opinion what action our Government should take.

ALLEN T. TREADWAY.

Hon. ALLEN T. TREADWAY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Can not wire answer your inquiry satisfactory because local conditions. Now is time to take a firm, uncompromising stand and to meet our responsibilities without further hesitation; otherwise conditions will grow worse and difficulties increase. Have written.

——— ———.

Yesterday I received his letter and it is as follows:

———, *January 14, 1916.*

Hon. ALLEN T. TREADWAY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALLEN: Your message received to-day inquiring as to Mexican situation and attitude of Americans thereto. I attempted to answer by wire, but found that I really could tell you little without running risk of doing American interests in Mexico possible harm. The telegraph office has leaks, and being in a prominent position here my wire would probably quickly find its way into the hands of the Mexican consul to the detriment of our people to the south of us.

The recent outrages and murders of Americans in Chihuahua has deeply stirred the people of the border States. Some of the murdered men are from this section and are well known locally. The return of their mutilated bodies will add fuel to the flame that has been smoldering for the past five years. While I do not look for trouble the situation has some danger of a race trouble. Approximately 1,000 Mexicans are employed here; trouble here would mean retaliation by Mexicans against Americans employed in Mexico, so that not only Carranza but Villa adherents would have their hand raised against the American. The intense feeling in El Paso has not shown itself here as yet.

We of the border have had five years of uncertainty and humiliation; all Mexican properties running intermittently and railroads destroyed; bullets have been fired into our town without hesitation; citizens have been shot, some fatally; over 100 3-inch shrapnel shells burst on our properties a few weeks ago and plant was compelled to shut down for two days. When Villa last appeared, in November, citizens were urged to leave their homes by the military because Villa said he was going to bombard ———. Americans in their own country forced to abandon their homes and to give up their occupations because of the failure of their Government to protect them.

The people of this section feel that there is nothing to protect them not only south of here but to the north. With 7,000 United States troops here, Mexican bullets came over by the hundreds. I was favored with two in my own house.

This is all preliminary to show that the present state of mind of our border citizens is the outgrowth of an accumulated and just grievance and a deeply seated sense of disappointment and shame that we must submit to such indignities at the hands of half-civilized neighbors.

During the recent raid of ——— by Villa the women of entire villages were given over to the so-called soldiers, and such a case happened at ———, about — miles from here. Daughters of respectable families were taken from their homes and passed from soldier to soldier, and yet we wait—for what? For just such occurrences as happened in Chihuahua, the murder of 19 fine chaps, whose deaths are but the harvest of our country's failure to meet its responsibilities. This responsibility rests upon us; we may duck and dodge and find plausible excuses, but we have the work to do. If we fail to assume the obligation, we are to be pitied, for no such Nation can last long.

This continued lack of decision and action has led the Mexican to believe that we are afraid of him. During these five years of turmoil he has been supplied with guns and ammunition through our ports, and he has learned how to use them. Carranza is not generally believed to have the ability to put his government over. Villa's game is, of course, to bring an intervention, and the quickest way to do this is to murder Americans. Each day of watchful waiting gives rise to much more to watch and witness.

To my mind the only thing to do is to demand and see to it that Carranza exterminates these outlaws within a stipulated and short period. This demand will be treated lightly because of soft impeachments of the past, but if definite results and tangible evidence of a successful government are not at hand within 30 days we should take a firm, uncompromising grip on the situation and put it over. I am not for intervention if a decent government could be put on its feet without armed interference, but I do not believe it can be done.

I appreciate that there are considerations I know nothing of, but I believe these considerations are magnified in an effort to justify our miserable, ineffectual, and characterless policy. Oh, for a strong, virile Americanism that stands for something. We of the border hang our heads.

Yours, ——— ———.

Mr. Speaker, this letter is first-hand information in relation to the conditions as they exist on the border, and I think is worthy of the attention and consideration of this House.

FRANCHISES IN TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the Clerk will call the committees.

When the Committee on the Territories was called,

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 65 for consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 65) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to certain gas, electric light and power, telephone, railroad, and street railway companies and franchises in the Territory of Hawaii, and amending the laws relating thereto.

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii entitled "An act relating to certain gas, electric light and power, telephone, railroad, and street railway companies and franchises in the Territory of Hawaii, and amending the laws relating thereto," approved by the governor of the Territory April 29, 1913, be, and is hereby, ratified, approved, and confirmed, as follows:

"ACT 135.

"An act relating to certain gas, electric light and power, telephone, railroad, and street railway companies and franchises in the Territory of Hawaii, and amending the laws relating thereto.

"*Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:*

"SECTION 1. The franchises granted by act 30 of the laws of 1903 of the Territory of Hawaii, as amended and approved by an act of Congress approved April 21, 1904; act 48 of the laws of 1903 of said Territory, as amended and approved by an act of Congress approved April 21, 1904; act 66 of the laws of 1905 of said Territory, as amended and approved by an act of Congress approved June 20, 1906; act 105 of the laws of 1907 of said Territory, as amended and approved by an act of Congress approved February 6, 1909; act 130 of the laws of 1907 of said Territory, as amended and approved by said act of Congress approved February 6, 1909; act 115 of the laws of 1909 of said Territory, as amended and approved by an act of Congress approved June 25, 1910; and act 66 of the laws of 1911 of said Territory, as amended and approved by an act of Congress approved August 1, 1912, and the persons and corporations holding said franchises shall be subject as to reasonableness of rates, prices, and charges and in all other respects to the provisions of act 89 of the laws of 1913 of said Territory creating a public-utilities commission and all amendments thereof for the regulation of public utilities in said Territory; and all the powers and duties expressly conferred upon or required of the superintendent of public works or the courts by said acts granting said franchises are hereby conferred upon and required of said public-utilities commission and any commission of similar character that may hereafter be created by the laws of said Territory; and said acts granting said franchises are hereby amended to conform herewith.

"SEC. 2. This act shall take effect upon its approval by the Congress of the United States.

"Approved this 29th day of April, A. D. 1913.

"WALTER F. FREAR,
"*Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.*"

Also the following committee amendments were read:

Page 3, line 4, after the word "ten," strike out the comma and the word "and" and insert a semicolon.

Amend, on page 3, by inserting, after the word "twelve," in line 7, the following:

"And also franchises heretofore granted to any other public utility or public-utility company, and all public utilities and public-utilities companies organized or operating within the Territory of Hawaii."

Amend, on page 3, by inserting, after the word "herewith," in line 24, the following:

"*Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall in any wise limit the jurisdiction of powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the acts of Congress to regulate commerce within the States and Territories of the United States: *And provided further*, That all acts of the public-utility commission herein provided for shall be subject to review by the courts of the said Territory."

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, this is for the purpose of ratifying an act for the Territory of Hawaii. In 1913 the Legislature of Hawaii passed a law creating a public-utilities commission with the intention of placing under the supervision and control of that public-utilities commission all of the public-service corporations in Hawaii. Now, it is a fact that a number of public-service companies or corporations had franchises and rights that were granted by Congress. It was not in the power of this Legislature of Hawaii to put them under this public-utility commission. The object of this act and its approval by Congress is for the purpose of putting all public-service corporations under the control and jurisdiction of this act. That is the general purpose of the bill, and the reason for it is apparent

without argument. It is an effort to put them on the same footing and to give this public-utility commission the same power over all these public-service corporations that it has over those it had the jurisdiction to embrace within it by its own act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Will this have any retroactive effect on vested rights?

Mr. HOUSTON. I think not, sir. That matter has been considered very carefully, and all these companies that have rights and franchises by the Legislature of Hawaii, or by act of Congress, have the provision attached to acts that Congress shall have the power to alter, amend, or change them at any time.

We have had upon that subject and upon all others full hearings before the committee, and the gentleman can get the facts about that from them.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The language of the bill is, "hereby ratified and confirmed." Should we not take some notice of the fact that it is amended? Would it not be better to insert the word "amended" before the word "ratified," so that it would read, "is hereby amended, ratified, approved, and confirmed, as follows"?

Mr. HOUSTON. The gentleman means the title of the act of the legislature?

Mr. MANN. Yes; at the top of page 2, where you provide that the act of the legislature is "hereby ratified, approved, and confirmed." I think you should add a word, and state it is "hereby amended, ratified," and so forth. It would cover the case. Something like that ought to go in to show that it is amended.

Mr. HOUSTON. Perhaps the proper amendment would be, "with an amendment."

Mr. MANN. Perhaps so. Perhaps it ought to be, "with an amendment." But it would be sufficient to say, "it is hereby amended, ratified, approved, and confirmed, as follows."

Mr. HOUSTON. I think that would be sufficient; and, Mr. Speaker, I offer that amendment. After the word "hereby" to insert the word "amended."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON].

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 1, after the word "hereby," insert "amended" and a comma.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOUSTON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the chairman of the committee if the amendment reported by the committee since the reporting of the bill has been submitted or offered?

Mr. HOUSTON. It has not been. I thought it would be right and proper to offer it later on. However, I can offer it now.

Mr. DOWELL. I wish the gentleman would.

Mr. HOUSTON. All right.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee to offer the amendment.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, after the bill was reported the committee in consultation decided to offer another amendment. It is on page 3 of the reported bill, line 19. The words "or the courts" should be stricken out.

Mr. MANN. The committee amendments have not yet been disposed of?

Mr. HOUSTON. No; I thought it would be proper to bring this up before the other committee amendments were acted upon. I suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that I called attention to this amendment for the purpose of discussion, and he can say what he desires about it.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to speak on the amendment partially, and I would like to have it read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 19, strike out the words "or the courts."

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, as has been explained by the chairman of the committee, this bill has for its purpose and object the placing of all the public utilities of the Territory of Hawaii under a utilities commission which was created by the Territory in 1913. This bill was adopted by the Legislature of Hawaii in 1915 and submitted to the Congress for its approval.

Under the provisions of the special acts creating the different utilities in this Territory we find that a great many methods have been adopted by Congress relative to the fixing of rates and to the control of these utilities. The commission is authorized under the provisions of the Territorial law to place all of these public utilities under its supervision and control. While this commission has not all of the authority or power that I would like it to have, it has the power of investigation, it has the power to fix rates and charges, and it has the power to compel service of these corporations. On its own motion it may make an investigation and may examine all the books and contracts of the companies, and may fix such rates as the investigation may show to be just and fair to the consumers or users.

This commission consists of three members, appointed by the governor for a term of three years; and it occurs to me that in order that this commission may have the power to give the best service to the people of the Territory all of these public utilities should be placed under its control and supervision, and all should be treated alike.

Now, on the question of the amendments of the committee, the first amendment is found on page 3 and covers any other public utilities not specified in the original act which may be doing business in the Territory. That your committee believed to be necessary in order that some utility company doing business in the Territory, though not having been granted a charter by Congress, should be placed under this commission.

The second amendment, or the last amendment, provides "That nothing herein contained shall in any wise limit the jurisdiction or powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the acts of Congress to regulate commerce within the States and the Territories of the United States." That amendment was offered by your committee because there is a railroad in this Territory which rightly comes under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and it is not the purpose to in any manner interfere with the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The other provision following is "That all acts of the public-utility commission herein provided for shall be subject to review by the courts of the Territory." This, we believe, should be adopted, because the power of the courts to review the action of the commission in fixing rates and charges, after making this investigation, should be retained by the courts.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice that the last proviso is that all acts of the public utilities commission shall be subject to review. It has power, has it not, besides the power to fix rates?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman think that all acts of a commission like that ought to be subject to the courts?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Purely administrative acts?

Mr. DOWELL. Congress has heretofore placed all of this power within the hands of a superintendent of public works, and no power is given to this commission, except what was in the power conferred by Congress upon the superintendent of public works.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But does the gentleman think that all of the acts, those acts that are purely administrative, not touching rates and not affecting the finances of the company at all, should be subject to court review?

Mr. DOWELL. I suppose the only question that could be raised would be the question of the reasonableness of the order of the commission.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield.

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman mean that this bill will give the court the right to fix rates in the future that would be purely legislative?

Mr. DOWELL. No. It is only the right to review the action of the commission in making an order.

Mr. SIMS. Whether it had exceeded its authority?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes; whether it was arbitrary or reasonable; and that power, it seems to me, ought always to be lodged with the courts.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. SLOAN. Is any power given to the courts in Hawaii that is not ordinarily given to the courts in the different States of the Union, over the acts and doings and decisions of public utilities commissions?

Mr. DOWELL. I think the act creating the public utility commission provided for an appeal directly to the supreme court, and all of the actions of that commission are by the act itself subject to review by the supreme court of the Territory.

Now I come to the next question, which is the amendment just offered by the chairman of the committee, and which is to strike out of line 19 the words "or the courts." I want to call attention to this amendment, gentlemen, because it is a question which involves the authority and the power of this commission, and also, it affects the power and authority of the courts heretofore granted in the various charters of these public utilities. Under the special charters that have heretofore been granted by the Congress we find that the methods of arriving at the rates and charges have not been uniform.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOWELL. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. DOWELL. I want to read, beginning at line 17, page 3, of the bill, the language which this amendment seeks to change, so that you may thoroughly understand the purpose of the amendment. In line 17, page 3, after the semicolon, I read:

> And all the powers and duties expressly conferred upon or required of the superintendent of public works or the courts by said acts granting said franchises are hereby conferred upon and required of said public-utilities commission and any commission of similar character that may hereafter be created by the laws of said Territory.

This amendment strikes out the words "or the courts"; and by striking out these words this amendment leaves conferred upon the utilities commission all of the powers and duties of the superintendent of public works, and does not confer upon the utilities commission the power and authority heretofore granted, in each special charter granted by Congress, to the courts of the Territory. I heartily favor this amendment, because I am not ready to take from the courts of the Territory the power and authority vested in the courts by the adoption of these special charters, which includes the power of condemnation of property, and also to forfeit the charters of these public utilities. This is a special power conferred upon the courts of the Territory by the acts creating these charters, and I believe the Congress is not ready to take from the courts the power and authority that have been heretofore granted in this respect. For this reason I hope that the amendment will be adopted; and with this amendment adopted, I believe that this bill is in the right direction, and that we are giving to the people of the Territory a better system and a better opportunity of fixing the rates and control of these public utilities than they have heretofore had. [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HOUSTON. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. I have just come in, and I do not know what may have been said. I want to ask the gentleman a question in reference to the last proviso in section 1:

> That all acts of the public-utility commission herein provided for shall be subject to review by the courts of the said Territory.

I should like to ask the gentleman in what way that amends or changes the utility law passed by the Territory?

Mr. HOUSTON. It does not change it at all. That is already the law of the Territory, as I understand it, and that clause was inserted in order that this act should not exempt these public-service corporations from the same control that the courts now have.

Mr. LENROOT. Not every act of a utility commission is reviewable by the courts of the States, so far as reasonableness is concerned. Will not the language contained in this bill deprive this utility commission of all power of determining the question of reasonableness and place the original matter in the courts in every instance where the act is complained of?

Mr. HOUSTON. I do not think so. Under the law of the Territory now the courts have jurisdiction and the right of review, and in the operation of this law in regard to these public-service corporations no question of that kind has been considered by the courts. They have left the question of fixing rates, and their reasonableness, to the superintendent of public works heretofore, and the proper authorities have had control of that. But this general provision is to cover a case that might arise, and if an injury or an injustice should be done by an act of theirs of that kind, under this law they would have the right to appeal to the supreme court of the Territory.

Mr. LENROOT. The language with reference to the review is very much broader than the language giving to the courts of the United States the power of reviewing the decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission and is very much broader than the authority given to the courts in reviewing decisions of State utilities commissions, so far as I know.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To interrogate the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON].

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman from Tennessee explain whether there is any organic law authorizing Congress to amend an act of the Hawaiian Legislature?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; every act. There is no provision in the organic law empowering Congress to do that specifically, but in all these public-service company charters there is a provision reserving to Congress the right to alter, amend, or repeal.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then these changes proposed now by the Congress of the United States are in line with the authority heretofore conferred?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; exactly; and these are the changes that have been passed by the legislature. It is the act of the Territory which is being ratified here.

Unless some one else wishes to speak, I ask the Clerk to read the bill.

Mr. MANN. The Clerk has read the bill.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, may I have just a moment to answer the question which has been asked?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWELL. In the provision of the law of the Territory, section 2234, all of the latitude proposed in the committee amendment is given in the original act creating the utilities commission. Your committee have conferred no greater or different power than is reserved by the charter in creating this commission.

The SPEAKER. Unless some gentleman wants to speak on this, the Chair will put the question. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. MANN. There was an amendment offered which has not been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the last amendment reported by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 3, line 19, strike out the words "or the courts."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the committee amendments? If not, they will be put in gross.

There was no demand for a separate vote, and the committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HOUSTON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER FRANCHISE IN CERTAIN DISTRICTS OF HAWAII.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6241) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act amending the franchise granted to H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, and now held under assignment to Island Electric Co. (Ltd.), by extending it to include the Makawao district on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, and extending the control of the public utilities commission of the Territory of Hawaii to said franchise and its holder.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act amending the franchise granted to H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, and now held under assignment to Island Electric Co. (Ltd.), by extending it to include the Makawao district on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, and extending the control of the public utilities commission of the Territory of Hawaii to said franchise and its holder," is hereby ratified, approved, and confirmed, and section 857 of chapter 59 of the revised laws of Hawaii, 1915, as approved by an act of Congress approved February 6, 1909, is hereby amended by adding after the words "district of Wailuku" wherever appearing in said section 857 the following words: "And district of Makawao," so that the same shall read as follows:

"SEC. 857. Franchise: H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, together with their associates, hereafter called 'The Company,' and their respective successors and assigns, are vested with the right, authority, and privileges, from and after February 6, 1909, to manufacture, sell, furnish, and supply electric light, electric current, or electric power in the district of Wailuku and district of Makawao, on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, for lighting the streets, roads, public or private buildings, or for motive power, or for any other purpose which they may deem advisable, and from time to time for the purposes above mentioned, and subject to the approval and supervision of the boards or officials having charge of said streets or roads to construct, maintain, and operate suitable poles, lines, wires, cables, lamps, lamp posts, conductors, conduits, and such other appliances and appurtenances as may from time to time be necessary for the transmission, distribution, or supply of electricity to consumers thereof, under, along, upon, and over the streets, sidewalks, roads, squares, bridges, alleys, and lanes in said district of Wailuku and district of Makawao, on the island of Maui, and to connect the said lines, wires, and conductors with any manufactory, private or public buildings, lamps, lamp posts, or other structure or object with the place of supply."

SEC. 2. Section 859 of said chapter 59 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, as approved by an act of Congress approved February 6, 1909, is hereby amended by striking out the word "district" in said section 859 and substituting therefor the word "districts," so that the same shall read as follows:

"SEC. 859. Poles, etc., not to interfere with use of streets, etc.: All poles, lines, wires, cables, lamps, lamp posts, conductors, conduits, and other appliances constructed, maintained, or operated under, along, upon, and over the streets, sidewalks, roads, squares, bridges, alleys, and lanes in said districts, on the island of Maui, shall be so constructed, maintained, and operated by the company as to not unnecessarily interfere with the use of such streets, sidewalks, roads, squares, bridges, alleys and lanes by the public."

SEC. 3. Said chapter 59 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, as approved by an act of Congress approved February 6, 1909, is hereby further amended by adding a new section thereto, to be known as section 865A, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, and reading as follows:

"SEC 865A. This franchise and the person or corporation holding the same shall be subject as to reasonableness of rates, prices, and charges, and in all other respects to the provisions of chapter 128 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, creating a public utilities commission, and all amendments thereof for the regulation of the public utilities in said Territory, and all the powers and duties expressly conferred upon or required of the superintendent of public work or the courts by said act creating said franchise, are hereby conferred upon and required of said public utilities commission and any commission of similar character that may hereafter be created by the laws of said Territory."

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect upon its approval by the Congress of the United States, provided that such approval be given on or before the 4th day of March, 1917.

During the reading of the bill the following occurred:

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, at this point I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina makes the point that no quorum is present, and the Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-seven Members present—not a quorum.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EMERSON) there were 149 ayes and 3 noes.

So the motion for a call of the House was agreed to. The Doorkeeper was ordered to close the doors and the Sergeant at Arms to notify Members.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adair	Farr	Jones	Patten
Austin	Finley	Keister	Pou
Black	Flynn	Kent	Price
Booher	Gallagher	Kitchin	Rowland
Callaway	Gallivan	Kreider	Sabath
Campbell	Glass	Liebel	Scott, Pa.
Carew	Goodwin, Ark.	Loft	Scully
Clark, Fla.	Graham	Longworth	Sparkman
Conry	Gray, Ala.	McGillicuddy	Stout
Crago	Green, Iowa	McKinley	Sumners
Cullop	Gregg	McLemore	Tague
Dale, N. Y.	Griffin	Maher	Talbott
Dempsey	Guernsey	Miller, Pa.	Winslow
Dyer	Hamill	Moss, Ind.	Wise
Edmonds	Helm	Overmyer	
Estopinal	Helvering	Paige, Mass.	
Fairchild	Hinds	Parker, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this call 368 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to. The doors were opened.

The Clerk proceeded with and completed the reading of the bill.

The following committee amendment was read:

On page 5, at the end of section 3, add the following:

"*Provided*, That all acts of the public utilities commission herein provided for shall be subject to review by the courts of the Territory of Hawaii."

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, this is an act to ratify and approve an act amending this franchise in the Territory of Hawaii, and I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. WATKINS.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, the only object of this bill is to extend the right of this franchise from the district of Wailuku into the district of Makawao, a district adjoining.

The original charter was granted to H. P. Baldwin and others in 1909 for the first district named. It was at that time understood that Baldwin & Co. were to have the benefit of the electric power of the Baldwin Sugar Co., but the Baldwins transferred the right to the electric company, and in this transfer this reservation of power, which had been contemplated would be used by the company, was not secured, and it threw a very onerous burden on the company and made the conditions such that they were unable to proceed with the operation of the work within that limited territory. Being thus embarrassed and hampered on account of the limited territory, they thought proper to ask the legislature of the Hawaiian Islands to grant them the right to extend the franchise to the district of Makawao, and the charter was so extended. A grant was given to the electric company, and this simply is to ratify the act of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii. There are no complications, nothing except the extension of that right. It does transfer all of the rights to the public utility commission which has recently been created there to take charge of all public utilities.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATKINS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the bill provides that a certain act of the Territorial legislature, naming the act by title, "is hereby ratified, approved, and confirmed," and then goes on to provide that section 857 of chapter 59 of the revised laws, and so forth, is amended to read "as follows," and then in other sections of the bill provides that other sections of the Territorial law be amended to read "as follows," and so forth. Is it supposed that the Territorial act, which is ratified and approved, is set out in the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. That is not what the bill says.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what the original act says, and that is copied in the bill.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman is satisfied with it, I am not going to complain; but it sets out the title of the Territorial act and says that it is ratified, approved, and so forth, and then goes on and says "and section 587 of chapter 59 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii * * * is hereby amended," and so forth.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what is reenacted in this bill—the section the gentleman now refers to.

Mr. MANN. The bill differentiates between the act of the legislature which is approved and the section which is amended.

Mr. WATKINS. This charter is simply granted under the statute law of the Territory.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, if I may have his attention, that I have before me the statute referred to there. Chapter 59 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii is the charter granted to H. P. Baldwin and others. First, there is the franchise; second, the operation, subject to regulations, which is 858; then 859 provides how they must set their poles, and 860 provides for inspection of plants, 861 for being responsible for negligence, and 862 for forfeiture of franchise, and so forth. This bill simply ratifies all of that, but extends it to additional territory, gives them a little more territory to operate in.

Mr. MANN. I am speaking about the form of the bill, which plainly says that a certain act, which it names, is ratified, approved, and confirmed, and as an additional proposition that section 857 is amended by adding certain words, and in section 2 it provides that section 859 is amended by adding certain words, and chapter 59 is further amended by adding a new section. There is nothing in the bill to indicate that you ratify and approve an act and afterwards amend certain other sections. It is all supposed to relate to the same matter. The form of the bill will leave it in dispute as to what is meant.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, while there is no particular objection to having the suggestion of the gentleman incorporated by way of amendment, the only idea is that all the law on that subject matter would remain intact except as amended, and as amended the amendment is stated in the bill. There can not be any doubt about it. There is no reason particularly for inserting the amendment. It will not add to or subtract from the bill. I think it is sufficient, but if there is an amendment offered to that effect we will not object to it.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, if no one else desires to speak, I will ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HOUSTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

HARBOR COMMISSIONERS OF HAWAII.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I now call up the bill H. R. 3042, to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, and amending the laws relating thereto.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 1, 2, and 3 of act 169 of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, 1915, entitled "An act to amend chapter 49 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, relating to harbors, by amending sections 683, 685, 687, and 691, and by adding one new section thereto to be known as section 691 A," approved by the governor of the Territory April 26, 1915, be, and the same are hereby, ratified, approved, and confirmed, as follows:

"SECTION 1. Section 683 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 683. Board of harbor commissioners: Except as otherwise provided by law, all ocean shores below mean high-water mark, shore waters, and navigable streams, and all harbors and roadsteads, and all harbor and water-front improvements, belonging to or controlled by the Territory of Hawaii, and all shipping within such harbors, roadsteads, waters, and streams shall be under the care and control of a board of harbor commissioners. Said board shall consist of five members, one of whom shall be the superintendent of public works of the Territory who shall be chairman, ex officio, and four shall be appointed by the governor as provided in section 80 of the organic act. Such commissioners shall be appointed for terms of four years or the unexpired periods thereof, in such manner that the terms of two commissioners shall expire every second year. Said terms shall begin on the 1st day of July: *Provided, however*, That upon the first appointments two of said commissioners shall be appointed for terms ending June 30, 1913, and two for terms ending June 30, 1915.'

"SEC. 2. Section 685 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 685. Powers and duties of board: Except as otherwise provided by law, said board shall have and exercise all the powers and shall perform all the duties which may lawfully be exercised by or under the Territory of Hawaii relative to the control and management of the shores, shore waters, navigable streams, harbors, harbor and water-front improvements, ports, docks, wharves, quays, bulkheads, and landings belonging to or controlled by the Territory, and the shipping using the same, and shall have the authority to use and permit and regulate the use of the wharves, piers, bulkheads, quays, and landings belonging to or controlled by the Territory for receiving or discharging passengers and for loading and landing merchandise, with a right to collect wharfage and demurrage thereon or therefor, and, subject to all applicable provisions of law, to fix and regulate from time to time rates for services rendered in mooring vessels, charges for the use of moorings belonging to or controlled by the Territory, rates or charges for the services of pilots, wharfage or demurrage, rents or charges for warehouses or warehouse space, for office or office space, for storage of freight, goods, wares, and merchandise, for storage space, for the use of donkey engines, derricks, or other equipment belonging to the Territory, under the control of the board, and to make other charges except toll or tonnage charges on freight passing over or across wharves, docks, quays, bulkheads, or landings. The board shall likewise have power to appoint and remove clerks, wharfingers and their assistants, pilots and pilot-boat crews, and all such other employees as may be necessary, and to fix their compensation; to make rules and regulations pursuant to this chapter and not inconsistent with law; and generally shall have all powers necessary fully to carry out the provisions of this chapter.

"'All moneys appropriated for harbor improvements, including new construction, reconstruction, repairs, salaries, and operating expenses, shall be expended under the supervision and control of the board, subject to the provisions of this chapter and of chapter 100. All contracts and agreements authorized by law to be entered into by the board shall be executed on its behalf by its chairman.

"'The board shall prepare and submit annually to the governor a report of its official acts during the preceding calendar year, together with its recommendations as to harbor improvements throughout the Territory.'

"SEC. 3. Section 687 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 687. Rules and regulations: The board may from time to time make, alter, amend, and repeal such rules and regulations not inconsistent with law as it may deem necessary respecting the manner in which all vessels may enter and moor, anchor, or dock in the shore waters, navigable streams, harbors, ports, and roadsteads of the Territory, or move from one dock, wharf, bulkhead, quay, landing, anchorage, or moorings to another within such waters, streams, harbors, ports, or roadsteads; the examination, guidance, and control of pilots and harbor masters and their assistants, and their conduct while on duty; the embarking or disembarking of passengers; the expeditious and careful handling of freight, goods, wares, and merchandise of every kind which may be delivered for shipment or discharged on the wharves, docks, quays, bulkheads, or landings belonging to or controlled by the Territory; and defining the duties and powers of carriers, shippers, and consignees respecting passengers, freight, goods, wares, and merchandise in and upon such wharf, landing, dock, quay, or bulkhead. The board may also make further rules and regulations for the safety of the docks, wharves, landings, quays, bulkheads, and harbor and water-front improvements belonging to or controlled by the Territory.

"'Said board may also, from time to time, make, alter, amend, and repeal such rules not inconsistent with law as shall be deemed necessary for the proper regulation and control of all shipping in the harbors, shore waters, and navigable streams belonging to or controlled by the Territory, and of the entry, departure, mooring, and berthing of vessels therein, and for the regulation and control of all other matters and things connected with shipping in all such harbors, shore waters, and navigable streams; and rules and regulations to prevent the throwing into such harbors, shore waters, and navigable streams of rubbish, refuse, garbage, or other substances liable to make such harbors, shore waters, and navigable streams unsightly, unhealthful, or unclean, or liable to fill up or shoal or shallow such harbors, shore waters, and streams, and likewise to prevent the escape of fuel or other oils into such harbors, shore waters, and streams, either from any vessel or from pipes or storage tanks upon the land.

"'Any rules and regulations so made shall be published by said board in the manner prescribed for the promulgation of the laws of the Territory, and upon such publication shall have the force and effect of law.'"

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 4, after the word "confirmed" insert the words "with an amendment."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, lines 8 and 9, strike out the words "except as otherwise provided by law, all" and insert the word "all."

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that committee amendment and instead thereof amend line 3, page 2, by inserting after the word "hereby" the word "amended."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to withdraw the committee amendment and substitute one which the Clerk will report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "hereby" insert the word "amended."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the other committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "except as otherwise provided by law, said" and insert the word "Said."

Page 6, insert as a new section the following:

"SEC. 4. The jurisdiction and powers hereby conferred on the board of harbor commissioners are subject to such restrictions as may be imposed by the statutes of the Territory of Hawaii, and shall be exercised in accordance with the provisions thereof."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the remaining committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows:

A bill to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, as herein amended, and amending the laws relating thereto.

On motion of Mr. HOUSTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is that all that the gentleman's committee has?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I report a bill to supply urgent deficiencies for the fiscal year 1915 and prior years, and for other purposes. (H. Rept. 57.)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserves all points of order. The bill is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice that I intend to call up the bill to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York gives notice he is going to call up the bill to-morrow? What time?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Right after the reading of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. Just after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk.

The Clerk will continue the call of committees.

BUREAU OF LABOR SAFETY.

When the Committee on Labor was called,

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill H. R. 153, known as the bill to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 153) to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 153) to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor.

Be it enacted etc., That there is hereby created in the Department of Labor a bureau of labor safety. There shall be a commissioner of labor safety, who shall be the head of said bureau, to be appointed by the President, and who shall receive a salary of $5,000 per annum. There shall also be in the said bureau a chief clerk and such experts, special agents, clerks, and other employees as may be authorized from time to time by appropriation or other law. It shall be the province and duty of such bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, to make general and special investigation and examination of labor-safety plans and devices of all kinds and the need therefor, generally and specially, and also the study of devices and methods for the prevention of vocational diseases, and to make public the results of such investigation, examination, and study from time to time. It shall be the duty of the Public Health Service in its investigation of vocational diseases and their causes to cooperate with such bureau upon request of the Secretary of Labor. It shall also be the province and duty of such bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, to gather, compile, publish, and supply useful information concerning the use of labor-safety plans and devices and vocational diseases in the industries of the United States and elsewhere.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, very briefly stated, the object of this bill, which received the approval of the House in the last Congress but failed of the necessary attention in the Senate, is to establish in the Department of Labor a function in the nature of a clearing house of information with reference to devices and methods calculated to prevent personal injury and loss of life in industrial occupations.

The ratio of accidents to the number employed in the United States, I regret to say, ranks very much higher than it does in the countries of Europe. It would not be exaggerating the difference to say that the tendency in our industries is to kill and injure at least twice as many for a day's employment as experience shows abroad.

As Members of the House well know, proper attention has at last been given in this country to the subject of these accidents in the direction of making compensation to the victims, at least two-thirds of the States having enacted legislation known as accident-compensation legislation.

It is probably not an exaggerated statement to say, although there is no definite computation, that the accident bill in a financial sense only will mean a loss to the industries of the country of $150,000,000 a year when these accident-compensation bills have become adopted and applied by all the States.

So, outside of the humane motive of preventing the injury to the victim himself, there is a financial phase of the matter of proportion calling for attention, and the very best attention, on our part. It is to be observed, Mr. Speaker, that in countries where the accident-compensation systems have gone into effect—and I have in mind the British railways particularly—the effect of penalizing the accident by requiring compensation to the victim, without reference to the fact of negligence, has been to cut down and reduce the number of accidents very materially. When the motives of humanity and the financial interests are both joined, it has been found that methods and devices preventive of accident have been called into activity with the splendid results I have suggested in the case of the British railways.

I need not say more—perhaps I was not called upon to say as much—with reference to legislation the commendable character of which appears so obviously on its own face.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the author of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not say very much concerning the bill, because I believe there is no opposition to it. I think there is no service we can render that is more valuable to humanity than to save the life and limb which otherwise would be lost by accident in the ordinary course of enterprise, and the Government can well afford to have experts somewhere in the Government who can give advice and aid to manufacturers in the effort to adopt safety appliances and devices which will prevent accidents causing injury or death.

That is the design of this bill. I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] and the other members of the Committee on Labor, which I regard as one of the most important committees of the House, for giving early attention to this subject.

Mr. Speaker, there has been on the part of some in the department and on the part of some gentlemen outside of the department, who are interested in the working of the department, some little fear that this bill might take away from some of the other official bodies of the Government authority which had been conferred upon them by act of Congress. While I do not think that the bill does that, in order to obviate any question and to dispel that fear, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following proviso, to wit:

"*Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be held to repeal, modify, or affect any other act of Congress in force at the time of the passage of this act."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LEWIS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CHILD LABOR.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, if now in order, I wish to call up the bill H. R. 8234, known as the Keating child-labor bill, and in that connection I should like to secure the acquiescence of the House, if I may, to an arrangement tentatively entered into by the friends and opponents of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state the arrangement?

Mr. LEWIS. The majority report on the bill has been printed and is available, but the minority views have not been printed, and yesterday the House gave the minority five calendar days in which to prepare them. I wish to ask the unanimous consent of the House that further consideration of the bill after reading the first section be deferred until Calendar Wednesday next, and that any time lost to-day should be reserved in favor of the bill for a later occasion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the title of the bill and first section.

The Clerk read as follows:

To prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That no producer, manufacturer, or dealer shall ship or deliver for shipment in interstate commerce the product of any mine or quarry situated in the United States, which has been produced, in whole or in part, by the labor of children under the age of 16 years, or the product of any mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment situated in the United States which has been produced, in whole or in part, by the labor of children under the age of 14 years or by the labor of children between the ages of 14 and 16 years who work more than eight hours in any one day, or more than six days in any one week, or after the hour of 7 o'clock p. m. or before the the hour 7 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] asks unanimous consent that this bill go over until a week from to-day.

Mr. LEWIS. And that the time surrendered to-day, which is about three hours, be reserved for any subsequent Calendar Wednesday for the use of the Committee on Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is this the last bill that the Committee on Labor is going to call up to-day?

Mr. LEWIS. It is.

The SPEAKER. And that the remainder of this legislative day, say about three hours, although there is nothing fixed about the length of the day, shall be reserved by the Committee on Labor for the consideration of this bill. Has the Chair stated it right?

Mr. LEWIS. On the following Calendar Wednesday. That would be two weeks from to-day.

The SPEAKER. Next Calendar Wednesday is next Wednesday, and not two weeks from to-day.

Mr. MANN. The Committee on Labor would have the balance of to-day and next Calendar Wednesday under the new rule. What they want to do is to give up the balance of to-day and, if necessary, have the three hours on the second Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wanted to understand. The rule provides that the Committee on Labor, for instance, have two Wednesdays hand running if it has business. Now, the gentleman asks that this be postponed until next Calendar Wednesday, and that the remainder of this legislative day, about three hours, shall be granted to that committee two weeks from to-day, provided the committee needs it.

Mr. RAGSDALE. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Rather, I wish to ask for information. As a matter of fact, if we do not object to this at this time, can the objection be raised on next Wednesday as to the extension of this time?

The SPEAKER. It can not, if the committee agrees to do it by unanimous consent to-day.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I object.

Mr. LEWIS. This is a concession to the gentleman's view of the matter. We are ready to-day to take the affirmative argument on this subject and make our argument to the House on this bill, and the minority make their argument next Wednesday, but at the request of the minority itself the majority argument is to be deferred until next Wednesday.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Will the gentleman allow me, before he interposes his objection?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina withhold a moment?

Mr. RAGSDALE. One moment.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman from South Carolina and to the House that the child-labor bill, which is the next bill that would be reported under the call, was reported from the committee on day before yesterday. The views of the minority of that committee have not been prepared, and on yesterday this House accorded to the minority members the right within five legislative days to present their views. It so happens that Calendar Wednesday comes to-day. The bill has been reported, and the report is before the House, but the views of the minority are not before the House. Gentlemen entertaining the minority views very naturally objected to debate upon the proposition to-day before the issue could be joined and their views presented to the House. Under those circumstances the committee was anxious that it should not lose its place upon the calendar, but at the same time that the discussion should not be precipitated when the record was thus incompletely made up. For that reason I, and gentlemen like-minded with myself, requested the chairman of the committee, in order to preserve his place upon the calendar, to permit the committee to give way to-day and ask unanimous consent that its place on the calendar should be carried over until next Wednesday; and in the meanwhile the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], the chairman of the Committee on Roads, might take up the road bill, which has been reported to the House, so that having gone over until next Wednesday whatever time had been lost to the Labor Committee, by reason of not taking up this question this afternoon, should be accorded to it on next Calendar Wednesday. I think that is a concession on the part of the committee to the views entertained by myself and the views which I understand the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] entertains.

It will be better, in my judgment, that this discussion be postponed until next Wednesday. In fact, I think it would be unjust if it were not postponed. For that reason I hope the gentleman from South Carolina will see that the postponement of this discussion at this time makes for a fairer and better opportunity for gentlemen entertaining his views to present them than could be had if this matter is precipitated at this time; and therefore I hope the gentleman will not insist on his objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The Chair will take the liberty of stating to all the Members—some of them are not here—that this Calendar Wednesday rule about debate has been radically changed, and only two hours of general debate are now allowed on one of these bills.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask that the other gentlemen who have bills on the calendar that might be called up whether they would be willing to practically dispense with to-day as Calendar Wednesday and go ahead with the roads bill, so as not to involve matters by having the bills go over. I think they are in very good shape to get their bills up very soon anyhow.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, as the Committee on the Revision of the Laws is the next committee on the calendar, I will state that our committee has no objection to that arrangement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday for the rest of the day?

There was no objection.

RURAL POST ROADS.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, the rural post-roads bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, known as the rural post-roads bill, with Mr. RUCKER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill by title, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads; that for the purposes of this act the term "rural post road" shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is or might be carried outside of incorporated cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000, and in said cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000 along streets and roads where the houses average more than 200 feet apart; that not more than $25,000,000 shall be appropriated under the provisions of this act for any fiscal year.

SEC. 2. That out of any appropriation made under the provisions of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall deduct the sum which he shall deem necessary to defray the expenses of his department in the administration of this act and apportion the balance of said appropriation for expenditure under the provisions of this act in the several States in the following manner: $65,000 to each State and one half of the remainder in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the population of all of the States as shown by the latest available Federal census and the other half of such remainder in the ratio which the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes in such State bears to the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes of all the States as shown by the latest available report of the Postmaster General.

SEC. 3. That as soon as may be after the passage of any act making appropriations under the provisions of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare and file in his office a statement showing the amount of such appropriation he has set apart to defray the expense of his department in the administration of this act, and the amount of the balance which will be available for expenditure in each State, and transmit a copy of such statement to the State highway department of each State which has such a department, and to the governor of each State which has not such a department; that the State highway department of any State, after receiving such statement, may apply to the Secretary of Agriculture for aid under the provisions of this act in the construction or maintenance of any rural post road in such State; and if, in his judgment, such road is one to the proposed construction or maintenance of which aid should be given under the provisions of this act, then he shall request such State highway department to furnish him with surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost of said proposed construction or maintenance, and any other information which he may consider proper; that he shall examine said surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost and determine what would be the reasonable cost of such construction or maintenance and what amount of aid will be given under the provisions of this act to such proposed construction or maintenance, which shall in no case be less than 30 nor more than 50 per cent of what he has so determined would be the reasonable cost of such proposed construction or maintenance, and shall forthwith transmit to said State highway department a written statement of his said determinations; that upon receipt of such written statement the said State highway department may transmit to the Secretary of Agriculture a statement in writing notifying him that such proposed construction or maintenance will be undertaken upon the terms proposed; that thereupon the proper authorities of the State may, in accordance with the laws of such State, commence and prosecute said construction or maintenance in substantial compliance with said surveys, plans, and specifications; that when the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that said construction or maintenance of said road has been finished in substantial compliance with said surveys, plans, and specifications he shall cause to be paid to the proper authority of said State whatever remains unpaid of the amount which he has stated, as hereinbefore provided, would be given to aid said State in said proposed construction or maintenance of said road; that the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, from time to time make payments upon such construction or maintenance as the same progresses, but these payments, including previous payments, if any, shall in no case be more than the pro rata part of the United States of the value of labor and materials which have been put into such construction or maintenance.

SEC. 4. That all construction and maintenance of roads under the provisions of this act shall be under the supervision and control of the State highway departments of the several States: *Provided*, That until January 1, 1920, the amount which has been apportioned to be expended in any State which has no State highway department shall be available for expenditure in such State in such manner as shall be agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the governor of such State; that the Secretary of Agriculture may make, or cause to be made, such inspection and examinations of any road constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act as he shall deem necessary, and he may prescribe what reports shall be made to him by the State highway department of any State in relation to any road in such State to the construction or maintenance of which aid under the provisions of this act has been given or sought, when such reports shall be made, and the form and subject matter of the same; that the Secretary of Agriculture shall have power to employ such assistants, clerks,

and other persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere to purchase such materials and supplies and to prescribe such rules and regulations for the administration of this act as he may consider expedient.

SEC. 5. That the necessary culverts and bridges shall be considered as parts of the roads constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act; that the roads which may be constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act shall include earth, sand-clay, sand-gravel, and other common types of roads, as well as roads of higher classes, one of the purposes of this act being to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming communities.

SEC. 6. That all payments of money from appropriations under the provisions of this act shall be made by the Treasurer of the United States upon warrants drawn by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 7. That this act shall be in force from and after its passage.

[Mr. SHACKLEFORD addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill. I am in favor of Federal aid for highways. I believe it is correct in principle, and I believe there is an overwhelming sentiment in the United States in favor of Federal aid to roads.

Our road system is wholly inadequate to meet the demands of this twentieth-century civilization. We inherit our road system from England, a system that England discarded in the seventeenth century. The great fault with our present road system is that it places upon the rural population the burden of building and maintaining 2,000,000 miles of roads, and then we criticize the farmer because he does not give us better roads.

We have made more advancement in the good-road movement in the last 10 years than we did in the preceding 50 years. The reason is that many of the various States have created highway commissions and have entered upon a system of State aid. We want that supplemented by national aid.

The advocates for national roads insist upon several things. One of them is that the amount appropriated by the General Government will be equitably distributed and divided among the various States.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. That is one of the very points that the minority of the committee makes, that this money is not equitably divided. Will the gentleman discuss that?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes; I will discuss that. The second requisite is that the National Government sees that every dollar expended by the National Government goes on the roads and is expended in an economical way, so that the Government gets a dollar's worth of road for every dollar invested.

I believe this bill meets those requirements.

First, in regard to the apportionment of the money appropriated the bill carries an appropriation of $25,000,000.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is it not true that this bill does not carry any appropriation at all?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The $25,000,000 is named in the bill.

Mr. MANN. It is an authorization.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Just simply an authorization. That is correct. Now, we propose to divide this $25,000,000 and apportion it as follows:

First, we give each State as a unit $65,000. Then, after deducting the amount that it costs to administer the law, we take 50 per cent of the balance of the money and divide it among the several States according to the mileage of the star routes and rural routes.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I do.

Mr. MADDEN. I should like to ask the gentleman what impelled the committee to reach the conclusion that $65,000 should be given to each State as an initial amount.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will answer that in this way: We thought that in the apportionment of this fund we would apportionate it in three ways. I will show the gentleman that it is equitable that States which have not a great population or a great mileage, but want to get good roads and want to improve the roads they have, should have something to start with; so we thought that to give each State the amount of $65,000 was simply fixing an arbitrary amount that we would give to each State for that purpose.

Mr. MADDEN. What is going to be done with that $65,000, and what is it given to the States for?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. It is for roads.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the consideration?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will answer the gentleman's question in arguing in favor of these other apportionments. It supplements those, and the three apportionments make it so that every State is reasonably provided for.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. How is the $65,000 distributed in the States themselves?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will get to that in a moment. The $65,000, and all the amounts given to the States, are distributed by the highway commissions of the States, if they have highway commissions, together with the Secretary of Agriculture. I will explain that further on.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to have the gentleman answer my question.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will answer the gentleman's question within the next minute or two. I want simply to speak of these other apportionments.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I decline to yield until I have made a statement. Then I shall be pleased to do so.

As I said, the first part we divide among the States as units, giving each one $65,000. Next, we distribute 50 per cent of the remainder among the States, according to the mileage of rural routes and star routes.

The third apportionment is to distribute the balance among the several States, according to their population.

This apportionment I believe is fair. It gives the large State with a medium population a fair show on the road mileage; it gives the small State with small road mileage and a large population a fair apportionment on the basis of population, and it gives States as a unit $65,000 to equalize the apportionment. It gives the small State that has a sparse population and a rather small mileage something along on that line. So that when you take the three modes of apportionment—figure them out—as you will see in the report, it gives each State in the Union a fair apportionment of the funds appropriated by the Federal Government.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Did I understand that each State is to get $65,000 regardless of whether it has any highway commission or not?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Without respect to the road mileage or the population?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Take the case of a State where they have no highway commission and spend no money on roads, and all the money they get is $65,000. What will they do with it?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The bill provides that where they have no highway commission the governor of the State shall distribute the fund, and they will have to have a highway commission by 1920 or they will get no more money. Twenty years ago only 10 States in the Union had highway commissions, and now they all have highway commissions except 8.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will allow me, the gentleman said that the State must have a highway commission by 1920. Is it the purpose of this bill not to distribute any money until 1920?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Oh, no; but I say until that time, it is to give the States a little time to prepare themselves.

Mr. MADDEN. And in the meantime what happens to the $65,000?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I have stated that the governor of the State, with the Secretary of Agriculture, will say upon what roads it shall go.

Mr. MADDEN. How many miles of road will $65,000 build?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The State gets $65,000, but it also comes in on the road-mileage apportionment and also the apportionment under population, so that they all get considerably more than the $65,000.

Mr. MADDEN. What was the scientific basis upon which the committee fixed the sum of $65,000 as necessary for each State?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Sixty-five thousand dollars, the amount specified in the bill, is purely an arbitrary amount fixed by the committee, but taken with the other two apportionments, it makes a very fair apportionment of the amount of the fund. I can not conceive any better way of apportioning funds for roads than the number of miles of road as one element; I can not imagine any better apportionment to go with it than the population, the number of people who are going to travel over the roads. But we want to encourage the small State, the State that has not many roads, has a sparse population, and so we give each State a certain amount as a unit. But the three apportionments taken together, according to the best experts we have, make as fair an apportionment as you can have.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Certainly.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is the apportionment that you have just spoken of to be taken as the future purpose for road building?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan. As an initial appropriation?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.
Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.
Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman was a member of the Committee on Roads in the last Congress.
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.
Mr. ROGERS. In the bill passed in the last Congress there is no specific appropriation for a flat amount.
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes; the apportionment was practically the same as in this bill.
Mr. ROGERS. There was $25,000,000 authorized, to be divided into halves, and there were two bases for apportioning the halves.
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The apportionment in that bill was practically the same as it is in this. Now, on the apportionment principle, there are a great many ways which could be suggested for this apportionment. Many of them would be probably fair, but I believe that, taking these three ways of apportioning the fund, it makes a very fair apportionment.

The next requirement is that the money which the Federal Government appropriates shall be fairly invested and economically invested, and not wasted. Under this bill, when the highway commission, if it has one, and if not, the governor of the State, brings out a system of roads and presents it to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture looks over the system of roads and determines what roads are to have Federal aid and whether that aid should be 30 per cent or 50 per cent or any per cent between those two amounts. He also specifies where the roads shall go and what kind of roads shall be built. After that is done, if it is accepted by the State highway commission and the State builds the road, after the roads are built, the facts and data are presented to the Secretary of Agriculture. He looks over the figures. He is having roads built in the 48 different States of the Union, and he knows just what kind of roads can be built and how much they cost.

If he thinks the road has been built in an economical way, in substantial compliance with the plans and specifications presented, he says you can have 50 per cent, or the per cent he has agreed upon. If he makes up his mind that they have been extravagant, that the road has cost more than it ought to have cost, then, under this bill he has the right to give that State commission 50 per cent of what that road ought to have cost. So, no matter if you build a road that costs $5,000 a mile which ought to have only cost $4,000 a mile you will only get $2,000.

You do not get what your road cost, but you get 50 per cent of what your road ought to cost. That is going to have this effect: Every State commission that builds a road for which it is going to receive Government aid, which is cut down by the Secretary of Agriculture in the amount, will be subject to criticism by the people of the State, and the people of the State will go to the commissioner and ask him why he did not build the roads more cheaply. It is going to be a check on every State highway department.

Roads being built in this way in various places in 48 States is going to give the Secretary of Agriculture and his expert engineers data upon which he can rely and from which he can tell very quickly, many times without inspection whatever, whether the road has cost more than it ought to cost. The Secretary of Agriculture can offer suggestions to the various highway commissions, and under the powers given him in this bill he is absolutely sure that every dollar that the Government expends on the roads shall be met by a dollar that the State expends, and the Government and State will thus get two dollars' worth of road for every dollar that the Government puts in.

Mr. Chairman, people term this a pork-barrel proposition. Under a bill of this kind, why can not the Secretary of Agriculture see to it that roads are constructed just as cheaply as the Secretary of the Navy can see to it that battleships are constructed more cheaply than they can be constructed in any private navy yard? If this Government can do other matters in an economical way, why can not it build roads in an economical way? I think it can.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan. In the construction of highways, bridges and culverts are a considerable item of expense?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan. This bill provides for building highways only?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. No; it includes bridges and culverts as a part of the highway system. Some of the Eastern States were opposed to this bill before and are opposed to it now. They say that they are raising more money by taxation than they are getting back. This matter of internal improvements has been going on ever since this Government was started, and the interior of the country, the great agricultural part of the country, has had very few of these internal improvements, and I can not imagine any internal improvement that is going to benefit as many people as will the improvement of our highways. [Applause.] The only questions are whether this money that is expended will be expended in an economical and in an intelligent manner upon the roads, and whether it is fairly apportioned. Those ought to be the only two questions considered.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.
Mr. POWERS. As I understand the gentleman, there are three methods of apportionment?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.
Mr. POWERS. Sixty-five thousand dollars arbitrarily fixed, population, and the length of the rural and star routes?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.
Mr. POWERS. All of these three are to be put together into an apportionment to any one State?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.
Mr. POWERS. That being true, would it not be unfair to the great State of New York to give it only $65,000 and to give $65,000, say, to a State like Delaware?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I do not think it would be any more unfair than to give two United States Senators to the State of New York and two to the State of Nevada.
Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.
Mr. REAVIS. The basis of apportionment to the State is, first, population?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.
Mr. REAVIS. And next, the length of routes?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.
Mr. REAVIS. What relation does the arbitrary appropriation of $65,000 to each State bear to either one of those necessities?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. It simply helps the young States, like many of the Western States that are just building roads and have not a large road mileage and have not a large population. In figuring up the apportionment under the two items spoken of, it will be seen that some States that need roads, when they complete their roads it will help the whole road system of the United States, and those States are very poor and ought to have something upon some other basis than simply population and road mileage.

Mr. REAVIS. The only basis, as I understand it, then of the $65,000, is that it is an arbitrary gift on the part of this committee?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Simply that each State as a unit shall have a fair amount.
Mr. REAVIS. Not based upon any necessity?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. It is based on necessity, and helps out these other two apportionments.
Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.
Mr. SLOAN. What jurisdiction is maintained by the Government after the road has been established to see that it has been maintained or continued?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. This amount provides for maintenance and construction of the roads.
Mr. SLOAN. But after the money has been expended by the Federal Government.
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. After it has been expended the States themselves have to look after it.
Mr. SLOAN. And the United States gives up this money and has no authority whatever over that road in any way for any length of time after having made the contribution.
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. No.
Mr. SLOAN. Does the gentleman think that is fair to the Federal Government?
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I think that is fair. I think it is for the interest of every locality to keep up the roads, for the interest of the State to keep up the roads, and when the State puts in a dollar as against a dollar that the Government puts in it is going to see that those roads are kept up in reasonable repair.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Suppose we pass this bill, where does the committee figure that they are going to get the money? How are you going to get the money first in the Treasury of the United States to start with? Under present conditions, where does the committee figure out it is going to get the money?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. We figure out we will get it in the same place where we get it for rivers and harbors——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. We have not been getting it.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. And are going to get it for the post offices. We were informed within a day or two we are going to have a lot of Federal post-office buildings, which are all right, probably; and we get the money for them from the same source; but we think this internal improvement is certainly more imperative than the improvement of many of our rivers and harbors or the building of post-office buildings at small towns.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will say to the gentleman, as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, if we get the money in the same place we have been getting the money under this administration for the improvement of rivers and harbors it is a useless performance to pass the bill of the gentleman. We have not been getting it.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. In the Sixty-third Congress the committee got over $50,000,000, and we only ask $25,000,000. Then we passed a bill appropriating $30,000,000 for a railroad up in Alaska for the benefit of 60,000 people.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. And we have not got it yet.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. We think it is not more than fair to the great rural population of this country which, when you include towns of 2,500 inhabitants, makes over half the population, 50,000,000 people, are entitled at this time to some consideration. That is the idea of this great improvement that it is going to help everybody. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will.

Mr. LANGLEY. I am in hearty sympathy with what the gentleman is saying, and I understood him to say a moment ago that we are going to have a lot of Federal buildings. I would like to know where the gentleman gets that information. I am a member of that committee, and I have not heard of it.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The other day the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] gave a very learned speech here and told us the fact that we could look for Federal buildings.

Mr. GORDON. As far as he was concerned.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. And that is all right; I am not questioning it.

Mr. LANGLEY. I hope the gentleman is right.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I am not questioning these other internal improvements, but I feel that a class of people whose property is taxed every year for more than $50,000,000, the rural population of this country, the farmers—taxed over $50,000,000 each year—that it is high time we paid some attention to them. [Applause.] I think it is time we built a few roads in this country to benefit them. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman about that, and that is one reason I am in favor of public buildings in the smaller towns, to which, as I inferred from the gentleman's statement, he is opposed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania rose.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I want to finish up what I am saying, and then if I have any time I shall be glad to yield.

Now, we know that the cost of transportation is an important matter to everybody, to the people who dwell in cities as well as in the country, and they claim that about 40 per cent of the cost of every article to the consumer is the cost of transportation. Now, we have improved our waterways so that to-day we can carry a ton of freight 1,000 miles for $1.25, we can carry a ton of freight in the United States over our railroads for something like 250 miles for $1.25, but we can not carry a ton of freight on our wagon roads in the United States to exceed 5 miles for $1.25. Now, if we hope to lessen the cost of transportation the wagon road is the place to lessen it. We pay to-day in the United States to carry a ton of freight over our rural highways over twice what it costs in any country in the world, and anyone who has thought upon this subject at all knows that our rural highways to-day are wholly inadequate to meet the demands of the traffic that passes over them. I have in my State rivers that have been improved, in my own district, where hundreds of thousands of dollars have been expended on those rivers to improve them, and there does not as much traffic go over those rivers in a year as goes over the rural highways that run parallel to those rivers in a week. If you can justify that proposition I would like to have it justified. I believe that it is going to benefit the people of the East in all the States that really opposed this bill in the last session, particularly east of the Allegheny Mountains. Those great States are dependent, somewhat at least, upon the prosperity of the great rural population, the great farming population of this country. They are as anxious about the crop of wheat or cotton or any other crop as the people of the West or the people of the South or any other agricultural community. They have had money for internal improvements. The great Panama Canal, that cost over $400,000,000, undoubtedly benefited them more directly than it did the great interior or agricultural population of this country, but we have not hesitated in paying this. We are willing even to support, and have for 50 years, the highest kind of a protective tariff on the goods we manufacture, but at this time, after going along for 50 or 100 years, not having any improvements, we say that in making this appropriation for wagon roads it is not asking too much, even if they do not get as much money back as they have to pay out. I want to say I do not concede that the money that comes into the ports of entry of these Eastern States, or any State having a seaport, belongs to them. [Applause.] It belongs to this whole country, and the prosperity of the East or the West depends upon the prosperity of every State in the Union.

The State which I have the honor to represent is one of the agricultural States. Every year for the last few years the value of dairy products alone reached over $100,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I do.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if he can tell the committee under what process of reasoning the Committee on Roads reached the conclusion that incorporated cities of 2,000 population should have their streets constructed at the expense of the United States Government while all cities above that population are to be excluded from that provision?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The bill provides that in large villages and cities where the houses are 200 feet apart, and they are on a road that the Secretary of Agriculture believes is a part of a road system, some aid can be placed upon them, but all of this amount is safeguarded by the Secretary of Agriculture. You can not get a cent for any road unless he O. K.'s it and says that it is a road that ought to have Federal aid. He is not going to do foolish things. We have to place in every public official certain discretion and he exercises his sound judgment upon it, and we get very good service from our Federal departments.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman to answer this question.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I would not like to be interrupted on that question further. If the gentleman has another question, I will yield.

The gentleman comes from a large city and represents a large city population, but even in the large cities the road associations favor bills of this kind. There is not a State highway department or State aid in any of the States that applies to the large cities. Some of them give aid to cities as high as 2,000 inhabitants and no higher. Why? Because in cities of that kind they are part of a system of roads and they do not want this road fund to get into the large centers, because it would be swallowed up in the extensive improvements on the city streets and would be lost.

This bill is primarily——

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I decline to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will yield to my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I wanted to call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin to the fact that the question asked by the gentleman from Illinois refers to that provision as to the towns having a population exceeding 2,000, and that provision was included in the bill for the specific purpose

of including in the participation of this fund those cities in New England where the incorporated limits of a town cover many square miles. The purpose of the committee was not to exclude from participation under this bill that section of New England that is included within the incorporated limits of cities, but where the homes are more than 200 or 300 feet apart.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The gentleman from South Carolina is entirely correct.

Mr. MADDEN. That would require the Secretary of Agriculture to have inspectors in every town of the United States to find out every year how close the houses are together.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The State will take care of those things themselves. Every State highway commission that apportions these funds gives them to the rural communities. This road bill is primarily for the benefit of the rural highways and not for the city streets in the big cities.

Mr. MADDEN. Would the gentleman concede——

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I refuse to yield any further.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I refuse to yield to interruptions.

Mr. MADDEN. This is not an interruption. I am just asking a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I refuse to yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I am asking this question in perfect good faith.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is entitled to the floor, and the Chair hopes there will be no interruption.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. All the State laws have apportioned the road funds to the rural highways and not to the large cities. Some of them go far enough to include villages and cities of 2,000 inhabitants, and there is not a single State law in the United States, among all of the States, that goes so far as to appropriate money for city streets. The reason is that it would not be a fair thing in this bill to provide for city streets. As I say, it is primarily for the rural highway. The cities get many forms of Federal aid, many internal improvements. They get their post-office buildings. The city of Chicago has its fine Federal buildings that cost millions and millions of dollars. And now gentlemen from the cities, or some of them, object to giving the rural communities a little money on a very belated and necessary improvement like the improvement of our wagon roads. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those Representatives from a city who do not object to the country getting a fair proportion of all appropriations, and when this bill was up before I voted for it——

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I know you did.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But I would like to ask the gentleman, in view of the statement he made a moment ago, as to how the farmers pay $50,000,000 in taxes to the United States Government?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. They pay their township taxes, and county taxes, and highway taxes, and pay a tremendous tax to your manufacturers. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I respond very promptly by saying that all residents of the city pay an enormous price for the products that come from the gentleman's farm, and the cost of living has gone up very high to consumers in the cities.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. You pay it to your commission merchants, who make as much as the farmer does.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That may be, and that is a matter for regulation by law. But let the gentleman answer my question as to how it is and where it is that the farmer pays $50,000,000 into the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I have not said he paid it directly into the Treasury of the United States. How does the State of Pennsylvania pay the amount of money to this Federal road fund?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The State of Pennsylvania has, up to date, paid for its own roads, and so have the New England States.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I asked you the question, Has the State of Pennsylvania paid one cent directly into the United States Treasury except by way of an income tax or something of that kind?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It has paid large sums into the United States Treasury in internal taxes and because of the improvement of rivers and harbors it is enabled to collect, and does collect, many millions in the form of customs duties.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Through our good roads we are going to benefit you in Pennsylvania the same as you benefit us. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I admit there may be a mutual benefit. We are interdependent, but my question referred to the farmers' payment of $50,000,000 to the Federal Government.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I did not make any such statement. I said we paid taxes on $50,000,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The farmer pays taxes in my State and in the gentleman's State, but not for Federal purposes. He pays taxes only for local purposes.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. If the gentleman has supported the bill in the last Congress, he should do so in this Congress, and he will support this bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I rose only to request the gentleman to be fair toward the various sections of the country, and not to attack those parts of the country through which the revenues of the country are collected—as to customs duties, one-third of the whole.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I am not attacking them. I am simply saying we ought to halt in these other internal improvements until we have made a very necessary and belated improvement in our roads. All the people of the United States have been contributing to the internal improvements, such as rivers and harbors and other works, for a hundred years, and the only United States law or Federal law that was ever passed for roads was passed away back in Jefferson's administration, in which we appropriated $7,000,000 for the great Cumberland Road; and that money was as well expended as any $7,000,000 that was ever appropriated by this Government. [Applause.] It opened and started the great western march of the people of this country toward the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman and I agree as to that.

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HELGESEN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says he knows the city people pay enormous prices for the products of the farmers. Does he know that the Secretary of Agriculture, after a very careful investigation, reports that the farmer gets only approximately 50 per cent of the price paid by the consumer?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The gentleman from North Dakota is absolutely correct.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The fact remains, however, that we pay enormously high prices in the cities for the products of the farmer. You have nothing on us in that respect.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I decline to yield further to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I repeat, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN] is entirely right in regard to the farmer getting only 50 per cent of the real selling price paid by the consumer of the product he raises.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will join the gentleman in attempting to remedy that condition as quickly as any other Member of the House.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Well, the Government is trying to work out that problem now, and I hope it is going to be successful. But it is certainly going to lessen the cost to the consumer when it will save an enormous amount of unnecessary cost in hauling products over bad roads. The Secretary of Agriculture says that in the hauling of the annual crop it really is a loss of something like $100,000,000 in marketing the annual crop of from $5,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000, caused by bad roads, and he says that the highest tax which the American people are paying to-day is the bad road or mud tax.

That is what this bill seeks to remedy. We have got over 2,000,000 miles of roads in the United States, and——

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Not now. I can not yield.

I say we have over 2,000,000 miles of roads in the United States, and it is an enormous thing to contemplate—the building, in the first instance, the keeping in repair and seeing after the maintenance of all these roads. If the Federal Government appropriates this amount, this is going to act as a great educational factor, as we argued. We have a small Roads Bureau in the United States Government now, but the trouble is that so little money is appropriated for it that it can hardly get out a bulletin or make an investigation. If we appropriate $25,000,000, that will be but a small thing for a State like Pennsylvania. That State will get something like a million and a half dollars from it. It may be a small thing, but it is going

to educate the people all over the United States as to road building. It is going to educate every State highway commission. The engineers have not yet figured out and gotten up a road that will stand the wear and tear of modern traffic. We are going to have the best engineers in the country working on that problem. In Pennsylvania, if you want macadam roads at $30,000 a mile, you can have them. If you just want to maintain the roads already built and not build new ones, under this law you can spend the money you receive toward maintaining them. It is a law that is workable in all the 48 States of the Union. You can not make a hard-and-fast rule or specify a kind of road that will be good or a road system that will be workable in all the 48 States, because there are so many different conditions that a road that is good in the interior of Pennsylvania, for example, would bankrupt one of our Western States or agricultural communities.

This bill provides that the moneys shall be apportioned and expended as recommended by the various highway commissions of the States, and it is safeguarded by the Secretary of Agriculture, who stands back there with all the experience and investigation he gets from the engineers and road builders in the different States, and he does not let a dollar go out of the Treasury until he knows that a dollar has been expended by the States, and not only expended, but expended in an intelligent manner. Then only does he let it go. I do not see but that this Government would be amply safeguarded in passing a law of this kind.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Is there a provision in this bill that the different States can not participate in this fund unless they contribute a proportionate part?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes. Every State has to pay. When a road proposition is presented by the State highway department to the Secretary of Agriculture, he is the judge of whether the Federal Government pays 30 or 50 per cent of what it can be built for. If it is a high-class road or macadam road, they will get probably 50 per cent. If it is a gravel road or dirt road, it may be 30 per cent. Then the State has got to pay the balance. If the Government gives 50 per cent, the State has got to pay 50 per cent. If the Government pays 30 per cent, the State has got to come forward and pay 70 per cent.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. POWERS. Is it left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the amount which shall be paid by the Federal Government and the amount which shall be paid by the State?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. It is left to him to determine the per cent, which shall be between 30 and 50 per cent. On an expensive road he will undoubtedly allow a larger per cent than he will on a dirt road or a gravel road; yet in thousands of places in the United States the only road that is practicable and that can be built will be a plain dirt road, well graded and kept up. In some places where they have the material a gravel road will be the kind of road they will build. Right back of all this you have the State highway commission watching over that matter and reporting, and you have the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States and his experts to say what kind of a road shall be built and whether a particular road is one that should have Federal aid or not. I think that the money the Government is called upon to appropriate is safeguarded in every way, and that the Government can be sure that the money appropriated by it is going to be used wisely and economically.

Mr. DILLON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. DILLON. I would like to ask the gentleman why the committee did not place in this bill a provision appropriating the money so as to vitalize the bill?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Appropriations have to go to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The Roads Committee is not an appropriating committee. We have not the authority to recommend appropriations.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The Roads Committee has no authority to make appropriations, and, of course, this bill will have to go to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DILLON. But Congress can appropriate the money?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Certainly.

Mr. DILLON. Then why does not it do that and vitalize this bill?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. If Congress passes this bill, then the question of appropriating the money goes to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DILLON. And that will be the last of it?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Oh, no.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What is the attitude of the Department of Agriculture and its Bureau of Public Roads with reference to this bill? Has it considered this bill, and what is its attitude?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I am informed that the Department of Agriculture favors this bill. I am also informed that the State highway commissioners of the various States, representing the State highway departments, met and got up a tentative bill that is substantially this bill. It may vary in some particulars, but on the whole it is practically this bill, and I know that a number of the highway commissions have written letters expressing their approval of this bill.

Mr. NORTON. If this bill passes, does it impose any obligation on the Committee on Appropriations to report, in the sundry civil appropriation bill, an appropriation of $25,000,000 a year, or any amount?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Of course the Committee on Appropriations has got to act on this just the same as on other bills. As the gentleman well knows, the Roads Committee has no power to appropriate any money. The Roads Committee passed on this bill, and if it is the sense of this Congress that this bill should pass, I think there are enough Members who will favor it so that undoubtedly the Committee on Appropriations would recommend the appropriation.

Mr. SANFORD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANFORD. Am I to understand from the reading of this bill that there is any provision here that will require the several States before receiving Federal aid to spend any amount of money whatever in the constuction of roads? That is, if the members of a community get together and do their share of the work—by convict labor, or by local labor, or in any other manner, if they produce the desired result—do they not become entitled to Federal aid when a certain portion of the road is finished, regardless of whether they have spent any money or not?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. They have got to present to the Secretary of Agriculture their system of roads.

Mr. SANFORD. They can do it in any way they want to, can they not?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. They must present their plans and specifications. Then, if they accept the terms imposed by the Secretary of Agriculture, they can go back and build their road, and the Secretary of Agriculture does not care how they build it. If they present to him a good road according to plans and specifications and show that it cost so much money, then he turns over to them the amount that the Government has promised. But if they spend more money upon that road than it ought to cost they do not get anything for the excess of cost. They get exactly what that road can be built for if it is built in the most economical way.

Mr. SANFORD. The point I am making is that a State or a community can build their road without spending one dollar, doing it by convict labor, for instance, or local labor.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. If they build it by convict labor, that represents so much labor or so much money. If I am riding over a road down in Kentucky, if it is a good road I, as a citizen of the United States, do not care how it has been built, and if the State has put in a dollar's worth of work, and the Government of the United States has put in a dollar, and we have two dollars' worth of road, that is all I care about.

Mr. SANFORD. If we spend $25,000,000 through the Federal Government, we will give employment to that much labor, as a reward for the local labor of the various communities. Does not that seem reasonable?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. They simply hire that work to be done. The convict system of labor is employed in only a few of the States of the Union to work on the roads. We would rather have convicts work on the roads than to have them work in competition with free labor in other directions.

Mr. SANFORD. I do not mean convict labor particularly. I mean that so long as the work is done by the State, the Government does not care how it is done.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. If they hire local labor and pay for it, they will have to spend that much money to do the work, and I should not think it would make any difference to the gentleman from New York whether the State as a unit

appropriated the money or whether the different localities appropriated the money. We want a law that will be workable in all the States of the Union. [Applause.]

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in somewhat a lonely minority on my committee in opposing this measure, because I believe it is an unwise policy for the Federal Government to undertake. After reading the speeches in the debates in the last Congress and listening to statements made by the honorable chairman of the committee and my associate who has just concluded, members of the Roads Committee, I am convinced that the only thing the Federal-aid road bill will not accomplish is the cure of measles and the eradication of the seven-year locusts. [Laughter.]

You would think to hear the statements made by gentlemen on the floor of this Chamber at the last session that if you can get Federal aid for highways all the evils in many communities of our several States are to be wiped out. I say that it is an unwise policy for this Government to undertake this thing at this particular time.

The chairman of the committee said that good roads have become a burning question in many of the Western States. Ah, yes, Mr. Chairman, a burning question, but not so burning that they are willing to appropriate their own money to build their roads and maintain their highways. He says there is a great public demand for this measure. Of course, Mr. Chairman, there is always a great public demand whenever there is an opportunity for communities or States to reach into the Federal Treasury and extract funds therefrom.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would like to inquire whether there is a road in the United States except the Cumberland highway that was not constructed by the farmers and the ordinary laborers and the people in the States without Federal aid?

Mr. WALSH. That is true, Mr. Chairman, but I say that these many States throughout this country can well afford to build their own roads, that it is no part of the Federal Government's duty or obligation to construct highways in whole or in part for the States. One of the bad features of this bill is that the very States that have expended millions of dollars in the construction of their own highways will be called upon to contribute heavily for the construction of roads in other sections of the country. Take the States of Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, yes Kansas and California, where they have modern highways, and you will find that in computing the proportion of direct taxes—and it will be by direct taxes that this appropriation will be made up—they pay a large proportion of the amount.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman says that the money that will go to pay these expenses will be raised by direct taxation. What does the gentleman mean; how does he mean to differentiate these taxes?

Mr. WALSH. I mean that the revenue of this country secured under the present tariff law is insufficient to carry on the functions of the various departments of this Government, and this administration has been forced to levy a war tax to help pay the expenses of the Government. If you add $25,000,000 more to the expenses of the Government, necessarily it must come out of the direct taxes which have been levied.

Mr. BLACK. But how does the gentleman know that this particular fund will come out of the direct taxes?

Mr. WALSH. What difference does it make, Mr. Chairman, whether it comes out directly or indirectly, you will levy the tax and the people will have to pay it. I point out to the gentleman in this connection that of the $52,000,000 secured by these special taxes during the year ending June 30, 1915, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania paid $31,140,000.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield for another question? Does the gentleman think that ought to be the criterion for public expenses—what a single State pays into the Treasury?

Mr. WALSH. I think when you are embarking on a policy entirely new, a plan entirely novel, to take up a matter which has heretofore been handled by the States independently of the Federal Government, that that certainly should be taken into account, and the further fact that the several States have expended millions of dollars improving their highways also should be taken into account when other States which have expended comparatively small sums for this purpose are asking for a contribution for internal improvements, such as is contemplated by this proposed measure.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will.

Mr. KELLEY. Does not the gentleman think the subject of transportation, whether on the railroads or on the rivers or on the highways, ought to be treated as a whole? In other words, practically all of the merchandise that is hauled over the railroads must be hauled over the highways, and if it is proper to assist in building railroads to a large extent all over the country as we have in times past, why is it not proper to assist in the development of highways which lead up to the stations? [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. In answer to that, I do not think it is proper, because there is no analogy between the two situations.

Mr. KELLEY. Why not? It seems to me that there is. Will the gentleman state in what particular the analogy fails.

Mr. WALSH. In this particular, because this bill is not confined to any particular road used in interstate commerce or in roads running from railroads to any particular point. Any little cow path or lane or alley, in so far as it may be outside the limits of any city, incorporated village or town, can receive Federal aid under this bill. It is not to be directed to thoroughfares from one State into another, but any little road, if it starts nowhere and goes elsewhere, can receive aid.

Mr. KELLEY. To make my question clear, if it is proper for the Federal Government to assist in building a road to carry produce over a road from city to city, why is it not proper for the Federal Government to assist in constructing a road from the farm to the station?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have not as yet admitted that it is proper for the Federal Government to construct a road from the farm to the city or from the city to the farm, nor to aid in the construction of railroads in the States.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does not the gentleman think that if the appropriation is once made out of the Federal Treasury for the construction of highways it will absolutely paralyze all local movement, and that no community will ever thereafter be willing to do anything for itself.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, that is one of the thoughts which I had in mind when I undertook here in my place to defend my position in submitting this report. I intended to express that thought, but I have been diverted by these many interruptions.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if I may answer the question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN]?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The answer is found on page 3 of the bill in the provision that when the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that the construction of a road has been finished he shall then pay the Government contribution, so that the State can not get any of the Government money until after it has complied with that provision and paid out the State money.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied the gentleman from Massachusetts can answer that question.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I must decline to yield at the present time. I would like to get along with my remarks. Possibly later when the opportunity offers I will be glad to withstand the bombardment of questions from these gentlemen who are so anxious and willing to admit that their own States have failed miserably in the duty which was laid upon them when their States were formed, to construct their own highways, as many States have done.

Take the great State of New York, for example. That State has expended millions and millions of dollars in constructing a modern system of highways, and would contribute several millions of dollars toward this appropriation, but it would receive back from its own contribution only a small amount, a little over $1,000,000, as its allotment under this bill, and yet it is contended that this distribution is equitable. Mr. Chairman, I believe the reason why the arbitrary amount of $65,000 was fixed in the bill is simply as the darky would say, to take the "cuss" off the whole proposition; and if it were not for that $65,000, Delaware would receive only $38,000, under the bill as drawn; Nevada, $36,000; Rhode Island, $74,000; Utah, $73,000; Wyoming, $60,000; Arizona, $52,000; Idaho, $105,000; and Vermont, $122,000.

Let me call your attention to the definition of what a rural post roads is, as contained in this bill. It is stated that the term "rural post roads"—

shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is, or might be, carried—

Mr. Chairman, I ask some one to point out a single highway in the whole Union that can not be considered a rural post road

under that definition, because the mail might be carried over it at some time. The bill continues:

Outside of incorporated cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000, and in such cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000 along streets and roads where the houses average more than 200 feet apart.

Mr. Chairman, they actually seek in this bill to set that up as a definition of a rural post road, which is to cover the appropriation of Federal funds in the construction of highways throughout these United States. I say it is defective, and the committee could very well have said that they will appropriate money simply for the aid of highways in the several States of the Union. Another feature of this measure which I submit is vicious in its import is that the Congress of the United States says to the several States of the Union: You have got to have a certain department in running your own affairs; you must necessarily have a highway commission within your borders, irrespective of whether the people of your State desire a highway commission or a highway department; if you want Federal aid you have got to establish one, and it has got to be called presumably by that name and under that designation.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, another defect in the bill is that once having appropriated money, and that money having been expended, the Government has no further supervision over the highways. The Government gives the State this money, and after the road is constructed and the money is paid the Government retains no jurisdiction or control over the highway, and that highway the very next year, for all that Congress knows, may be discontinued or abandoned or used in some other way or for some other purpose, so that the money that the Congress has appropriated and expended for this purpose will have become wasted.

If this is a wise policy to adopt, there should have been some provision for the control or supervision in the future. In my opinion, appropriating the money to aid in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads is a shallow pretext, because the concluding section of the bill makes it clear that it is done simply to aid the farmers of the country; and, in so far as that is true, this is class legislation. I am not criticizing the farmers of the country, because we have farmers in the New England States—in "effete" New England, as it was termed here the other day—and the farmers in the New England States have been in the past and will be in the future ready and willing to assume and bear their burdens by way of increased taxes and build their own roads from their farms to the railroad stations or from their farms to the post offices—and under this bill no allowance is made for what they have done in this direction heretofore—but to seek to appropriate money on the pretext that you are doing it to aid rural free delivery or to improve rural post roads, in view of the words in the next to the last section of the bill, shows conclusively that it is not done to aid in the delivery of the United States mails or to build up a great system of highways for the great Postal Service of the country, but is done to relieve a certain class of our population in certain sections of our vast country of burdens which in other sections of the country have been patiently, if not cheerfully, borne by individuals of the same class. And I say it is to the glory and credit of the New England farmer, and the farmers of other States where large sums of money have been expended, that they have borne this burden in the shape of taxation, and have, in addition, contributed their just share of taxation for other improvements, local, State, and national, without a whimper. The Massachusetts farmers, in common with the farmers of other New England States and the farmers of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, New Jersey, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, and California are no weaklings, Mr. Chairman, and they are reaping the benefits of expenditures to which they have contributed without a thought of a partnership between their State and the Federal Government.

But if it is done to relieve the farmer of the burdens which they ought to be willing to bear, if there is this great demand, and if it is going to lift these great burdens from the farmers, and it is going to result in this tremendous financial benefit to them, why should they not be willing in the States of the West or the States of the South or the States or any other section of the country to bear the burden of increased taxation and have the roads built under State supervision? The advocates of this measure talk about the State appropriating half the money. Why, Mr. Chairman, if they are willing to appropriate half the money, if the Government should put in half, why are not these States willing to appropriate their half at once or in the near future without Federal aid and show to the country at large that they have made an honest effort, a conscientious endeavor, to remedy a defect which has existed owing to the lack of a modern system of highways in their respective communities? We have proceeded in this country heretofore, as I before stated, with the building of roads as a matter of State duty and State jurisdiction, and we would be as well justified in appropriating money here in this Congress to build schoolhouses or town halls and to take care of the paupers of the many States of this Union as we would be to step in and appropriate money to build these roads. If this is to become a law, I submit that if those States are sincere in their effort to have improved highways there should be some provision inserted in this bill whereby the States which receive this money shall repay at least a part of it back to the Federal Treasury.

I have pointed out in my minority views printed to accompany the report on this bill, Mr. Chairman, some of the inconsistencies and discrepancies which occur in the apportionment of the money under the provisions of this bill, and I want to call attention to the fact that, although this bill is supposed to improve roads in rural communities, no allowance is made in computing the population. No allowance is made for the population in the great cities of these various States. They are all included in the total of population and in the ratio which the population of that State bears to the population of the entire country. But if this is to aid the rural communities, the population should be apportioned upon the ratio which the rural population bears to the population of the entire country, so that this money will go to those communities where the need may be expressed as great. For instance, Colorado, with a population of nearly 800,000, is allowed $252,000; Oregon, with 672,000 population, gets $248,000; North and South Dakota, with a population combined of less than 600,000, get $335,000 and $337,000, respectively——

Mr. DILLON. That is not right.

Mr. WALSH. While Connecticut, with over 1,000,000 of population, is allowed but $258,000. The mileage comparison is the same and the same discrepancies occur; and in the star-route mileage, as set forth in this bill here, in the table accompanying the report, the same discrepancies occur. Rhode Island, with 87.61 miles of star routes, gets $139,000. Wyoming, with 4,137 miles of star-route highways, only gets $125,000. Now, Mr. Chairman, at least some effort should be made in appropriating Federal money to see that it goes to States which at least try to improve their own system of highways. In 1913 the State of Alabama, as a State, for State highways, spent $127,000, and under this allotment here she would be allowed to receive $579,000. Delaware spent $30,000, and is allotted under this bill $103,000. California spent $2,000,000 and over in 1913, and yet she gets but $504,000. Connecticut spent $3,483,000, and she gets but $258,000. Florida and Georgia spent not a cent, as States, for highways in 1913, and yet get $202,000 for Florida and $722,000 for Georgia.

The following States made no expenditures for State highway funds in 1913: Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. The total amount of State expenditures for highways in 1913, Mr. Chairman, in the United States only amounted to $37,437,000, and of this amount the States of California, Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and even Washington, in the far Northwest, contributed of that $37,000,000 the sum of $30,000,000. So you can see the many States that have neglected the road problem. Of course they can say that there has been a great increase in highway commissions and highway departments in some of these Western States, but it is interesting to notice that this increase in these highway commissions has been coincident with the introduction of Federal-aid road bills in the Congress of the United States. I say it is because these highway commissions have sought to expend or to assist in the expenditure of Federal aid.

Now, Mr. Chairman, something has been said about the Government having the constitutional authority to expend money for post offices and post roads. That may or may not be true. There may or may not be some doubt upon that question, but irrespective of that, whenever the United States Government undertakes to expend money for improvements they see to it that in expending that money that it is wisely and judiciously expended; and furthermore, they exercise, after the expenditure is made, some degree of control, and that is not the case with this law.

They say that because the United States uses these highways and byways in carrying the rural mail to the patrons of the country post offices that they should therefore aid to the extent of one-half of the expense in constructing and repairing those roads. I say, sir, that if this bill and its purpose is to be based upon the theory that because the Government uses the highways it should therefore contribute to the maintenance and constructing of them, that then the Government should only contribute its fair share toward maintaining and constructing these highways,

taking into account all the uses to which the highways are put; and if that were the theory upon which this legislation were to stand you would find, instead of paying from 30 to 50 per cent of the cost, that this Government would only pay from 1 to 10 per cent of the cost, and no such large sum would be required to be appropriated.

I say, sir, that to enact this legislation will discourage rather than encourage road building under State auspices, because once you get Federal expenditure or Federal appropriation or Federal participation in carrying out any of the great functions of the Government the growth and tendency of the times have been to discourage doing or performing that function under State auspices and to gradually and slowly turn that power, authority, or duty over to Federal supervision and control. And I say that under this bill that will inevitably follow. There may not be men here who will see it, but there will come a time if we launch the Government upon this program when the States will take the stand that if their highways become run down and out of repair that because the United States Government at one time expended money for the construction or maintenance of those roads they will not do anything more for them until the United States Government comes to their rescue.

I say, sir, that this legislation is not wise, and I want to call the attention of the gentlemen on this side of the House especially to the fact that this is one of the measures which for several years has been in the platform of the Democratic Party, while the Republican Party has never incorporated a plank for Federal aid, but has simply asserted its belief in good roads and recommended the improvement of them to the several States of the Union. And I am not surprised at the frantic endeavors of the Democracy to fulfill their platform promise in this respect, because it is in striking contrast with their efforts in the past to put into practice their promises upon one or two other doctrines laid down in that immortal document, and I might refer perhaps to the one-term plank as to the presidential term of office.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I say, sir, that it is well for this Congress at this time to stop and consider whether, in view of the many important questions that are pressing for consideration, whether in view of the present condition of the Federal Treasury as it has been enunciated upon both sides of this Chamber, this country is in a condition to launch out upon an entirely new policy involving an expenditure of $25,000,000. But if it is well to set forth upon this unknown sea, I submit it would be much better for this House to reduce that appropriation materially—down to less than $5,000,000—and see what will happen with that kind of an appropriation and the consequent apportionment that could be made thereunder. But I object, because I honestly and sincerely believe that this is not a policy for which we as Members of this great body ought to stand under the present conditions in this country, and in view of the fact that the sole demand, as it were, seems to come from States which in the past have been unwilling to aid themselves and now see a chance to have Federal aid from the United States Treasury. [Applause.]

I desire to submit the following comparative tables and invite the attention of the proponents of the measure to them:

Comparisons.

MILEAGE COMPARISONS.

Louisiana, with 0.75 per cent of combined routes, gets	$345,064
West Virginia, with 1.19 per cent of combined routes, gets	340,688
Montana, with 0.76 per cent of combined routes, gets	192,998

RURAL FREE DELIVERY MILEAGE.

Alabama, 25,845 miles rural free delivery routes, gets	579,180
Kentucky, 18,765 miles rural free delivery routes, gets	580,274
New Jersey, 7,149 miles rural free delivery routes, gets	438,054
Vermont, 7,610 miles rural free delivery routes, gets	187,528

STAR-ROUTE MILEAGE.

Illinois, 717.77 miles, gets	1,372,330
Montana, 6,541 miles, gets	792,998
Rhode Island, 87.61 miles, gets	139,392
Wyoming, 4,137.03 miles, gets	125,170
Connecticut, 4,724 miles, gets	253,168
Delaware, 359.06 miles, gets	258,638

Yet Pennsylvania, with 8.36 per cent of population and 4.48 per cent of rural free delivery and star routes, and receiving $1,469,696, is given $65,000, the same as the smaller States; also New York, with 9,113,614 population, 9.94 per cent, and 4.04 per cent of combined routes, receiving $1,372,330, receives $65,000, the same as Nevada and other small States.

TABLE 1.—*State highway expenditures to Jan. 1, 1915.*
[Prepared by U. S. Department of Agriculture.]

State.	Year original State-aid law passed.	Expenditures in 1914.							Total State money expended for road work from outset to Jan. 1, 1915.	State money available for road work, 1915.
		Local funds expended in road work by counties, townships, and districts.	Joint funds (State and local units).			Road work done solely at expense of State.	Total of all State money expended for road work.	Total of State funds and joint funds.	Total of State funds, joint funds, and local funds.	
			Local unit's share.	State's share.	Total joint fund.					
Alabama	1911	[1] $2,795,000	$160,693	[2] $170,232	$330,925		$168,232	$330,925	$3,125,925	$460,271	$144,000
Arizona[3]	1909	603,608				$406,125	406,125	406,125	1,009,733	[4] 563,210	396,883
Arkansas[5]	1913	2,332,368		115,000	115,000		115,000	115,000	2,447,368	140,000	25,000
California[6]	1895	9,495,281				5,175,333	5,175,333	5,175,333	14,670,614	8,269,942	7,000,000
Colorado	1909	1,621,950	678,225	301,274	979,499		301,274	979,499	2,601,449	821,751	85,000
Connecticut[7]	1895	[1] 1,400,000	265,125	1,307,381	1,572,506	2,124,276	3,431,657	3,696,782	5,096,782	14,934,176	1,000,000
Delaware	1903	360,411	30,000	31,000	61,000		31,000	61,000	421,411	193,695	30,000
Florida[8]	1915	[1] 3,450,000							3,450,000		
Georgia	1908	[1] 2,500,000							2,500,000		
Idaho	1905	1,265,000	43,466	49,812	93,278		49,812	93,278	1,358,278	372,812	200,000
Illinois	1905	7,102,977	446,702	387,989	834,691		387,989	834,691	7,937,668	867,989	2,100,000
Indiana		13,258,761							13,258,761		
Iowa	1904	11,363,000		74,000	74,000		74,000	74,000	11,437,000	175,000	100,000
Kansas	1911	5,427,424		9,080	9,080		9,080	9,080	5,436,504	[1] 20,000	11,000
Kentucky[9]	1912	1,700,000		18,000	18,000		18,000	18,000	1,718,000	43,000	600,000
Louisiana	1910	4,000,000	300,320	161,186	461,506		161,186	461,506	4,461,506	461,506	145,000
Maine	1901	1,863,000	375,731	467,149	842,880	831,716	1,298,865	1,674,596	3,537,596	4,835,864	1,000,000
Maryland	1898	2,000,000	356,845	356,845	713,690	4,283,768	4,640,613	4,997,458	6,997,458	14,253,142	4,572,000
Massachusetts	1892	3,318,742	241,838	242,560	484,398	2,217,469	2,460,029	2,701,867	6,020,609	16,365,425	2,437,000
Michigan	1905	6,715,000	2,082,612	657,264	2,739,876	61,348	718,612	2,801,224	9,516,224	2,207,701	1,700,000
Minnesota	1905	4,272,244	2,643,621	1,309,956	3,953,577		1,309,956	3,953,577	8,225,821	2,708,174	1,770,741
Mississippi		2,850,000							2,850,000		
Missouri[10]	1907	[1] 8,000,000		277,253	277,253		277,253	277,253	8,277,253	1,421,983	350,000
Montana	1913	2,553,773		13,516	13,516		13,516	13,516	2,567,289	16,000	25,000
Nebraska[11]	1911	3,347,062					36,783		3,347,062	257,850	100,000
Nevada	1911	240,000							240,000	20,000	
New Hampshire	1903	1,250,000	301,288	491,520	792,808	9,365	500,885	802,173	2,052,173	2,593,450	400,000
New Jersey	1891	3,000,000	2,235,976	1,306,596	3,542,572		1,306,596	3,542,572	6,542,572	7,192,268	1,360,000
New Mexico	1909	371,196	40,281	115,732	156,013		115,732	156,013	527,209	510,833	175,000
New York	1898	7,741,142	6,655,072	8,544,126	15,199,198	6,950,133	15,494,259	22,149,331	29,890,473	82,638,729	15,000,000
North Carolina	1901	3,930,000		5,000	5,000		5,000	5,000	3,935,000	28,500	10,000
North Dakota	1909	2,365,000							2,365,000		

[1] Data approximate.
[2] Includes $2,000 paid to county for bridges, but not reported as expended.
[3] Data for fiscal year.
[4] July 1, 1912, to Jan. 1, 1915.
[5] No money aid for construction.
[6] Data includes the State expenditure of $150,920 on 519 miles of State mountain roads, divided as follows: Construction, $54,866; maintenance, $89,713; engineering, $2,894; and administration, $3,446.
[7] Data from State comptroller's report.
[8] State highway department provided for beginning Oct. 1, 1915.
[9] State aid in road construction beginning 1915.
[10] Data from the State auditor's report.
[11] State aid in bridge construction only.

TABLE 1.—*State highway expenditures to Jan. 1, 1915*—Continued.

State.	Year original State-aid law passed.	Expenditures in 1914.								Total State money expended for road work from outset to Jan. 1, 1915.	State money available for road work, 1915.
		Local funds expended in road work by counties, townships, and districts.	Joint funds (State and local units).			Road work done solely at expense of State.	Total of all State money expended for road work.	Total of State funds and joint funds.	Total of State funds, joint funds, and local funds.		
			Local unit's share.	State's share.	Total joint fund.						
Ohio	1904	[1] $8,500,000	$906,543	$1,855,338	$2,761,882	.....	$1,855,338	$2,761,882	$11,261,882	$5,123,671	$3,300,000
Oklahoma [2]	1911	3,375,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	10,000	.....	3,375,000	20,323	15,000
Oregon	1913	5,155,657	1,718,000	10,697	1,728,697	$178,278	188,975	1,906,975	7,062,632	188,975	233,000
Pennsylvania	1903	5,500,091	657,437	1,976,768	2,634,205	2,290,284	[3] 4,354,666	4,924,489	10,424,580	24,259,954	5,000,000
Rhode Island	1902	385,000	.....	.....	.....	199,598	199,598	199,598	584,598	3,703,665	180,000
South Carolina	.....	[1] 1,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000,000	.....	.....
South Dakota	1911	1,421,501	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,421,501	.....	.....
Tennessee [4]	1915	[1] 2,500,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,500,000	.....	.....
Texas	.....	[1] 8,750,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	8,750,000	.....	.....
Utah [5]	1909	[1] 750,000	249,204	157,732	406,936	.....	157,732	406,936	1,156,936	688,732	100,000
Vermont	1898	723,011	300,000	458,456	758,456	.....	458,456	758,456	1,481,467	3,186,419	400,000
Virginia	1906	2,148,436	1,243,432	523,578	1,767,010	.....	523,578	1,767,010	3,915,446	2,186,895	520,000
Washington [6]	1905	[1] 4,000,000	.....	1,343,431	1,343,431	877,700	2,221,131	2,221,131	6,221,131	7,117,769	2,167,583
West Virginia [2]	1909	2,388,000	144,000	.....	144,000	.....	3,766	144,000	2,532,000	[7] 121,766	11,800
Wisconsin	1911	4,519,000	3,117,329	1,482,379	4,599,708	.....	1,482,379	4,599,708	9,118,708	2,829,486	1,215,000
Wyoming	1911	426,448	.....	.....	.....	.....	6,237	.....	426,448	38,237	5,000
Total	.....	174,035,083	25,193,740	24,220,850	49,414,591	25,605,393	49,968,643	75,019,984	249,055,067	211,859,163	54,884,007

[1] Data approximate.
[2] Educational and advisory.
[3] Includes $87,714 for surveys and plotting State routes, county road maps, etc., not classed among items given.
[4] State highway department provided for by act of legislature, 1915.
[5] Data from State comptroller's report.
[6] Figures given are one-half of the exenditures for the period Apr. 1, 1913, to Apr. 1, 1915.
[7] Of this, $118,000 was returned to counties in 1911 by act of legislature.

TABLE 2.—*Distribution of expenditures under State control for the year 1914.*

State.	Expenditure of joint funds of State and local units. Work done under State control or inspection.									Expenditure of State funds for work done solely at expense of State.					
	Contribution from State funds						Contribution from local funds.								
	Construction roads and bridges.	Maintenance.	Engineering and inspection.	Administration.	Miscellaneous equipment, etc.	Total from State.	Construction.	Maintenance.	Total from local units	Construction roads and bridges.	Maintenance.	Engineering and inspection.	Administration.	Miscellaneous equipment.	Total State expense.
Alabama	[1] $160,412	$320	[2]	$8,200	$1,300	$170,232	$160,693	.....	$160,693	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Arizona	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	$301,173	$14,670	$14,569	$19,161	$56,552	$406,125
Arkansas	.....	.....	$25,000	15,000	75,000	115,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
California	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,630,895	142,697	137,177	174,699	89,865	5,175,333
Colorado	285,851	.....	[3]	13,501	1,922	301,274	609,863	$68,362	678,225	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Connecticut	1,307,381	[4]	.....	.....	.....	1,307,381	265,125	[5]	265,125	1,015,536	925,332	135,774	47,634	.....	2,124,276
Delaware	30,000	.....	.....	1,000	.....	31,000	30,000	.....	30,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Florida [6]	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Georgia [7]	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Idaho	21,733	.....	21,713	6,366	.....	49,812	43,466	.....	43,466	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Illinois	281,702	.....	[3]	51,735	54,552	387,989	446,702	.....	446,702	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Indiana [8]	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Iowa [9]	.....	.....	50,000	10,000	14,000	74,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Kansas [10]	.....	.....	8,130	.....	950	9,080	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Kentucky	.....	.....	9,000	6,000	3,000	18,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Louisiana	123,962	487	21,855	13,208	1,674	161,186	298,859	1,461	300,320	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Maine	375,452	60,246	31,451	.....	.....	467,149	338,016	37,715	375,731	688,355	.....	43,400	42,649	57,312	831,716
Maryland	356,845	.....	.....	.....	.....	356,845	356,845	.....	356,845	3,768,037	341,877	131,689	30,326	11,839	4,283,768
Massachusetts	242,560	.....	.....	.....	.....	242,560	241,838	.....	241,838	1,125,512	805,723	175,343	50,986	59,905	2,217,469
Michigan	590,716	13,035	36,167	11,808	5,538	657,264	2,032,612	50,000	2,082,612	61,348	.....	.....	.....	.....	61,348
Minnesota	963,547	202,624	131,601	12,184	.....	1,309,956	2,523,134	120,487	2,643,621	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Mississippi [9]	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Missouri	175,885	93,802	.....	7,566	.....	277,253	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Montana [10]	.....	.....	850	5,124	7,542	13,516	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Nebraska [11]	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Nevada [12]	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New Hampshire	271,767	157,155	.....	11,995	50,603	491,520	225,000	76,288	301,288	9,365	.....	.....	.....	.....	9,365
New Jersey	558,027	679,969	18,600	.....	50,000	1,306,596	770,715	1,465,261	2,235,976	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New Mexico	115,732	.....	.....	.....	.....	115,732	40,281	.....	40,281	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New York	3,358,625	[13]5,185,501	.....	.....	.....	8,544,126	3,239,473	3,415,599	6,655,072	5,258,833	28,000	[14]1,230,254	[14]307,520	125,526	6,950,133
North Carolina [10]	.....	.....	3,000	1,250	750	5,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
North Dakota [10]	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Ohio	1,363,975	232,890	108,907	83,139	66,427	1,855,338	906,543	.....	906,543	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Oklahoma [10]	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Oregon	10,697	.....	.....	.....	.....	10,697	1,718,000	.....	1,718,000	161,475	.....	.....	16,803	.....	178,278
Pennsylvania	[15] 1,542,323	343,726	90,719	.....	.....	1,976,768	657,437	.....	657,437	[16] 574,312	1,344,780	45,925	266,206	59,061	2,290,284
Rhode Island	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	28,440	146,807	19,351	5,000	.....	199,598
South Carolina [7]	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
South Dakota [10]	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Tennessee [8]	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Texas [8]	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Utah	120,809	.....	[17]	6,750	30,173	157,732	249,204	.....	249,204	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Vermont	318,456	140,000	.....	.....	.....	458,456	120,000	180,000	300,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Virginia	[9] 474,684	.....	48,894	[18]	.....	523,578	1,243,432	.....	1,243,432	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Washington	[10] 1,300,514	42,917	.....	.....	.....	1,343,431	.....	.....	.....	733,779	25,691	75,927	32,859	9,444	877,700
West Virginia [10]	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	144,000	.....	144,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wisconsin	1,395,379	.....	[9]	87,000	.....	1,482,379	3,117,329	.....	3,117,329	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wyoming [19]	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	15,744,835	7,152,672	605,887	351,827	363,431	24,220,850	19,778,567	5,415,173	25,193,740	18,357,060	3,775,577	2,009,409	993,843	469,504	25,605,393

[1] Includes $2,000 paid to county for bridges, but not reported as expended.
[2] Engineering included in administration.
[3] Engineering paid by counties.
[4] Included in trunk-line maintenance.
[5] Town pays one-fourth of maintenance on State aid.
[6] No State highway department, 1914.
[7] Convict labor to counties.
[8] No State highway department.
[9] Supervisory.
[10] Educational and advisory.
[11] State aid in bridge construction only.
[12] Maintenance of State convict road camps.
[13] Of this, $1,816,119 was for State aid to towns.
[14] Engineering and administration expenditures include all State-aid work.
[15] Includes $200,000 bonus to townships.
[16] Includes $79,393 for purchase of toll roads.
[17] Engineering included in cost of construction.
[18] Administration included in engineering.
[19] Permanent highways.

TABLE 3.—*State highway mileage, Jan. 1, 1915.*

State.	Total all surfaced roads in State (approximate).	Total all public roads in State.	Percentage of surfaced roads in State.	State and State-aid roads built in 1914.	Total all State and State-aid roads built to Jan. 1, 1915.	Roads maintained with State aid, 1914.
	Miles.	*Miles.*	*Per ct.*	*Miles.*	*Miles.*	*Miles.*
Alabama	5,491	49,639	11.1	[1] 113	399	.....
Arizona	400	[2] 5,987	6.7	[3] 10	247	122
Arkansas	1,085	36,445	3.0	[4]	.....	.....
California	9,388	48,069	19.5	406	1,124	919
Colorado	655	30,571	2.1	[5] 248	[6] 655	.....
Connecticut	3,300	12,582	26.2	[7] 199	1,282	1,125
Delaware	241	3,000	8.0	10	144	.....
Florida	2,625	17,954	14.6	[8]	.....	.....
Georgia	12,500	83,986	14.9	[9]	.....	.....
Idaho	611	18,406	3.3	70	100	.....
Illinois	9,000	94,141	9.6	99	284	.....
Indiana	26,831	63,370	42.3	[10]	.....	.....
Iowa	2,505	104,027	2.4	[11]	.....	.....
Kansas	1,170	111,536	1.0	[12]	.....	.....
Kentucky	10,636	58,000	18.3	[13]	.....	.....
Louisiana	607	24,962	2.8	75	299	38
Maine	3,264	25,528	12.8	260	1,323	648
Maryland	2,706	17,025	15.9	330	978	787
Massachusetts	8,928	17,272	51.7	[14] 184	[15] 1,113	967
Michigan	8,859	68,906	12.8	694	2,437	1,754
Minnesota	[16] 6,206	91,890	6.8	[17] 305	4,242	8,364
Mississippi	1,800	44,072	4.1	[18]	.....	.....
Missouri	8,000	120,000	6.6	[18]	[18]	6,250
Montana	100	23,319	0.4	[12]	.....	.....
Nebraska	250	80,338	0.3	[19]	.....	.....
Nevada	65	12,751	0.5	[20]	.....	.....
New Hampshire	1,025	15,116	6.8	149	1,024	875
New Jersey	4,500	14,842	30.3	102	1,935	2,000
New Mexico	900	16,920	5.3	[21] 50	357	.....
New York	22,398	80,112	27.9	[22] 863	[22] 5,167	[22] 4,000
North Carolina	6,166	49,802	12.4	[13]	.....	.....
North Dakota	200	61,593	0.3	[13]	.....	.....
Ohio	28,312	83,681	33.8	151	569	340
Oklahoma	500	71,325	0.7	.....	.....	.....
Oregon	3,994	42,930	9.3	125	309	.....
Pennsylvania	[2] 3,976	87,387	4.5	360	1,889	6,882
Rhode Island	1,246	2,121	58.8	2	325	325
South Carolina	4,888	45,549	17.3	[8]	.....	.....
South Dakota	290	56,354	0.5	[13]	.....	.....
Tennessee	5,554	45,913	12.1	[8]	.....	.....
Texas	9,790	128,971	7.6	[10]	.....	.....
Utah	1,653	7,970	20.7	[24] 66	1,072	.....
Vermont	3,278	15,082	22.7	200	1,631	4,252
Virginia	4,482	43,399	10.3	[25] 751	2,916	.....
Washington	4,250	37,000	11.5	288	1,024	340
West Virginia	825	31,629	2.6	[12]	.....	.....
Wisconsin	11,500	61,090	18.8	[26] 695	2,632	.....
Wyoming	450	10,569	4.3	[20]	.....	.....
Total	247,490	2,273,131	10.9	6,805	35,477	39,988

[1] Also 59 miles of road graded, but not surfaced.
[2] Data approximate.
[3] Also 77 miles of road graded, but not surfaced.
[4] No money aid for construction.
[5] In addition, 2,823 miles of earth road were graded.
[6] Does not include 3,500 miles of grading.
[7] Includes reconstruction, 33 miles.
[8] No State highway department in 1914.
[9] Convict labor aid to counties.
[10] No State highway department.
[11] Supervisory.
[12] Educational and advisory.
[13] State aid begins 1915.
[14] Includes 83 miles of small town construction.
[15] State roads only.
[16] Also 3,700 miles of graded road.
[17] Also 1,104 miles of grading and turnpiking.
[18] Mileage not reported.
[19] State aid in bridge construction only.
[20] Maintenance of State convict road camps.
[21] Also 198 miles of graded road.
[22] In addition, 844 miles of town and county roads.
[23] State and county highways only.
[24] Also 314 miles of earth roads.
[25] Also 104 miles of earth road graded.
[26] Also 602 miles of grading.

Comparisons.

Arizona, 240,354 population, is allotted	$117,512
Nevada, 81,875 population, is allotted	101,102
Wyoming, 145,965 population, is allotted	125,170
New Hampshire, 403,572 population, is allotted	175,494

Same with States of larger population—

Kansas, 1,690,949 population, is allotted	$747,656
Louisiana, 1,656,388 population, is allotted	345,064
Massachusetts, 3,366,416 population, is allotted	535,420
Missouri, 3,293,335 population, is allotted	974,115

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SAUNDERS, Mr. BORLAND, and Mr. HELGESEN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from North Dakota rise?

Mr. HELGESEN. The gentleman from Massachusetts said that he would answer questions if he had time, and he now has the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has yielded the floor.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL]. [Applause.]

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts, my Republican colleague on the Roads Committee, who lives in a great city and, of course, opposes our bill, is careless when he refers to our rural mail routes as "cow trails." If he will go to the real rural sections of the South and call our cherished rural routes "cow trails," his next trip will be up a telephone pole. His speech of an hour makes it clear that no further argument is needed to convince the majority of this House that this road legislation is equitable, beneficial, and desirable at this time.

There is no conflict between the city and the country as the gentleman from Massachusetts has discussed for an hour. Whatever helps the one upbuilds the other. The city and the country are the thoroughbreds of the future, who are to go hand in hand down the ages in patriotic service to our common country. [Applause.] All thinking men know that prosperity to the country brings wealth and success to the city. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in no other way can our Government add so rapidly to the prosperity of the Nation than by contributing to road building, thus saving millions in transportation and making our sparsely settled sections so desirable that the inhabitants will not wish to leave them. If it is wise and beneficial for the State to raise a general fund, as does the State of Louisiana, out of which a portion of the cost of constructing our roads is to be paid, it would seem equally just and equitable for the Federal Government to contribute a portion toward the cost of constructing highways in each and every State. It is a fundamental principle of democratic government that for the common good and in their own interest the strong sections shall contribute their just part in upbuilding the weak. It is a fact that nearly all large appropriations made by the Federal Government in the past have been expended in and near great cities, while but little, and generally nothing, has been expended in our rural sections. The time has come to right this wrong. In the past for their taxes our farmers have received from the Federal Government a few garden seed, a limited number of rural mail routes, and an occasional promise, not yet fulfilled by the Government. This bill, providing that the Federal Government shall pay not less than 30 per cent nor more than 50 per cent of road construction and road maintenance, is the first direct proposition to give the farmers of the country a square deal. [Applause.]

Roads are local concerns, and primarily it is the duty of the States to provide them for their people. On the other hand, it should be noted that no system of permanent highways was ever built or maintained in any country without the substantial aid of the general government of that country.

To carry and deliver the mail is a function of the Federal Government, and it is its duty to provide itself with the facilities necessary to a proper performance of this function, such as postmasters, post offices, and post roads. A post road is just as truly a postal facility as is a post office. As in most rural communities, it has been found less expensive and more expedient to rent post offices than to build them, so it would be less expensive and more expedient to use the roads of the States as post roads than it would to construct and maintain an independent system. In such case it would seem but just that the General Government should make some contribution to the construction and maintenance of the roads which it thus uses.

In times past when the volume and weight of postal matter were negligible the interest of the General Government in the conditions of the roads was not substantial, but with the advent of rural free delivery came a Federal necessity for better roads, and with the now rapidly expanding parcel post that necessity has become acute. The demand upon the Federal Government as expressed by this bill is immediate and imperative, not only for the performance of its functions in the mail service, but to prepare a virile and aggressive citizenship upon which the Government must depend for prosperity and supremacy.

Our great rural population produces the wealth that makes our cities great and perpetuates the power of the Federal Government. They bear the burden of the Government in times of peace, and in times of war the country boy and the boy from the smaller town fearlessly follow the flag where "thickest falls the red rain of human slaughter." He receives little of the blessings of Government beyond the post office and the rural carrier, but in times of need he forgets all this and gives himself freely, if need be, in the cause of his country. [Applause.] This bill is for him. You are for him. The Nation should be for him, for the Government depends upon him. The speedy passage of this bill is but a feeble expression of the gratitude due

him. Then, surely, road building and road maintenance by the Federal Government in cooperation with the States is just, equitable, and beneficial, not only as an economic and social necessity but as one of the highest forms of preparedness that will bring needed wealth to the Government in its hours of possible distress. Germany began her marvelous plan of preparedness by building permanent roads and factories and establishing farm credits and scientific agriculture, thus making her citizens efficient and sufficient as a national asset. [Applause.]

Unless we provide for internal improvements as a basis of our national prosperity, upon what shall the additional taxes be levied to meet the emergency for a proposed larger Army and Navy? A nation impoverished within can not be a world power. In this emergency, I for one shall insist that the increased revenue for the Army and Navy come from a Federal inheritance tax and a larger income tax, so that the usual revenues of the Government may be expended upon our needed internal improvements. [Applause.]

We are to be called upon to expend extra millions for the Army and Navy in preparedness. When is a nation prepared? That nation is best prepared when it equips itself within for stalwart growth, prosperity, and power. Internal stagnation means national weakness. It is understood that preparedness means an adequate Army and Navy, with ample coast defense and an efficient merchant marine, but it also means good roads, good schools, rural mail routes, improved waterways and drainage, scientific agriculture, rural credits, and adequate public buildings for the conduct of the public business. All the people, regardless of class or position, have the same right to enjoy these blessings. My conception of preparedness includes these internal activities to give meaning and force to our national life. As we grow strong within we become more truly the leading world power.

This good-roads bill, directing the Department of Agriculture to expend $25,000,000 annually in road building and road maintenance, in cooperation with the State highway departments, deals with one of the important factors in national preparedness. The General Government has constitutional power to construct and maintain post roads, military roads, and roads used in the transportation of interstate commerce. On the general principle that the greater contains the lesser, it follows that the General Government should aid the States in the construction and maintenance of such roads.

As a member of the House Committee on Roads, which committee has studied this subject and worked faithfully upon it for three years, I appeal to you, my colleagues, to pass the bill now by such an overwhelming majority that the Senate of the United States, where a similar bill died in the Sixty-third Congress, may respond to the sentiment of the country and pass the bill without delay, so that it may become effective in this year 1916. [Applause.]

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] says that the purpose of this bill is to aid the farmers. Well, even if that were the sole purpose of this measure, it would not be an ignoble, or unworthy one. I know of no class of our people who are more deserving of aid than the farmers of the country, or who have received less at the hands of Congress in the way of special legislation. [Applause.] Some gentlemen seem to think that all of our appropriations should be confined to the big cities. In their view it is entirely proper to construct magnificent public buildings in those cities, and expend gigantic sums from the public revenues in dredging deeper the harbors of our port towns. This, in their judgment, is wise legislation and profound statesmanship. But as soon as some Member from a country district seeks to advance rural conditions, and spend a little money for the improvement of the country roads, these same gentlemen oppose such a bill with great vehemence, insisting that it is unconstitutional, and impolitic. A proposition to expend a thousand millions of dollars on a needless increase in our military establishment is hailed with delight, while a bill to expend a meager twenty-five millions on farmers' roads is denounced as a pork barrel. Well the fellows that have been enjoying the fat sides, and plump hams of the past, ought not to begrudge the farmers a few spareribs, and backbones. The Congress has expended many millions upon projects far less meritorious than the great cause of better roads for the farmers. It has expended since 1878, over $650,000,000 on rivers, and harbors. It has expended over $400,000,000 on the Panama Canal, and the end is not yet in sight. We donated over 197,000,000 acres of splendid land in the West toward the building of the transcontinental railways.

The farmers have been very patient. "They pay a very large part of the revenues of the Government that go into the Federal Treasury, a larger part in proportion to their wealth than any other class of our citizens. They have received in return from the Federal Government in the way of appropriations for their benefit, less than any other class. Uncomplainingly, year after year, and decade after decade, they have seen their millions go by the way of Federal appropriations, to the aid of rivers and harbors, for the erection of great and imposing buildings in the cities, for elaborate and expensive coast defenses, for the citizens on the seaboard, and for a thousand other purposes." To crown it all, the men who are advocating a billion-dollar military program, begrudge them this pittance.

Permit me on the part of the committee to reply briefly to one or two of the criticisms that our friend from Massachusetts has directed against this bill. One of them is his objection to our definition of a rural post road. For that definition we rely upon the following provision of the Revised Statutes:

> All public roads and highways while kept up, and maintained as such, are hereby declared to be post roads.

If this citation does not furnish ample authority for the definition used in our bill, then I am unable to draw a correct conclusion, or fairly interpret a comparatively simple statute.

One other objection urged by the gentleman from Massachusetts was that in making the apportionment between the States, we took into account the population of the cities. I admit that our scheme of apportionment is purely arbitrary, but I insist that no other scheme than an arbitrary one can be adopted. However, did the gentleman who complains that we have taken into consideration the urban population in the several States, have in mind that the very purpose we had in view in including this population, was to be fair to States like Massachusetts, and New York, with their great cities of Boston, and New York. So with respect to the great urban populations in other States, they too with a view to being fair, were included for the purposes of apportionment. The rest of us would be more than willing to have the gross appropriation divided between the States upon a basis which would eliminate the population of the great cities. Such a scheme of division would be greatly to our advantage. Yet our friend is complaining of a provision that was inserted for his benefit, and for the benefit of other States similarly situated. This illustrates the unreasonable character of his opposition to the pending bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to occupy the time of the House this evening with an argument in favor of good roads designed to present in detail the benefits that will inevitably flow from a universal system of improved highways. I take it for granted that in this age of the world's civilization there is no need to advance such a contention. A universal consensus of judgment in favor of improved highways may be taken for granted. It was an unfair criticism on the part of the gentleman from Massachusetts to intimate that the friends of this measure present it as a cure for all the ills of the body politic. We do nothing of the sort. We make no such claim in its behalf. We believe that this measure is a well digested, well worked out, and rational plan to mobilize a portion of the resources of the entire country in aid of domestic development. Further, we expect to satisfy the most exacting critic of this measure that the interests of the Federal Treasury are adequately safeguarded, and that every precaution has been taken to guarantee that the Federal contribution in aid of road construction, will be wisely, economically, and judiciously expended. As guardians of the Federal Treasury we should surround the expenditure of Federal money with appropriate protective provisions. This we have done. The gentleman from Massachusetts belongs to the school of thought that in its day objected to river and harbor development, on the ground that there was no warrant of Federal authority for such work. This objection has long since been abandoned, and if the gentleman was not such a belated representative of an ancient school of strict constructionists, he would know that in this House at least, the time has passed when it is necessary for an advocate of a measure of this character to present arguments for his contention that there is full warrant of constitutional authority for Federal appropriations in aid of the construction, improvement, and maintenance of post roads. [Applause.] The authority to enact this legislation is so fully afforded by the Constitution, that it is no longer open to question, or challenge. But two needful things remain for us to establish on behalf of this measure, and they are, First: Would a universal system of road development in the United States be helpful to the general interests of the entire country? On this proposition, as I have said, we are all agreed. Second: Having in mind the results intended to be secured, is this a bill that will efficiently secure those results? Our bill will be justly criticized, if it is open to the charge that it is so loosely, or carelessly drawn, that the money proposed to be appropriated, may be wastefully, or extravagantly expended. Such however is not the case.

The Members of this body who were here two years ago, and voted for the bill of that session, will recognize that this bill is in large measure along the same lines. It contains the same general principle of Federal aid, but I think I may say to those who voted for the former measure, that the present bill is a better phrased and better balanced bill than its predecessor, and one that will more thoroughly meet the objections of the gentlemen who opposed that bill on the ground that the interests of the General Government were not sufficiently protected. I desire to point out to you that if we have erred in any respect in this measure, it has been along the line of giving too much authority to a Federal department. Still, I do not apprehend that this power will be abused.

We have not included in the present bill that portion of the former bill which divided the roads into classes, and provided a fixed amount to be paid on the roads in each class, contingent on the maintenance by the States of those roads to the standards prescribed. That section was most vehemently assailed in the last session of Congress, and we have eliminated it entirely, without admitting however that these objections were well taken. At any rate we have removed a stumbling block, and rock of offense to a portion at least of our membership.

It was also urged by gentlemen in opposition in the last House, that it was possible for some smaller unit than the State to take up with the Federal department a project of road development, or road maintenance. We have always denied that there was anything in the former bill which in any wise justified this contention, but to meet all objection on this line, we have recast our language in such fashion that this contention is now impossible. It is made absolutely clear that when the Government is approached with respect to a project, either of maintenance, improvement, or construction, it must be approached by the road commission of a State, or its equivalent, as provided by the bill. Since I have been a Member of this body I have seen the full development of popular approval of this principle of Federal aid to roads. Today the great bulk of the States are equipped with road commissions, and these commissions are actively advocating the principle of this bill. Moreover the committee appointed by the National Association of Highway Commissioners, to collaborate and cooperate with your House committee, has given the express stamp of their approval to the pending measure.

I may say further that the Agricultural Department which, on behalf of the Federal Government, will be charged with certain large duties in connection with the execution of this measure, has likewise indorsed the plan of aid reported by your committee, so that this bill comes before you with the favor of the highway commissioners, the favor of the Agricultural Department, and practically the unanimous indorsement of your House committee.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. For how many years has the Roads Committee considered this question upon testimony and by meetings?

Mr. SAUNDERS. This is the second bill that the Committee on Roads has reported.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. For how many years?

Mr. SAUNDERS. This particular committee was created two years ago. It was established in response to an insistent demand on the part of the country, and of the House, that a committee should be created that could adequately deal with this great subject matter.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That committee reported this bill unanimously, with the exception of one member.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. POWERS. I am in sincere sympathy with the purposes of Federal aid to good roads; but I should like to know what there is in the criticism of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that the Federal Government will have no authority or jurisdiction over the roads after the money has been appropriated and expended upon them?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The statement of fact is correct, but the criticism based upon the fact is unfounded. That provision was deliberately inserted in the bill to meet objections that came from all over the country to the effect that if the Federal Government retained jurisdiction over these roads, such retention would introduce perplexing questions of conflicting jurisdiction between the Federal Government, and the States. The committee was overwhelmingly opposed to Federal jurisdiction over the highways proposed to be aided under the provisions of this bill. It is true, as a matter of fact, that the Federal Government will have no jurisdiction over the roads aided, after the money is once expended in that direction. But this provision should be the subject of commendation, not of criticism.

May I go a step further in the discussion of this bill? We invoke the fullest inquiry into its general purpose, and legislative provisions, and I hope to be able to answer satisfactorily the questions of the friends of this measure who may not be clearly advised as to some of its provisions. At the same time I shall endeavor to repel the criticisms of those who oppose it, either in whole, or in part. But while we believe in the general principle presented, we are not wedded to any particular form of language designed to make that principle effective. As I said, if a project of road development is desired to be submitted by a State, that State approaches the Federal Government through its road commission.

In other words, the unit is the State. The representative of that commission presents the project to the Agricultural Department, giving a sufficient outline of the improvement desired to enable the experts of the Agricultural Department to determine in advance whether the proposition is, or is not, meritorious. Then if the department is inclined to think that the proposition thus presented is meritorious, and worthy of aid out of that proportion of the general fund which is segregated for that particular State, it may call upon the State to furnish further information, and such data, estimates, and plans as will enable the experts of the department to determine the cost of construction, and the full merits of the project, in a word to determine in relation to the case submitted everything that the Federal department ought to know before reaching its conclusions.

Having advanced thus far, if the department approves the project as a whole, the State is authorized to proceed with the work. When the work is concluded, and it is ascertained by the Federal department through its appropriate agents, that the work has been done according to the plans approved by its experts, then the department may make payment of the sum which has been decided upon for this particular project of road construction, improvement, or maintenance. Will any gentleman on this floor suggest that up to this point there is anything of authority lacking to the Federal Government to enable it to safeguard the expenditure of its money, or to compel the construction of the improvements contemplated, upon the terms agreed on between the contracting sovereignties?

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. There is a provision in the bill which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to pay money to the States from time to time as the work progresses.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I understood the gentleman to say that the Secretary of Agriculture could not pay the money until the work was completed and approved.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I should have completed my statement by adding that if, in the progress of the work, it was developed that the same was being done in conformity with the prescribed requirements, the department could make such payments as it chose to make, not to exceed 50 per cent of the value of the work already done. But this is a question of discretion in the Government. It is not compellable to make these pro rata payments.

Mr. MADDEN. Will it interrupt the gentleman if I ask him a further question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman from Virginia enlighten the committee on the question of the advisability of clothing the Secretary of Agriculture with the power to say whether 20, 30, 40, or 50 per cent of the cost shall be paid by the Federal Government?

Mr. SAUNDERS. We have fixed those limits—between 30 and 50 per cent.

Mr. MADDEN. Whatever it may be.

Mr. SAUNDERS. We have given him that discretion.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask the gentleman what he thinks of the wisdom of that?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Personally I would prefer to fix a flat amount of 50 per cent, but the flexible provision was put in to meet the objections that might be urged on the ground that for some work 50 per cent of aid would be too much, and for other work under different conditions, 30 per cent would be too little.

Mr. MADDEN. May I ask one more question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman from Virginia believe that with that large discretionary power in the hands of the

Secretary of Agriculture, sooner or later political influences will be used upon the Secretary of Agriculture to induce him to pay 50 per cent where only 30 per cent ought to be paid, and 30 per cent where 50 per cent should be paid, and that a political scandal will ensue as the result of that?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Not a bit of it. The payments in one State do not concern any State in the Union save the one interested. The amount of money that will go to a State is fixed in advance. The exercise of the Secretary's discretion in aiding the roads of a State, will not increase the aggregate of the allowance for that State, or diminish the respective quotas of the other States.

The Secretary need not make these pro rata payments. They are entirely within the discretion of a Federal official. This provision is another illustration of the painstaking care exercised by the committee to safeguard the Federal interests.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. In response to the gentleman from Illinois the gentleman from Virginia stated that under the bill the Secretary of Agriculture could make a partial payment. Is it not true, though, that even that partial payment by the Secretary of Agriculture can not be made unless it shall be shown that in no case it exceeds the pro rata part of the United States of the value of labor and materials which have been put upon the road?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Of course. And as I said, the Secretary need not make these pro rata payments. These payments are entirely within the discretion of a Federal official. This provision is another illustration of the painstaking care exercised by the committee to safeguard the Federal interests.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I beg the pardon of the gentleman, but I want to make plain, if I can, a point which I think has been misunderstood. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] unintentionally misinterpreted the clause of the bill which was referred to by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. These partial payments, if any, can "in no case be more than the pro rata part of the United States of the value of labor and materials which have been put into such construction or maintenance"—by the State, of course.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly, and as I insist again, the Federal Government is not even required to make these partial payments.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. I have looked over this bill in rather a rapid way, and I do not find that it would cover an instance of this kind. In California we have carried out these advanced conditions to a remarkable degree. We have raised by a bond issue something like $18,000,000, and spent it in less than four or five years. We have spent it on a program by which the counties were to contribute almost half that amount; so I should say, without the figures before me, that we have spent $40,000,000 on improvements of roads within the last four or five years. The question I want to ask the gentleman is, Does your bill cover a case of this kind where, as I say, California and the counties have expended so much money; that is, will the amount provided in this bill be apportioned to California, and can California let it lie to its credit in the Treasury until such time as they can use it?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, it must be a working capital, so to say. It must be put to work. But I wish to call the gentleman's attention in this connection, because it is one of the most valuable features of our bill, to the fact that it does not interfere with the domestic road policy of any State. Each State can use its pro rata fund in a way to work out its problem according to its own conception, so as to promote the best interests of road development in that State. Of course the road to be constructed must be one of the approved types prescribed by the bill, and the work must be done under the supervision of the State commission, and the Department of Agriculture.

The gentleman advises us that California has completed a large mileage of roads, something very much to the credit of that State, but these roads must be maintained. A State that fails to provide a maintenance fund, does not meet the situation, and the maintenance fund of your State will be very large. California can utilize her pro rata part of the general fund for the maintenance of the roads which she has already completed.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman's construction of the bill is that it provides for maintenance?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, it says so expressly. Look at the title.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. SWITZER. Has there been any estimate made as to what increase there will be for the number of employees and overhead charges that would be incurred by the Department of Agriculture in the distribution?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, you can not well make that estimate at this time. No preliminary estimate has been made as yet. The bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall retain in his hands a sum sufficient to provide the necessary expert assistants.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. POWERS. I want to know whether or not the Federal Government will contribute any part of this money to the roads that have been already constructed; will this go to the maintenance of roads over which the Federal Government has had no jurisdiction?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Of course. The gentleman will see that by looking to the title of the bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROGERS. The bill proposes to expend not exceeding $25,000,000 per year?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Suppose the State should in a given year not expend quite all of that to which it was entitled under the bill; can it save that up on the treasurer's books?

Mr. SAUNDERS. It remains to the credit of the State until it is returned to the Treasury under the covering-in statute. I think that time is two years.

Mr. ROGERS. Then a State could not roll up for a period of five years the amounts due it, and use it for an elaborate system of highways?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia with whom rests the final determination as to the material that enters into the road?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The State submits its plans and propositions to the department at Washington. I said a moment ago that if the bill erred in anything it was in giving too much veto power to the Agricultural Department. The State is entitled under this bill to build any prescribed type of road that it prefers. In one locality it may build a concrete road, in another a macadam road, in another a sand clay road, in still another a dirt road of approved type. The State is compelled to present its proposition to the Federal department. If it satisfies that department that the proposed improvement is meritorious, the work is begun, but if it fails to satisfy the department, that particular project must be dropped.

Mr. KING. The final determination rests with the Federal department at Washington?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, it can put a veto on any proposition that the State submits. I submit that under this bill it will be impossible to expend the money of the Government wastefully and extravagantly, unless the Agricultural Department is corrupt, or inefficient.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Under this bill I understand in the process of the work the Government can make partial payment before the whole of the road is completed.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, a pro rata part of the value of the work completed up to that time.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Whether or not the road is completed through a county or township or a subdivision of the State and completed to the satisfaction of the State highway authorities, full payment could be made for that subdivision.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, pro rata payments in the discretion of the department may be made on any work under construction.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I notice that section 1 of the bill undertakes to define what a rural post road shall be. It says for the purposes of this act the term rural post road shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is or might be carried outside of incorporated cities, towns, and boroughs, and so forth. It seems to me that is subject to the construction that it could not be placed upon any rural road or post road that does not extend out of a city of that size.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I think not.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Should not you change that clause so that it would read to public roads outside of incorporated cities of that size?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I will say just this. The committee is not enamored of any particular phrasing. If the

gentleman will prepare his amendment and submit it, and on consideration it appears that the bill is justly amenable to the criticism he makes, there will be no difficulty in having his amendment adopted by the committee.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I understand what the committee intended to express was that rural post roads shall include any road outside of a city of 2,000 inhabitants, and so forth.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes. I suggest to the gentleman that he prepare his amendment and submit it. There will be no difficulty about accepting any amendment that improves the bill.

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. HELGESEN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] objected to the bill because, according to his idea, great agricultural States of the West would get a benefit from it over what States in the East would get?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. HELGESEN. Is it not a fact that one of the causes of the high cost of living is the cost of taking the farm products from the farm to the consumer?

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is true.

Mr. HELGESEN. Is it not a fact that with good roads the cost of delivering farm products to the market, and to the consumer is reduced from 30 to 75 per cent?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The gentleman is undoubtedly correct in his statement.

Mr. HELGESEN. The State of South Dakota, to which he referred as a small unit of less than three-quarters of a million people, undoubtedly hauls 10 times the tonnage that the farmers of the State of Massachusetts do, all of which is food products. If you can reduce the cost of taking those products to the market, it will inure to the benefit of the consumer, of which he is one.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Unquestionably. So far as the criticism of the gentleman from Massachusetts is concerned, I do not think it is a serious one, and answering it in a sort of ad hominem way, I would say that the agricultural States that are without harbors have heretofore been paying their full part of the money that has gone to those States where there are harbors, and where costly harbor improvements have been constructed, as in Massachusetts for instance.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. I notice the gentleman said in answer to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON] that the State could use those funds in any way it saw fit, so far as expenditure on any road is concerned. In other words, if a State had a system of crossroads or interstate highways, it could use its portion of the fund upon that system.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Absolutely, and upon any one road in that system.

Mr. BORLAND. And, on the contrary, if it had simply rural roads or local post roads, it could use the money for the maintenance of that class of roads?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. And that the initiative came from the State?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, and the veto from the Federal Government.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, I am not quite clear in my own mind about this matter. Do I understand that the difference between this money that will be given to these States and the expenditure of Federal funds ordinarily is that after the Government has finally paid the money into this road fund it forever has lost all jurisdiction over the roads through which it goes, while in all other public improvements it maintains some control?

Mr. SAUNDERS. All jurisdiction under this act. If the United States has any jurisdiction otherwise, by virtue of any provision, or section of the Constitution, that jurisdiction is not sought to be interfered with, and could not be interfered with, by this act. But under this act, the Government does not take any jurisdiction as the result of the expenditure of its money under the oversight of the Agricultural Department.

We consider that the Federal Government gets value received for that expenditure in the benefits that will inure to the entire country from this application of a portion of the Federal funds.

Mr. MEEKER. May I ask if this is not the only project of that sort whereby the Government gives its money away and thereafter has no control whatever?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I am not prepared to say, but I will admit it, pro arguendo. The statement, if true does not detract at all from the merits of the proposition.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true that the Government contributes money to the departments of agriculture of the various States and retains no control over those departments?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, yes; all of the land grant colleges are aided in that way. That in itself is a sufficient answer to Mr. MEEKER's question. As I said, I am willing to admit that this proposition stands single and alone in the above respect, but that does not impeach its merits.

I wish to make reply to one further objection urged by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and in this respect I speak from practical experience. I refer in this connection to the inquiry propounded to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN]. The facts that I will cite will show how mere theory must be rejected in the light of actual experience. The gentleman from Texas asked the gentleman from Massachusetts if he did not think that, if this bill went into effect, it would nullify the local spirit of road development, and lay a blight upon the present eager spirit of highway improvement existing throughout the United States. The gentleman from Massachusetts very promptly and enthusiastically agreed that it would. It happens that in the State of Virginia we operate under a system that is precisely analogous to the system that is proposed in this bill; and so far from having paralyzed the zeal of local endeavor, it has been a most helpful aid to road development in our Commonwealth.

Permit me to illustrate the workings of the Virginia system. If a county in that State desires to secure aid from the Commonwealth, it submits its proposition to the State highway commission. That commission sends its engineer to the county concerned. He investigates the project, determines its merit, and reports to Richmond. If the project is approved as meritorious, the highway department causes a survey to be made, and prepares plans. Then it says in substance to the county, "Build this road according to these plans, and when the road is completed we will pay one-half of the cost, out of your quota, as heretofore ascertained." I wish to say that this has been a decidedly helpful policy in aid of the development of good roads in Virginia. With that experience confronting me, I am able to answer, as I have said, from actual knowledge, the question propounded by the gentleman from Texas, and assert with confidence that the pending bill would give a mighty impulse to road development in the entire continental United States.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, if it is not a fact that his own State of Virginia has more miles of unimproved road in proportion to its mileage than any other State in the Union, or had last year?

Mr. SAUNDERS. That may be so. The State of Virginia has not been so fortunately situated with respect to its financial affairs, as the State from which the gentleman comes.

The Civil War left us prostrate in every way, and burdened with a heavy ante-bellum State debt. Crippled, wounded, oppressed with the problems of reconstruction, the Commonwealth of Virginia heroically undertook to pay a large portion of the indebtedness incurred before it was dismembered, and trampled under foot by marching armies. Bowed down under the burden of that indebtedness, which is as yet unpaid, we are open to the ungenerous reproach of the gentleman from Massachusetts. We admit that with better fortune and more ample means, Massachusetts has far exceeded us in the direction of road development. Still, we have not been altogether remiss in this matter, as the following figures will show:

Total amount of bonds issued by the counties for road making between July 1, 1906, and September 30, 1915, $7,151,100.

Number of miles of macadam and other roads constructed under the supervision of the highway commission during the above period, 3,762.49 miles.

Number of counties in which work was carried on under the supervision of the highway commission during the year ending September 15, 1915, 97 counties.

Total road mileage under construction in the above year by the commission, 846.55 miles.

Cost of same, $1,893,190.

This work is continually growing.

Mr. SIMS. I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. I notice in the bill that the amount is limited to $25,000,000 per year.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. That, of course, will not bind any future Congress.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Of course not.

Mr. SIMS. Further, would it not be rather in the way of development? Would it not practically require the States of the whole Union not to take more than $25,000,000 a year unless they could participate in the fund?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The scheme of this bill is as equitable a system of distribution as I believe can be worked out. I have already called the attention of the gentlemen who clamorously insist that certain great tax paying States, as they describe them, will contribute an unequal proportion of this money, to the fact that those same great tax paying States will receive by far the greater proportion of the fund to be expended under this bill. The State of New York will get something like a million and a half, out of this $25,000,000.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I want to say to the gentleman that I approve of this bill as a whole; and I want to say, too, what the gentleman said in regard to the working of the law in Virginia is true as to the working of a similar law in Michigan.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I am very glad to have the support of the gentleman's experience.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Appropriations have been made by the Legislature of Michigan to pay State awards for the construction of roads, to assist communities in building roads, and to encourage the building of roads by the communities.

Now, I want to ask the gentleman a question. There was some criticism because the Federal Government is asked to contribute large sums of money and was to have no control whatever over the road after it is built. Would it not be wise or proper to have inserted in this bill a provision to the effect that no road which is built or improved by contribution of Federal money shall ever be made a toll road?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Well, I am not prepared to say at this moment whether that would be a wholesome limitation, but I do not reject the suggestion. Of course I am not in a position to accept it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There are not as many toll roads as there used to be, but in some States I guess there are some now.

Mr. SAUNDERS. There are some in Virginia.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. So as to be sure they would be used always for the general benefit and not for private profit. Some of these roads have tollgates maintained by private interests. Would it not be wise to have a provision that no road which was constructed or maintained, or on which Federal money had been expended, could be made a toll road?

Mr. SAUNDERS. As I say, that is a suggestion that is well worthy of consideration and discussion, but I am not prepared just now, speaking for myself, to say that I accept it. Of course I do not reject it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia has expressed his doubt as to whether the State of New York would be willing to expend a sum equivalent to that allotted to it under this bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I did not suggest that. I said I doubted whether the contribution in the way of taxes which the State of New York will contribute to the fund of $25,000,000 would be as much as the amount that it will receive under this bill. It may, or it may not. I do not know.

Mr. WALSH. I want to ask the gentleman if he is aware that the expenditures in the State of New York in the year 1913 for highways was $13,820,000?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I did not know the figures, but I knew that the State of New York had made great expenditures upon its roads in recent years. New York is a very rich State. I wonder whether this money came from the rural communities where it was expended, or mainly from the great municipalities.

Mr. WALSH. I understood the gentleman to challenge it.

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, I did not challenge it. You were complaining with respect to the appropriation for this Federal road fund that the big, rich States would pay an unjust and disproportionate amount. I simply said that under this $25,000,000 apportionment the State of New York would get something like $1,500,000, and I doubted if the amount she would pay in the way of taxes to make up the fund of $25,000,000 would amount to $1,500,000. I do not know whether it would, or not. It is immaterial.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will.

Mr. SLOAN. I favor the general purpose of this legislation, but the gentleman has asked for criticism——

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes. We desire to work out a well-guarded bill.

Mr. SLOAN. Suppose the Appropriation Committee, having discretion to appropriate all the way from one cent to millions of dollars, should in view of the condition of the Treasury say that they would appropriate only $5,000,000 a year, does the gentleman think this would be a fair arrangement among the States to give them, first, the arbitrary factor of $65,000 and divide the other differentials in accordance with the scope of the bill?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes. If the gentleman can work out a more equitable plan, present it in the way of an amendment.

Mr. SLOAN. Suppose, for instance, they would appropriate $4,000,000 instead of $5,000,000, it would all be distributed, would it not, on the first fixed factor?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Does the gentleman think it a wise proposition to leave it in that form?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes. I do not think any State should receive less than $65,000, because we did not consider that a less sum than that could be economically administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the several States. That was the reason for arbitrarily setting aside $65,000. An amendment might make it $25,000 or $50,000, or whatever was decided upon.

Mr. GORDON rose.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GORDON. I wish to inquire whether or not the gentleman from Virginia really believes there is any close analogy, or any analogy at all, between the relations existing between the several States and their several political subdivisions, townships, and counties, and relations between the Federal Government and the States?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Suppose I answer no?

Mr. GORDON. Then I contend your illustration very far fetched, because——

Mr. SAUNDERS. My illustration would not fail at all, because it is not dependent upon the exact character of the relationship. It was given merely to illustrate the manner in which these subdivisions would approach the superior authority. It does not make any difference what the relationship may be. In the relation between the State, and the county, the State has supervision of this project to see that the State money is justly expended in the counties. Under this bill the Department of Agriculture will see that the amount of money that the Government of the United States puts into a project in a State is adequately and properly expended in that State. We need not go into any technical quibbling about the exact character of the relationship under the Federal Constitution between the States, and the Government, as compared with the relation between the States, and the counties.

Mr. GORDON. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in the different subdivisions of the State the money is spent under State supervision, and the State has absolute control.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Under this bill every dollar will be controlled and expended under the supervision of the Federal Government, so far as the Federal Government contributes a dollar toward any individual project.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks that the enactment of this bill will make unnecessary the continuance of the emergency-tax law or war-tax act?

Mr. SAUNDERS. There are some questions I do not think ought to be asked, because they imply a reflection upon the intelligence either of the gentleman who asks them, or of the gentleman of whom they are asked. [Applause.] I do not care to make any other answer to the question.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman does not care to answer that question I would like to ask if he knows the proportion which the State of New York pays of the taxes levied under the emergency-tax law?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No. I am entirely indifferent as to that. If New York pays a large proportion of those taxes, that fact merely shows that her people have prospered more than the rest of the country. That is all. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. And that is the reason you want to enforce this additional burden upon them?

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is not a bad reason. If you suggest it as a reason I will accept the suggestion.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In the matter of the Federal Government contributing money for the construction of roads in a State and having nothing to do with the use of the money, or the question of what control the Government should have along the line of inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON],

I will say there is precedent for this kind of expenditure, and this proposed character of regulation, under the Lever law, under which money is contributed by the Federal Government for use by the State for farm management and farm demonstration.

The law requires that the agricultural college of the State shall submit a proposition, or rather a plan of operation, for the next succeeding year to the Department of Agriculture, and that plan shall be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. Then the money is turned over bodily to the agricultural college, and the agricultural college expends it as it sees fit. It reports to the Secretary of Agriculture the manner in which the money has been expended, and thereafter money can be withheld if the money already received, or before that time received, was not properly expended. It is about on the line of the provisions of this bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS. With respect to the payment of taxes, the rich man in New York pays in proportion to what he owns, the rich man in Virginia does likewise. If there are more rich men in New York than in Virginia, then they are just that much better off than we are, and we do not begrudge them their good fortune. But if they have more, they ought to pay more, under any equitable system of taxation. The State contributes to build roads in Virginia, but we do not aid a single city with respect to its streets, although the cities of Virginia pay a large proportion of the road tax. I do not know of any system of taxation under which the expenditures in a community are limited to the taxes paid by that community.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts referred to the amount of taxes coming from these different States. Did not the committee itself make a part of the report those very lists so as to invite attention and discussion on the floor?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; and I tried to point out that the argument of my friend from Massachusetts was for that reason not well founded, and that the figures as to urban population that he criticizes, were deliberately put into the report by the committee, so that it would be readily seen that each State would receive a proper proportion of this road fund under the proposed scheme of distribution.

Is there a better scheme of distribution? Certainly the proportion of roads in the States which are used by the Federal Government in the transportation of its mails—and that is becoming an increasing proportion year by year—is a just factor for the purpose of determining the apportionment under this bill. Certainly the number of people in a State that will use the roads to be aided, is a just factor in considering the question of the amount to be expended in that State. Hence we have considered both road mileage, and population, in the solution of the problem. Whatever inequality may be done by one factor of the apportionment, we think is measurably corrected by the other.

If anyone on this floor can work out a juster system of apportionment than that which has been worked out by the committee, I would be glad if he would submit it. I think the system adopted by the committee is entirely fair, and it is precisely the system that the House last year favored by a vote of about 7 to 1 on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. Would it not be a good plan to take the number of automobiles owned as a basis?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Well, if the gentleman wishes, he can put his suggestion in the form of an amendment, and submit it.

Now, one word with reference to my State. While the State of Virginia is not, for the reasons that I have mentioned, as bountifully supplied with good roads as other States more fortunately situated with respect to their financial resources, I wish to say that we are not as badly off as the figures of State construction would indicate. The greater proportion of the roads in Virginia are built by the counties. We have counties in the State of Virginia which have bonded themselves for road purposes in amounts running from $500,000 to $1,000,000. The roads in those counties are just as good roads as those in the State of my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Perhaps the gentleman may have the information. There is a road running from Washington down to Virginia. How much has the General Government contributed toward the building of that road?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not know. I expect my friend is better apprised as to the facts of that case than I am.

Mr. MANN. No; I do not know what the amount is, but I know that the General Government has contributed some. I do not know just on what excuse it was, but I suspect——

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, that was possibly a road leading to Arlington Cemetery.

Mr. MANN. No; way down into Virginia.

Mr. SAUNDERS. To Mount Vernon, possibly?

Mr. MANN. No; not that.

Mr. SAUNDERS. To the Government experimental farm beyond the Potomac, perhaps.

Mr. MANN. No; they have a road leading to Alexandria and down in that neighborhood.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Well, anything that would help Alexandria would be justified, I reckon. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MANN. Anything which would help the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. CARLIN] would meet my approval, and I have no doubt that this is what caused them perhaps to call it the "Carlin Road"—for the reason that he had gotten this money out of the Treasury.

Mr. SAUNDERS. What I have said with respect to road construction in Virginia was merely by the way. The counties of Virginia in the last few years, particularly under the impulse of the system of State aid that now prevails there, have expended many million dollars in the betterment of our roads.

Pass this bill and we will spend many millions more. I submit this measure to the House committee, fully believing that we have worked out a measure that will meet the just expectations of every advocate of road development in the United States; a bill which is in aid of the interests of all the people in all the States. I do not stop to measure the benefits that it will confer, or forecast its beneficent influence, for no man can measure the benefits that will accrue to our entire country, from the establishment of such a system of highways as this bill contemplates. I submit this bill to you in the full confidence that it is justly conceived, adequately framed, and destined to accomplish great results of betterment in every State of the Union. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition, and will then yield to the gentleman from Missouri to move that the committee rise.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. We will take care of the gentleman from Illinois in the morning. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RUCKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries.

ALASKAN ENGINEERING COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 610).

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, in two volumes, for the period from March 12, 1914, the date of the approval of the Alaskan Railroad act (38 Stat., 305), to December 31, 1915, inclusive, together with accompanying maps, charts, and profiles.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 19, 1916.*

The SPEAKER. The message is referred to the Committee on the Territories and ordered printed, without the accompanying documents.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1773) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Kermit, W. Va.

The message also announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On January 14, 1916:

H. R. 136. An act granting an extension of time to construct a bridge across Rock River at or near Colona Ferry, in the State of Illinois.

H. R. 4717. An act to authorize Butler County, Mo., to construct a bridge across Black River.

On January 17, 1916:

S. 2409. An act to authorize the Ohio-West Virginia Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at the city of Steubenville, Jefferson County, Ohio.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 1773. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Warfield, Ky., and Kermit, W. Va.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CLARK of Florida, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. CONRY, indefinitely, on account of illness.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. ANDERSON, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House the papers in the following cases, no adverse reports having been made thereon:

Thomas O'Reilly (H. R. 7626), Sixty-third Congress;

Louisa M. Salim (H. R. 2185), Sixty-second Congress;

Louisa M. Sabin (H. R. 16351), Sixty-third Congress;

Lucie Bostian (H. R. 2186), Sixty-third Congress;

John Brin (H. R. 4625), Sixty-third Congress;

Melissa J. Gross (H. R. 7311), Sixty-third Congress;

George W. Bryant (H. R. 3423), Sixty-third Congress; and

Benjamin F. Dayton (H. R. 7318), Sixty-third Congress.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request:

Mr. Moss of West Virginia asks permission to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies thereof, the papers in connection with the claim of Mrs. Harvey Sayre (H. R. 7136, 63d Cong.), upon which adverse action was taken by the Committee on Claims. (Rept. No. 442, Mar. 23, 1914, by Mr. MOTT, from the Committee on Claims.)

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to this request?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, does that come from the Committee on Claims?

The SPEAKER. It is presented by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MANN. It is quite customary to grant leave to withdraw papers where no adverse report has been made, but this is a case where an adverse report has been made. It seems to me some one on the Committee on Claims ought to give attention to the matter before the request is granted. I shall not object at this time, but I think they ought to know about it.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. On the 6th of December House joint resolution 14, laying an embargo on arms, ammunition, and submarines, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. A change of reference is asked to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and, without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a petition and brief in support of a bill that I introduced to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a petition and brief in support of a bill which he introduced to-day. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman seems to have rather a formidable looking document in his hand. What good will it do to print it in the RECORD, in fine print, which nobody will read? The committee before which the matter is pending can order it printed if it desires to. It is not customary to print the briefs of lawyers or of other people in the RECORD. I hope the gentleman will find out what he can get the committee to do before asking to put it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

BUREAU OF LABOR SAFETY.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend some remarks in the RECORD on the bureau of safety labor bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, it is said that time at last sets all things even, and Goldsmith poetically argues that the blessings of Heaven to all mankind are about distributed equally. So it is with the conduct of the able gentleman who refers the bills in this House to the different committees. He manages to give to the committee of which I am chairman about as many bills to which the committee is not entitled as it takes away from its proper jurisdiction and gives to other committees. In point is the one just transferred from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. There is another bill, which I introduced myself, proposing an amendment to a law enacted on the report of the Committee on Military Affairs in the last session of Congress. The bill ought to go to that committee instead of to my committee. I have not the bill in my hand, but I will get the bill and the number and give it to the proper clerk, and I ask unanimous consent that the reference be changed from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman must have the number of the bill and not take any chances.

Mr. ADAMSON. It is the only bill that I introduced to correct the Panama bill at the last session.

Mr. MANN. I know what the bill is; I have read the bill. I objected to granting the request because it is such a loose way of doing business. The clerks could never keep track of them.

Mr. ADAMSON. It can not be very loose, because I will get the bill and give the number to the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 20, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of $7,500 for an increase in the salaries of the three Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury Department, from $5,000 to $7,500 each per annum (H. Doc. No. 595); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an amendment to estimate for salaries, office of the Supervising Architect, as printed on page 38 of the Book of Estimates for the fiscal year 1917 (H. Doc. No. 596); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of War, submitting an amended estimate of appropriation under "Salaries, office of Quartermaster General," for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 597); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication of the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of $386 for the relief of John E. Jones, an American consul of class 3 (H. Doc. 598); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Knapp Narrows, Md., with a view to securing a deeper channel between Tilghman Island and the mainland (H. Doc. No. 599); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of Delaware River, N. Y., N. J., and Pa., at or near the mouth of

the Neversink River (H. Doc. 600); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on Morris Cove, New Haven Harbor, Conn., with a view to the construction of a harbor of refuge (H. Doc. 601); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Piscataway Creek, Prince Georges County, Md., and entrance thereto (H. Doc. No. 602); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

9. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Saugatuck Harbor and Kalamazoo River, Mich., with a view to securing increased depth to the town of Douglas (H. Doc. No. 608); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

10. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Columbia River at Kennewick, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 603); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting reports of bureau officers concerning typewriters, adding machines, and similar labor-saving devices exchanged during the fiscal year 1915, transmitting a further communication from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, explaining that there were no exchanges of this character in the Manila (P. I.) district during said year (H. Doc. No. 604); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Judge Advocate General of the Army, together with a list of leases granted by the Secretary of War during the calendar year 1915 (H. Doc. No. 605); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates in connection with the legislative, executive, and judicial bill (H. Doc. No. 606); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

14. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Comptroller of the Currency, amending his estimate of appropriation on page 43 of the Annual Book of Estimates for the fiscal year 1917, for "Salaries, office of Comptroller of the Currency" (H. Doc. No. 607); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

15. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Public Printer, submitting urgent estimates of deficiencies in appropriations for the Government Printing Office (H. Doc. No. 609); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII:

Mr. KEY of Ohio, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 54) to pension widows and minor children of officers and enlisted men who served in the War with Spain, Philippine insurrection, or in China, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 59), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2202) granting an increase of pension to Martha Ann Benjamin; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3844) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Kerlee; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6330) granting a pension to Joseph F. Flynn; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7103) granting an increase of pension to Willard L. Anthony; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7471) granting a pension to Edward A. Ward; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7472) granting an increase of pension to John W. Bruce; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7475) granting an increase of pension to H. R. Watkins; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8851) granting a pension to John Zanger; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 9409) to repeal sections 35 to 49, inclusive, of the act of June 13, 1898, concerning mixed flour, as amended by the act of March 2, 1901, and as further amended by the act of April 12, 1902, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 9410) for the erection of a public building at Galva, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 9411) to require numbering and recording of undocumented vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9412) to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes as amended by the act of May 16, 1906; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 9413) for the erection of a public building at Rushville, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 9414) to grant certain holidays to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 9415) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain widows and remarried widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 9417) to fix the price for gas in the District of Columbia and prescribing punishment for its violation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 9418) authorizing the construction of two wagon bridges across the Umatilla River, in the Umatilla Indian Reservation, in Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 9419) to appropriate money to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to license and inspect warehouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 9420) to transfer the Bureau of Mines to the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. BRITT: A bill (H. R. 9421) to extend the free-mail privilege to official mail matter of the Organized Militia and Naval Militia of the several States and Territories of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9422) to provide for the construction of a public building at Rock Hill, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9423) for the erection of a public building at Cheraw, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9424) for the erection of a public building at York, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9425) providing for the erection of a monument at Cowpens battle ground, Cherokee County, S. C., commemorative of Gen. Daniel Morgan and those who participated in the Battle of Cowpens on the 17th day of January, 1781; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9426) for the erection of a public building at Winnsboro, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: A bill (H. R. 9427) for the relief of a certain class of officers on the retired list of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 9428) relating to procedure in United States courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9429) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United

States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 9430) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Bloomington, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 9431) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 9432) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HELGESEN: A bill (H. R. 9433) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9434) to give a legal status to a dam constructed in the Red River of the North at Fargo, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 9435) to prevent the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 9436) to amend the provisions of section 12, act of February 8, 1875, as amended by section 2, act of March 1, 1879, and section 3149 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 2, act of March 1, 1879, as to the appointment and bonding of deputy collectors of internal revenue; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. BEALES: A bill (H. R. 9437) granting pensions to Emergency Men of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREAR: Resolution (H. Res. 98) instructing the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate railroad opposition to river and harbor legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution (H. Res. 99) authorizing and directing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions of transportation to Mount Vernon, Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 107) proposing an amendment to the Constitution for the election of Representatives for a four-year instead of a two-year term; to the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. FINLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) providing for the printing of the roster of the officers and enlisted men of the Union and Confederate Armies; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) providing for a committee to investigate certain matters relating to the matériel of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 9438) granting an increase of pension to John Flight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 9439) granting a pension to Richard Devers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 9440) granting a pension to Leo F. Raske; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9441) granting a pension to Dorcas A. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9442) granting an increase of pension to George E. Roe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9443) granting an increase of pension to John W. Pence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 9444) for the relief of Marion B. Patterson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 9445) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 9446) for the relief of George Welty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9447) granting an increase of pension to J. E. Stafford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9448) granting a pension to Claudia E. Geary; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 9449) for the relief of Axel Jacobson; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9450) granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 9451) granting an increase of pension to Mary Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9452) granting an increase of pension to Hugh J. Clevenger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 9453) granting a pension to Herman W. Breuel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9454) for the relief of the Cheraw Lyceum, Cheraw, S. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9455) for the relief of the heirs of James H. Gardner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 9456) granting an increase of pension to Paul Beyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9457) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Gerber; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 9458) for the relief of the heirs of Santos Benavides; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9459) for the relief of the heirs of S. P. H. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9460) for the relief of the heirs of Joshua D. Haskett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAMLIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 9461) vesting jurisdiction in the Court of Claims to entertain the claim of Charles A. Morrison, as administrator de bonis non of the estate of William Morrison, deceased, against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9462) granting a pension to Ellen S. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 9463) for the relief of the heirs of Richard Norwood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRISON (by request): A bill (H. R. 9464) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Wood and the estate of I. T. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9465) for the relief of the estate of Jonathan Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9466) for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of Charles Johnson and Kate Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9467) granting a pension to Rufus R. Ford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY: A bill (H. R. 9468) for the relief of the heir of Wiley Yarborough; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9469) for the relief of the widow of John Norwood; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9470) for the relief of the heirs of Henderson C. Rush, Ben Wheeler, and James M. Rush; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9471) for the relief of the heirs of James M. Rush; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9472) for the relief of the heir of Hundley V. Fowler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 9473) granting an increase of pension to Jane A. Dickinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 9474) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca J. Calhoun; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9475) granting a pension to Thomas D. Harvey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULBERT: A bill (H. R. 9476) to authorize the President to award a medal of honor to Dr. John T. Nagle, for conspicuous bravery at the Battle of Kernstown, Virginia, on July 24, 1864, while serving as an acting assistant surgeon of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 9477) granting a pension to Violetta Wyckoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9478) for the relief of John Burke; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 9479) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of R. W. Harris, administrator of James P. Harris, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LIEB: A bill (H. R. 9480) granting an increase of pension to Millard I. Nettleton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9481) granting an honorable discharge to Larkin T. Robinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9482) granting an increase of pension to Bertha Assmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9483) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9484) granting an increase of pension to Jeannie Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9485) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Walsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9486) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Feldkamp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9487) to remove the charge of desertion against James McGinnis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 9488) granting an increase of pension to Robert Field; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 9489) granting an increase of pension to Henry Allison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9490) granting an increase of pension to Erastus P. Daggett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9491) granting an increase of pension to John W. Bush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 9492) granting a pension to Poppy H. Winslow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURRAY: A bill (H. R. 9493) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 9494) granting a pension to Katie Noblitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OAKEY: A bill (H. R. 9495) granting an increase of pension to Abby J. Cadwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLNEY: A bill (H. R. 9496) granting a pension to William D. Edwards; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 9497) granting a pension to William B. McCarthy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9498) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Douglass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 9499) granting a pension to Sarah E. Benjamin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 9500) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to readjudicate the cases of Mattie W. Jackson, widow, and others against The United States and Mattie E. Hughes against The United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 9501) to correct the military record of James M. Wiley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 9502) granting an increase of pension to Warren E. McIntyre; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 9503) granting an increase of pension to James D. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 9504) granting a pension to William Couture, or Goodhue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 9505) granting a pension to Isaac Hammett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9506) granting an increase of pension to W. B. C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9507) granting an increase of pension to John T. Rankin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 9508) granting a pension to Sue M. Burch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 9509) granting a pension to Rebecca A. Beery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 9510) granting a pension to Cale Trippett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 9511) granting a pension to Victoria Pemberton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9512) granting a pension to Cassie Spears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9513) granting an increase of pension to Conrad L. Westerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 9514) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Charles P. Phillips; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 9515) for the relief of John J. Mangen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 9516) granting a pension to Joseph W. Hill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 9517) for the relief of John A. O'Keefe, administrator of estate of William M. O'Keefe; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARD: A bill (H. R. 9518) for the relief of Henry Fuller, administrator of Philo Fuller, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 9519) granting an increase of pension to Dallas F. Jarvis; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Waterville (Me.) Defense Society, favoring adoption of the Swiss military plan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of West Lafayette Bank and the Farmers' and Merchants' Bank, of Warsaw, Ohio, protesting against stamp on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEALES: Memorial of Philadelphia (Pa.) Bourse requesting the unconditional repeal of the seamen's act and enactment of a comprehensive law that will develop an American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh relative to railway-mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of laborers employed in Pittsburgh (Pa.) post office favoring the classification of laborers in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BENNET: Petition of Swedish Americans, Friends of Peace, an organization having over 50,000 members, favoring embargo on arms, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNING: Memorial of Salem (N. J.) Quarterly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends protesting against national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE: Petition of W. H. Wade and 50 others, of Plymouth and Sheboygan Counties, Wis., favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 83 members of the Sheboygan (Wis.) Liquor Dealers' Protective Association, protesting against increase in the tax on beer, wines, liquor, cigars, tobacco, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Wisconsin Retail Clothiers' Association at Madison, Wis., favoring passage of House bill 4715 to prevent discrimination in prices and to provide for publicity of prices to dealers and to the public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of West Bend (Wis.) Woolen Mills, favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON: Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Illinois, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of A. V. Morris & Sons and Van Brocklin & Stover, of Amsterdam, N. Y., favoring protection to the American manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: Memorial of board of supervisors of Napa and other California counties, favoring legislation for the preservation of the California oil industry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Brooklyn Teachers' Association, favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of C. K. Gleason, of New York, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Harry D. Wescott, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the appointment of clerks of the courts of the United States by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGAN: Memorial of the Church Peace Union, of New York, protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Papers to accompany House bill 9267, granting an increase of pension to William F. Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of L. S. Olson and 28 others, of Hixton, and J. B. Scheil and 41 others, of Unity, Wis., urging passage of the

Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9268, granting a pension to Mahala Claflin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Wisconsin Retail Clothiers' Association, of Beloit, Wis., favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of the Franklin Board & Paper Co., of Franklin, Ohio, favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of the Brooklyn Teachers' Association, favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Chicago Insulated Wire & Manufacturing Co., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Earl Mutual Fire Insurance Co., of Earlville, Ill., protesting against the tax on mutual insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rockford (Ill.) Motor Club, protesting against a proposed tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of S. D. Warren & Co., of Boston, Mass., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of L. L. Vincent and others, of Rickreall, Oreg., favoring law abolishing manufacture of intoxicating liquors in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of Monthly Meeting of Society of Friends at Flushing, Ohio, and representative committee of the Yearly Meeting of Society of Friends of Philadelphia, Pa., and Joseph E. Myers and other citizens, against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULBERT: Memorial of Iron Shipbuilders' Cooperative Association and Drillers and Tappers' League, Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to more pay for workmen in the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Papers to accompany House bill 7120, granting a pension to Robert A. Imrie; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of Boulder (Colo.) Commercial Association, urging the passage of House bill 651 as a measure both fair and equitable to shipper and carrier; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of Carson, Pirie, Scott & Co., of Chicago, Ill.; Gardiner Hall, jr., & Co., of South Wilmington, Mass.; and the American Mills Co., of Waterbury, Conn., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAMES: Petition of sundry citizens of Ahmeek, Mich., favoring exacting full reparation from the Mexican Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of the executive board of the Rhode Island Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of James I. Jenks, of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring the passage of House bill 8234, the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Sydney Worsted Co., of Woonsocket, R. I., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KONOP: Memorial of Retail Clothiers' Association, protesting against passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of 147 citizens of Roulette, Pa., protesting against national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of Union League Club of New York, relative to national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Association of Ex-Deputy Collectors of Internal Revenue, protesting against taking position of internal-revenue collector from under civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the American Institute of Architects, protesting against bill for building for Department of Justice; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petitions of more than 3,000 citizens of St. Louis City and County, Mo., favoring passage of a bill for improvement of the Missouri River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Paul Bertrand, Charles G. Mayer, and John Lieb and others, of Philadelphia, favoring bill to prohibit sale of ammunition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petitions of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also (by request), petition of Lawrence Litchfield, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: Petition of sundry business men of Gilbert, Minn., urging passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOTT: Petitions of Brownsville Paper Co., of Brownsville; Knowlton Bros., of Watertown; G. C. Chauncey and others, of Phoenix and Fulton; and Eureka Paper Co., of Fulton, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 702, for dyestuff tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSON: Petitions of merchants in the third congressional district of Wisconsin, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of citizens of the third congressional district of Wisconsin, favoring illiteracy test for immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. NORTH: Petition of Peter Graff & Co., of Worthington, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OAKEY (by request): Memorial of New Britain Retail Wine, Liquor, and Beer Dealers' Association, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OVERMYER: Petition of German-American Alliance, of Tiffin, Ohio, favoring an embargo on munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Santa Clara Camp, No. 111, and Erambert-Case Camp, No. 77, Department of Ohio, Spanish War Veterans, favoring pensions for widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Sandusky Council, Knights of Columbus, No. 546, favoring the passage of House bill 4699, to make the 12th day of October each year a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PLATT: Petition of C. F. Hoag & Co., of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of the Merrill Silk Co. and the Merrill Hosiery Co., both of Hornell, N. Y., urging the enactment of House bill 702, entitled "A bill to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of California State Board of Education, favoring Federal aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of citizens of Lassen County, Cal., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of sundry citizens of Albany, N. Y., favoring bill for Federal censorship of motion picture commission; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of New York, favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNELL: Petitions of John F. Butler, R. J. Sanford, J. R. Weston, T. H. Perrin & Co., C. E. Haywood, H. W. Pearl, Henry Wells Co., W. F. Hinman, Smith & Smith, Scott Mayfield, W. H. Bartholomew, C. W. Kennedy, John A. Dutches, M. Needham, Thomas Woods, E. J. Denney, H. J. Van Ness, F. T. Swan, L. Goldsmith, Whitney & Sackett, Floyd & Morgan, Sullivan & Fobes, Elliott Taylor & Sons, Willis McGee & Co., O. P. Benson, James H. Sullivan, and F. A. Weed, all of Potsdam, N. Y., urging the passage of the Stevens maintenance bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions of Mohawk Valley Paper Co., of Little Falls; Mohawk Valley Cap Factory and Foster Box Board Co., of Utica, N. Y., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Ashaway (R. I.) Line & Twine Manufacturing Co., favoring passage of House bill 702, for tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of J. W. Busiel & Co., of Laconia, N. H., favoring passage of House bill 702, for tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petitions from the citizens of Hotchkiss, Paonia, Cortez, Delta, Durango, Ouray, Telluride, Montrose, Grand Junction, Leadville, Glenwood Springs, Silverton, Gunnison, Mancos, Dolores, Palisade, Kremmling, Hot Sulphur Springs, Steamboat Springs, Yampa, Oak Creek, Hay-

den, Craig, Aspen, Breckenridge, Basalt, New Castle, Silt, Eagle, Redcliff, Minturn, Fruita, Carbondale, Grand Valley, Clifton, De Beque, Rifle, and Olathe, in the fourth congressional district of Colorado, in support of the measure to tax interstate mail-order business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Forsythe Dyeing Co., of New Haven, Conn., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Joseph A. Parker & Sons Co., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of Coral Manufacturing Co., of Norristown, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *January 20, 1916.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we seek Thy favor and grace and guidance for the duties of this new day. Our duties are ever increasing; our responsibilities are more and more with every coming day. By Thy grace we have erected a great empire and by Thy grace alone shall we be enabled to project the policies which carry out the plans and secure the permanency of our Nation's life, and the development of all its resources. Grant us Thy guidance and blessing as Thou hast given Thy guidance and blessing to the fathers. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

REFUNDS OF DRAWBACKS (S. DOC. NO. 248).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, which will be read.

The communication was read and ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 18, 1916.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of the Senate resolution, dated the 10th instant, directing me to submit to the Senate a statement showing certain data relative to applications for, and payment of, drawbacks under paragraph O, Section IV, of the present tariff act, for various periods.

In reply I have to state that instructions have been given to various collectors of customs to forward the required data to the department, where it will be compiled and submitted to the Senate with the least possible delay. I may add that the clerical labor involved, requiring as it does reference to every drawback transaction in the Customs Service for a period of two and a half years, will consume considerable time, but that the same will be expedited in every possible way.

Respectfully,

W. G. MCADOO, *Secretary.*

WATER-POWER SITES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 17, 1916.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: In accordance with the provisions of Senate resolution No. 544, passed by the Sixty-third Congress, third session, I have the honor to transmit herewith the information in my possession as to the ownership and control of the water-power sites in the United States; showing what proportion of such water-power sites is in private ownership and by what companies and corporations such sites in private ownership are owned and controlled; what horsepower has been developed and what proportion of it is owned and controlled by such private companies and corporations; and facts bearing upon the question as to the existence of a monopoly in the ownership and control of hydro-electric power in the United States.

Respectfully,

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not know what to do with the accompanying papers.

Mr. MYERS. I ask that the matter be printed as a public document. It contains valuable information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Here it is [indicating].

Mr. MYERS. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing, then.

Mr. OVERMAN. It seems to me that as the question is being dealt with by the Committee on Commerce it ought to go to that committee.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. OVERMAN. The question of constitutionality is being considered by the Committee on the Judiciary and also by the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SMOOT. The subject matter, however, is before the Committee on Public Lands. I think the communication and accompanying papers ought to be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, they will go to the Committee on Printing.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 65. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to certain gas, electric light and power, telephone, railroad, and street railway companies and franchises in the Territory of Hawaii, and amending the laws relating thereto;

H. R. 153. An act to create a Bureau of Labor Safety in the Department of Labor;

H. R. 407. An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3042. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, as herein amended, and amending the laws relating thereto; and

H. R. 6241. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act amending the franchise granted to H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, and now held under assignment to Island Electric Co. (Ltd.), by extending it to include the Makawao district on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, and extending the control of the Public Utilities Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to said franchise and its holder.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MYERS. I present a letter in the nature of a petition from Hon. A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of Montana, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD with his signature.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MONTANA, SECRETARY OF STATE.
Helena, January 14, 1916.

To the PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: In 1907 reconnoissance and preliminary surveys were begun upon the Flathead irrigation project in northwestern Montana.

In 1908 a construction upon the project was authorized and the first appropriation made by act of Congress. In 1909 actual construction was begun.

In spite of the fact that since the beginning of actual work in 1909 more than six years have elapsed, the project is now only 22.2 per cent completed.

The Flathead project is the largest and most comprehensive Indian irrigation scheme ever undertaken in the United States. The area of the completed project is about 152,000 acres. There is not the slightest question but what all of these lands would easily pay the water-construction charge of $45 an acre, or even more, if necessary.

There has been a large amount of settling upon these lands, but the people have found, to their sorrow, that they are unable to make a living without irrigation. They have been led to believe, and were entitled to believe, that the Government of the United States would complete this project.

It never can be completed within the lifetime of a settler now upon the project with such insignificant appropriations as have been made in recent years. A large amount of the work already accomplished will go to pieces and its value will be lost unless the work is pushed to final accomplishment.

The State of Montana is firmly of the opinion that an appropriation of $1,000,000 should be made for the Flathead project this year of 1916, and we ardently hope that the Congress of the United States will recognize the necessity for such an appropriation.

I have the honor to remain,
Sincerely, yours,

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS. I present the petition of pupils of the Reservoir Valley School, in Montana, praying for an appropriation for the Flathead reclamation project in that State. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD with the name of the first signer and underneath the words "and many others" and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESERVOIR VALLEY SCHOOLHOUSE.

To the PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

The undesigned, pupils of the Reservoir Valley Schoolhouse, do most urgently and respectfully petition of Congress that an appropriation of not less than $1,000,000 be passed by this session of Congress for work on the Flathead irrigation project for the ensuing year. This schoolhouse is located within the Flathead project and our education will depend to a large extent on the manner that this project is prosecuted.

Respectfully,

VENUS CAFFREY,
(And many others).

Mr. ASHURST. I present resolutions in the nature of a petition, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the resolutions were read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

Whereas the Grand Canyon of the Colorado has been set aside by the President of the United States as a public monument; and
Whereas every part of this great region should be made accessible and usable in the largest degree to the public, as well as preserved for the good of generations to come; and
Whereas if this public monument were made a national park, the necessary care and attention could and would be given to it by the United States Government for the benefit of the present generation and posterity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Yavapai County Chamber of Commerce, through its board of directors, this 13th day of January, 1916, That they do hereby recommend and earnestly urge that the Grand Canyon of the Colorado be made a national park at the earliest date expedient; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane, to Senators HENRY F. ASHURST and MARCUS A. SMITH, and to Representative CARL HAYDEN; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the various commercial organizations of Arizona, together with the request that they cooperate in every way to help secure the proper legislation.

Approved.

C. E. YOUNT, *President.*

Attest:

GRACE M. SPARKES, *Secretary.*

Mr. ASHURST. I present resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Yavapai County, Ariz. The resolutions relate to a delicate subject, and I ask that they be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WARREN. I have a telegram from the National Wool Growers' Association, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD without reading and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

SALT LAKE, UTAH, *January 19, 1916.*

Senator F. E. WARREN,
Washington, D. C.:

Probably Gov. Gooding, of Idaho, and myself will leave for Washington to-day. If we do not reach there in time, it is imperative that the stock trails provided for in the homestead bills should be at least 1 mile wide. You must remember that in order to reach forest reserves and shipping points sheep will have to be in these trails as long as 15 days, with no feed other than that furnished by the trails. Certainly no man should be allowed to make an additional entry unless it adjoins his original entry. We hope action on the bill can be delayed until we reach Washington, and we hope that the Senate will wait for the recommendations of the committee.

NATIONAL WOOL GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of sundry citizens of Monroe, Mich., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the University Club of Harbor Springs, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of S. A. Valentine Camp, No. 21, Department of Michigan, United Spanish War Veterans, of Escanaba, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GRONNA. I have here resolutions adopted by the Devils Lake District Medical Society, of North Dakota, calling attention to the lack of a sufficient number of medical officers in the Regular Army. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEVILS LAKE DISTRICT MEDICAL SOCIETY,
Devils Lake, North Dakota.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the Devils Lake District Medical Society January 11, 1916, the following resolution was passed and a copy ordered sent to the Secretary of War and our Senators and Congressmen:

"Whereas the President and the honorable Secretary of War have announced in the public press that a scheme for the reorganization of the Army will be presented to Congress at its coming session which will materially increase the military establishment; and

"Whereas we recall the indignant protests and criticisms of the Nation at the failure to provide adequately for the sick and wounded at the beginning of the Civil War and the Spanish-American War; and

"Whereas it is known that this failure was due to the lack of a sufficient number of medical officers in the Regular Army and a means for increasing the medical establishment at the outbreak of war; and

"Whereas in spite of the lessons of the Spanish-American War, which were fresh in mind in the reorganization of the Army in 1901, the medical department was not properly increased, and no provision was made for its expansion in time of emergency; and

"Whereas to correct the defects in the 1901 legislation subsequent legislation was necessary, in which the medical profession of the United States was called on to assist: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Devils Lake Medical Society of North Dakota,* That the Secretary of War be petitioned to make adequate provision in the reorganization of the Army about to be presented to Congress for a sufficient number of medical officers for the regular establishment, which provision should aggregate a proportion of medical officers of at least seventy-five hundredths of 1 per cent of the enlisted strength of the Army, or such number as the Surgeon General of the Army may deem necessary; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Secretary be petitioned to make provision in this reorganization for the expansion of the medical department at the beginning of war by calling into service in the Medical Reserve Corps physicians from civil life who have been instructed in their special duties as medical officers in our summer camps and otherwise, as the War Department may see fit."

G. F. DREW,
Secretary Devils Lake Medical Society.

Mr. HARDING presented memorials of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against an additional tax on intoxicating liquors, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Mansfield, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Norwalk, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Norwalk, and of sundry citizens of North Olmsted, all in the State of Ohio, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Norwalk, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Norwalk, and of sundry citizens of North Olmsted, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the pure-food law to make misdemeanors false and fraudulent statements regarding curative qualities of medicines, which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Norwalk, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Norwalk, and of sundry citizens of North Olmsted, all in the State of Ohio, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Sandusky Council, Knights of Columbus, of Sandusky, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to set aside October 12 as Columbus Day, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry inmates of the Soldiers' Home of Sandusky, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide pensions for widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a fixed price for trade-marked and patented articles, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Memorial Baptist Church, of Albany, N. Y., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of B. F. Gladding & Co., of South Otselic, N. Y., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WEEKS presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 413, Loyal Order of Moose, of Quincy, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to grant the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Methodist Preachers' Association, of Springfield, Mass., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the American Writing Paper Co., of Holyoke, Mass., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented a petition of the congregation of the Whitney Avenue Memorial Christian Church, of Washington, D. C., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I ask to have printed in the RECORD a telegram which I have just received. It is short.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

DOUGLAS, WYO., *January 20, 1916.*

Senator CLARK, *Washington, D. C.:*

Please withhold action on homestead and leasing bill just passed by House until you can hear from a delegation appointed by the National Wool Growers and a delegation to be appointed by the American National Live Stock Association at El Paso 25th to 27th this month, if possible to do so. Please answer.

J. M. WILSON.

OIL LANDS IN CALIFORNIA.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a telegram bearing upon the proposed legislation affecting the oil industry in California. I ask to have it read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CAL., *January 19, 1916.*

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Please have following petition read in Senate immediately:

"To the President and Congress of the United States:

"A multitude of citizens of the United States, some thousands in number, who are the threatened victims of legislation concerning oil lands now pending in the National Congress, hereby beg leave to enter protest against any precipitate and hurried legislation upon the subject referred to. The bills as now pending bear every evidence of superficiality in their sweeping emasculation of long-established statutory laws which have been the basis of a rational and uniform development of the national domain for over a half century. They absolutely wreck a most important division of the national land system and leave in confusion the legal status of vested rights acquired by a large element of worthy and industrious citizens who are seeking to acquire property under laws sanctified by long usage. The bills referred to bear strong evidence of having been inspired by those who have been the recipients of munificent donations from the General Government and whose holdings are now the subject of judicial inquiry. The proposed enactments are not only confiscatory but are punctuated with ambiguities which will require an untold amount of litigation to determine their legal significance. If such legislation is enacted it will paralyze every effort of the man of modest means who has withstood the privations and severities of a desert country in seeking mineral wealth, believing that the legislatures and courts of both State and Nation would insure to him the full protection of rights acquired by him under the established mineral laws of the United States, which have been in full force and operation for many decades. Any law which imperils or destroys property rights thus acquired can only result in intensifying and expanding the growing popular idea that it is the purpose of the Government to preserve the public domain for the exclusive benefit of the rich and powerful and add to the difficulties of the poor who are seeking to acquire property rights by a strict conformity to the laws of the land. The bills which are pending before the House and Senate should each be entitled 'A law for the establishment of a monopoly of all fuel and power for the benefit of those who have already been enriched by donations from the public domain.' No possible statute could more effectually create and perpetuate such a monopoly, as no private individual or association of persons outside of the great interests themselves could acquire any portion of the public domain by lease with any possible hope of producing an article of commerce therefrom with the handicap of Government supervision and taxation and market such article in competition with those who have already received vast donations of public mineral lands and are exempt forever from any burdens of public surveillance and onerous royalties. The vast majority of legislators have received no information emanating from the private operator in the field except that which has been manipulated and mutilated by influences in close touch with those who frame the laws and give them color and effect. The small operator and prospector have been totally ignored, and their plea for consideration has been smothered by the adroitness of preponderating wealth and sinister politics. Already the atmosphere is becoming malodorous with sensational charges of a political and financial nature which promise to culminate in scandals unequaled in national legislation. Your petitioners enter an earnest plea that all legislation of this character may be delayed until proper consideration can be given to same unmixed with and unsmothered by the tumultous clamor over international affairs. It is no time for revolutionary legislation touching purely domestic questions, whose consideration is overshadowed by world affairs which now completely absorb the popular mind, and it is the almost universal opinion of those best advised that this particular hour and condition has been selected to perpetrate this ill-advised and outrageous legislative felony. The President and Congress will at an early date receive expression from the thousands whose little all is at stake through the medium of mass meetings held for this purpose for the reasons above stated. A rational delay on such drastic legislation is hereby impleaded."

JNO. J. MORRIS,
WM. T. FORSYTH,
D. F. WILSON,
Committee Representing over 300 Bona Fide Oil Land Locators.

FREIGHT CONGESTION AT OCEAN DOCKS.

Mr. WORKS. I also send up a letter from the Chamber of Commerce, of Santa Cruz, Cal., on the subject of the congestion of freight at ocean docks, and ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Chamber of Commerce of Santa Cruz urgently calls the attention of Congress to the congestion of freight at ocean docks which is seriously threatening the prosperity of the Nation in general and of the Northwest in particular.

Millions of tons of freight, the products of our farms and factories, are piling up in freight cars, in storage, and on the wharves at water terminals, unable to find bottoms for transportation to the markets of the world. Far from offering relief, the situation assumes a graver aspect every day and must inevitably cause reaction, which may cause a material depression in the price of farm products and stagnation in the work of our factories.

Our farmers and merchants are losing, perhaps forever, the new opportunities and the new markets now open before them, because of a state of paralysis in international means of transportation and the greed of foreign shipowners over which our Government has no jurisdiction: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to speedily adopt emergency measures to adequately meet this situation and to place at the disposal of the President full power to employ all the executive agencies of the Government for the purpose of reopening the congested arteries of trade.

S. A. PALMER, *President.*
A. S. T. JOHNSON, *Secretary.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. NORRIS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 710) to authorize national banking associations to avail themselves of State laws providing for the guaranteeing of deposits, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 61) thereon.

Mr. STONE. By direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 3264) to authorize the payment of an indemnity to the Norwegian Government for the detention of three subjects of Norway in Hudson County, N. J., and I submit a report (No. 60) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS.

Mr. CATRON. From the Committee on Claims, I report back favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 1878) making appropriation for payment of certain claims in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims, reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts, and under the provisions of section No. 151 of the act approved March 3, 1911, commonly known as the Judicial Code, and I submit a report (No. 59) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill go to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BROWNS FERRY BRIDGE, MISSOURI.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 4716) to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River, and I submit a report (No. 58) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ST. FRANCIS RIVER BRIDGE, MISSOURI.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 6448) to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River, and I submit a report (No. 57) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 3721) for the relief of the estate of Thomas F. Swafford, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3722) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3723) providing for the holding of terms of the district court for the southern division of the western district of the State of Washington at Aberdeen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 3724) authorizing the setting aside of certain lands for highway purposes through the public domain, forests, and other reserves of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3725) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Patterson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS:

A bill (S. 3726) for the relief of J. A. Denny;

A bill (S. 3727) for the relief of William Lewis Bryan;

A bill (S. 3728) for the relief of the heirs of Elijah D. Guthrie;

A bill (S. 3729) for the relief of Ben Pigott;

A bill (S. 3730) for the relief of George Jerkins;

A bill (S. 3731) for the relief of John G. Young;

A bill (S. 3732) to refund the cotton tax to the States wherein collected;

A bill (S. 3733) for the relief of Sarah R. Hay;

A bill (S. 3734) for the relief of Martha A. Moffitt, widow of Eli A. Moffitt; and

A bill (S. 3735) for the relief of Cleveland L. Short; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 3737) providing for an investigation into the extent and conditions of the practice of experimentation on living animals; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 3738) granting an increase of pension to Julia C. Bradley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 3739) granting a pension to James Gallagher;

A bill (S. 3740) granting a pension to Anna C. Gregory;

A bill (S. 3741) granting a pension to Lucy S. Hamilton; and

A bill (S. 3742) granting a pension to Mary C. Christensen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BECKHAM:

A bill (S. 3743) to reimburse John Simpson; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3744) granting an increase of pension to Emma Luman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3745) granting an increase of pension to Mary Eliza Swise (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3746) granting an increase of pension to Alice A. McDonald (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3747) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Gray (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3748) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Colburn (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3749) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Fist (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3750) granting an increase of pension to John Clinger (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3751) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Hughes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 3752) granting an increase of pension to George H. Stillman;

A bill (S. 3753) granting an increase of pension to Herman F. W. Fisher;

A bill (S. 3754) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Sausaman;

A bill (S. 3755) granting an increase of pension to William A. Dodge;

A bill (S. 3756) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Riddle; and

A bill (S. 3757) granting an increase of pension to James S. Anderson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 3758) for the relief of the heirs of William S. Shoemaker, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 3759) for the relief of Wellington F. Larabee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 3760) granting an increase of pension to Berry H. Smith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 84) authorizing the appointment of a board to ascertain and report to Congress the probable cost of acquiring lands on each side of Pennsylvania Avenue as sites for buildings necessary for the transaction of present and prospective governmental business; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PORTSMOUTH (N. H.) DRY DOCK.

Mr. GALLINGER. I introduce a bill which is a duplicate of one I introduced at the last session, and I ask that it be received and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (S. 3736) making an appropriation toward the construction of a dry dock at the Portsmouth Navy Yard was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—JOHN G. YOUNG.

On motion of Mr. OVERMAN, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the case of John G. Young (S. 3237, 63d Cong.) be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

PUGET SOUND CANAL, WASHINGTON.

Mr. JONES submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause preliminary examination and survey to be made and a report to be made thereon to Congress of the intervening territory between Puget Sound and the Columbia River, with a view to determining the advisability of constructing a canal connecting Puget Sound with Grays Harbor, Willapa Harbor, and the Columbia River.

STRATEGIC VALUE OF INLAND WATERWAYS (S. DOC. NO. 249).

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I have here an address delivered by the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] at the eighth annual convention of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, held at Savannah, Ga., the 9th of November last, on the subject of the strategic value of inland waterways. It is a most exhaustive and illuminating discussion of the necessity of the improvement and enlargement of our coastwise waterways. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXPORTATION OF LOGWOOD FROM JAMAICA.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have a letter from Hon. Robert Lansing, Secretary of State, in reference to the question of the embargo on the exportation of logwood from Jamaica. As this is a matter which concerns very deeply the textile industries of the country, as well as certain other industries, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD without reading.

Mr. STONE. The letter just presented by the Senator from New Hampshire concerns logwood imported from what country?

Mr. GALLINGER. It relates directly to the embargo on the exportation of logwood from Jamaica, but it touches other countries.

Mr. STONE. Would it not be well to have the letter, after it is printed, referred to the Committee on Finance?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it ought to be done, and I ask that that course be taken.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 15, 1916.

The Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER,
United States Senate.

SIR: With reference to previous correspondence with this department in regard to the British embargo on the exportation of logwood from Jamaica, I have the honor to inform you that the department is in receipt of the following cablegram from the American ambassador at London, dated January 13, 1916:

"Foreign office now informs me that as urgent requirements of Great Britain have been met, governor of Jamaica has issued general license permitting export of logwood chips and logwood extract to all British, United States, French, and Italian ports, and that instructions are being sent to governor of British Honduras to issue similar license. It is added that in informing me of measures taken by British Government to facilitate relaxation of embargo in favor of manufacturers in United States it is desired to explain that relaxation must necessarily be conditional on British Government being satisfied that supply of dyewood extract from United States to Canada will be resumed on reasonable scale, and states that they have no doubt but that I will be in a position to give this assurance in view of efforts which have been made by British authorities to meet convenience of American manufacturers.

"Please instruct me if I can give the assurance that dyewood extract is being sent from United States to Canada."

As the lifting of the embargo on logwood in favor of manufacturers in the United States is made conditional on the British Government being satisfied that the supply of dyewood extract from the United States to Canada will be resumed on a reasonable scale, the question of whether American firms are able to obtain logwood from Jamaica and British Honduras will depend on whether the manufacturers of logwood extract, of whom the department is informed there are only two or three, are willing to resume exportation to Canada on a reasonable scale. The department has as yet received no assurances from manufacturers of logwood extract that they will do this.

Information received from American consular officers stationed along the Caribbean coasts and in the West Indies, in response to instructions from the Department of State, directing them to ascertain what supplies of logwood were available for shipment to the United States, indicate that at the present time the only available supply of logwood outside of Jamaica and British Honduras is apparently in Haiti with the possibility of the development of a supply on a reasonable scale from the districts surrounding Barranquilla, Colombia.

I have the honor to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
ROBERT LANSING.

SEIZURES OF COTTON AND FOODSTUFFS BY GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, at an earlier day during the session I had an opportunity to address the Senate with reference to the orders in council of March 1 and March 11, passed by Great Britain. I then called attention to the fact that the order of March 11 was, in effect, a declaration of blockade against all the ports of Germany; that it was a direction to enforce that blockade by seizing neutral vessels before they passed the straits which separated Denmark, Norway, and Sweden; that so far as Norway and Sweden and the Baltic coast were concerned it was ineffective and illegal, on account of the fact that Great Britain could not blockade the ports of Germany on the Baltic against the vessels of Norway and Sweden; and that no blockade can be enforced legally unless it is enforced against all neutrals alike.

I also called attention to the fact that this order directed the seizure of the commerce of neutrals going into and out of neutral ports without regard to the character of the goods, if those goods were of presumed German origin or destination.

The illegality of those orders, their disregard of recognized rules of international law, is so apparent that no real effort has been made in Great Britain to defend them. We now hear that Great Britain is about to recede from those two orders. I am not surprised at that. No British statesman of any prominence now a part of the British Government or who is in Parliament has failed within the past 12 years upon the floor of Parliament to denounce as illegal the very procedure of Great Britain which is being conducted at the present time under the order of council of March 11.

We are told that with the repeal of the orders of March 1 and March 11 by the privy council we are to have a direction for a real, genuine blockade of German ports, and that the effect of that action will be to tighten the blockade, and to still further restrict the trade of neutrals with Germany. Some of our newspaper correspondents are, thoughtlessly I hope, scattering the idea that, with a complete declaration of blockade, some increased right of interference will be given to the British Government.

Mr. President, if a declaration of absolute blockade were made, it would change the present status only to this extent: The present order in council leaves it to the discretion of the prize courts as to how they shall handle goods of neutrals seized when seeking to reach blockaded ports. The complete order of blockade would simply subject the vessels and their cargoes seeking to reach blockaded ports to confiscation. But, Mr. President, no neutral vessels are seeking to enter German ports that are now blockaded. Our real contest with Great Britain is the interference with our trade through neutral ports, and no blockade can extend to neutral ports. Blockade is an act of war; it is a part of the process of war directed toward an enemy's soil. It can not be directed toward the soil of a neutral.

On a former occasion I presented to the Senate decision after decision by the courts of Great Britain sustaining the proposition that I have just laid down. I cited text-writer after text-writer, and English judicial decisions from distinguished English authors and jurists, in support of the proposition that a blockade can not reach a neutral port; that the right of interference at neutral ports is limited to the character of the goods. It can only be based on the contraband character of the goods, which means that their character is such that they will be used in war by the military or naval forces of the enemy of Great Britain.

Goods have been classified as "absolute" and "conditional contraband" to assist in deciding the question of evidence required to justify the seizure; "absolute," of such a warlike nature that, going to a belligerent country, they are presumed to be intended for the army, and therefore can be seized on account of their character; "conditional contraband," goods which might be so used, and which might also equally be used by noncombatants; and in this case no seizure can be made unless the belligerent seizing them establishes the fact that they are really to be used by the military and naval forces of the opposing belligerent, the burden being upon the belligerent seizing the goods to make the proof.

Mr. President, the English rule has been that conditional contraband going to a neutral port could not be seized at all. Let me illustrate by foodstuffs. Ten per cent of the people are probably in arms and 90 per cent noncombatants. There are, therefore, nine chances out of ten that the food might be used by the noncombatants. If it is to be so used, it has the right to go to an opposing belligerent through a neutral port untouched.

Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the fact that, even though an absolute blockade is directed in the broadest sense, our State Department has already committed us, and correctly committed us, squarely to the proposition that such a blockade would give no right to seize innocent goods owned, by neutral citizens, sailing from neutral ports to neutral ports, even though those goods are to be sent to an opposing belligerent—to Germany or to Austria. I will read just a line from the letter of March 30 from our State Department sent to Great Britain:

It is confidently assumed that His Majesty's Government will not deny that it is a rule sanctioned by general practice that, even though a blockade should exist and the doctrine of contraband as to unblockaded territory be rigidly enforced, innocent shipments may be freely transported to and from the United States through neutral countries to belligerent territory without being subject to the penalties of contraband traffic or breach of blockade, much less to detention, requisition, or confiscation.

I quote, Mr. President, three other extracts from this letter, and I shall quote during my remarks a number of extracts from various papers. I will call attention to their substance, and ask leave now from the Senate to embody in the RECORD the exact language.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The quotation I have just read is an assertion of the right of citizens of neutral countries to trade with the enemies of Great Britain through neutral ports in noncontraband goods. This is an assertion of the right without regard to the orders of March 1 and March 11 last, and even though a formal blockade were declared.

Again, the letter states:

And no claim on the part of Great Britain of any justification for interfering with these clear rights of the United States and its citizens as neutrals could be admitted. To admit it would be to assume an attitude of unneutrality toward the present enemies of Great Britain which would be obviously inconsistent with the solemn obligations of this Government in the present circumstances.

Again, the letter states:

But the novel and quite unprecedented feature of that blockade, if we are to assume it to be properly so defined, is that it embraces many neutral ports and coasts—bars access to them.

Again, it states:

It is manifest that such limitations, risks, and liabilities placed upon the ships of a neutral power on the high seas * * * are a distinct invasion of the sovereign rights of the nation whose ships, trade, or commerce is interfered with.

These and other strong expressions are found in this letter protesting as illegal any effort by Great Britain to blockade the neutral ports of northern Europe against the trade of neutral nations in neutral goods.

The course of Great Britain and the threatened course are well understood by British statesmen to be illegal.

Its continuance is so palpable a violation of the rights of neutrals that no self-respecting nation should submit to it.

Some, even in the United States, have replied that the exigencies of war excuse the British Government for disregarding the rights of American citizens.

I wish to submit a few authorities to show that no nation has a right by municipal regulation to set aside rules or international law and thereby interfere with the rights of trade of a neutral nation.

In second Dallas, the Supreme Court of the United States held "the municipal law of a country can not change the law of nations so as to bind the subjects of another nation."

Time and again the Department of State of the United States has declared a municipal decree "whether executive, legislative, or judicial, contravening the law of nations has no extraterritorial force."

Mr. Evarts, when Secretary of State, announced—

if a Government confesses itself unable or unwilling to conform to those international obligations which must exist between established Governments of friendly States, it would thereby confess that it is not entitled to be regarded or recognized as a sovereign or independent power.

When Ecuador undertook to set up by statute rules subversive of the principles of international law, our State Department declared that "Ecuador placed herself outside of the pale of international intercourse."

Sir Henry Maine, in his work upon international law, declares that—

the State which disclaims the authority of international law places herself outside the circle of civilized nations.

In the first chapter of Moore's Digest of International Law many authorities upon this subject will be found.

The rules of international law come to us from the established customs of nations. The sovereignty of a nation extends to the

commerce of her people upon the ocean; and no opposing nation can interfere with the merchandise of a citizen of another nation not at war, except where the customs of nations have conceded the right of seizure. No nation, by a municipal regulation, can set up a rule of its own in defiance of the customs of nations, and seize the goods of a neutral without being guilty of a lawless act.

But let us see for a moment why the regulation of the privy council is passed. Why are not simply orders issued to the naval forces to seize these vessels and stop this commerce? The reason is obvious. If the cases were permitted to go to the British prize courts with only the direction by the Government of Great Britain to its navy, the prize courts would decide the cases under the rules of international law, and the conduct of Great Britain would at once be stopped by releases in her prize courts of all these illegal seizures. But Great Britain, through her privy council, which is a legislative body, sets aside rules of international law and prescribes a new rule for the seizure of goods of neutrals. Her prize courts are bound by their order, and are prevented from following rules of international law.

There is but one remedy for a neutral nation. It is to contest the orders of the British Privy Council, to assert our rights as a nation. Our citizens can have no redress under these orders in British prize courts.

Treating as established the rules of international law sustained by authority and brought to the attention of the Senate on a previous occasion, I wish to ask consideration of the order of August 21 by the British Privy Council declaring cotton absolute contraband and then to point out the violation by Great Britain of the rights of citizens of the United States, both in its treatment of foodstuffs and of cotton.

COTTON CONTRABAND ORDER.

Never but once before has any country sought to interfere with the free shipment of cotton. It has been recognized as a commodity largely entering into the peaceful uses of the people of the world, and therefore has never been classified as contraband but once before.

This was in the case of Russia, during the Japanese war.

The pretext for the declaration was the use of cotton for the manufacture of powder and explosives. Great Britain promptly protested the action of Russia.

Russia yielded, and cotton continued to be shipped by subjects of Great Britain from India and Egypt to Japan.

I wish, first, to answer the defense of this action which has been widely circulated by English agents and pro-English newspapers.

It has been upon two lines:

First. That the United States made cotton contraband during the Civil War.

Second. That cotton is essential to the manufacture of powder and explosives in Germany, and by the suppression of cotton shipments into Germany the war power of Germany and her allies may be destroyed.

UNITED STATES NEVER DECLARED COTTON CONTRABAND.

As to the first of these claims, it is sillily false. The United States never made cotton contraband during the Civil War. This old story is fully exposed by Moore, in his Digest of International Law. A classification of contraband is based upon the unneutral nature of the goods, and authorizes one belligerent to prevent those goods from entering the country of an enemy nation. It is to keep the enemy from obtaining possession of goods which would be used for military purposes.

What would have been the sense of an order classifying cotton as contraband to prevent it from being shipped into the Southern States? Nobody wanted to ship it into the Southern States. It was already there. They had almost a monopoly of its production. The claim was false and stupid.

Yet, Sir Gilbert Parker, the publicity agent for Great Britain, distributed an article defending the order making cotton absolute contraband, written by Hon. Bernard R. Wise, and justifying the order upon the ground that the United States made cotton contraband during the Civil War.

Now let me deal with the second British excuse.

CONSPIRACY TO INJURE COTTON.

After depressing the price of cotton in the fall of 1914, the British spinners organized to depress the price again in 1915. One-third of the exports of American cotton normally go to Germany and Austria and the neutral ports of northern Europe. Germany and Austria alone consume nearly 3,000,000 of bales annually.

If the British spinners and cotton manufacturers could cut off this market for cotton raised in the United States, it would naturally depress the price. If they could cut it off, they would exclude the products of German mills from competing with the products of English mills throughout the world.

When the great patriotic gathering was held early in the summer of 1915 in London to demand that cotton should be made absolute contraband, that great soldier, Sir Charles McKara, presided at the meeting. His military record, so far as it is known, is limited to the office which he fills. He is president of the English Cotton Spinners' Association.

I can not believe that English statesmen were so poorly informed, or so lacked capacity for observation, that they did not understand the real purpose of the movement.

When Sir William Ramsey advocated in the London Times placing cotton on the absolute contraband list, he asserted that it was essential to the manufacture of explosives and most of the powder used by Germany. A far more distinguished British scientist flatly contradicted him. Mr. W. F. Reid, former president of the Society of Chemical Industry of Great Britain, spoke as follows before that society in London:

The whole thing is a great fraud. Eminent scientists have made erroneous statements on this subject. If people associated with science would speak only on the branches with which they are connected, the advantages would be very great.

COTTON NOT USED TO MAKE POWDER IN GERMANY.

I shall show by abundant evidence that for months before the order making cotton absolute contraband Germany had substituted wood cellulose for lint cotton in the production of powders. The use of cotton for the manufacture of powder has always been confined principally to what is called linters. Linters are the short waste scraped from cotton seed at the oil mill when the seed are being ground. Manufacturers' waste consists of the very short particles of cotton that fly off as the cotton is spun. Linters and manufacturers' waste, when used as a base for powder, are ground to pulp. They then become the base or filler which is treated with explosive acids to make powder.

Linters and manufacturers' waste are of but little ordinary value, and have usually sold at very low prices. They form a cheap and useful base for nitrocellulose powders. The manufacture of powders of this character by the use of cotton linters or waste began in 1854. Long before the war in Germany cellulose had been made from wood pulp, and this wood-pulp cellulose had occasionally been used as a substitute for cotton linters and manufacturers' waste in the manufacture of nitrocellulose powders.

Shortly after the war began it was published that Germany was abandoning the use of cotton linters and waste and building numerous plants for the manufacture of wood cellulose as a base or filler for nitrocellulose powders.

I am now prepared to show that for months past Germany has abandoned the use of cotton in the manufacture of powders and is using wood cellulose as the filler for its nitrocellulose powders.

President Lohman, of the Bremen Chamber of Commerce, is one of the foremost business men of Germany. In a speech delivered last month before the Bremen Chamber of Commerce he declared that for more than eight months Germany had used wood pulp as a substitute for cotton in the manufacture of nitrocellulose powders.

I have in my hand a letter from Dr. W. Will, director of the Central Bureau of Technico-Scientific Research of the University of Bremen. He declares that the chemists of Germany long before the war began understood the use of wood pulp as a substitute for cotton in the manufacture of nitrocellulose powders, and that for months past the substitute had been used in the German powder mills, and used with perfect success.

I ask that his letter be printed in the RECORD as an exhibit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The letter referred to is printed in the appendix at the end of Mr. SMITH'S remarks.)

REPORT OF MR. BIBLE.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In the early fall Mr. Howard W. Bible, of North Carolina, whom I have known for a number of years, a most reputable citizen of the United States, returning from Germany, assured me that the lack of linters or cotton was in no way affecting the manufacture of powders in Germany; that wood pulp was used as a substitute. He intended returning to Germany in a few weeks, and, at my request, he agreed to personally investigate the subject while in Germany and to give me his testimony on the result of his investigation.

Mr. Bible is now in Washington. I have in my hand a letter from him, prepared last week. He is ready to testify before any committee of Congress upon this subject. He points out in this letter that, on returning to Germany, in Bremen he presented letters from me to President Lohman and explained my desire, if cotton had ceased to be used in Germany for the manufacture of powder and explosives, to furnish proof of that fact

for a protest I wished to make against the British order declaring cotton contraband.

President Lohman gave him his cordial support and arranged for a conference in Berlin between Mr. Bible and representatives of the various departments, that he might make his formal application to them for definite information and personal knowledge with reference to the use of cotton in the manufacture of gunpowder and explosives.

His letter states that, with President Lohman, he met representatives of the various departments by appointment in Berlin, and after presenting the objects of his investigation, he was assured by them that for months past the German Government had ceased to use cotton, and had with entire success substituted wood pulp in the manufacture of powder and explosives.

He was furnished a list of 60 mills in Germany engaged in the manufacture of wood cellulose, and also a list of munition plants, and authorized to visit such number as he saw fit, that he might have personal knowledge as to the materials therein used for the manufacture of powder.

He selected one plant, and, with Prof. Lohman and an officer of the German Government, he visited the plant; was permitted to go entirely through it, and found that all the raw material being brought in for manufacture into powder was wood cellulose, and that in some portions of the mill there were still rags used. He states that he found some cotton linters in the mill, but they had been laid aside, and were no longer used in the manufacture of powder.

He further states that he saw 3,000 bales of linters at one place which had been released by the munition department of the Government and disposed of to cotton factories.

I ask that Mr. Bible's letter be printed in full as an exhibit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have upon my desk packages of wood cellulose sent from Germany to me by Mr. Bible.

I defy anyone to produce proof to sustain the British claim. I was also advised by Mr. Bible that Col. Kuhn, our military attaché at Berlin, had been given the same opportunity to visit munition plants and to acquire the information that he, Mr. Bible, had acquired, and that Col. Kuhn was furnished the opportunity to know that Germany used no cotton in the manufacture of nitrocellulose powder.

I applied to the Secretary of War for Col. Kuhn's report. He could not give it to me. I have his letter here. First I applied orally. He explained to me the difficulty; that it was agreed between all countries that military attachés during a war were only permitted to remain in countries and make reports with the understanding that the neutral receiving them would regard them as absolutely confidential until the war was over, and for that reason he could not give me Col. Kuhn's report.

But the British embassy has admitted it. They did not intend to admit it, but they have admitted it. Yesterday, realizing that the false pretext upon which they justified their order making cotton absolute contraband had been and would be exploded, they issued a statement on the subject. I hold it in my hand. It begins:

> The British military authorities have issued the following information with regard to the use of cotton for military purposes.

It goes on then to show how cotton can be used as a base for ballistite, cordite, and nitrocellulose powder. It shows how much is used of each when cotton is used as the base. It then says:

> Apart from explosives, cotton forms the base of many fabrics and materials employed for military purposes, such as clothing, sheets—

And so forth.

I think we knew that before. I do not think it was a novel statement that sheets could be made out of cotton or that clothing could be made out of cotton. Then it closes:

> The alleged use of substitutes for cotton in the manufacture of explosives does not affect the fact that cotton is a war material in general use.

What does that mean? About this: "We told you last summer that we made your cotton contraband, and we justified the order of March 1 and March 11, because by keeping cotton out of Germany we would end the war. We would put an end to Germany's munition-plant service; we would suppress their powder magazines, and leave her without anything in the shape of explosives to conduct the war. But now you know it is not so, and we say that even if it is not used for explosives, even though substitutes are used instead of cotton in Germany, still it is a war material in general use."

If anywhere among English writers or English statesmen before can be found such a statement, I invite its production. Nearly anything can be used in some way in connection with war. That does not make it contraband as war material. Cotton can be used to make sheets. But sheets are not limited to soldiers. Cotton can be used to make clothes, and clothes are not limited to soldiers.

The very distinction that is drawn in treating the merchandise of neutrals is that a belligerent can not strike down the trade of a neutral simply because it might be used for military purposes. Every decision of Great Britain, every text writer of Great Britain, and every statesman of Great Britain for the last hundred years dealing with the subject has denounced any claim of right to interfere with neutral trade simply because it might in some way be used by an enemy army or navy. The rule has been laid down without interruption that the belligerent seizing goods must prove that they were intended for the army and navy, and that they were not for the use of noncombatants.

COTTON ALWAYS FREE FROM SEIZURE BY A BELLIGERENT.

Having disposed of the two excuses given by Great Britain for making cotton absolute contraband, let us consider the status which this commodity occupied under the customs of nations with reference to naval warfare.

The great majority of the people of the world are clothed with goods manufactured from cotton. In times of war not over 10 per cent of the population would be engaged in active service. Therefore, 90 per cent of the population of any country engaged in war would require in their peaceful pursuits the use of goods manufactured from cotton.

Recognizing this fact, cotton has uniformly been classed as an article which no nation could make contraband, but which all neutrals could ship freely to belligerent countries.

RUSSIA YIELDS TO BRITISH VIEW.

As before stated, the one exception was in the case of Russia, which, in 1904, during the war with Japan, declared cotton absolute contraband. England protested this action by Russia in the following language:

> The quantity of raw cotton that might be used for explosives would be infinitesimal in comparison with the bulk of the cotton exported from India to Japan for peaceful purposes, and to treat harmless cargoes of this latter description as unconditionally contraband would be to subject a branch of innocent commerce to a most unwarrantable interference.

This was Great Britain's view even before wood cellulose had been developed as a substitute for cotton.

Oh, what does this letter from the British embassy look like when we consider this action of Great Britain toward Russia? But not only Great Britain, the United States protested. Mr. Hay, Secretary of State, sent a splended letter to Russia on this subject. Among other things he said:

PROTEST BY MR. HAY.

> Nor could the United States Government acquiesce in the treatment of raw cotton as absolutely contraband of war. While that product may enter to some extent into the manufacture of explosives and military clothing, the quantity of it used for such purposes is so far out of proportion to its uses in the arts of peace that the recognition of its treatment as absolutely contraband would, in principle, justify the same treatment of all forms of iron and steel, as well as wood, wool, all kinds of fuel, and all other materials which would be used in the manufacture of guns, carriages, or any other article of potentially military use, and would therefore be destructive of virtually all commerce of neutral States with the noncombatant population of belligerents. Cotton is one of the principal products of the United States. The crop for the year 1904 exceeds 12,000,000 bales. Its exportation from the United States is one of the principal items of its foreign commerce. To Japan alone the exportations of raw cotton during the periods specified were as follows:

	Raw cotton.		
	Bales.	Pounds.	Value.
Year ending Dec. 31, 1903	83,434	44,651,240	$4,510,580
Eleven months ending Nov. 30, 1904	65,338	33,461,739	3,753,361

> In view of the foregoing His Imperial Majesty's Government can not fail to perceive the deep concern with which the United States would view the establishment of precedents and the recognition of a principle which would work such disastrous consequences to its legitimate commerce with neutral States. According to the view of the United States Government expressed herein and in its circular of June 10 and its instructions of August 30 and September 1 last, the seizure and condemnation of neutral ships and goods on the broad grounds enunciated by Count Lamsdorff, would necessitate a radical change in the law of nations and in the procedure of prize tribunals, and would, if generally adopted, inflict incalculable injury upon great producing and exporting countries, like Russia and the United States, who are vitally concerned in the maintenance of the rights of legitimate commerce with the peoples of belligerent States.

Russia yielded, and the one exception of an effort by a nation to make cotton contraband having been abandoned by that nation on the protests of neutrals, emphasizes the rule that the customs of nations has fixed cotton as a commodity which can not be made contraband.

The story has been heralded by the press that Germany has declared cotton absolute contraband. I called on the State Department to verify it. They could not do it. They had no such notice, and they cabled Berlin for information, and the reply was that the statement was false. Yet there is a class of newspaper men who pick up anything they can to start and circulate it in the effort to justify the illegal conduct of Great Britain. It is not patriotic to be hunting for an opportunity to strike the commerce of your own country, and I am not proud of the men who do it.

DECLARATION OF LONDON.

The declaration of London covering the rules of international law applicable to naval warfare was signed February 26, 1909. It is gratifying to see that the press of the country is beginning to recognize the great value of the declaration of London as an authority upon the rules of naval warfare.

Still it is worth repeating that this declaration was prepared by the representatives of the 10 great naval powers of the world. They were called together at the instance of Great Britain to consider and, if possible, agree as to what were the correct rules of international law applicable to those branches of naval warfare submitted to them.

There were 40 delegates present chosen from England, France, Germany, Austria, Russia, Japan, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, and the United States. Among their number were authors of distinction, naval officers who had made a specialty of the rules of international law applicable to naval warfare, professors of international law from great universities, and the counsellors of the state department of Great Britain.

The rules of international law which they announced were unanimously agreed to by them.

These rules classified contraband as "absolute" and "conditional" contraband.

They make a list of those commodities which by the customs of nations, on account of their general use for peaceful purposes, no nation is authorized to make contraband. They declare that the "free list" which they present can not be made contraband by any belligerent, and this free list is headed with "raw cotton."

BRITISH SUPPORTED CLASSIFICATION OF COTTON ON FREE LIST.

The British representatives to this conference, in a letter to their Government with reference to contraband, reported on March 30, 1909:

> We * * * have secured the addition of a free list which will place it beyond the power of belligerents in the future to treat as contraband the raw material of some of the most important of our national industries.

When the declaration of London was considered by the House of Commons during the year 1911, the representatives of the Government prided themselves upon the fact that the London conference had placed cotton upon the free list, thereby preventing any belligerent in the future from ever treating cotton in any way as contraband. The opposition to the Government ridiculed the claim that this was valuable, because they insisted cotton was already established upon the free list by the recognized customs of nations.

Upon this subject Mr. Balfour said:

> They pride themselves on having prevented cotton and wool and other things from being made contraband of war, and so far as I can make out only because one nation, again ineffectively and for a very brief time, said that cotton might be regarded as conditional contraband.

And Mr. Cave, one of the able lawyers of the House of Commons, in support of his contention that no nation could make cotton contraband, said:

> A thing can not be made contraband unless it is declared contraband by the belligerent power and the claim is accepted by the neutral power. After all, treating a thing as contraband is taking away property—goods and possibly the ship—of other nations with which you have no quarrel at all, and in order to establish that you must have the assent of that nation to the transaction as a whole. Neutral nations agree to form a kind of ring around the two parties who are at war and not to assist either by sending goods which will help them in their warlike operations. The mere fact that one of the two nations says, "These goods assist my enemy in his operations," does not make those goods contraband. It is always a subject of controversy between neutrals and belligerent nations as to whether the neutrals will accept a declaration of contraband.

Great Britain has by a municipal regulation sought to make cotton absolute contraband.

The order making cotton absolute contraband was not only in violation of the customs of nations but in violation of the protest of Great Britain to Russia when Russia made cotton contraband in 1904.

It disregarded the provision of the declaration of London, which only permitted a belligerent to make absolute contraband goods which could be used alone for military purposes.

This provision of the declaration of London followed the instructions from the British Government to her delegates to this conference, which advised them that it must be conceded under rules of international law that no belligerent could make anything absolute contraband which could be used for other than military purposes.

We may well protest the legality of the order of August 21, 1915, by the privy council of Great Britain making cotton absolute contraband.

It is the greatest export commodity produced in the United States. In the past century we have sold the export of cotton for $16,750,000,000. It is now, with its legitimate markets open and including cotton seed, a crop worth $1,000,000,000 a year. It furnishes employment in its culture and its manufacture to more people in the United States than any other commodity. We have no national asset of greater value.

ORDER HAS NOT SO FAR HURT COTTON.

It is true that the passage of the order making cotton absolute contraband last August did not of itself interfere with cotton shipments, but this was only because already, by the illegal orders of the privy council of Great Britain of March 1 and 11, 1915, the neutral ports of northern Europe had been blockaded.

All the commerce of citizens of the United States was, by these blockade orders of March 1 and 11, shut out from Germany and Austria, so that an order in August making cotton absolute contraband did not itself shut cotton out of Germany and Austria. It had already been shut out months before by the illegal blockade orders.

ANIMUS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

In this connection I call attention to the report of Consul General Robert P. Skinner, of London, which, on page 1055, reads as follows:

> It continues to be the case that many classes of goods, the exportation of which from the United States to neutral countries is attended with great difficulty and hazard, are going forward freely from Great Britain to the same countries, and in some cases in largely increased quantities. * * * Exports of cotton, as reported under the cotton statistics act of 1868, were as follows up to August 5, 1915:

	American bales.
To August 5, 1915	220,847
To July 30, 1914	106,382

During the months of March and August, 1915, inclusive, Great Britain, while seizing cargoes of cotton belonging to citizens of the United States and taking them into British ports, there to be sold, permitted her own citizens to ship 95,000 bales of cotton to Holland and Sweden alone, although the year previous they shipped only 6,200 bales during the same period.

Interference with shipments by citizens of the United States was lawless. The purpose of the interference is shown when citizens of Great Britain are permitted to ship American cotton to these points from which American citizens were excluded.

Sir Edward Grey and the British ambassador have sought to excuse this misconduct by pointing to increased shipments by American citizens to neutral countries of northern Europe during the year 1915. These shipments were made principally in January and February. They were not made after the British blockade was put into effect.

During the month of February, 1915, citizens of the United States shipped cotton to Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Germany to the amount of 450,000 bales.

The shipments in March, 1915, were seized and carried into British ports.

Shipments for April last dropped to 45,000 bales. Few of these reached their destination.

Shipments for May and June dropped to 25,000 bales, and finally efforts to ship cotton were practically abandoned.

There was a demand for a million bales of cotton owned by citizens of the United States in these countries from March to July. The illegal conduct of Great Britain cut off this market for the 1914 crop and cut off a market for 3,000,000 bales of the 1915 crop.

HISTORY OF COTTON SHIPMENTS SINCE WAR BEGAN.

There has been a continuous assault made upon the American cotton product in Great Britain since the war began.

During the fall of 1914 constant reports were circulated, apparently by authority in London, that cotton was about to be made contraband.

British marine insurance companies declined to insure cotton sailing to the ports of northern Europe.

The ports of Germany were not blockaded, and yet no cotton sailed to them. Practically no cotton sailed to Norway, Sweden, Denmark, or Holland.

The price of cotton in the United States fell to 6 cents a pound and less, while cotton in Germany was reported to be selling at over 20 cents a pound.

Finally, a resolution was introduced in the Senate on October 22, 1914, providing for the appointment of a committee which should seek through the State Department a formal declaration

from the British Government avowing its purposes with reference to cotton.

On the 26th of October, 1914, Sir Cecil Spring-Rice wrote Mr. Lansing, then Acting Secretary of State, as follows:

Last night I received a reply from Sir Edward Grey, in which he authorizes me to give the assurance that cotton will not be seized. He points out that cotton has not been put in any of our lists of contraband, and, as your department must be aware from the draft proclamation now in your possession, it is not proposed to include it in our new list of contraband. It is, therefore, as far as Great Britain is concerned, in the free list, and will remain there.

Mr. GALLINGER. What was the date of that answer, I will ask the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It was October 26, 1914. The absolute promise from the British Government less than two years ago in connection with this war, when possibly they did not know that Germany no longer needed cotton to make powder, was "cotton is on the free list, and will remain there."

Ah, the blush of shame must come to the cheeks of great Englishmen who for the past 20 years have been the exponents of international law, who have been the great leaders in defense of the rights of neutrals. They laid down the rules so clearly that the violation by Great Britain now is apparent. Surely Great Britain, on second thought, will rejoice once more to lead as the nation devoted to law.

This statement, furnished by Great Britain October 26, 1914, was freely circulated among cotton merchants, shipowners, and institutions in a position to finance cotton shipments.

By December cotton began to sail, with a German and Austrian destination. During the months of December, January, and February those two countries absorbed two and a quarter million bales of cotton raised in the United States.

The price of cotton began to rise, and by the early spring it had reached 10 cents a pound.

Then came the seizure of cotton under the illegal orders of Great Britain, passed March 1 and 11; cotton went down 2 cents a pound.

Later on it was discovered that the crop of 1915 was nearly 6,000,000 bales less than the crop of 1914. Besides this, the farmers had raised ample foodstuffs and were prepared to hold their cotton.

The facilities for financing loans afforded by the Federal Reserve System was another valuable aid in protecting the crop from sacrifice, and in spite of the lawless conduct of Great Britain, a fair price per pound for an ordinary-sized crop was obtained by the cotton farmers.

With their markets open, in view of the very short crop, the price would have been sufficient to have enabled them to recover some of their serious losses of the previous year.

Then, another thing is affecting the production of cotton, and that is that no potash now comes in from Germany. Nearly one-half the cotton land will practically yield little or no cotton without such an application. You can not grow cotton on some land without potash.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator means that cotton can not be grown on sandy soil without potash.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes. I was just going on to say that the land without potash is a sandy loam. In certain sections of our States where clay is found potash also is found, but in our sandy-loam lands the application of some potash by artificial addition is necessary. That is certainly the case in my own State, and I suppose it is so everywhere.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is true everywhere.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; and the inability to obtain potash, with the consequent reduction in the size of the crop, has helped to keep up the price of cotton. The customs of nations had freed cotton shipped by neutrals to belligerents from seizure. It had placed it upon a free list, which could not be made contraband and could not be subject to seizure.

Great Britain led in the protest when Russia undertook to make cotton contraband, and forced Russia to permit cotton to pass free.

Forty distinguished students of international law, meeting at the instance of Great Britain to codify the rules of international law applicable to naval warfare, unanimously agreed that cotton should head the list of items free from seizure by belligerents and which no belligerent could make contraband.

When the declaration of London was before the House of Commons in 1911 all members of the House of Commons who spoke upon the subject took the position that cotton could not be made contraband by a belligerent and must be permitted to pass free.

As late as October 26, 1914, the British Government assured our Government that cotton is, "as far as Great Britain is concerned, in the free list and will remain there."

Are we quietly to submit? Are we to permit the rights of the people of this country in commerce to be ruthlessly and knowingly disregarded? I come now to foodstuffs.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, would it interrupt the Senator from Georgia if I should ask him a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am intensely interested in this discussion, because I believe that Great Britain has gone very far beyond her rights in one direction during the progress of this European war. I will therefore ask the Senator if the State Department of this administration holds a different view from what the Senator himself does on this subject; and, if it does not, has any earnest effort been made to correct the existing condition of things?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will answer the Senator from New Hampshire. I introduced my remarks by a clear, clean, intense protest against the legality of the course of Great Britain made by the administration. The letter of March 30 is strong and emphatic. Again, the letter of October asserts our rights in the plainest and most forcible way. The position already taken by the State Department is in entire accord with every view of the law which I have presented. I am simply seeking before the Senate and the country to support those declarations of our legal right in a more elaborate way than a state paper could properly do.

FOODSTUFFS.

I wish now to bring to the attention of the Senate the illegal manner in which Great Britain has treated the commerce of neutrals in foodstuffs during the present war.

Foodstuffs have been classified uniformly as conditional contraband. Under this classification they could only be seized by a belligerent, according to the view of most nations, when they were sailing to a port of an enemy, and when the proof showed that they were there to be used by the armed forces of the enemy. If the proof failed to show that the foodstuffs were not to be used by noncombatants, then the foodstuffs had the right, shipped by neutrals, to enter a belligerent country, and no opposing belligerent had the right to seize them.

Great Britain has been seizing foodstuffs since the winter of 1914, even if they were sailing to neutral ports and without any proof that they were going to a belligerent country for the use of the military or naval forces of the opposing belligerent.

Millions of dollars of goods belonging to citizens of the United States have been ordered confiscated by the prize courts of Great Britain, when the goods were shipped to Sweden and to other neutral countries, with no proof presented that they were going to the military or naval forces of Germany or Austria or of any belligerent opposing Great Britain.

This conduct of Great Britain was used by Germany as a pretext for the submarine warfare, which was declared to be a retaliatory measure.

In February the United States addressed letters to each of the Governments urging that each withdraw from the respective lines of conduct just mentioned. Germany practically agreed to accept the proposition and Great Britain refused.

ILLEGAL ORDER OF PRIVY COUNCIL.

I have no doubt that the basis for the decision of the English prize courts is found in the order of the British privy council of October 29, 1914, which directs the following modification of the declaration of London:

PAR. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of article 35 of the declaration of London, conditional contraband shall be liable to capture on board a vessel bound for a neutral port if the goods are consigned to order, or if the ship's papers do not show who is the consignee of the goods, or if they show a consignee of the goods in territory belonging to or occupied by the enemy.

PAR. 4. In cases covered by the preceding paragraph it shall lie upon the owners of the goods to prove that their destination was innocent.

Paragraph 35 of the declaration of London provides:

Conditional contraband is not liable to capture except when found on board a vessel bound for territory belonging to or occupied by the enemy, or for the armed forces of the enemy, when it is not to be discharged in an intervening neutral port.

This provision in the declaration of London was unquestionably a correct statement of the recognized rule of international law.

The British orders just quoted directed the naval forces of that country and the prize courts of that country to abandon the rules of international law which distinguished absolute from conditional contraband.

Under the rules of international law foodstuffs could not be seized when sailing upon a vessel bound to a neutral port. By this order England determined to seize them, though sailing to a neutral port.

According to the rules of international law, a neutral could ship foodstuffs to Germany or Austria, unless it was proven to be going for the use of the military or naval forces of Germany or Austria. By this order Great Britain directed that foodstuffs should be seized if going through a neutral port consigned to private citizens in Germany or Austria. If the foodstuffs were going at all into Germany or Austria, Great Britain directed their seizure.

According to the rules of international law, the burden was upon the belligerent seizing foodstuffs to prove that they were to be used by the army or navy of the opposing belligerent.

By this order Great Britain directed foodstuffs seized and confiscated when shipped to a neutral port if consigned to order, or to consignees in Germany, or if the ship's papers did not show who was the consignee of the goods, and also required the owners of the goods to prove that their destination was innocent.

It was a clear case of action by the privy council of Great Britain, which has authority to legislate upon this subject for that Government alone, setting up an illegal regulation to be enforced against the citizens of other nationalities in utter disregard of their rights under the rules of international law.

GREAT BRITAIN CONDEMNED BY HER OWN PRECEDENTS.

Again, I will rely upon English authority to show the lawlessness of this course pursued for more than 12 months past and still pursued by Great Britain.

In 1885 the French Government announced its intention of treating rice as contraband when destined to Chinese ports north of Canton.

Lord Granville, British foreign secretary, declared that the—

British Government could not admit that provisions could be treated as contraband of war merely because they were consigned to a belligerent port. The British Government—

Said his lordship—

did not deny that provisions might acquire a contraband character under particular circumstances, as if they should be consigned directly to the fleet of a belligerent or to a port where such fleet was lying, but that there must, in any event, be circumstances relative to any particular cargo, or its destination, to displace the presumption that articles of this kind are intended for the ordinary use of life, and to show prima facie, at all events, that they are destined for military use, before they could be treated as contraband.

Lord Granville further stated:

His Majesty's Government feel themselves bound to reserve their right of protest at once against the doctrine that it is for the belligerent to decide what is and what is not contraband of war, regardless of the well-established rights of neutrals.

Lord Salisbury thus defined the position of His Majesty's Government on the question of foodstuffs:

Foodstuffs, with a hostile destination, can be considered contraband of war only if they are supplies for the enemy's forces. It is not sufficient that they are capable of being so used; it must be shown that this was in fact their destination at the time of the seizure.

When the Russian Government undertook during the Russo-Japanese war to treat foodstuffs as contraband, Lord Lansdowne protested that His Majesty's Government observed "with great concern that rice and provisions will be treated as unconditionally contraband, a step which they regard as inconsistent with the law and practice of nations. His Majesty's Government," said Lord Lansdowne, did not contest "that, in particular circumstances, provisions may acquire a contraband character, as, for instance, if they should be consigned direct to the army or fleet of a belligerent, or to a port where such fleet may be lying"; but that His Majesty's Government could not admit "that if such provisions were consigned to the port of a belligerent (even though it should be a port of naval equipment) they should therefore be necessarily regarded as contraband of war."

BRITISH STATESMEN SHOW FOODSTUFF SHOULD GO THROUGH NEUTRAL PORTS TO GERMANY.

During the debate in the House of Commons growing out of the action of Russia, Mr. Bryce, Sir Charles Dilke, and Mr. A. J. Balfour, spoke as follows:

Mr. BRYCE. Food, by the general consent of nations, was not contraband of war unless it could be clearly proved to be intended for military or naval purposes. As one well-known authority had declared, it was unjustifiable so to treat it merely because of some uncertainty as to its ultimate destination.

Sir CHARLES DILKE. As regarded the attempt of Russia to treat food and raw material under all circumstances as contraband of war simply because they were destined for Japan, that was impossible for this country to accept.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR. I must express on my own behalf a general concurrence with the views on international law expressed by all of the honorable gentlemen who have spoken.

The Russian Government yielded.

ROYAL ENGLISH COMMISSION ON FOODSTUFFS.

The English Government appointed a royal commission in 1904 to consider the question of supply of food and raw material for Great Britain in time of war.

This commission consisted of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales and 20 other leading English statesmen.

Among other things, their report contained the following statements:

As regards foodstuffs, the rule of the British and United States prize courts is that which was most fully expounded by Lord Stowell in the case of the *Jonge Margaretha*. "I take," he said, "the modern established rule to be this, that generally they (provisions) are not contraband, but may become so under circumstances arising out of the particular situation of the war. * * * The most important distinction is whether the articles were intended for the ordinary use of life or even for mercantile ships' use or whether they were going with a highly probable destination to military use." Prof. Holland states as follows the rule which, in his opinion, has all but won its way to universal acceptance:

"Provisions in neutral ships may be intercepted by a belligerent as contraband only when, being suitable for the purpose, they are on their way to a port of naval or military equipment belonging to the enemy, or occupied by the enemy's naval or military forces, or to the enemy's ships at sea, or when they are destined for the relief of a port besieged by such belligerent."

It is, however, necessary to call attention to action taken by two powers on recent occasions not in accordance with the rule as thus stated. France in 1885 announced her intention of treating rice as contraband in her war with China, on the ground of its importance as food of the Chinese people and army, conduct the more remarkable because during the whole history of international law France had been distinguished by her refusal to admit the contraband character of provisions under any circumstances. The British Government protested, but, owing to the rapid termination of the war, the controversy was carried no further.

Russia, as has been already mentioned, at the commencement of the present war went so far as to include foodstuffs in her list of absolutely contraband articles, mentioning specifically "rice, all kinds of grain, fish, fish products, beans, bean oil, and oil cake." She has, however, receded from this position in consequence of strongly expressed protests from several of the powers, Great Britain and the United States in particular, and, in accordance with the advice of a commission presided over by Prof. de Martens, has undertaken that these articles will henceforth be regarded only as conditionally contraband, according to the use to which they are to be applied.

Lord Lansdowne's dispatch of June 1, 1904, stated that "His Majesty's Government observe with great concern that rice and provisions will be treated as unconditionally contraband, a step which they regard as inconsistent with the law and practice of nations." Mr. Hay's note of August 30, with reference to the judgment of Vladivostok prize court, confiscating as contraband the cargo of the *Arabia*, consisting of railway material and flour consigned to private commercial houses in Japan, spoke of that judgment as "rendered in disregard of the settled law of nations in respect of what constitutes contraband of war." He proceeds to state as "a substantive principle of the law of nations" that "articles which, like arms and ammunition, are by their nature of self-evident warlike use, are contraband if destined for the enemy's territory, but articles which, like coal, cotton, and provisions, though of ordinarily innocent, are capable of warlike use, are not subject to capture and confiscation unless shown by evidence to be actually destined for the military or naval forces of a belligerent. The Russian claim," he adds, "obviates the necessity of blockade, renders meaningless the principles of the declaration of Paris that a blockade to be binding must be effective, obliterates all distinction between contraband and non-contraband goods, and is in effect a declaration of war against commerce of every description between the people of a neutral and those of a belligerent State."

The interest of neutral nations in the maintenance of international law (especially if the nation interested is strong enough to enforce its views) affords a further and increasingly potent guaranty of its being duly observed. It is, for instance, hardly to be expected that a neutral nation, if able to resent it, would tolerate the seizure as contraband of goods which had previously been recognized by international law as innocent. It should be remembered also that the nation which we should have the greatest reason to hope would be neutral, were Great Britain engaged in war, the United States of America, is also that which, in such a case, would be most interested in maintaining those neutral rights of which it has ever been the foremost advocate.

So it will be seen that Great Britain did not permit Russia to treat foodstuffs as subject to seizure simply because they were sailing to Japan when Russia was at war with Japan. They required Russia to show affirmatively that the particular foodstuffs were to be used by the army and navy of Japan, and not by the noncombatant population of Japan.

This could not be proved except in the rarest cases, so foodstuffs went to Japan, as Russia yielded to the British contention.

The United States took exactly the same position, and Russia also yielded to the view of the United States Government.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator to inquire whether or not, if the embargo were relieved as to foodstuffs, the Senator believes there would be any risk or danger in allowing foodstuffs to pass, arising from the possibility of including in such cargoes material that might be used for military purposes?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is a possibility. If it took place and the vessel were caught, the vessel and the cargo would be forfeited. If, in point of fact, they undertook to hide in a vessel sailing from the United States real contraband of war and they were caught, they would forfeit the ship and forfeit the goods. They would all be confiscated. That is the restriction against such reckless conduct.

I should be glad to have our inspectors at the ports see what is in the vessels and see that the manifest is true and publish it at once to the world. Give us our rights, nothing more; and give us our rights with an open hand. This would stop the possible illegal shipments suggested.

The House of Commons in 1911 had under consideration the declaration of London. The Government was urging its adoption. The opposition to the Government was opposing it.

The fight made upon the declaration by the opposition to the Government was principally because foodstuffs had not been put upon the free list where no belligerent could ever make them contraband of any character.

Mr. McKinnon Wood was undersecretary of state in charge of the debate for the Government. I will give a number of interesting expressions during that debate from members of Parliament, now leaders in Great Britain, which show how utterly Great Britain is disregarding the rights of neutrals and how fully these British leaders know that the rights of neutrals in the treatment of foodstuffs are being disregarded.

Mr. McKINNON WOOD. * * * We tried at the peace conference to have food placed on the free list. We could not secure an approach to international agreement. The declaration of London places it on the list, in accordance with the old-established British doctrine—or, at any rate, our doctrine for a long time now. * * *

Mr. McKENNA. * * * He admits, and I admit with him, that in general practice food has only been conditional contraband, the condition depending upon whether it was intended for the armed forces of the enemy. * * * The declaration of London declares that food may become contraband under precisely these conditions. * * *

Sir EDWARD GREY. * * * If food is to be declared absolute contraband, so that all food coming to any commercial port is to be stopped by a belligerent, the belligerent can only do that by driving a coach and four through what is the plain meaning of the declaration of London.

It will be observed that Mr. McKinnon Wood had stated that the provision of the declaration of London was in accordance with the old-established British doctrine—that is to say, the rule of international law—with reference to foodstuffs long recognized by Great Britain.

Sir Edward Grey, therefore, declares that a belligerent could only stop all food going to a commercial port by driving a "coach and four" through the plain meaning of "the old-established British doctrine."

Mr. BALFOUR. * * * There are great continental countries which habitually import such corn as they require through neutral ports. They can not be touched under this declaration. * * * The old practice and the old theory were that it was only when corn was actually being obviously imported for the use of soldiers or ports of equipment or the use of fortresses that then, and then only, we had any right to treat it as contraband. * * *

It will be observed that Mr. Balfour declared that under the old theory—that is to say, the established rules of international law—corn (foodstuffs) could only be treated as contraband—that is to say, seized by a belligerent—when it was being imported for the use of soldiers or ports of equipment or a fortress.

Great Britain has seized foodstuffs belonging to citizens of the United States and has confiscated them simply because it was claimed that they were going to Germany. Not that they were going for the use of the soldiers, but because they were going to Germany, even though they were to be used by the noncombatant population of Germany.

Mr. Balfour is to-day secretary of the navy of Great Britain.

Mr. BONAR LAW. They have to prove, as we have to prove, that food is destined for the armed forces of the other side.

Mr. Bonar Law is one of the leading statesmen of Great Britain, and he declares that food can only be stopped when Great Britain proves that it is destined for the armed forces of Germany.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. And in contravention of that rule, if I read the matter correctly, Great Britain has placed an embargo upon the exportation of milk to the babies of Germany at the present time.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Absolutely.

Mr. GALLINGER. They must be noncombatants.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Unquestionably. The truth is, Senators, we all know that Germany has provided her army with all the foodstuffs it needs. The resources of that country are ample for the army, and everybody knows the army will be cared for first. This interference with foodstuffs does not touch the army.

Great Britain is seizing foodstuffs simply because it is going to Germany, and seizes it going to a neutral port, unless the neutral citizen owning it can prove that it is not going to Germany.

During the debate in Commons in 1911 the following statements were made:

Mr. ATHERLY JONES. What is the law, and let the right honorable gentleman, the undersecretary, correct me if I am not stating the law aright. When I speak of law, it has no sanction except that of usage. It is a mere custom of law, but it has very powerful sanction. It has this powerful sanction that the common sense of Europe has justified the law, and justified it so far that it has never, except in one or two extravagant cases, been violated. The law is that foodstuffs, unless carried to a port of naval or military equipment, can not be seized—I mean foodstuffs in neutral vessels. That is absolutely unequivocal, and I think unanimously recognized to be the law of Europe.

Mr. Atherly Jones is one of the most distinguished law writers in Great Britain. He declares that foodstuffs can not be seized unless being carried to a port of naval or military equipment of Germany.

Mr. BUTCHER. I think my honorable friend who has spoken has laid down the law with absolute clearness when he said that the general modern practice of nations for a hundred years has been to treat food not as contraband, liable to seizure in any circumstance, but as conditional contraband, liable to seizure only when it is proved to be intended for the armed force of the enemy. We have the opinion of one undersecretary to-night; let me read the opinion of another Liberal undersecretary for foreign affairs, a man whose authority as a jurist and a statesman none of us would dispute. I refer to the Right Hon. James Bryce. He said, from his place in this House, on August 11, 1904:

"Food, by the general consent of the nations, was not contraband unless it was clearly proved to be intended for military or naval purposes."

Does the right honorable gentleman dispute the accuracy of the statement of Mr. Bryce? It has gone unchallenged in the House of Commons until to-day, and not a single jurist or anyone else has challenged it until it was challenged by the undersecretary this afternoon.

Mr. Butcher is a distinguished English statesman and law writer. He indorses the view of Viscount James Bryce that food could only be seized when clearly proved to be intended for military or naval purposes.

Mr. SHIRLEY BENN. One case in which a country tried to starve another country into submission was our own case, in 1795, when that celebrated order in council was issued instructing British cruisers to capture all vessels going into any French port that had food supplies on board. Our captains captured some, but what was the result? The United States complained that it was not legal, and the matter was left to a mixed commission, and that commission decided that it was not legal, and England had to pay not only for the value of the goods but also for the loss of market and detention. The second case was the one referred to in the House this afternoon, when France, in her war with China, declared that any rice going to any port north of Canton should be considered as contraband. What was the result? Lord Granville, the Liberal foreign minister, promptly issued a proclamation to the effect that no decision of a prize court carrying out such a doctrine would be recognized by England, and the result was that it was not carried out.

Mr. Shirley Benn, another prominent English statesman, not only agrees with those to whom I have already referred, but he further concedes the fact that, when in 1795 British cruisers seized a vessel of the United States carrying foodstuffs, solely because it was going into a French port, France being then engaged in war with Great Britain, the case was left to a mixed commission, and this commission decided that the seizure was illegal, and England not only had to pay the value of the goods, but for the loss of market and detention.

I wish, however, to read a few extracts from one of the speeches made on the floor of Parliament in 1911. It is from Sir Robert Finlay. After showing that foodstuffs could go to a neutral nation without molestation and that they could go to a belligerent port without molestation unless they were shown to be intended for the army or navy of the belligerent, he then concludes in this way. Just listen——

Mr. COLT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. COLT. I have listened with great interest to the argument of the Senator from Georgia, and I should like to ask him whether he does not think that, as the rules of municipal law are suspended in time of war, so the rules of international law are in part suspended by a belligerent in time of war; that a nation at war is in a fever or delirium where so-called rules of law, which may be made in times of peace, seem of comparatively little consequence compared with the great issue of preserving the national life; and hence that belligerents will seize upon any ambiguity in an international rule or upon any forced construction in order that they may in fact suspend the rule; and that the great defect in international law is that nations at war will not obey rules of conduct agreed to in times of peace?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President and Senators, nations, like men, are likely to be lawless if they see no danger to themselves from being lawless. Nations in times of war may be disposed to disregard law if there is no power to call them and make them regard it. But we saw in the Russo-Japanese War the power of Great Britain to call Russia when she desired by a municipal regulation to set aside international law. Russia was called, and she came back to the law. And so it may be to-day that the lawless in Great Britain have intimidated the believers in law and persuaded them to issue these illegal municipal regulations. It needs but the power of the United States, as the great neutral, to assert the rights of neutrals, and we will find the great statesmen of England glad to come back in the conduct of English affairs to the recognition of those rules of international law that they have contributed so much to create.

Now, let me read to you, from an English statesman, his opinion of what Great Britain could rely upon. I want the Senator from Rhode Island to hear what the English statesman thought Great Britain could rely upon to see that the rules of international law were enforced if Great Britain was at war. It had been suggested that while the rules of international law gave the privilege of these shipments of raw materials and foodstuffs, some other belligerent might wish to violate them. Now, let me show you where Great Britain put her reliance that the rules of international law would be enforced that would give her the supplies she needed. I read from Sir Robert Finlay, near the close of the debate upon the declaration of London in 1909:

Sir R. FINLAY. The law of conditional contraband is perfectly clear. It has always been held in this country, it has always been held in the United States, and it has been laid down authoritatively that food is contraband only if it is for the army or the fleet, and is in consequence of that part of naval or military equipment. A very able writer on international law, Mr. Hall, says the opposite view is not arguable, and a right honorable gentleman of considerable authority in these matters to whom honorable gentlemen on the other side might be disposed to listen, Mr. Bryce, our ambassador at Washington, expressed himself on this subject on the 11th of August, 1904, in a debate in the house in these terms:

"Food, by the general consent of nations, was not contraband of war unless it is clearly proved to be for military or naval purposes. In 1885 an attempt was made by France to treat rice as contraband of war. Lord Granville protested in the most energetic manner, and in point of fact rice never was treated as contraband of war."

That authority is one which, I think, is amply borne out by a more extended view of the law on this point, into which on this occasion I do not intend, of course, to enter.

* * * * * * *

Will any honorable gentleman say that any power at war with us would be likely to provoke the displeasure of the United States by declaring that corn carried in a United States vessel to this country should be absolute contraband of war? Not only is the law on the matter clear, but it has behind it, so far as we are concerned, a sanction of the most effective kind, for happily, I think, we may dismiss the very idea of the possibility of war between this country and the United States as not within the range of practical politics, and as long as we are not at war with the United States we may depend upon it that no country, however powerful, would incur the displeasure and the possible hostility of such a power as the United States by putting forward an unfounded claim to treat food brought to this country as contraband of war.

This exposition by Sir R. Finlay needs little comment. He told the British Parliament, in 1911, that no country, however powerful, would incur the displeasure, and possible hostility, of such a power as the United States by putting forward an unfounded claim to treat food brought to Great Britain as contraband of war.

I wonder what he thinks of the United States now, when we submit not only to the seizure of vessels destined to German ports carrying foodstuffs, but to the seizure of vessels destined to neutral ports of Holland and Sweden and permit Great Britain, disregarding rules of international law, by orders from the privy council, which must be followed by her prize courts, to confiscate cargoes of foodstuffs belonging to citizens of the United States with no proof whatever that they were intended for the military or naval forces of Germany?

Germany and Austria have a population of over 110,000,000 people. It is estimated that perhaps 10 per cent of these are under arms. Certainly over 90,000,000 people in these two countries are noncombatants.

By every rule of international law citizens of the United States have the right to ship to these noncombatants for their use, through the neutral ports of northern Europe, all the foodstuffs they wish to buy. The same is equally true of raw cotton.

Raw cotton is the great commodity used to clothe the world. So that Great Britain is suppressing the shipment of foodstuffs and clothing to the noncombatant population of her enemy, in utter defiance of established rules of international law, in utter defiance of rules which all of her present statesmen have within the past five years declared to be the correct rules of international law, and rules which they insist Great Britain, in case of war, could safely rely upon, because the United States would not permit them to be broken.

Only a partial knowledge of German and Austrian resources will convince all that these countries have ample internal resources to produce foodstuffs and clothing to fully supply the men under arms.

They will also supply the noncombatants to an extent which may bring pinches from want, but will not destroy. To this there may be one exception—young children may die for lack of milk.

Great Britain can not hope to accomplish anything so far as the immediate effect of the war is concerned by this lawlessness. We may find a reason for their course so far as cotton is concerned. The manufacture and exportation of cotton fabrics has been a great industry in Germany. The marvelous skill of these people as mechanics, their superiority as chemists have made markets in the world for their manufactured products which have seriously encroached upon English commerce.

If cotton can be kept out of Germany and the exports from Germany suppressed, then perhaps England may capture this trade and help her own commerce.

PRESIDENT LONDON BOARD OF TRADE DEFINES POSITION.

The frankness with which the president of the London Board of Trade, in a speech before the House of Commons on January 9, proclaimed the purposes of Great Britain almost staggers comprehension.

Let me give a few extracts. He declared that—

England will assault Germany's trade now and after the war. * * * We must keep control of the world's coal; we must secure control of the supply of oil. While the war is on we must do everything in our power to destroy German finance, credit, and trade * * * so that after the war Germany does not have the opportunity of reorganizing her commercial system before our trade has begun to flow in ever-increasing volume. * * * We must make it clear, however, that when peace comes we will not permit the outbreak of the economic war which Germany would wage against ourself and our allies. * * * It has been all along the policy of the board of trade to capture German trade while the war is still on. In the case of South America, we have since the war began developed a trade which, I hope, will continue long after the cessation of hostilities.

In the course of the debate there were some references to the danger of competition with the United States, to which John Halford Mackinder replied:

The member has spoken of America as a dangerous commercial rival, but I can not conceive of that competition taking the complex, scientific, and destructive form of Germany's competition.

On the day following this speech cable reports advised us that—

Insertion of a clause in the peace agreement binding Germany to refrain from all export business for a period of years is one of the methods suggested by British trade experts to cripple German trade after the war. Leading London business men generally approved the statement made by President Walter Runciman, of the board of trade, in commons last night that Great Britain must so cripple German commerce that the Germans can not again dispute world supremacy with the British nation.

The commercial rights of citizens of the United States and of other neutrals are being recklessly disregarded by Great Britain. They are being disregarded in part to destroy Germany commercially and in part to advance the trade of Great Britain.

Shall we quietly continue to furnish Great Britain what she is compelled to obtain from the United States while the commercial rights of citizens of this country are trampled under foot?

Great Britain can not continue the war without munitions from the United States.

Great Britain can not feed her population without foodstuffs from the United States and other neutrals.

Great Britain can not keep her million and a half people engaged in the Lancashire mills at work 60 days without cotton from the United States.

Great Britain can not accomplish her scheme for world-wide domination of commerce in her vast products of cotton-manufactured fabrics without cotton from the United States.

The administration has forcefully brought to the attention of Great Britain the rights of citizens of this country.

It has been demonstrated that citizens of neutral countries have the right to ship foodstuffs and cotton in unlimited quantities through the neutral ports of northern Europe to the noncombatant inhabitants of Germany and Austria.

The Congress of the United States slept over the right of shippers of foodstuffs last winter. This was perhaps because the prices were good, perhaps because we did not investigate the subject.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTING in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. Does not the Senator think that Great Britain, of course, realizing that she can not carry on her war without munitions from the United States, and foodstuffs, and so forth, also understands that the United States will not forego the business opportunity of supplying those things to Great Britain, and that therefore she does not feel uneasy about the situation?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. She may think that is true, and she may think that these influences are so great that the United States would not, but she knows that we could do without shipments for 60 or 90 days, and she can not. She knows that we would be suspending profits while she would be going to absolute ruin. One word further, she knows that we are right and that she is wrong.

Mr. BORAH. But she understands, of course, that she is fighting for her existence and that we are unwilling to deny ourselves the opportunity which that situation presents.

I am delighted to hear the Senator's argument, but it is a practical question. Does the Senator believe that by any possibility we could pass through the Congress of the United States an inhibition against or an embargo upon the shipment of those things which Great Britain needs?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If I could have the support of the able Senator from Idaho, I would be glad to join him in passing such a provision—to go into effect in 30 days, unless Great Britain in the meantime receded from her orders in council and recognized our rights of international law.

Mr. BORAH. That would make two.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Here is another.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. With the support of the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Arkansas we could well hope for the balance.

Mr. BORAH. I think I can, in the Senate, count five or six.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I can count a good many more than that on this side.

Mr. BORAH. Then let us get to business; decide what it is wise and just to do.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then let the Senator from Idaho give me one of his splendid speeches in support of this policy and we will go hand and shoulder together. I am simply presenting suggestions for the thought of the Senate now. I am seeking to lay the rights of our countrymen and the power of our country before you, and if the Senator from Idaho is ready to join I am more encouraged by that fact than by anything I have heard.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I manifested my disposition as to the shipment of munitions of war last year when the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] introduced his resolution. I will say to the Senator that I am perfectly willing, as a Senator, to take action both with reference to protecting our rights upon the sea and upon the land, on the ocean and in Mexico. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to assume the responsibility not of speech but of action. I have but one guide in these matters—the interests, rights, and safety of Americans. I am neither anti-English nor anti-German. Wherever American rights are invaded, American property destroyed, or American lives sacrificed, I am willing to proceed to action along any wise and effective line which will insure a recognition or respect of those rights and protection to the lives of our people. I realize that such things require reflection, but I have reflected and I am willing to vote upon effective measures now.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I can not say how gratified I am to hear the expression of the Senator from Idaho. I had not heard it from him before, but I am not surprised. It is what I would expect from him, with my estimate of him as a man and a Senator.

The lawlessness of Great Britain has increased greatly during the past 12 months. Each day brings new evidence of disregard for neutral rights.

By firmness, but peacefully, neutrals can easily obtain their rights from both belligerents.

Paraphrasing the language of Mr. Jefferson, England may feel the desire of absorbing the commerce of Germany and of starving her people, but she can have no right of doing it at our loss or of making us the instrument of it.

Mr. President, I am in favor of enforcing our rights against all the belligerent nations. I am in favor of action by Congress which will let the belligerents understand that unless our rights are promptly regarded we will act, and such knowledge in London as the expressions of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] going to London will help those men in London who believe in the law. They will help bring a rescision from the illegal orders in council, for when they know that we are in earnest they must stop and think, and then return to the principles which they have so long advocated, and which they must find no pleasure to set aside.

APPENDIX.

ABSCHRIFT CENTRALSTELLE FUR
WISSENSCHAFTLICH-TECHNISCHE
UNTERSUCHUNGEN, G. M. B. H.,
Neubabelsberg, den 3. Dez. 1915.

HOWARD W. BIBLE, Esq.,
Hotel Adlon, Berlin.

SIR: An interesting chapter in the history of chemical industry will be the account of the technical achievements which have been produced during this great war.

Ever since the chemist Leblanc under the pressure of the continental blockade effected the manufacture of soda from cooking salt in France, the problem has often been solved in Germany of also making her independent of other countries by the manufacture of hitherto indispensable foreign products from native raw materials. Never, however, has the great creative power of chemical research been so in evidence as in the course of this war in which the enemies of the central powers aim to conquer them by cutting off their supply of imported raw materials. Such materials which we used to import by sea in time of peace we now manufacture from the air surrounding us, from the water, and our native soil to an extent that makes us absolutely independent of other countries. Problems, the solution of which still seemed an impossibility only a few years ago, such as the manufacture of nitrogen products from the air, have matured to accomplished facts in the chemist's laboratory.

Therefore it seems astonishing that even learned scientists of foreign countries who are regarded as experts in the field of chemical research consider problems which we have long since solved as impossible of solution. Thus it is surprising when the opinion is expressed among well-known chemists in England that to shut off her supply of cotton could destroy Germany's defensive power, even force her to conclude peace within a few months because the lack of cotton would make the manufacture of the required amount of gunpowder impossible, and thus put us at the mercy of our enemies who were not hampered by such restrictions. (Ramsay, Times, Dec. 8, 1915: "Stop cotton and we should stop the war.")

Is that really the opinion of this scientist? Does he not know what every expert in explosives should know, that cotton cellulose, as used in the manufacture of ammunition, can in every respect be replaced by wood cellulose, an unlimited supply of which is always on hand in Germany? In time of peace Mr. Ramsay had ample opportunity to become acquainted with a large part of the German chemical industry. Does he really underestimate it so much that he does not consider it able to turn wood cellulose into a form in which it can be used instead of cotton for the manufacture of gunpowder?

It is true that a much more extensive cleaning of wood cellulose is necessary, if the existing machinery is to be used, and no time lost nor any more nitric acid consumed. It was necessary to give the manufacturers of cellulose some instruction in regard to the chemical and physical requirements of the product. But the fulfillment of these requirements presented no difficulty. The manufacture of nitrocellulose from wood fiber and its conversion into gunpowder, which is absolutely on a par with that made from cotton in respect of its durability and its ballistic properties, had long been solved in all its details in our laboratories. It had only to be transferred from the laboratory to the factories, which was not difficult, thanks to the expert knowledge of the chemists in the factories. Thus wood cellulose is since considerable time being used on a vast scale by the plants in the manufacture of nitrocellulose. The need for raw cotton is no longer felt in our gunpowder industry. The capacity of our cellulose factories exceeds many times the demand for cellulose for nitrating purposes.

After the war the world will learn of many great new achievements which our chemical industry had to and was able to accomplish in order to protect our German fatherland against all the efforts of the enemy to cut off its supply of food and ammunition. Many of these products will continue after the war is over. Even in times of peace they will be valuable in making us independent of foreign raw materials.

It looks very much as if the successes achieved by the cellulose industry will be among these.

Dr. W. WILL,
Professor at the University of Berlin;
Director of the Central Bureau for Technico-Scientific Research.

JANUARY 7, 1916.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Last October while in Washington I stated to you that during my visits to Germany, in the months of June, July, August, and September, 1915, I had been assured that cotton was no longer used in and no longer, in any sense, essential for, the manufacture of powder or explosives in Germany. As I was intending to return to Germany in November, I agreed to make a personal investigation of this subject and give you the results of that investigation. I also agreed that as soon as I reached a conclusion I would wire you, and I agreed with you upon a code to be used, in which the word "commodity" was to be substituted for the word "cotton" and the name "John Thomson" signed to the wire instead of my own. In pursuance of that agreement on December 4, 1915, after a full investigation of the subject in Germany, I sent you the following wireless message:

"Absolute evidence that commodity is not required. Substitute more effective, cheaper, and preferred for future use.

"(Signed) JOHN THOMSON."

Before sending this message I had made a most careful and unrestricted investigation of the present method of the manufacture of powder and explosives in Germany, and I satisfied myself that wood cellulose had been successfully substituted for cotton in the nitrating plants of Germany.

I reached Bremen November 28 and brought my desire for a personal investigation upon this subject at once to the attention of those largely interested in handling cotton in the Empire. I transmitted to them your request for information along the lines indicated, and they at once extended their cooperation and influence with the German Government in order that the facts might be secured.

A series of meetings were held in Bremen, and on Tuesday, December 1, President Alfred Lohman, of the Bremen Chamber of Commerce, accompanied me to Berlin for the purpose of presenting the case before the several departments of German Government, whose consent was necessary before the facts could be obtained and the necessary investigation conducted. It was arranged that I should appear before a meeting in Berlin, where the representatives of the several departments of the Government would be assembled to hear the presentation of your request that this information be furnished, and to determine whether or not it was to the interests of the German Government to comply therewith.

This meeting was held at the imperial foreign office December 3 at 5.30 p. m. It was recognized as a purely commercial matter, one involving the business interests of the United States and the German Empire, and was not regarded as an infraction of diplomatic usage.

There were present His Excellency Unterstaatssecretär Richter, Ministerial Director Muller, Geheimrat Dr. Mathies, department of interior; Ministerial Director Johannes, Geheimrat Dr. Grunewald, imperial foreign office; Rittmeister Markwald, war department; Geheimrat Dr. Stimming, finance department; Kaptain Trapp and a scientific doctor, navy department; Alfred Lohman, president of the Bremen Chamber of Commerce.

These gentlemen gave the strictest attention to the subject of our several interviews and the correspondence that passed between us rela-

tive to the unlawful restriction placed upon cotton, which I presented at considerable length, placing particular emphasis upon the value of proof that cotton was in no wise an essential element to the progress of the war as a necessity for the manufacture of explosives.

At the conclusion of my remarks I was assured by all present that cotton was no longer used or necessary in Germany for the manufacture of powder or explosives, and that the German Government would gladly extend to me every facility for securing such proof as I deemed necessary, and which might be obtained by a careful inspection of the manufacture of explosives in one or more plants operated by the Imperial Government, the selection of such plant or plants being left entirely to me. I was given an outline of where the principal powder plants were located adjacent to Berlin and authorized to select for inspection any I might prefer. I decided on the morning of December 4 to inspect the Kemiglichen Munitionsfabriken at Spandau. Accompanied by President Lohman, I reached the above plant about 10 a. m. The inspection of the various departments was at once begun, and we were accompanied in this inspection by the commanding officer of the works, Maj. Gorke, of the German Army, and Mr. von der Bocks, Koniglicher Betriebleiter der Technischen Instituten der Artillerie.

The fullest access was given to all processes of the nitrating of cotton and cellulose and a notable freedom of investigation was a feature of our visit to this plant. We first inspected the warehouses utilized for the storing of the raw material for nitrating. The first warehouse visited was entered by a railroad track with platforms on either side, and bales of wood cellulose were at the time being unloaded from freight cars. I made a careful inspection of the entire platforms on either side and found nothing there but wood cellulose and rags. Going among this stock, I directed that several bales should be opened and samples of wood cellulose were secured from the following manufacturers:

1. Altdamn—Stahlhammer (Natronzellstoff).

2. Sulphide cellulose of the cellulose manufactory, Waldhof-Mannheim.

3. Sulphide cellulose of the A. G. fur Maschinenpapier-fabrikation, Aschoffenburg.

4. Sulphide cellulose of the cellulose manufactory at Tilsit.

We then secured samples of nitrating material from rags. These samples were marked with the manufacturers' names—"Jackson" and "Breitenau." Absolutely no cotton linters were found upon this level of the warehouse and only a few bales were in evidence on the upper floor. These had been in stock for some time and were placed at one side, having been definitely rejected in favor of the use of wood cellulose and rags.

In regard to the rags, would say that all evidence pointed to their early elimination as a material for nitrating. In fact, the incoming supplies were apparently confined to wood cellulose, and there was no evidence to support a contention that dependence was being placed on rags. Leaving the warehouses, we proceeded to the buildings which were employed for the use of drying nitrocellulose and rags. The two commodities were placed in small perforated iron receptacles, which were closely packed and passed to the drying process. A careful inspection of work under way disclosed a large preponderance of wood cellulose, as compared to rags. The work in this department was entirely done by women and girls. In passing from the drying building, we entered the departments where nitrating was in progress and inspected three houses devoted exclusively to the nitrating of wood cellulose and one devoted entirely to the nitrating of rags.

In all of these houses I made a careful inspection of the tanks, causing several to be opened and obtaining therefrom absolute evidence of the use of wood cellulose or rags, as the case might be. Furthermore, I examined the pipe conveyers and ascertained the contents thereof, and in each case found it to be as stated—either wood cellulose or rags. Proceeding from the nitrating department, we came to the washing department, where the nitrated material is washed, and again I made a careful inspection of the contents of the washing tanks and confirmed the use of wood cellulose or rags. Passing from this department, we entered the building where grinding was in progress, and I ascertained beyond all doubt the nature of the materials so treated. The wood cellulose or rags was then rewashed, which concluded the process of preparation (and proved conclusively that no difference existed, whether the guncotton was prepared from linters, rags, or wood cellulose). During the process of this investigation special attention was directed to the easy absorbing capacity of the wood cellulose, and it was stated that wood cellulose contained when nitrated an especially high amount of nitrate (more than 13 per cent). On account of the cleanness of the wood cellulose the finished powder is especially described "bestandig"—that is, immune against decomposition. In the nature of cost, wood cellulose was declared to be one-third less than the price of linters. Before proceeding to the commercial effect of the restriction in the movement of cotton upon the future I would call attention to an illustration of effect of ignition upon nitrated materials, namely, rags and wood cellulose.

Quantities of both of these materials, after nitration, were taken from the buildings and placed upon the ground at some distance and there ignited by alcohol. no real difference being discernible between the action of the explosive force of the rags and wood cellulose. The nature of flame, response, character of smoke thrown off, and duration of action seemed identical. Later I was shown a similar demonstration in the smokeless powder derived from both materials, and again could find no difference. I merely state this as an instance of observation, for I am not in a position to give any technical information of value in the matter of witnessing such explosions. The illustration came about through the repeated statements that the forces of the allies could determine the difference in the character of ammunition used. This is said to be beyond the range of human possibility by explosive experts with whom I have discussed the matter, and is borne out by these demonstrations.

During the inspection of the Spandau Works, the following interesting facts were gleaned from Maj. Gorke and other officers, namely, that: Prior to August, 1914, all gunpowder and explosives were produced from saltpeter nitrogen, manufactured from saltpeter imported from Chile; that cotton linters prior to that date were exclusively used, and were mostly imported from the United States; that until seven years ago camphor, an essential part in the manufacture of explosives, was imported from Japan. The high price of camphor then induced German chemical manufacturers to produce synthetic camphor, which was manufactured to a great extent by the use of turpentine oil. The turpentine oil was an American product and large quantities, running into the millions of dollars in value, were imported for this purpose. The stoppage of this exportation from America by Great Britain compelled the German chemists to seek for a new substitute, and synthetic camphor is produced to-day from another material, which is considerably cheaper than turpentine and more effective than Japanese camphor. It is therefore shown that the German ammunition manufacturers have successfully solved all important questions, and that within the German domain is contained all necessary materials. At this time Germany is supplying, to a large extent, the ammunition demands of Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey, and has several months' reserves on hand for the necessities of most stringent warfare.

The losers by Great Britain's action are therefore:

First. Chile, two-thirds of whose saltpeter production, prior to the outbreak of war, found its way to Germany, for with the establishment of an industry for the production of nitrogen from the air, at a cost of 100,000,000 marks, this product will hereafter be supplied by Germany, and a saving has already been effected, for the price of Chilean saltpeter compared with German saltpeter is 9 as against 7 marks. This not only enables Germany to meet her own demands after the conclusion of war, but to become a competitor with Chile in the markets of the world.

Second. America, from whose cotton fields almost all the linters used in the manufacture of gunpowder and explosives were supplied. Now, in times of war and peace this demand is entirely removed, for the solution of the cellulose problem enables Germany to effect a considerable saving in cost and will lead, upon the conclusion of peace, to the elimination of linters from the manufacture of explosives.

Third. America, from whom supplies of turpentine oil were obtained at a cost of many millions of marks through the enforced substitution of a commodity created by necessity and claimed to be the superior of this American natural product.

In the matter of cotton holdings, it can be definitely stated that there is an ample sufficiency in hand to meet all military demands for the next three years, such as uniforms, hospital supplies, and other purposes. The same is said to be the case with wool, and one thing is certain, namely, that large purchases of wool and cotton in Turkey were made by the newly formed Deutsch-Orientelische Handelsgesellschaft, of which Mr. Alfred Lohman is president.

Returning to the question of the use of wood cellulose as a component part of manufacture of explosives, I would direct attention to the fact that 49 manufacturers' plants are engaged in the manufacture of wood pulp in the German Empire, and as a part of this report I submit a list of the names and locations of these plants.

I would furthermore direct attention to the fact that wood cellulose is used in explosives in the same relative manner as is cotton, namely, as a propellent; that the extent to which cotton has been used in this connection does not justify the statements so frequently circulated since the cotton question became an acute war issue.

Without the use of cellulose or rags there is a sufficiency of linters in German Government hands, but with the solution brought about by the perfection of wood pulp within the past 60 days a large amount of Government-owned linters have been released for industrial demands, and I saw at one place 3,000 bales of linters which were released by the Government to manufacturers because not required for military purposes. Careful inquiries from every source of knowledge at my command, namely, observation in the zones of activity, the statements of military authorities, the reports of the war press representatives, and the first-hand knowledge of civilians who have witnessed the passage of supplies to the various parts of the front, convinced me that there has been no necessity for a change in the manufacture of guns; that the wood cellulose propellent is of equal strength to the cotton propellent; that the rifling of the large arms of the service as well as the small weapons does not demand a change due to the difference of propellents in explosives, the same firing chamber being used to equal advantage.

I directed my investigations in these channels as far as possible not only on this present trip to Germany, but upon the numerous occasions which have presented themselves since the war began and which carried me to many parts of Germany and Belgium and the regions of military activities. One prominent attaché assured me that throughout his entire observation of German military progress, artillery was employed with the greatest freedom, and that at no time was there any scarcity of shells nor evidence of a varied nature of explosives employed. In concluding my report upon this important and far-reaching subject, I desire to note my interest in the matter by stating that I have absolutely no affiliation nor connection with any company or individual, either American, German, or of other nationality, who is engaged in or would profit by the movement of cotton from the United States to Germany. My interest in this matter is wholly political, for I feel that the Southern States have been deprived unfairly of one of their greatest markets; that the British Government has been forced against its will to act in bad faith by making cotton contraband; that certain Liverpool interests, actuated by purely financial reasons, were behind the false statements which developed into a preconceived campaign of misrepresentation as to the use of cotton for explosives; that is the extent to which cotton can be employed. For this reason I secured an opinion from Prof. Will, of the University of Berlin, and I am pleased to submit his letter of December 3, 1915, bearing on this subject. I will add that my real interest in seeing a restoration of commerce, guaranteed by the law of nations between Germany and the United States, comes through my desire to bring about a movement of dyestuffs from Germany to the United States. Having been instrumental in the securance of supplies of these important materials from Germany during the autumn and winter of 1914, I have closely followed the possibilities of providing American industries and labor with such essentials, and I find to-day that we are facing a serious industrial problem, which can only be overcome by a speedy solution of the commercial relations between Germany and the United States.

Very respectfully, yours, HOWARD W. BIBLE.

During the delivery of the speech of Mr. SMITH of Georgia,

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

After the conclusion of the speech of Mr. SMITH of Georgia,

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this war has been prolific on the part of all the belligerents of violations of the rules of inter-

national law as we have understood it heretofore. The Senator from Georgia deserves great credit for calling attention to the manner in which the British Government in one way or another has violated the rules of international law in respect to American commerce. Most of our commerce during the war has filtered into or through the little neutral countries of northern Europe—Holland, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. Most of the commerce which has been held up by the British orders in council has been commerce and traffic plying to those countries.

Now, while in no manner justified, on the contrary I entirely agree with the conclusions reached by the Senator from Georgia in respect to the conduct of Great Britain, yet in this connection I want to present to the Senate another side of the picture. There are those four little countries that I have referred to in northern Europe. I have a list in my hand here of the number of merchant ships of those countries which have been sunk by German submarine boats and German mines since the war began up to the 14th of this month, and the list is perfectly startling. These are merchant vessels, traders. I will say that I have compiled this list from the leading commercial newspapers of the city of New York that have from day to day published an account.

The total number of vessels sunk by submarines, mines, and by warships—the latter being only one—is 134. One hundred and three have been sunk by German submarines, 30 have been sunk by mines, some of them German and perhaps some of them English, and 1 was sunk by a war vessel.

I have been able in this list to give the names of the vessels and to give the date when they were torpedoed or sunk. It appears from this list of 134 vessels that the total number of Dutch ships sunk is 11, the total number of Danish ships sunk is 15, the total number of Swedish ships sunk is 27, and the total number of Norwegian ships sunk is 81.

As I said the other day, since the German merchant marine has been eliminated from ocean traffic most of the trade traffic is carried on by our own ships, some by the English, and to a large extent by these neutrals.

I am unable to give in this list the tonnage of all the vessels. In some instances the tonnage has been given. Neither am I able to give a list of the people who have been destroyed when the ships were sunk, but it is a horrible record. In many instances many of the poor sailors, the crews on these vessels, have perished by reason of the submarines.

Now, there is this difference, to which I want to call the Senator's attention, between the British method and the German method. The British have held up our ships, taken them into port, searched their cargo and taken out what they conceived to be improper and either confiscated it or commandeered it, but in the main they have let the ships go; they have not destroyed the ships. The Germans have not only destroyed the cargo but they have destroyed the ships, and in many instances they have killed the crews on these vessels.

Of course these four little neutral countries of Holland, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden are, in the face of these great powers, helpless. They have to submit to this treatment. I bring this to the attention of the Senate in order that when the great country of the United States intervenes in this matter it will see to it that the traffic of these neutral countries is protected—protected not only in the interest of our commerce, but in the interest of fair play to these neutral nations.

Just think of it, 134 vessels destroyed, mainly by German submarines, since the war commenced.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Can the Senator give us the locality of those vessels, where they were principally?

Mr. NELSON. I can not give the locality. It has been done along the Norwegian and Swedish and Danish coast and the Holland coast in nearly every instance. I will say, in addition to that list, there are a great many Scandinavian vessels that have been taken into German ports, and have been condemned in their prize courts. There have been two or three instances where German warships have seized Swedish vessels within Sweden's territorial waters. One occurred a short time ago. They finally released it.

So, Mr. President, without intending to take up the time of the Senate any further, in view of the able speech of the Senator from Georgia, and in view of the fact that he presented one side of this picture of interfering with neutral rights, I felt it incumbent on me to present the other side of it, that the people of this country may see just what has transpired.

Mr. President, I ask that this list may be incorporated, without reading, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTING in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list referred to is as follows:

Data concerning the sinking of neutral vessels belonging to the northern neutral nations, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Holland, and which were sunk by belligerents engaged in the present European war by means of submarines, mines, or warships between the dates Aug. 1, 1914, and Jan. 14, 1916.

Nationality.	Tonnage.	Sunk by—	Name.	Date of sinking.
Norwegian	1,507	Submarine	Pluton	Aug. 1, 1914–Feb., 1915.
Do		Mine	Gottfried	Aug. 27, 1914.
Do		do	Hesvik	Sept. 23, 1914.
Do		do	Tromo	Oct. 14, 1914.
Do		do	Vaaren	Dec. 17, 1914.
Do		do	Boston	Dec. 22, 1914.
Do		do	Eli	Dec. 25, 1914.
Do		do	Castor	Jan. 10, 1915.
Do		do	Bjerka	Feb. 20, 1915.
Do		Submarine	Semantha	Feb. 3, 1915.
Do		Mine	Regin	Feb. 23, 1915.
Do		Submarine	Belridge	Do.
Do		do	Nor	Apr. 1, 1915.
Do		do	Eva	Apr. 22, 1915.
Do		Mine	Caprivi	Apr. 24, 1915.
Do		Submarine	Lalla	Apr. 30, 1915.
Do		do	America	May 1, 1915.
Do		do	Baldwin	Do.
Do		do	Oscar Fr'stad	May 3, 1915.
Do		do	Oscar, Arendal	Do.
Do		do	Martha	May 15, 1915.
Do		Mine	Maricopa	May 19, 1915.
Do		Submarine	Minerva	May 22, 1915.
Do		do	Gubona	June 2, 1915.
Do		do	Superba	Do.
Do		do	Glitterind	June 7, 1915.
Do		do	Trudvang	Do.
Do		do	Belleglade	June 13, 1915.
Do		do	Devanger	June 14, 1915.
Do		do	Granit	June 16 1915.
Do		do	Gerda	1915.
Do		do	Truma	June 23, 1915.
Do		do	Thistlebank	June 30, 1915
Do	1,925	do	Cumbuskenneth	Do.
Do	1,094	do	Gjeso	Do.
Do		do	Katka	Do.
Do	914	do	Marna	Do.
Do	1,448	do	Fiery Cross	July 5, 1915.
Do		Mine	Peik	Do.
Do		Submarine	Lysaker	July 8, 1915.
Do		do	Svein Jarl	July 9, 1915.
Do		do	Nordaas	July 10, 1915.
Do	1,073	do	Harboe	July 15, 1915.
Do		do	Rym	Do.
Do		do	Nordlyset	July 22, 1915
Do	3,819	do	Fimreite	July 26, 1915.
Do		do	Sogndalen	July 27, 1915
Do		do	G. F. Harbitz	Do.
Do	2,730	do	Trondhjemsfjord	July 30, 1915.
Do		do	Vandis	Aug. 5, 1915.
Do		do	Horman	Aug. 7, 1915.
Do	1,081	do	Geiranger	Aug. 9, 1915.
Do		do	Morna	Aug. 11, 1915.
Do	189	do	Jason	Aug. 10, 1915.
Do		do	Aura	Aug. 13, 1915.
Do	820	do	Ramulus	Aug. 14, 1915.
Do	649	do	Mineral	Do.
Do	1,381	do	Bras	Aug. 19, 1915.
Do	1,063	do	Magda	Do.
Do		do	Sverresborg	Do.
Do		do	Kong Guttorm	Aug. 28, 1915.
Do	884	do	Glimt	Sept. 5, 1915.
Do	1,639	do	Storesand	Sept. 7, 1915.
Do		do	Norte	Sept. 15, 1915.
Do	563	do	Actie	Oct. 1, 1915.
Do		do	Florida	Do.
Do	1,398	do	Salerno	Oct. 14, 1915.
Do	987	do	Selma	Oct. 26, 1915.
Do	1,091	do	Eidsiva	Nov. 1, 1915.
Do	5,600	do	Wacousta	Nov. 14, 1915
Do	1,659	Mine	San Miguel	Nov. 17, 1915.
Do	2,379	do	Ulriken	Nov. 18, 1915.
Do	516	Submarine	Klar	Nov. 26, 1915
Do		do	Hercules	Dec. 1, 1915.
Do	782	do	Nereus	Dec. 10, 1915.
Do	780	do	Ingstad	Do.
Do	712	do	Nico	Dec. 19, 1915.
Do		do	Homelen	Dec. 29. 1915.
Do	1,912	Mine	Rigi	Dec. 30, 1915.
Do	2,275	Submarine	Fridtjof Nansen	Jan. 6, 1916.
Do	1,158	do	Bonheur	Jan. 7, 1916.
Swedish	2,534	Mine	St. Paul	Aug. 1, '14–Feb., '15.
Do	1,461	do	Alice	Do.
Do	1,183	do	Atle	Do.
Do	1,412	do	Andreas	Do.
Do		do	Droit	Aug. 1, '14–Feb., '15.
Do		Submarine	Heima	Mar. 13, 1915.
Do		do	Elida	May 1, 1915.
Do		do	Elisa	May 2, 1915.
Do		do	M. Roosvall	May 28, 1915.
Do		do	Bergladen	June 22, 1915.
Do		do	Minosa	Do.
Do		do	Fram	June, 1915.
Do		do	Otis	June 22, 1915.
Do		do	Kipple	June 2, 1915
Do		Mine	Daisy	July 14, 1915.
Do		Submarine	Capella	July 22, 1915.
Do		do	Emma	July 28, 1915.
Do		do	Sogndalen	July 27, 1915.

Data concerning the sinking of neutral vessels belonging to the northern neutral nations, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, etc.—Continued.

Nationality.	Tonnage.	Sunk by—	Name.	Date of sinking.
Swedish	303	Submarine	Fortuna	July 29, 1915.
Do	3,779	do	Malmland	Aug. 7, 1915.
Do		do	Mal	Aug. 9, 1915.
Do	804	do	Disa	Aug. 25, 1915.
Do		do	Sven Renstrum	Sept. 5, 1915.
Do	1,167	do	Frosvik	Sept. 22, 1915.
Do	1,601	do	Texelstroom	Oct. 7, 1915.
Do	1,013	do	Wolf	Nov. 1, 1915.
Do	1,229	do	Nereus	Nov. 28, 1915.
Danish	272	Mine	Skuli Fogeti	Aug. 1, 1914–Feb., 1915.
Do	1,270	do	Hamma	Do.
Do	580	do	Mary	Do.
Do		Submarine	Cathay	May 5, 1915.
Do		do	Betty	May 26, 1915.
Do		do	Soborg	May 31, 1915.
Do		do	Nogill	July 27, 1915.
Do		do	Maria	July 28, 1915.
Do		do	Neptunis	Do.
Do		do	Lena	Do.
Do		do	Hans Emil	Aug. 7, 1915.
Do		do	Frode	Sept. 5, 1915.
Do	1,217	do	Thorvaldsen	Sept. 22, 1915.
Do	82	do	Veset	Sept. 28, 1915.
Do	1,229	do	Minsk	Dec. 10, 1915.
Dutch	2,336	Mine	Houtdijk	Aug. 1, 1914–Feb., 1915.
Do	927	do	Nieuland	Do.
Do	2,804	Submarine	Maria	Do.
Do		do	Media	Mar. 13, 1915
Do		Mine	Scheiland	Apr. 1, 1915.
Do		Warship	Katwyk	Apr. 14, 1915.
Do	9,000	Mine	Emma	Sept. 22, 1915.
Do	4,815	Submarine	Emdyke	Sept. 25, 1915.
Do	2,229	do	Ellewoutsdijk	Dec. 7, 1915.
Do		Mine	Erin	Dec. 29, 1915.
Do	2,609	do	Mooshaven	Jan. 14, 1916.

Total tonnage of Norwegian ships	44,030
Total tonnage of Swedish ships	16,839
Total tonnage of Dutch ships	25,720
Total tonnage of Danish ships	4,650
Total available tonnage of ships destroyed	91,239
Total number of ships sunk by submarines	103
Total number of ships sunk by mines	30
Total number of ships sunk by warships	1
Total number destroyed	134
Total number of Norwegian ships	81
Total number of Swedish ships	27
Total number of Danish ships	15
Total number of Dutch ships	11
Total number of ships sunk	134

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], with his usual good, hard, sound common sense, has said several things well worthy of remembrance, and especially this one thing, that there never was a war in the world between two or more great powers possessing land or sea strength when the rights of neutrals were strictly respected.

Mr. President, we carried on a war with France for quite a while once, when neither the French Republic nor the American Republic ever declared war, but the forces of the two countries were fighting one another upon the high seas, because the French Republic, under the control of the Convention, had defied every international law known up to that date.

Not long after that Great Britain, joining in with Prussia and with Austria, the continental powers, in making war upon the French Republic, violated nearly every right of neutrality the world had ever recognized by international law.

Mr. President, in all these troubles—this one and the previous trouble—there has been this marked distinction that goes to the heart of every man who has a heart. There was a class of hostilities and troubles that threatened and sacrificed our property. There was a class of hostilities and troubles that threatened and sacrificed our lives. Although I am not a great admirer of the ex-President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, and never have been in a political sense, though his relations and mine personally have always been pleasant, he has said one thing that I, at least, think to be true, that any comparison between what the United States owes to her citizenship in connection with the sacrifice of life and what she owes to her citizenship in connection with the sacrifice of property is a comparison between resenting murder and resenting petty larceny. That utterance of Roosevelt is worth sinking into all your minds, and let it sink. It is true.

Mr. President, we had a war over here between the States not very many years ago as history goes, a great many years ago as the ordinary individual life goes, and what did your people do to mine? Was it your Army that whipped us? You know it was not. If it had not been for the women and children and men whom you starved to death and the soldiers who could no longer wear a uniform and shoot, because they had nothing to eat, I imagine we might have been fighting yet. Your Navy whipped us. Your sea power strangled us. Your sea power starved our civil population first and then starved our army afterwards.

The Confederate soldier was the most quixotic human being in the world, I reckon. He was fed on Sir Walter Scott's novels and upon the ideas of chivalry that he drank from that source and from others. We sometimes made complaint, as Admiral Semmes did, that a Yankee vessel had armor on it while our vessel did not, and that it was "not a gentlemanly way of fighting." We sometimes made complaint as an old friend of mine did, that he was captured by the Yankees because he was mounted on a Yankee mule and the mule went back to the braying of the other artillery mules in the Yankee line, in the battery from which the mule had been captured. Most quixotic claims were made by all of us; but there never was a Confederate from Jeff Davis down to the humblest soldier who ever "pleaded the baby act" because his wife and children and he were starved by your Navy.

You would not even let quinine come in. You would not let quinine come for your own soldiers at Andersonville to be administered by a Federal surgeon when Jeff Davis proposed it to you.

Now, I am not complaining here. My forefathers did not complain. War is war. It is not a system of caressing. [Laughter.] War is carried on subject to certain rules of civilized warfare. We people down there for a little while thought that Sherman was a regular barbarian. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] will remember that. You people thought for a little while that Admiral Semmes was "a sea pirate," at least you said so. Are they not both angels compared with what we have seen lately in Europe? Sherman did not do anything except to burn down houses of noncombatants and issue orders at Atlanta that noncombatants must get out of Atlanta, when the poor, helpless women and children had to "trek" as best they could. But that is absolutely angelic in comparison with what has been done lately in this European war. Who ever dreamed at that time that any civilized power had any right to strew the high seas with mines, not to destroy on purpose, but to destroy accidentally, anything that incidentally struck the mine? Who ever dreamed at that time that any power at war had a right to cast bombs from midair upon noncombatant women and children sleeping peacefully in villages and cities? Who ever thought at that time that any assassin of the sea had a right, without warning, to shoot and sink men and women and children upon an unarmed merchant ship? A lot of you here have been trying to excite yourselves and trying to excite the American people lately about 19 American citizens who were killed upon Mexican soil. Killed by whom? By the Mexican Government? No. Killed by anybody pretending to represent the Mexican Government? No. Killed by bandits, killed by robbers, robbed of their clothes and of their money when they were killed so as to prove that their murderers were robbers, and yet a lot of you seem to want to shed Mexican blood and have Mexicans shed your blood because of it—oh, I beg your pardon, not your blood, but the blood of some of your fellow American citizens. None of you want to have your blood shed, not a blessed one of you. A lot of you seem to want to shed the blood of Mexicans and to have Mexicans shed your national blood, we will call it—if there is any such thing—because 19 American citizens were killed by robbers and bandits upon Mexican soil—upon Mexican soil; remember that.

There was a man by the name of Jesse James who was more or less remotely connected with the Confederate military service. Later on, his way of carrying on war not being in accordance with the Confederate Government's idea of carrying on war, his connection with the Confederate Government became rather remote, but he carried on war in his way. Suppose that in February, 1865, Jesse James had happened to kill two or three British subjects while he was killing other people, and had happened to take their watches and their money away from them while he was taking the watches and money away from other people, and suppose that the British Government had written Abraham Lincoln and Secretary of State Seward at that time a note to the effect that they would be personally liable, and that the United States Government would be held liable, unless they caught Jesse James and punished him within some period, definite or indefinite, what would you have thought? You were powerless, even with all your power, to catch or to punish him.

You put a paper blockade upon the South; nobody ever pretended that your blockade was effective all the way down the

line. The whole Atlantic coast and the whole Mexican coast was within the scope of your paper blockade, and whenever anybody violated that blockade, even if the violators got loose and escaped out upon the high seas, you captured their ships and confiscated their cargoes, and you had a right to do it. Whether you did or not the world submitted to it. My forefathers never plead the baby act about it. You whipped us in fair fight as war goes—war never is altogether fair—but you did it. Now, even-handed justice recommends the poisoned chalice to your own lips, including the doctrine of continuous voyage, which this Government either originated or very much emphasized and stretched.

Now, let me talk about cotton a little, for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] has been talking about cotton. Cotton is worth twelve and thirty-eight one-hundredths cents a pound—middling spot cotton, not futures—in the Memphis market, which happens to be my market, and it has been worth that for two or three weeks. Prior to that time it was worth twelve and twelve and a half one hundredths cents per pound in the Memphis market for two or three months.

If peace came to-morrow, cotton would not be worth over 10 cents a pound. Why? The increased demand for explosives and tents and tarpaulins and uniforms and the increased rapidity in the destruction or wearing out of each. Whatever else this war has done, it has not lowered the price of cotton. True it is that for the first four or six months of the war the war did lower the price, because it dislocated the entire financial system, the entire exchange system, and the entire trade system. It demoralized everything in connection with imports and exports, but especially in connection with bank business, financial operations, and foreign exchange. We suffered enormously upon the first year's cotton crop after the war broke out, and I suffered my share. It has made me run pretty close to the shore for quite a long while. But at present what is becoming of the cotton crop? It is selling at from 1 to 2 cents per pound higher price than, with the same supply and demand, it would if all the world were at peace and there were no war uses for it. Why, Mr. President, Great Britain and France and Italy in normal times take 73 per cent plus of our entire cotton-export business, and that 73 per cent is going to them now. More than the usual amount is going abroad, outside of Germany, Austria, and Italy, for the neutral countries are not only getting their share, but Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Holland have been getting a little bit more, which has been pretendedly imported for themselves, but really shipped through them to Germany and her allies. So the 73 per cent amounts to-day to about 83 per cent. That is uninterfered with. Now, I want to talk plainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator from Mississippi will allow me to ask him a question, I will ask, does the Senator refer to our general exports or to our cotton exports?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I refer to cotton exports, of course.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator from Mississippi did not exactly understand me. I understand him now to be referring to our exports, and he did not say whether the countries he mentioned took 73 per cent of our cotton exports or whether they took 73 per cent of all our exports. I suppose he meant our cotton exports, and that was the reason I asked him the question, as I wanted to be sure that I correctly understood him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Georgia is right in his supposition, and I supposed that every Senator who understood the situation knew what I meant. Of course, our exports of cotton to Great Britain, France, and Italy could not constitute 73 per cent of our total exports of goods and merchandise, and if I failed properly to express myself——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I only want to say to the Senator from Mississippi that he is mistaken about that. If he will refer to the statistics of the department, he will find that those countries do not take 73 per cent; he will find that Germany, Austria, Norway, Holland, and Denmark take but one-third of our entire export of cotton, that Japan and other countries take about 10 per cent of it, and that the countries he names take not quite 60 per cent of it—about 55 per cent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I stand upon my assertion.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Of course the Senator can stand upon it, but he is merely mistaken.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Notwithstanding the Senator's denial, I say that, although I have not the papers by me and have not the statistics by me, Great Britain and her colonies and dependents—of course I meant to include them in the British trade—France and her dependencies, and Italy and her dependencies take about 73 per cent of our total cotton exports. Even if I were wrong about that, Holland and Norway and Sweden and Denmark have been getting during this entire war, except during the first four or five months of financial dislocation, which affected everybody, much more than their full normal share of our cotton.

Now, I want to say another thing—that if the Senator from Georgia could have his way, and if this Congress were to pass and the President were to sign the measures which he is advocating, it would necessarily result in nonintercourse with the allies, unless the allies were going to stand still like a lot of whipped curs, while they were engaged in a war which they believe to be for life and liberty and for national independence, and obey the ukase of a United States Congress, with 90,000 men in the Army behind its ukase and only the fourth navy in the world behind it. It is absurd to suppose that they would be cowardly enough to stand bullying from a people who can not bully because they have nothing behind them to bully with, who can not bluff because they hold no hand. Men from the time they are children are bullies. A schoolboy never bullies a fellow that he knows is bigger and stronger and whom he believes braver than he is. He generally bullies somebody he thinks is weaker than he is or else who is, in his opinion, more cowardly than he is—one of the two. You stand here and say to Great Britain, to the allies, and to the balance of the world that you propose to put an embargo on the shipment of ammunition and munitions of war, contrary to our traditional theory, unless they change their paper blockade—if you choose to call it a paper blockade, but which seems to be wonderfully effective, because it stops every ship, which is more than your northern blockade did during the War between the States—you stand here and say that to them and then expect them to lie down in a fight which they believe to be a fight for the liberty and independence of the world against a newer Roman Empire, revamped and revarnished—expect them to keep quiet and purr without even growling. Will they? Of course not.

Then what will follow? Commercial nonintercourse. Then what becomes of cotton? Cut off the British market and cut off the French and the Italian market and their colonies and their dependencies, and cotton would not be worth 4 cents a pound week after next. You will not even have helped, but would have murdered the price of cotton, even after you had been base enough to make that the chief consideration of your policy.

I hate to argue a great international question from the standpoint of a special interest, even though it be my interest. I do not think it is worthy of the occasion. I do not think that the fact that I might or might not be temporarily disfinanced by this war——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will in a moment—is a sufficient reason for undertaking to let the Germans or English or French or Russians or Italians or anybody else kill American boys summoned to the colors, unprepared and undrilled and untrained, to be murdered. I do not believe it is a sufficient reason for me to justify myself for killing other country's boys even if ours were trained and drilled and ready.

Mr. President, I hope to live to see the day sometime when internationalism will become popular and when the narrow feeling, which is highly creditable as patriotism, will at least not be the leading thought of the world. I hope some day to see "a parliament of man; a federation of the world." I have not lost my hope nor have I lost my trust because of this European war. I have learned, to my sorrow and regret, that the world is less civilized by 100 years than I was foolish enough to think, but I believe still that somehow God reigns and that we are His instruments.

I thought the time had passed when noncombatants could be arraigned and put under peace bonds to keep everybody from shooting against an invading foe, and when they could not keep somebody—a foolish somebody maybe—from indulging in it they would be lined up by a belligerent as Belgian men and boys have been and shot like cattle. I did not believe that that was a possibility. It is not the first instance in my life when I have been a fool. That time I was one.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will yield to the Senator in one second.

Mr. President, the interruption of the Senator from Nebraska has for a moment taken me off the track, but I will try to conclude that thought as briefly as I can. I have come to the conclusion that the forces making for peace and liberty and honor and contract keeping and righteousness in this world have got somehow to whip the forces that are fighting for the other and opposite things; and I would hurl foul scorn at myself as my father's son if I ever came to the conclusion that I had

no right to fight for liberty and righteousness and national independence and the life of my women and children against world dominion and somebody's "place in the sun," if it became necessary to fight. I am no professional combatant, either. I have for long years submitted to hearing myself denounced as "a peace fanatic," and in a certain sense I am, for "my passion is peace," as Thomas Jefferson said, not only nationally but in every other way. I would not lift my foot against an ant upon the sidewalk if I could help it. But it is about time we were recognizing facts; and, above all things, I do not want to see Dixie, I do not want to see Georgia, Mississippi, and old Virginia, and the volunteer State of Tennessee and her sisters, Louisiana and Arkansas and the Carolinas, and all the other Southern States, put in the attitude of seeming, at any rate, to care just as much about property as they do about life; of seeming, at any rate, to care more about their particular property, which is the cotton crop, than they do about the women and children that went down unknelled and unshriven to their graves in the sea, not upon German soil, as the 19 Americans were upon Mexican soil, but upon the high seas, the property of no Government and of no power, and upon unarmed merchant vessels—"unknelled, unhonored, unsung," and unwarned. Until that question is settled I do not propose to join in any movement to nag the President of the United States and to nag this present Democratic administration—and, by the way, for a Republican administration I would say the same thing; at least I think I would, although I am not sure [laughter], because nobody is perfectly certain of himself when he is as dyed-in-the-wool partisan as I am; but I believe I would—I shall not join in any movement to nag them into something that must result in—I hardly know what it would result in, but it must result in something very bad, something worse than we can at the present time predict, at any rate.

Mr. President, I think I know my people, and when I say that, I do not mean the people of the whole United States, because I am a provincialist, an ultra southerner, and I am not in the very highest and most catholic sense even a citizen of the United States; but I do, I think, know my people, and I know that the men who followed Jackson and Lee and whose wives and children starved and who themselves starved in what they thought a holy cause—the men who followed Stonewall Jackson in his last campaign up the valley, when they had nothing to eat but parched corn and were rationed like the horses—except that the horses ate the corn raw and they ate it parched—are not ready yet to put cotton and human life upon the same level, and especially when they have sense enough to know that it would not even help cotton if they did, and that the only hope for cotton is keeping open the English, French, Italian, and neutral markets of the world. Now, I will yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi has said that he would not assert the neutral rights of the United States with the Army and Navy because they are inadequate. He has said, in effect, that he would not assert through the powers of Congress commercial pressure to compel a country to recognize our neutral rights. Now, I ask him what he would do when a country defies the protests we make against the outrages of our rights as a neutral? What would he do if he would not take either of these other courses?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if ever I said either one of those two things which the Senator from Nebraska has attributed to me, I must have said them in a dream or while I was asleep. I have forgotten them, if I ever did say them. What would I do? That question is pertinent, and I shall answer it. I should do what the United States Government did during the French revolutionary war and during the Napoleonic wars and during all the other periods of our history when we were faced with this unfortunate situation of maddened, angered, blood-intoxicated belligerents, not respecting neutral rights. I would lodge my protest, and I would uphold the principles of international law and the rights of neutrals until a proper day of reckoning came under our treaties and under general international law, rather than fight about money, if the sole cause of the quarrel were either money or base merchandise; I would wait until the people to whom I had appealed, or to whose Government I had appealed, had become sober and cool, and then I would accomplish about what the United States Government did in the case of the Geneva award. Abraham Lincoln and Seward and the men other than Seward who were advising Abraham Lincoln did not push that matter just at that time, but when the proper time came they did push it. All quarrels about money can be cured with money, and all delay in curing them with money is measured by universal agreement by a rate of interest. I would not kill one human being on the surface of this globe, American or foreign, because of mere property or because of mere dollars until I had been able at least to appeal to a cool and self-possessed court, not maddened by war passion, not intoxicated with blood, and had then found that a foreign power had deliberately, coldly, and purposely refused to do me justice, even after an award. Then, if that took place, I would fight with what heart and strength and might and main that God had given me.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I had one other question that I wanted to present to the Senator. Of course, there is some precedent for some such method, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] suggests, such as the acts passed during the administrations of Washington and of Jefferson, the patron saint of the Senator from Mississippi, but I do not care to refer to them, although I should like to hear the Senator express his opinion of them. I want to say to the Senator, however, that there may be another issue besides money—a direct sovereign right of the United States may be invaded, as we know it has been invaded. Does the Senator know anything about the violation of the mails of the United States upon the high seas? Does he know that 63 bags of mail sent upon a Holland boat from New York to Rotterdam were seized upon the high seas, taken into the Downs, and those 63 bags of United States mail, addressed to a neutral country, were taken upon English soil——

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator means, addressed to citizens of a neutral country.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; I mean to say that the universal postal convention, enacted and reenacted for many years, in which every civilized country of the world takes part, guarantees the immunity of the mails, and contains the solemn promise that every party to it will permit the mails to cross its dominions free and immune. Finding that Great Britain insisted on censoring our mails which touch at British ports, our Post Office Department began the plan of shipping neutral mails direct to a neutral port, and then Great Britain seized those mails upon the high seas—first-class mail and registered letters, and sent by neutral citizens of one country to neutral citizens of another country—took them into a British port, and have not yet consented to render any justice. Now, I ask the Senator, suppose that right, that sovereign right, of the United States to send its mails to a neutral country is not acknowledged by Great Britain, what would the Senator do under those circumstances if he would not fight and would not pass legislation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. What the Senator wants me to say, I suppose, is that I would agree to declare war upon Great Britain and have a whole lot of Irishmen, Englishmen, Welshmen, and Scotchmen and a whole lot of Americans and Canadians and Australians killed because my mail had been interfered with. Well, I decline to do it. [Laughter in the galleries.] That is all there is about that. I do not know how important the Senator's mail is, but mine is not important enough for that; and I do not think the mail of the average citizen of the United States is, unless it is some spy within the United States bearing the title of an American citizen while he really bears allegiance to some foreign government, and, so far as he is concerned, I do not care whether his mail is interfered with or not. I pass over any reference to the single great mistake of my patron saint's—Mr. Jefferson's—life, his embargo and nonintercourse acts, which hurt us more than our enemies, and maddened New England to the verge of secession.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator permit another question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator know what the instructions of the English Government are to its censors who examine American mail?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Nobody else does, precisely. I know what I have seen in American newspapers.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is entirely mistaken. I have the confidential——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not care about the details.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, let me tell the Senator——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, I do not care about them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But I should like, if the Senator will permit me——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not care what they are; I am not going to shed one drop of American or Canadian blood on account of any confounded [laughter in the galleries]—I beg pardon—on account of any foolish action of the British censors with regard to letters and parcel-post matter. So it is absolutely immaterial as to what they have said; I do not care about the itemized account. What they have done is wrong, and I refuse, notwithstanding it is wrong, to cut their throats about it. That is sufficient.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator does not care if the business mails of the United States are opened, and the bills of lading are examined, and the weights and prices are taken, and they are

all taken to a central authority in Great Britain, where they can be transferred to the British manufacturers and the British shipping agents, so that they may know the secrets of the United States business men and may steal away their trade in the midst of war? The Senator does not care for that? If they do that act under the great war power of censoring the mails for the purpose of promoting their own commerce, does not the Senator care?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Mississippi "cares" in a certain sense. Of course the Senator resents every act of a belligerent which violates neutral rights. I am not talking about not caring. If I said I did not care, my mouth overshot my intellect. But what I do mean is that I do not care enough to shed human blood about it. Now, as to whether the British censors take these private business letters and hand them over to British business concerns, do you know, I do not believe a word of that. I think Great Britain is a little bit too busy in war on land and on sea just at present, fighting to maintain her naval supremacy and her empire, to be engaged very much as a government right now in discovering or betraying "trade secrets." But, whether she is or not, it is one of the sad things that always accompanies a nearly universal war between peoples when each side thinks it is fighting for its existence and when they are not paying as much attention as they ought to to the bystander. It is just as if the Senator from Wyoming and I became inflamed, and both were armed and prepared, and began to shoot at one another on the street; if a bystander happened to run in between our shots it would be very bad for the bystander, and if my bullet happened to go plumb through his body or his bullet through mine and hit somebody else on the other side it would be bad for that person.

Now, you must recognize facts. When you get people engaged in deadly warfare, fighting, as they think, for their very lives, for their very liberty and national integrity, for their very civilization and culture, respectively, they are thinking chiefly about themselves; secondly, about the enemy; and thirdly, about neutrals. "You all" paid mighty little attention to neutrals during the war when you were whipping us, when you strangled us, and when you starved us—and you only whipped us by starving us. Your sea power is the way you whipped us, and you had a right to do it, after once war was declared, provided your right to declare it was recognized. We had gone into it. We went into it with our eyes open. We knew what we were meeting. You struck a country that never had made food enough to feed its own population during any year of its existence, and does not do it even now. You had a plain open-and-shut game before you. If you could just keep up the embargo long enough we would die by self-strangulation, by starvation; and we did.

No; I am not saying that I do not care about these violations of neutral rights. I am merely saying what I said a moment ago—that I do not care enough about them to shed blood about them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I went further than that, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Here are 3,000 miles of boundary between us and Canada up here. We never have had a fort along that line. They are as much Americans as we are, although they call themselves Canadians, and we assume to ourselves the name of an entire continent. Do I want my boy to go out and kill Canadian boys, and Canadian boys to come in and kill my boy—and if we go to war some of my boys will be in it—because somebody stopped Mr. Threefoot's mail on its way to Schweissenkopt or somewhere else in Sweden, Copenhagen, Norway, or somewhere else?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] does not propose to go to war.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no. He proposes to do what will force us into commercial nonintercourse, with the hazard of war half considered.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And the Senator is not in favor of that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I am not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What is he in favor of? Again I ask him, What is he in favor of doing for the purpose of compelling the observance of our neutral rights?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have told the Senator twice.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. He is in favor of letting them go on——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And prosecuting a damage suit in some future years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ah, well!

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What is he in favor of doing for the purpose of stopping them now?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska as an individual did me some money wrong, as an individual he would not think it was cowardice or poltroonery upon my part if I said that I would leave it to the determination of some cool, nonimpassioned third party to act as a judge. Now, why should it be cowardice or poltroonery between nations?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, then, suppose the thing went on, the offense continued, indefinitely?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, well, suppose that the moon were made of green cheese. [Laughter in the galleries.] We have not arrived at that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries will please preserve order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We are there now, right in the midst of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; we are not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It has been going on for months.

Mr. WILLIAMS. God's honest truth is that—no; I will not say that, because there are some truths that you ought not to tell upon the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I have already said what I thought we ought to do. What I think we ought to do is that where a damage sounds in money we ought to claim money in damages, and where there is nothing at stake except money that we ought not to shed blood in order to constitute for ourselves a remedy. In other words, I illustrated it by the Geneva award. I could have illustrated it by a hundred other cases where a neutral country, when two belligerents were excited and blood intoxicated, waited for money-indemnity cure until a time came suited to it. I would not surrender one neutral right in the world. I would declare and redeclare every one of them. I would protest against every violation; but I would not shed blood about base merchandise if I could help it.

That it is my answer, and, if it is not sufficient, it is all the answer I can make. The only thing I would shed blood about is blood. When a man came to taking the blood of my wife and my children, then I would want his. The distinction seems to me to be pretty plain. It is plain to men who were raised as I was raised. I never heard, in the time of the duello in the South, about gentlemen ever challenging one another about money. I never heard that the worst duelist fanatic in the world ever wanted to kill another man about a bill or about a property damage, and I am not going to do it now.

Mr. President, 19 American citizens are killed on Mexican soil, and a whole lot of you want to nag and nag and nag your President into a course of conduct that will result in war with the Mexican people. You want to go down and kill a lot of Mexican peons and a lot of Yaquis and a lot of other Mexicans because a Jesse James bandit somewhere robbed and killed a certain number of your citizens. And yet not a blessed one of you is introducing a resolution about the several hundred Americans killed, not on German soil but upon the high seas; not by irresponsible bandits but by the prepared and declared policy of a Government. And why? Why are you pursuing such different courses? Simply because you think Mexico is little enough to be kicked, and Germany is too big to be kicked. That is all.

I am not blaming you about the course pursued with regard to Germany. I make many allowances for those people. I do not hate Germans and Germany. I love German literature; I love German history; I love German lakes and rivers and mountains and seas; I love German culture, and I love especially the people of the Rhine country and about Wurtemberg and Schwaben and Bavaria. I know they are my equals and yours. I am not quarreling with you because you are not nagging the President about Germany. I am not quarreling with you about that; but I am quarreling with you because you are nagging him about Mexico when no Mexican governmental offense has been committed, and when you dare not nag him about Germany. You are wise when you do not. You had better get ready, so that you can support your "nagging," before you get to nagging anybody who can fight back. What is more, you know it, and by divergent courses of conduct and elocution you are daily and hourly confessing it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] brought to the attention of the Senate a list of vessels that had been sunk by German torpedo boats, submarines, mines, or some other kind of device, and he stated that he desired both sides of the case presented to the Senate.

We may all congratulate ourselves that the side of the United States, so far as Germany is concerned, has been presented and that every indication justifies the hope that the position of the United States upon the subject of safety at sea has been recognized, and that great good has resulted from the course pursued by our Government. I wish, however, to call attention to the fact that in February the President of the United States submitted both to Germany and to Great Britain a request that each should agree in future to cease acts violative of estab-

lished rules of international law—Germany to abandon her submarine attacks, Great Britain to abandon her disregard of international law in the suppression of shipments of foodstuffs going to Germany. Germany's answer practically accepted the suggestion of the United States, and Great Britain's practically repudiated it.

I am no apologist for what has been done by Germany. I am proud of the fact that our Government has contributed to bring to a stop conduct upon the ocean that endangered human life. But, Mr. President, to call attention to the fact that Great Britain has not only disregarded our rights upon the ocean, but continues to do so, and refuses absolutely to recognize the sovereign rights of this country, should not in any sense be considered a condonation of what Germany has done.

Our German troubles are practically over; and the beneficial results of the communications that have passed between the two countries I trust will live in time to come.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a minute?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I do not interrupt the Senator for the purpose of disturbing him or annoying him in his argument.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It will not disturb me at all.

Mr. NELSON. I simply want to call his attention to the fact that so far as our negotiations with the German Government related to submarines, there was only an understanding as to what they call "liners," the great steamships that carry passengers on regular routes. The agreement or understanding, or whatever you may call it, that was made between our Government and the German Government, related only to that kind of ships, and not to the freighters—not to other ships than merely the liners that carry passengers on regular routes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think the Senator is mistaken about that. I think it extends to stopping before sinking freighters also. I so understand it.

What is the attitude of Great Britain? Each violation by Great Britain is followed by another violation of our international rights. Because Germany has been guilty of murder, are we for that reason to concede the right of perpetual robbery to Great Britain? Are we, each time we ask for recognition by the Senate and by the House of our rights upon the ocean, disregarded by Great Britain, to be turned off from their consideration by something that I trust is a thing of the past, and has been practically disposed of by diplomatic negotiations? I trust not.

But, Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], differing so much as he does at different times both in the accuracy of his intellect and in his style of expression, this afternoon presented himself in an inaccurate frame of mind. He declared that the first assertion of the right of seizure of ships or cargoes upon the theory of continuous voyage was set up by the United States during the Civil War. Why, the Senator does not manifest his usual familiarity with history. He surely should know the earlier cases in which this doctrine was set up in Great Britain, and the difference between the two lines of thought. He says that during the Civil War the United States Government blockaded the coasts of all the Southern States and of Mexico. Again he shows his utter inaccuracy, his lack of knowledge upon which to predicate a statement. The order of blockade issued by President Lincoln was limited to the Rio Grande, and if the Senator were at all familiar with the cases upon this subject he would know that in the Peterhof case the Supreme Court called attention to the fact that the order of blockade stopped at the Rio Grande, and that it did not apply to Matamoras, across the Rio Grande, and that innocent commerce could pass into the Confederate States through Matamoras free from any interference by the United States.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask the Senator if he can tell how long prior to the Civil War England had abandoned the doctrine of continuous voyage?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The continuous-voyage rule, as laid down by Great Britain before the Civil War and as laid down by the National Government during the Civil War, has no connection whatever with the issue to-day between the United States and Great Britain. The continuous-voyage doctrine as laid down by Great Britain was with reference to her colonies, and limited to them, and it does not touch our issue at all.

Mr. STERLING. And even the doctrine of continuous voyage, as it related to the colonies of Great Britain, had been abandoned long prior to the Civil War; had it not?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think so. It had been questioned, at least, and I think there had been no continued enforcement of it.

The doctrine asserted by the United States in the *Bermuda* case was on a construction of facts; the court found that the vessel left England with the purpose, really, of going to Charleston and running the blockade, and for this reason it was subject to seizure at any time, though it nominally had a destination of Nassau, while its real destination was a southern port closed by blockade. That was the doctrine of the *Bermuda* case, and that was the doctrine applied to the goods in the *Springbok* case.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia, so that this matter can be gotten straight, whether there has been any controversy whatever between our Government and Great Britain in this matter touching the doctrine of continuous voyage?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think not.

Mr. WALSH. Do not both of them admit the doctrine as applied to the present situation?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think each agree that the doctrine of a continuous voyage does not justify a belligerent in seizing neutral goods going to a neutral port, and from there to the enemy, if the goods are innocent.

Mr. WALSH. The United States concedes that they may justly apply the doctrine of continuous voyage?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. To contraband.

Mr. WALSH. To contraband.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Why, certainly; and Great Britain has never asserted the right under rules of international law to apply it to innocent goods, or to apply it to conditional contraband where she could not show that the conditional contraband was intended for the army or navy of the enemy. She has not proceeded under the rules of international law. She has set up a bald order in council, setting aside international law.

But the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has assumed to speak for "my people." He is very eloquent when he talks about "my people," though not always very accurate. It always amuses me when he discusses a business question. He is entitled to preeminence for his incapacity to handle business questions, either in discussion or in reference to statistics. He tells us he is the cotton planter from Mississippi! I desire to assure the people of the country that they are not limited to his production for their supplies. [Laughter.]

But the Senator from Mississippi turned on me with a ferocious look—I almost trembled—and asserted that "my people would resist the idea of putting money above life." Then he talked about the "code duello." Well, he has lived ages ago. I do not know anything about that. Thank God, it had passed out before I came along. I deny his right to suggest, directly or indirectly, that those of us who criticize the course of Great Britain in suppressing our legal trade have placed commerce above life. It is an unfounded suggestion. It is an inexcusable one. It is the refuge of the advocate to divert attention from the real charge.

There is not a people anywhere more loyal to personal rights than the people of the section that I have the privilege in part to represent; but I do not place them in that respect ahead of our neighbors farther north or west. My own belief is that the people of our entire country, let them come from where they will, place life above property. But I have yet to find, even in my section, those who for that reason are willing to have all their property rights and the sovereign rights of this Nation disregarded. There may be some few who, like the Senator from Mississippi, soar in such lofty flights at times that they place property so low that they object to any word ever being spoken in defense of it; but I deny that that sentiment represents the people of the section from which I come. I am sure that they would not embarrass the President.

The Senator says that we are seeking to nag the President. The statement is absurd. It is from lack of information that the Senator so expresses himself. Unfortunately, he did not have the advantage of hearing the entire presentation of the subject which I made. He only came in at the last, and lacks information; and now he has left, and still insists upon not being informed.

Mr. President and Senators, I would not nag the President. I have the highest regard for him. I expect to support him this

fall for reelection, and I hope the good judgment of the people of the country will keep him where he is. I do not differ with the President about this matter. I am following the letters of the State Department, and asking Congress to do its part. I do not mean that under no circumstances would I differ with the President. If I thought a President was doing anything calculated to involve this country in war which was unnecessary, I would deem it the part of patriotism to protest his action. I do not admit that a President must be followed if his conduct would bring the country to war, when those who have the right to declare war disagree with him. Fortunately, however, no such condition confronts us. The President has resisted, under great pressure, those who would have involved us in war.

The President placed the loss of life first in his diplomatic notes; but he did not fail, as the negotiations moved along, to present a most earnest protest against the illegality of the course of Great Britain. In opening my remarks I took occasion to call attention to the splendid letter of March 30 and to show that that letter protests squarely not only what Great Britain is doing now, but the right of Great Britain, if a complete blockade should be made, to stop our trade to neutral ports.

Mr. President, that splendid country, Sweden, those brave people, are standing out for their commercial rights. I want to reach a hand across the ocean and say: "We stand by you," not in a spirit of war but in a spirt of courage and manhood; not in a spirit of bullying. I have uttered no words that sounded like bullying. The face of the Senator from Mississippi, as he turned upon me, had every appearance that I was to be bullied and silenced; but for some reason I was not frightened, even by his assumption of knowledge and superiority. What I ask is that we let it be known that we understand our rights, not to bully Great Britain, but to call on Great Britain to return to law, to return to the law which she has made, and give her great statesman the support that action on our part would furnish to stand out against lawless acts. I long to see those principles of international law that Great Britain and the United States together have given to the world fully followed by both nations; that they may mitigate the evils of war and help to strengthen the rights of those at peace.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I am not going to prolong this discussion longer than a very brief moment, but I want to submit a few observations. That England's interference with business intercourse between the neutral nations on the high seas is in violation of international law which she herself was a party to writing and which she herself had admitted to be the law from time immemorial there is no question. The people of the State whom I have the honor to represent in this Chamber have suffered grievously from that violation. It has cost the cotton growers of the South on the crop of 1915, in my judgment, not less than one quarter of a billion dollars. It has enabled the manufacturers of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Russia and the manufacturers in the United States to obtain cotton for their mills at 75 per cent of its true value, and the losses resulting from this unfortunate situation have fallen heavily upon the men, women, and children who toiled for 12 long weary months to produce the cotton. Something has been said about going to war—taking human life to promote commercial interests. Mr. President, I do not want to go to war; I would not go to war for the purpose of promoting commercial interests. I would not have the United States Government sacrifice one soldier for all the money on earth. But I maintain it is incumbent upon the United States Government to protect the business interests of its citizens. I hold it is just as much the duty of the American Government to protect her citizens against robbery, against plunder; in other words, protect them in the enjoyment of their liberty and property as it is to protect them in the enjoyment of life. Unless they shall be thus protected, life would not be worth living. If the business rights of the citizens are not protected, if international law shall be violated and our citizens robbed and plundered without interference or protest on the part of our own Government, it is but a short step from such a violation of the law to that of murder. No; we do not want war, and every means possible consistent with honor should be exhausted and every expedient available should be employed to avoid war, with all of its horrible consequences. Nobody is asking the United States to go to war with Great Britain at this time in order to protect the business interests of the people of America and force her to observe the law. But the reverse is true. We are only asking the United States Government to employ peaceful means within its power by which the Government of Great Britain may be induced to respect the business rights of the American people.

Now, to say that we will permit England to continue the methods of the highwayman, which she has persisted in for nearly a year without protest, lest she may retaliate by cutting off all business intercourse, is asking the American people to be guilty of something which to my mind approaches pusillanimity. If the Congress shall pass an act putting an embargo upon the shipments of munitions to the allies, to remain in force until the allies shall cease to interfere with trade between the neutral nations, it would be doing no more than we have a right inherently to do. We have a right to employ retaliatory or any other measures for the protection of the American people, and if war should come from the exercise of our inherent, legitimate rights the responsibility for war will not be upon the American people. I hope, Mr. President, that we have not become a nation of cravens. We will not sell our manhood for 4 cents a pound on cotton; we will not yield to the tyrant's demand, even though it should involve us in war; and I want to say further just in this connection that the American Government is amply able both on the sea and land to defend the rights of her people. We have the greatest Navy to-day the world has ever known, with the exception of Great Britain's and as large an army as may be necessary to defend the American flag and keep that sacred emblem in the air, and we are ready to-day to do service in that noble undertaking. I am very weary, if I may be permitted to use that cant expression, Mr. President, of listening to all this talk both in the Halls of Congress and in the public press about the inadequacy of our Navy and insufficiency of our Army. The contention made by the Senator from Georgia is sustained by all writers of international law. He is in this matter only following the lead of the President of the United States and of the great Secretary of State, Mr. Lansing, in his interpretation of the law. He has insisted upon what every other patriotic representative of the American people should insist upon, that even the exigencies of war can not be urged as an excuse for a gross and palpable violation of international law, especially a violation of the law which is followed by such disastrous consequences as that which flows from the conduct of the allies in interfering with the legitimate commerce of a neutral country. All we ask is justice—that the rights of our citizens shall be respected and the honor of the Nation upheld. For my country—

> I am not covetous for gold,
> Nor care I who doth feed upon my cost;
> It yearns me not if men my garments wear;
> Such outward things dwell not in my desires;
> But if it be a sin to covet honor,
> I am the most offending soul alive.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. KERN. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be until Monday next. I make this motion because there is a great deal of committee work to do, and I have been requested by Members on both sides to be given an opportunity to complete certain committee work.

The motion was agreed to.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. The amendment to the amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the words proposed to be inserted by the Senator from Arkansas insert:

Within two years after the passage of this act the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located, for the purpose and to the end that the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves, in the form of a treaty or other binding agreement, to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines, and also to mutually obligate themselves, equally and not one primarily nor to any greater extent than another, to maintain as against external force the sovereignty of said Philippines for the period of not less than five years from the taking effect of such treaty or agreement.

Within one year after the taking effect of such treaty or agreement the President is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippines.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I submit the following amendment to Senate bill 381, the Philippine government bill, which I should like to have printed.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the proposed amendment for the information of the Senate.

The SECRETARY. After the word "appoint," on line 10, page 21, insert "all executive secretaries, directors and assistant directors, chiefs and assistant chiefs, superintendents and assistant superintendents of departments, bureaus, and divisions, the attorney general and assistant attorney general, collectors and deputy collectors of customs, and," and after the word "such," on line 11, insert the word "other," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 22. That the supreme executive power shall be vested in an executive officer, whose official title shall be "The Governor General of the Philippine Islands." He shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, and hold his office at the pleasure of the President and until his successor is chosen and qualified. The Governor General shall reside in the Philippine Islands during his official incumbency and maintain his office at the seat of government. He shall, unless otherwise herein provided, appoint all executive secretaries, directors and assistant directors, chiefs and assistant chiefs, superintendents and assistant superintendents of departments, bureaus, and divisions, the attorney general and assistant attorney general, collectors and deputy collectors of customs, and, by and with the consent of the Philippine Senate, such other officers as may now be appointed by the Governor General, or such as he is authorized by this act to appoint, or whom he may hereafter be authorized by law to appoint; but appointments made while the senate is not in session shall be effective either until disapproval or until the next adjournment of the senate, etc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there will be no session to-morrow, and there is no likelihood of disposing of the bill this afternoon, I desire to submit to the Senator in charge of the bill if it would not be proper to terminate the proceeding upon it at least formally. It is perfectly evident that the measure can not be disposed of to-day, and by running over until Monday it is likely that it can be disposed of on that day or certainly the day following.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is thoroughly satisfactory to me either to lay the bill aside temporarily or to adjourn. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is temporarily laid aside.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico:

H. R. 65. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to certain gas, electric light and power, telephone, railroad, and street railway companies and franchises in the Territory of Hawaii, and amending the laws relating thereto;

H. R. 3042. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, as herein amended, and amending the laws relating thereto; and

H. R. 6241. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act amending the franchise granted to H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, and now held under assignment to Island Electric Co. (Ltd.), by extending it to include the Makawao district on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii; and extending the control of the public-utilities commission of the Territory of Hawaii to said franchise and its holder.

H. R. 153. An act to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 407. An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 24, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 20, 1916.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Clyde A. Rosseter to be register of the land office at Valentine, Nebr.

James Y. Callahan to be register of the land office at Guthrie, Okla.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

Horace Palmer Cravens, Magazine.
W. L. Jarman, Helena.

KANSAS.

I. J. Hart, Pleasanton.

MICHIGAN.

John W. Barley, Dexter.
Clio S. Case, Brighton.

MINNESOTA.

Jessie J. W. Hogue, Tyler.
John Kasper, Faribault.

NEBRASKA.

Francis A. Thompson, Clay Center.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John F. Mann, Wilcox.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate January 20, 1916.

POSTMASTER.

Z. M. McCarroll to be postmaster at Walnut Ridge, Ark.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *January 20, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William A. Leopold, D. D., of Bethany Evangelical Church, Norristown, Pa., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of nations and of people, we come to Thee with grateful hearts this morning, and thank Thee for health of body, strength of purpose. Guide us this day, we pray Thee, in all the ways of truth and righteousness. We can not trust ourselves, we can not trust the elements of the universe, but we can trust Thee, O Thou Supernal Guide. Guide us in all the affairs of life, and let Thy blessing rest upon the President of the United States and his Cabinet. Bless the Members of the Congress. Guide us all in the ways of righteousness and wisdom and true holiness. Help us to do right and fear no one but God, and serve Thee—the true and living God. Thy blessing be upon us as we go through the journey of life, and at last receive us into Thine own blessed kingdom, through Him who taught us to say, when we pray, Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven; give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us, and lead us by Thy council in all the ways of righteousness, and in the end receive us as Thine. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. LAZARO, be granted leave of absence for 10 days on account of important business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. LAZARO, be granted 10 days' leave of absence on account of important business. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ITALIANS.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague Mr. SIEGEL, who is absent at a committee hearing, may extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing therein two letters, one to himself and his answer thereto, in relation to alleged discrimination against citizens of Italian birth at the Military Academy at West Point.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] asks unanimous consent that his colleague Mr. SIEGEL, who is unavoidably absent, may extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing two letters in relation to alleged discrimination against Italians at West Point. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes. Pending that motion I

wish to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] if we can agree upon dispensing with general debate?

Mr. CANNON. I can not agree to dispense with all general debate. Two members of the committee, not including myself, and I might want to submit a few remarks, have made requests for time, as well as others. I may say that I have requests for three hours and a half of time. I think perhaps I could get along with less than that, but two members of the committee desire to have, one, 45 minutes, and the other 40 minutes. I have a request from my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], for 60 minutes. I do not know whether he is fully in earnest about that.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, surely.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, in lieu of the fact that the House has been in general debate since the Christmas holidays, and that there are some matters in this bill that are of peculiarly urgent character, it seems to me that we should endeavor to have this general debate on some other bills where general debate is in order. I have one request on this side for one hour. I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that he take two hours and this side will take one hour, and that he ask some of those who have made requests to take time on some other bills.

Mr. CANNON. I will try to get along with that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to three hours, two hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and one hour by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be confined to three hours, two hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and one hour by himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the urgent deficiency bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9416, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, with Mr. HARRISON in the chair.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois to use some of his time. Any statement that I have to make regarding the bill can better be made under the five-minute rule, I think.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT].

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, this is the first bill reported by the Appropriations Committee, and I think it an appropriate time to discuss briefly the recommendations for appropriations which the administration has forwarded to us in the Book of Estimates. The appropriations made last year amounted to $1,114,937,012.02, being larger than had ever been made at any session of any preceding Congress. Now the President recommends to us that we appropriate in this session $1,285,857,808.16, a hundred and seventy-one millions more than the appropriations of last year, exclusive of deficiency and miscellaneous appropriations, which amounted then to $14,600,000 and are likely to be larger this year, and so will make this year's appropriations nearly $200,000,000 larger than last year's.

The greater part of this increase is for the Army and the Navy. For these increases I have no criticism. While I do not wish to take the time of the House now to discuss the endless subject of preparedness, I will very concisely state my position as to these appropriations.

I believe this country is in serious danger of an attack which would cost us more in 1 year than we could spend on our Army and Navy in 50 years. If either side wins in the present European war, it will emerge with a fighting machine such as the world has never known and before which we are helpless. Its navy could blow ours from the sea or bottle it tight in our ports. Between Penobscot Bay and the Chesapeake are numerous undefended harbors, where in a month they could land an army of veterans supplied with every appliance known to war and which our few ill-equipped troops would be powerless to resist. It could take our fortified cities in the rear, where they are unprotected, and easily master the richest part of our country and the seat of our greatest industries and levy contributions beside which the suggested appropriations for defense are infinitesimal. By a possible alliance with a power on the Pacific, our western coast might suffer the same fate.

It is often asserted that the victor in this war will be too exhausted for such an attack. But the victor will be at the summit of its military power, with seasoned troops, every kind of artillery and ammunition and aeroplanes and armored motors—in short, it will be rich in everything martial which we lack, and it will be poor in the products of peace, food, and clothing and luxuries and gold, which we have been accumulating in such boundless measure and, as they think, at their expense, and which they will deeply need and covet. Our very prosperity is making us a tempting prey.

We have not a friend in Europe, unless, perhaps, Belgium. We have donated millions of supplies to every nation on a scale of generosity never dreamed of before; but, nevertheless, all reports prove that we are everywhere disliked. For that I am not disposed to blame them harshly. Engaged in a death struggle, keyed to the highest pitch, unable to see any side but their own, judging everything by its effect on them, a true neutral seems to them an enemy and the rights of neutrals seem only outworn and impractical theories. Then they see us as an exasperating reality, reveling in the luxuries which they think we have gained out of their misery. There is no impulse of friendship to hold them back from attacking us. Is there any other impulse to restrain them? Those conditions which we have always considered as pledges of immunity are all gone. We trusted in the balance of power in Europe; but if one side triumphs now that will be upset. We trusted to international law and the moral opinion of the world and the rights of neutrals; but this war has shattered and destroyed them all. We trusted to 3,000 miles of ocean; but if either side triumphs it can overwhelm our Navy, and then the ocean is an easier and quicker highway than the land. The war has revolutionized both military and moral standards. To obtain respect and fair treatment to-day we must be strong.

I think our danger begins at the moment this war ends, if either side is a victor. I would prepare at once. I think we have delayed too long. I think Congress ought to have met last fall, and by this time the keels of additional battleships should have been laid, submarines put under construction, and the strengthening of our Army begun. We do not want simply to prepare so that we could ultimately win a war; we want to prepare so as to prevent a war, so that no nation will venture to attack us. They know vastly better than we what is adequate preparation. We can not deceive them. So I want our best expert advice, and I am more concerned to see some decisive steps taken quickly than to spend time in laying out a policy extending over years. It will be expensive; but better millions for defense now than billions for tribute later.

But while I would not grudge money for this primal necessity of adequate defense, this insurance against frightful calamity, we ought all the more in other directions to count the cost and try to save. That is where I criticize these estimates submitted by the administration. While our present outlay is daily exceeding our receipts and while enormous increases for defense are recommended, there is no suggestion of economy in our ordinary running expenses. On the contrary, every recommendation is for an increase. We are urged to swell the Agricultural appropriation bill from $22,971,782, which it was last year, to $24,159,089, an increase of $1,187,307; the Diplomatic bill from $4,061,280.01 to $5,426,698.70, an increase of $1,365,418.69; the District bill from $11,859,584.45 to $15,473,676.34, an increase of $3,614,091.89; the Indian bill from $9,771,902.76 to $10,175,036.66, an increase of $403,133.90; the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill from $36,904,799.75 to $39,749,377.25, an increase of $2,844,577.50; the Post Office bill from $313,364,667 to $316,364,879, an increase of $3,000,212; the rivers and harbors bill from $30,000,000 to $44,376,710, an increase of $14,376,710; the sundry civil bill from $126,922,750.79 to $141,181,110.93, an increase of $14,258,360.14; the permanent annual appropriations from $121,567,207 to $135,074,673, an increase of $13,507,466.

That amounts in all to an increase in those bills of $54,557,277.12. Included in that there is recommended for the Panama Canal $7,956,420.83 more than was appropriated last year; and as each Congress must appropriate for that purpose whatever is necessary, I do not hold the administration responsible for that, and I deduct it, leaving $46,600,856.29. That is the increase over last year for which this administration is responsible in these housekeeping bills, and this is a time of stress and the Democrats call themselves the party of economy. The

only bill in which they make a saving is the bill for pensions for the old soldiers. They cut that three and a half millions.

There is one singular incident which attracted my attention. The Secretary of the Treasury in his annual report states that "the postal revenues will probably amount to $316,000,000, with expenditures for the Postal Service for the same period under existing laws of $324,000,000." But the estimates for the Post Office appropriation bill were only $316,000,000, and I wondered where that balance of $8,000,000 was taken care of, and I finally found it tucked away in the estimates for permanent appropriations. There is no precedent for placing it there. Why was not the Post Office bill estimated at $324,000,000 instead of $316,000,000? Why was that $8,000,000 hidden under permanent appropriations? I can think of no reason—or, at least none that I care to suggest—and I think it ought to be explained.

In view of this increase all along the line in the recommendations for next year's appropriations, it is interesting to recall that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], in his first formal speech after assuming his new duty as leader of the House, said:

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to show that there is not one word of truth in the charge of Democratic extravagance.

Such statements made by irresponsible stump speakers we are accustomed to, and we ignore. But made by the leader of this House, and made, I suppose, with as much deliberation and cool blood as the gentleman ever experiences, it is entitled to consideration.

What evidence did he give to support his statement? He supported it by two arguments, both of which were erroneous in fact and both faulty in logic. One argument was the the Republicans had voted for all the Democratic appropriations and so were estopped from criticizing them. That argument is erroneous in fact, because the minority did not, in fact, vote for those bills, and it is faulty in logic, because, even if they had, the party in control of Congress was responsible for its acts and could be held to that responsibility by the minority even if they had acquiesced in the action.

The argument of the gentleman of course will have no weight in the House, for every Member knows what he meant and how uncandid he was. He meant not that the Republicans actually voted for the bills, but that because there was no yea-and-nay vote on them those present were presumed, by a fiction of parliamentary law, to vote aye, when there was really no vote at all. To change that fiction into a fact and pretend that because of it Republicans voted for the bill may deceive those outside of this House who do not understand our procedure, but is not very worthy of a party leader. As the gentleman well knows, the fact that the minority does not demand a record vote on appropriation bills does not indicate that they are satisfied with the bills, does not prove that they consider them free from extravagance, and does not estop them from criticism. Indeed, the gentleman's own doctrine of estoppel would prevent his making the argument, for his party for years continually denounced our appropriation bills as extravagant, but still voted for them according to this parliamentary fiction. We, however, were not so unfair and uncandid as to charge them with inconsistency, or blame them for not protecting us against ourselves. The real reason no minority party, as a rule, forces record votes on appropriation bills is that these bills consist of hundreds and thousands of items; they have been fought out item by item in the Committee of the Whole House, where there can be no record vote; that is where the bills are really framed and the contest made; when they come to final passage in the House itself there can be no record vote on the separate items, there can only be a record vote on the bill as a whole; Members who think it extravagant know that the bill must pass in some shape or the wheels of Government will stop, and inasmuch as every appropriation bill is a compromise, and that bill has been thoroughly thrashed out in Committee of the Whole by the House and stamped with its approval, and is not subject to amendment, the minority hardly ever demands a record vote. It recognizes that it is the best compromise which the majority will allow to become a law.

I feel almost ashamed to take the time to state these facts, which are so well known to the Members of the House, but when a person occupying the honorable and responsible position of leader of the majority tries so unfairly to obscure the issue, I think it worth while to make it plain.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. KEATING. I do not like to interrupt the gentleman——

Mr. GILLETT. I am willing, if I have time enough.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman's statement gives the impression that we all acquiesce in what he is saying. He has just stated that no opportunity is given in the House to amend these bills and to secure a record vote. The gentleman does not desire to convey the impression to the country that opportunity is not given for amendment in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. GILLETT. Oh, no. That is where they are discussing it, but there can be no record vote there.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman does not intend to convey the impression to the country that a vigilant minority, endeavoring to restrain an extravagant majority, has been in this House offering amendments in Committee of the Whole or in the Committee on Appropriations to cut down these so-called extravagant appropriations?

Mr. GILLETT. Well, I do not know how vigilant the minority has been. I know I have offered a great many amendments to cut down appropriations absolutely without any success.

Mr. KEATING. Has the gentleman offered those amendments in the committee or in the House?

Mr. GILLETT. In the committee; of course, I can not offer them in the House.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman means to say, in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. GILLETT. I mean in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KEATING. Has the gentleman offered them in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. GILLETT. That is what I meant, in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KEATING. And similar amendments have been offered from the Democratic side?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly; the Democratic side often offer such amendments.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. I will.

Mr. SHERLEY. How much support has the gentleman had from his side on this question?

Mr. GILLETT. I have had more from my side than I have had from the Democratic side.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think the gentleman will not seriously say that, although he now says it so glibly on the floor. The gentleman knows——

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman can ask a question, of course, he understands.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. GILLETT. But he has no right to interpolate remarks.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no desire to encroach, except I wondered if the gentleman is purporting now to maintain the proposition that the minority in Committee of the Whole has shown a disposition as a minority to hold down expenditures.

Mr. GILLETT. Members of the minority have done so in the Committee of the Whole, but I am not entering into that now. The gentleman, of course, understands that no matter which side is in the majority, the minority always is more inclined to expenditure than the majority, for the reason that the majority is checked on these extravagances by its sense of responsibility. It has the responsibility and has to go out to the country under that responsibility, whereas the minority has no such responsibility, and therefore there is always a tendency for the minority to be more liberal and more careless about expenditures than the majority.

Mr. HAMLIN and Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania rose.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] rose first, and I yield to him; but I must say, Mr. Chairman, unless I can get more time, I can not yield extendedly; otherwise I shall be glad for any discussion.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman a simple question?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is not the duty of the minority to stop the wheels of Government because the majority is extravagant, is it?

Mr. GILLETT. Of course not.

Mr. SHERLEY. May I ask just one question?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Has the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] who just interrupted been one of those active advocates in supporting his efforts toward economy?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not wish to go into personalities. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GILLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HAMLIN. I desire to ask the gentleman a question. He does not desire to convey the impression to the country that the minority could not secure a record vote on these propositions if they desired to do so?

Mr. GILLETT. I do. It can not have them on all the propositions. It can have one record vote.

Mr. HAMLIN. On a motion to recommit?

Mr. GILLETT. One record vote.

Mr. HAMLIN. And putting themselves on record as protesting these bills if they want to do it?

Mr. GILLETT. I say that for 20 years, for all those years when your party was in the minority, you did not do it. It is not the custom, of course, to do it, for it is useless.

Mr. RAGSDALE. It is not on the whole question, but on every single amendment that is offered that the minority can get a vote?

Mr. GILLETT. No.

Mr. RAGSDALE. On any amendment that is adopted?

Mr. GILLETT. Any amendment adopted, of course; but they are never adopted. I have offered many an amendment, but never one that was adopted, that I can remember. If they are adopted, we do not care for a record vote, because they go through. If the Committee of the Whole adopts an economical amendment, when it comes to a record vote in the House the chairman of the committee against whose protest that was adopted does not call for a record vote, because he recognizes that the House was in favor of it and there is no use of having a record vote, although it was against his wishes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman each year, on almost every appropriation bill that comes up here for discussion, rises in his place to criticize the majority for increasing expenses. Is it not true, regardless of which party may be in power, that as the Government has grown in the past, under all political parties, increases have gradually been made in the expenses of the Government?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly, that is true; that is fair.

Mr. BARKLEY. And is it not true that such will be the policy in the future so long as this Government continues to grow and not remain standing?

Mr. GILLETT. If it grows and there is no increase in the scale of expenditure, of course there will be still increases in the expenditures, but nothing like the increases that have happened in the last Congress over the preceding Republican Congresses.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the gentleman state that the appropriation for increases within the last two years has been greater than the increases in former years?

Mr. GILLETT. I think so.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GILLETT. I will.

Mr. FESS. Can the majority defend itself against the charge of extravagance on the ground that the minority did not prevent it?

Mr. GILLETT. It strikes me like being a baby act. They had a majority of 150 in the last Congress.

Now, that is one argument which the gentleman from North Carolina presented. The other argument which the gentleman submitted to show that his party was not extravagant was that "the Wilson administration and Democratic Congress appropriated for its first year $17,258,000 less than for the last year of the Taft administration, and for the last year—this fiscal year—over $10,000,000 less." That, he thinks, is sufficient proof of economy. I suppose the trouble is that the gentleman from North Carolina has lived in the atmosphere of the Ways and Means Committee, and when a Democrat deals with the tariff he enters a realm of fancy and imagination and unreality and loses his capacity to deal with real facts and figures. So it is not strange that the gentleman is mistaken in his figures and has entirely omitted certain pertinent comparisons, which, in the interest of abstract truth, I shall endeavor to supply.

In the first place, the gentleman is wrong in his figures. The clerks of the Appropriation Committee have made the computation and find that the true difference between 1914 and 1915 is $10,549,045.85, and I have more confidence in their accuracy than in that of the gentleman from North Carolina. He has made a little mistake of $7,000,000 in his subtraction.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Of course the question of extravagance is a relative one.

Mr. GILLETT. I am coming to that.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I wanted to ask the gentleman whether at this time he could state to the House the actual cash balance in the Treasury to-day which could be drawn upon to pay any current obligation of the Government?

Mr. GILLETT. I can not state exactly. I suppose it is about $40,000,000.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is that all the available cash that would be subject to draft at any time?

Mr. GILLETT. I have not looked at it for a few days. I should think it was about that.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Now, can the gentleman state whether there are any outstanding obligations of the Government to-day that have not been paid?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Lots of them, from the Republican administration. They will not be paid for 10 years.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If they were paid, what would the balance be in the Treasury?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The country would be bankrupt if we paid all the obligations from public funds.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Of course you would.

Mr. GILLETT. Returning to my argument, if the comparison of the gentleman from North Carolina were a fair one—and it is not—still it would fall far short of establishing his case. I will judge him simply by Democratic standards. "Frightful extravagance" and "lavish waste" were the phrases used in the last two Democratic national platforms to characterize Republican appropriations. A reduction from $813,000,000 in the last year of the Taft administration to $802,000,000 in the first year of the Wilson administration, a reduction of a little over 1 per cent, would hardly be called a change from "frightful extravagance" to "that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government," as demanded by their platform.

That is a reduction of $11,000,000 in a total expense of $800,000,000, and it would not be generally considered, it seems to me, a change from "frightful extravagance" and "lavish waste" to that strict economy which is supposed to be the prerogative of the Democratic Party. It is a reduction of a little over 1 per cent. That is hardly a change from the epithets which they used toward us to the encomiums they apply to themselves.

Mr. GORDON. Right there, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GILLETT. I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. GORDON. Has the gentleman any figures available that would enable him to put in the RECORD a statement of the amount of continuing appropriations which in the last year of the Taft administration were fastened on its successor and the subsequent Congress?

Mr. GILLETT. I have not it in my head, but it is very easy to get.

Mr. GORDON. It was a very large sum, was it not?

Mr. GILLETT. Well, each Congress puts on a large sum.

Mr. GORDON. Was it not an exceptionally large sum?

Mr. GILLETT. I presume it was, because in the last year of the Taft administration this House was controlled by the Democrats. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GORDON. Of course, there was no way by which the Sixty-third Congress could evade those appropriations that were imposed on us, was there?

Mr. GILLETT. No; because, as I say, the Democratic Party controlled the House. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GORDON. Let me ask the gentleman one more question. Is it not a fact that the Senate and Mr. Taft himself added enormously to the appropriations made by the House in the Sixty-second Congress?

Mr. GILLETT. I will never undertake to claim that the Senate, no matter what party controls it, will ever be economical. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORDON. Well, the Republicans controlled the Senate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GILLETT. It does not now.

Mr. GORDON. Did not Mr. Taft threaten to veto the sundry civil bill if they did not add a lot of public buildings to it?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not think so.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman will not dispute it. It is a fact and was asserted on the floor of this House by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and has not been disputed by anyone. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GILLETT. I will dispute it now. [Applause on the Republican side.]

As I say, this reduction of 1¼ per cent was not a reduction of which a party can be very proud. It reminds me of the statement which a very distinguished Democrat made when he came before the Committee on Appropriations in the first year of the Wilson administration. He was Secretary of State, and he said he had made up his mind that there was one department of the Government that should show a reduction in cost over its predecessor, and the State Department's estimates were $120 less than those of the Republican administration. [Laughter on

the Republican side.] That is about the scale of economies which the Democratic Party can suggest when they are driven to show a record.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. No; I can not yield any more. Well, yes; I will yield to my chairman. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. I just wanted to say that the bill——

Mr. GILLETT. Oh, I refuse to yield except for a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman, my colleague, should not bandy my name around when he is——

Mr. GILLETT. I am not doing that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. GILLETT. You can put it in the RECORD when you please, but you can not put it in now. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. I thank the gentleman, but I please to put it in now. [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETT. You can not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But I will.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand order. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GILLETT. But let us look further at this comparison, which the gentleman from North Carolina adduces as the only and sufficient proof of Democratic economy, and see if it is a fair one. He omits the Post Office bill for both years. The Post Office bill in 1914 was $285,000,000 and in 1915 was $313,000,000, $28,000,000 larger. If you do not omit these bills, the appropriations of the first Democratic Congress were $17,000,000 larger than its predecessor. He says Post Office bills are "always excluded." That is a novel and guileless proposition. If he had said Democrats always omitted them when it would be to their advantage, it might be true. But Democrats have not omitted them unless the omission helped. Democrats did not omit them when they ran a campaign on the issue of a billion-dollar Congress. If they had excluded them, it would have ruined their catch phrase, so they never thought of the justice of it. They did not omit them in their national platform before the last, when they stated and condemned the total of the Republican appropriations. But now, when it is to his advantage, the gentleman excludes them.

Extravagance can show itself in Post Office appropriations as well as elsewhere. Extravagance is apt to show itself in increase of salaries, and nowhere were salaries so increased in 1915 as in the Post Office bill which the gentleman excludes. If the gentleman did not omit the Post Office bills, both the 1915 and 1916 appropriations would be much larger than 1914, and the gentleman's argument would be gone.

But let us adopt his method, only let us carry it a little further, and let us omit not only the Post Office bills from both years but other appropriation bills for whose size everyone will admit Congress was not responsible. I rather wondered at first why the gentleman selected this one year, 1914, for his comparison with both the Democratic sessions. You expect a leader to be fair. But I find that the year 1914 had the enormous pension appropriations of $195,000,000, while in 1915 the pension bill was only $169,000,000. There was a saving of $26,000,000, but that was due to no volition of Congress, no change of the law, no Democratic economy, but to the death of old soldiers. A pension appropriation bill differs from all others because Congress exercises no discretion except to estimate how many pensioners will be alive. The law determines what each shall receive, and unless they change the law—and that has not been done since 1913—the pension bill offers no opportunity for economy, but it simply appropriates the amounts the law calls for, and unless appropriations were made in 1914 which really belonged in 1913, the only reason 1915 should be smaller than 1914 was that it was estimated some thousands of the veterans would be dead and need no pensions. Should you get credit for that? Was that part of your scheme of economy? There was $26,000,000 less required for pensions in 1915 than in 1914, and if you take that out in your comparison as you do the Post Office bills, because you were in no wise responsible for it, then both the first and second Democratic sessions spent over $15,000,000 more than the last session of the Taft Congress. And yet the gentleman claims that there is not one word of truth in the charge of Democratic extravagance.

In all the other branches of expenditure, outside of this pension bill, the Sixty-third Congress was more extravagant than the Sixty-second. How, then, can the gentleman say there is no extravagance when he insists Republicans were always extravagant—particularly as the pension law which compelled this enormous appropriation in 1914 originated in and was passed by a Democratic House?

There is another of the appropriation bills which the gentleman might have considered in his search for Democratic economy. The river and harbor bill of 1914 was $41,000,000. The river and harbor bill of 1915 was $20,000,000—so that bill made a saving of $21,000,000 for the first year of the Democratic administration over its predecessor. But is the Democratic Party entitled to that credit? Was that economy due to their wish and action? The Democratic President recommended a river and harbor appropriation of $34,000,000. The Democratic House passed a bill for $39,000,000. It went to the Senate, and the Democratic Senate committee reported it for $43,000,000. Why did it not pass? Was it because of Democratic economy? It failed because Senator Burton, a Republican, led a filibuster against it, and by the power which the Senate rules give the individual Member that little band brought the Democratic majority to their knees and reduced the bill to $20,000,000. And the gentleman is claiming that reduction as an evidence of Democratic economy. If the bill had become a law, even as your Democratic House passed it, which was its most diminutive form, then on your own basis of comparison the first Democratic Congress would have exceeded its predecessor by about $8,000,000, and your claim of economy would be gone. But a Republican filibuster in the Senate made that economy for you.

And if, in making the comparison between the sessions of Congress which you have selected, in addition to the Post Office bill you omit the pension bill and the saving made in the Senate by the Republican filibuster, for which the Democratic Party certainly can claim no credit, then the appropriations of the first session of the Democratic administration exceeded those of the last session of the Taft administration by $34,000,000. And the gentleman claims that this comparison refutes all charges of Democratic extravagance.

I admit that literally the Democratic Party is entitled to the credit of the Republican filibuster. The party in power is responsible for the acts of the Congress which it controls. If by happy accidents or the acts of the minority good legislation comes, the majority can properly claim it, just as it can be properly blamed for bad luck. The results accomplished by a Congress are the fruits by which the majority party must be judged, no matter how the majority was composed which passed each particular bill. It is most important that this sense of party responsibility should be strictly preserved. I would not diminish it or impair it. But when the gentleman, in his comparison, begins to omit appropriation bills on grounds of equity, the process can be carried further, and it can be shown just how much the Democrats really contributed to economy.

So far I have followed the line of comparison which the gentleman himself initiated. But I deny that he selected a fair basis for comparison. He argues that the method of determining whether a Democratic Congress is extravagant is to ascertain if it spent more than a Republican Congress, and then he proceeds to compare it with a Congress which was only half Republican. In disproving Democratic extravagance why should he compare the Democratic Party with itself? Why should he not compare its conduct with that of the party which they have always maintained furnished a standard of "frightful extravagance" and "profligate waste"? That would be the true comparison. In the year 1914, which the gentleman picked out for his comparison, Congress was not controlled by the Republicans. This House, which originates all the appropriation bills, was Democratic. The Senate, to be sure, was Republican; but I trust it is not unparliamentary or unfair to say that in my experience here I have learned never to look to the Senate for economy, no matter which party controls there. If there is to be economy, it must start and stop here. But if the gentleman had taken both the sessions of the Sixty-second Congress, which was half Republican, and compared them with both of the sessions of the Democratic Sixty-third Congress instead of selecting the session which made the best showing for his purpose, the result would have been very different. The appropriations of the Sixty-third Congress exceeded that of the Sixty-second by $112,963,651.26. Excluding all post-office bills, the appropriations of the Sixty-third Congress exceeded those of the Sixty-second by $43,040,187.26. And as the gentleman's only evidence that the Sixty-third Congress was not extravagant was that each of its sessions had spent less than one session of the Sixty-second Congress, when we find that, comparing the two sessions of the Sixty-third with the two sessions of the Sixty-second, according to his own select method of bookkeeping, the Democratic Congress appropriated $43,000,000 more than its predecessor, his only prop falls from under him. And I ask, was it fair, in comparing both sessions of the Sixty-third Congress with the Sixty-second, to pick out only one session of the Sixty-second Congress when, if you had

taken both sessions, the result would have been so entirely different?

But even that comparison favors him unduly, for the Sixty-second Congress was half Democratic. To find out how much the Democrats have improved over the party which for 12 years they held up as the exemplar of extravagance let us compare the record of their first Congress, the Sixty-third, with the last Congress controlled by the Republicans, the Sixty-first. That is the natural and the fair comparison. The appropriations of the Sixty-first Congress were $2,054,584,510.90, and the appropriations of the Sixty-third Congress were $2,239,055,150.57; so the Sixty-third exceeded the Sixty-first by $176,470,639.67. If you exclude the post-office bills, as the gentleman desires, the Sixty-third exceeds the Sixty-first by $52,782,788.67. But if it is fair to exclude the post-office bills, it is certainly fair to exclude the amount devoted to the Panama Canal, for Congress exercised no discretion there. The Sixty-first Congress spent more on the canal than the Sixty-third by $44,993,426.70. So excluding both the postal and the canal expenses the Sixty-third exceeded the Sixty-first by $97,776,215.37. Either method of figuring disposes of the gentleman's argument that the Sixty-third Congress was economical compared with its Republican predecessor. If you include all the appropriations, the last Democratic Congress spent $176,000,000 more than the last Republican Congress. If you omit the appropriations for the Postal Service and for the Panama Canal, it spent $97,000,000 more.

I do not claim that the Sixty-third Congress was necessarily extravagant because it appropriated more than any of its predecessors. But that is the argument of the gentleman from North Carolina. He offers as conclusive proof that the Democratic Congress was not extravagant the fact that it spent less than the previous Congress, which was only half Democratic; and he is not even correct or fair or candid in that comparison. He does not dare to make the comparison with any of the Congresses when the Republicans had complete control because the results would be so disastrous for him. I do not think that the mere fact that a Congress spent more than its predecessor proves that it was extravagant. Personally I do not think that the Republican administrations were very economical.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman give me five minutes more?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. GILLETT. I do not claim for the Republican administrations great economy, although they did not deserve the abuse heaped on them by the Democrats, but they certainly were economical compared with their Democratic successor. And if they made large appropriations they at least provided the money to meet them. That is where I specially condemn the present administration. The mere amount of money spent does not prove extravagance. The proportion of income to outgo must be considered. What is parsimony in a millionaire might be waste in a pauper. What was reasonable expenditure in good Republican times might be rank extravagance in lean Democratic years.

Last winter, when our outgo was steadily gaining on our income, when every month showed a growing deficiency, when there was no prospect of any change, when private individuals everywhere were cutting down expenses, the President recommended and the Congress adopted larger appropriations than had ever been passed by any previous Congress. That I call extravagance—not simply on the ground which ought to estop any Democrat from denying it, that the appropriations were vastly larger than those of any Republican Congress, but on the ground that no provision of income was made to meet their large appropriations. The outlook was stormy; there was every reason for trying to retrench and set aside reserve resources, and yet in the face of these conditions you went on spending lavishly for current expenses and frittering away the surplus which had been provided by Republican savings. And now we are reaping the natural result. Now we are facing inevitable and increased expenses. The surplus of $150,000,000, or according to present bookkeeping of $200,000,000, which this administration found in the Treasury would have gone far to meet them if it had not been wasted. And yet even now, when the President recommends to us enormous outlays for armed defense, he does not offer a single suggestion of economy or show that he is conscious of the fact that money can be provided by cutting off expenses as well as by increasing revenues.

The Democratic Party has so long been in the minority and been reproaching us for extravagance that I suspect it deceived itself into believing that it really represented the spirit of economy. But the conduct of our finances the past two years ought to have destroyed that illusion. A few leaders may still make a pretense, but I do not think the intelligent voters who form public opinion in both parties can longer be deceived. They will not believe a party which continually denounces its opponent for extravagance and then when it achieves power itself increases enormously the very appropriation which it had so unsparingly condemned. The Democratic Party is either extravagant now or it was unjust and demagogical before. It can choose either horn of the dilemma. But it can no longer convince any impartial judge that its conduct conforms to the statements of its leaders or the pledges of its platform. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is the hope of all students of government that the time will come in all Congresses when candor will be the most predominant trait in men who speak about public affairs. Unfortunately every four years this country is subjected to a lot of speeches that are made simply with a view of the presidential election, and without that virtue of candor being especially prominent.

I do not believe that any man who has ever considered the workings of the American Congress but what has come to one conclusion, and that certainly is also the conclusion of the American people, that irrespective of the tendencies of respective parties, the method of making appropriations in the National Congress inevitably leads to extravagance [applause], and men who want to be candid instead of being political will so state.

No man who has served on the Committee on Appropriations, as has the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts and myself, but what knows that fact. They know that that committee comes to this floor repeatedly with bills by which they undertake to make a saving; but that there is pressure both before the bill is reported and after it is reported by Members on both sides of the aisle for additional expenditure of money that makes their efforts for economy of little avail.

Anyone can very easily cite expenditures under any party that show extravagance, but if they are frank they will say that, speaking by and large, there is no disposition on the part of the individual Member to help along the lines of economy, particularly if the subject matter happens to relate to his section of the country. That is the plain truth; and yet we all play politics, we all try to get advantages from the analysis and comparison of the statements of expenditures of one Congress with another, though we know that as long as we have the present system we will have increases of expenditure. Practically every congress in the world has found that in order to curb extravagance they had to take away from the individual member of the congress the right to increase estimates of appropriations as submitted by the administrative officers in control.

There is another thing touching expenditures and touching extravagance, and that is as to whether you shall consider simply totals as evidence of extravagance or whether you should consider what they were spent for and how they were spent. There comes in the life of every nation the need to do many things that must increase expenditures, and nothing is more shortsighted than to undertake to determine extravagance and economy simply by a mathematical determination of totals.

There recently has been much that has developed by new men taking hold of the departments as to the needs of the departments touching the physical property of the Government. That probably would have been true if Republicans had succeeded Democrats. I can cite instance after instance in connection with the Coast and Geodetic Survey, in connection with the Bureau of Fisheries, and other departments, where the physical property of the Government had reached the point that it required to be replaced and new put in its stead. Those things come about whenever you get a change from one set of officials long in power to another and without regard to parties. I am not saying this simply to offset any political advantage the gentleman from Massachusetts may get from his political speech, but because I am interested in having the people of America consider the real matters that underly extravagance in government.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; briefly.

Mr. FESS. Would the gentleman's defense against the charge of extravagance stand also for the charge of his party in its platform against the extravagance of the Republican Party?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will answer the gentleman's question. In the first place, I am neither trying to make a defense or an attack. I am trying to state what is so rarely

done during times of political agitation, namely, the facts that everyone knows and few admit publicly. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GILLETT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. I would like to continue a short time longer, and I will ask the gentleman from New York to yield me a little more time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that I am in accord and sympathize with what the gentleman has said; but I call attention to the fact that my remarks were made in answer to and in exposition of, as I thought, the lack of candor on the part of the leader of the Democratic Party and the leaders of this House.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am perfectly willing to admit that the gentleman agrees pretty largely with me except when he is making a political speech. I concede that now. In reply to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] I desire to say this: I agree thoroughly with the idea that a party in power must stand sponsor for what is done, but I also wish that, along with that responsibility, there could be means for making it a real responsibility, which do not exist at the present time. We all know that the method of appropriations does not in a practical sense, though it does in a theoretical sense, give to the majority party in power control over expenditures. That is one of the reasons I have been fighting for something of a budget system in our Government. It is one of the reasons why I believe that, irrespective of parties, you will not get any real remedy as long as you proceed in the present way.

Now, just a word touching the matter of revenues, Mr. Chairman, and I am through. The gentleman from Massachusetts seems to lay great stress on the fact that the Democratic Party fails to raise sufficient revenues to run the Government. That, I think, could be met simply by the statement that the facts do not warrant the assertion, but what underlies his remark, and what constantly underlies the remarks of men on his side of the Chamber, is that we do not hide the methods by which we tax the people as successfully as the Republicans do. [Laughter.] They seem to think that there is a virtue in taxing through a customhouse and a vice in taxing in any other way. I know it has been frequently said that the height of statesmanship lies in taxing the people without their knowing it. That is unfortunately largely true as to political success, but with respect to political morality it is the most vicious proposition that was ever presented to a free people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The truth of the business is that taxation is taxation, whether it comes from the customhouse or by levy of a direct tax; but the individual, when he pays a direct tax, having it brought home to him, complains, because all men like privileges and dislike obligations. When taxation comes, however, through the customhouse he is not conscious of it—it rarely can be traced—and you do not have the protest. One of the greatest statesman that England ever produced said that you could tax the coat off a man's back without protest if you did it by indirect methods, and, reviewing the history of this country at several periods, I am inclined to think the statement was not an exaggeration.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield.

Mr. FESS. Is the gentleman willing to supersede the indirect taxation methods through the customhouse by the direct method?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am both willing to supersede or to increase them according as the circumstances may warrant. Do not say that is evasion. I mean it in this sense: I would not levy a tax at the customhouse simply to evade letting the people know they were paying a tax. I would levy taxes at the customhouse where I thought the subject taxed was a proper one to be taxed—a legitimate method of raising revenue.

What I resent is the constant assumption that there is some peculiar virtue in hiding a tax and a peculiar vice in letting it be known. That is the thing that leads to extravagance. Why is it that your average State legislature does not spend money so easily as the Congress of the United States does? Why is it that all of the States, talking State rights, and forgetting State obligations, are coming here with demands for new Federal activities? I will tell you why. It is because if those activities are undertaken by the States it means increased taxation that shows in the tax rate when the citizen goes to pay his taxes, and so they begin to ask whether the thing they are paying for is worth the price paid; but they come up here, hide the fact that governmental activities mean governmental expenses and taxation, and expect to get away with it, and one of the very reasons why you are seeing thrown upon the Federal Government such a tremendous amount of work that ought to be done in the communities back home is because of the hiding of the fact that governmental activities cost money. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. I regret that I can not yield further.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CARTER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 4716. An act to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River; and

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] in his usually fair and candid way, rather more than fair, I think, considering the class of alleged argument that he has to meet and answer, has discussed some of the faults of this administration and Congress touching appropriations. I think that in general debate we should, as far as possible, confine the discussion, as the gentleman did, to the subject matter of the bill. Just at this time, however, there is another question than that of appropriations attracting wide public attention, relative to which there is a great deal of discussion, to wit, the Mexican situation, and, owing to the importance of that question, I beg leave of the House to discuss for a few minutes in connection with the consideration of this bill.

THE MEXICAN SITUATION.

The administration's Mexican policy has again borne logical, horrid, and humiliating fruit in the fiendish murder of nearly a score of American citizens at Santa Ysabel, and the only answer of the administration to this fresh evidence of brutish ferocity toward American citizens, and utter contempt of the American Government among the bandit forces of Mexico, is a polite note to Carranza to please apprehend and punish the offenders.

This fresh outbreak of hate and ferocity has aroused the country more perhaps than any of the long line of outrages and murders committed on our people in Mexico during this administration. But dastardly and deplorable as was the murder of these American mining men, journeying on a business mission, it had no aspect or element of horror which had not had its counterpart in the repeated outrages and murders of American men and women, in their homes in Mexico, which have occurred during the past three years.

Some of the comments and suggestions which this latest outrage have brought forth are, taking into consideration what has gone before, curious and significant. Gentlemen are now getting into the lists with severest denunciation who have heretofore held their peace during the development of the policy which produced, prolonged, and multiplied these outrages and murders.

We are now hearing caustic comment from some of those who have been the most unctuous and emphatic in thanking God for Wilson and meeting all adverse criticism of the administration's policy by denouncing all who have plead or protested against it as wicked partisans, pestiferous trouble makers, or bloodthirsty advocates of armed intervention.

Some who have alternately apologized for or defended the administration policy because it has, so they say, "kept us out of war," are now most anxious that Congress shall assume all responsibility, for the situation the administration policies have produced, and relieve the administration from all past and present blame by having Congress do what they have applauded the administration for not doing or proposing. Some have gone so far along this road as to offer the pusillanimous and humiliating suggestion that we invite other nations to join and assist us in avenging and defending our own people and restoring our shattered prestige in Mexico.

FIXING THE RESPONSIBILITY.

In the midst of these counsels of belated and strangely blended belligerency and timidity, of avoidance and apology, whatever is done, or may be necessary to do, should be done in full and complete appreciation, and recognition of, what has heretofore been done and left undone and of the proper responsibility for it.

Unless responsibility for what has occurred is clearly understood and definitely fixed, the acts of commission and omission, which have wrought so lamentable a condition of loss of prestige and respect in Mexico, which have brought our Government and flag into contempt and subjected our people to every conceivable insult, outrage, and violence, may, when these outrages are dimmed or forgotten, be used as precedents for like policies in the future. Policies of unjustifiable interference or unseemly alliance with factions of other nations, and supine indifference to, and deliberate neglect of, our duty to our own citizens or those whose protection we assume as the sponsor for the Monroe doctrine.

In the presence of these fresh manifestations of outlawry in Mexico, and of hatred toward our citizens and contempt of our power, let it be remembered that these and similar occurrences are the inevitable fruit and outcome of the policy the administration has with stiff-necked persistency pursued from the beginning, and that these outrages have had their genesis and development out of definite acts and purposes of the administration, even more than as the result of its vacillation, timidity, and seeming indifference.

The administration has not only failed to take prompt, decisive, and determined action for the protection of American life and property and the punishment of outrages; it has deliberately adopted a policy and pursued a line of action which brought upon our people the suspicion, ill will, and hatred of first one, then another, and finally all of the factions in Mexico, which, ripening into contempt, developed into outrage and murder.

DELIBERATE DESERTION.

More than this, the administration has exposed our people in Mexico to mortal danger, and by deliberate act deserted and abandoned them to insult, outrage, and danger of death in the fatuous pursuit of its indefensible policy. If anyone challenges the truth or accuracy of this charge, let him recall the occurrences at Tampico in the days immediately following our taking of Vera Cruz.

In the excitement of that time, when the wildest tales and rumors of occurrences at Vera Cruz were being circulated among the Mexicans in and about the oil fields of Tampico, several hundred American men, women, and children, leaving their homes and property, gathered at Tampico, expecting to find safety there under the guns of American warships. As the story of our taking of Vera Cruz and the killing of several hundred Mexicans spread in Tampico an angry, tumultuous mob gathered around the hotel where most of the Americans were quartered and began heaping upon them threats and insults.

At this juncture, upon peremptory orders from Washington, the American commander reluctantly withdrew his ship, which lay along the wharf with shotted guns and ready for action, and sailed out into the open roadstead, where lay six American battleships, leaving our people defenseless and at the mercy of an armed, angry, infuriated, and drunken mob.

The story of the nameless and unprintable insults heaped upon that little band of Americans, directed at American men in the presence of their wives and children, as related to me by one who bore, witnessed, and heard them, are calculated to make one's blood boil. They almost justified the impassioned declaration of that humiliated and exasperated citizen that he never could again respect his country's flag or think or speak with patience or patriotism of the Government at Washington.

SAVED BY A GERMAN CAPTAIN.

Fortunately for that harassed and beleaguered little band there lay in the harbor of Tampico the German gunboat *Dresden*, and her commander, without invitation or request of our authorities, trained his guns upon Tampico, served notice of his intent to use them if injury or further insult were attempted, and escorted our people—men, women, and children—to the wharf, where they were loaded on English and German boats and taken out of danger.

That April day strikes me as being one of the darkest in American history. That unspeakably infamous desertion was a deliberate part and parcel of the administration's policy, and was purposed and effected out of fear that the protection of our citizens might bring on a clash with the Mexicans, result in the joining of the two Mexican forces—the one defending and the other attacking Tampico—and thus interfere with the President's plan and purpose to crush and defeat the Huerta government.

KEYNOTE OF ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY.

In this infamous incident we have the keynote of the administration's policy in Mexico, a policy of personal antagonism and antipathy to an individual Mexican, of interference with the sovereign right of Mexico to manage its own affairs and fight out its quarrels without let or hindrance; to have or maintain such government, or lack of government, as suits its people, or is tolerated by them, so long as foreign lives and property are secured and protected.

POLICY OF PREJUDICE AND INTERFERENCE.

Out of the establishment, pursuit, and continuance of its policy of prejudice and interference, of alternating impertinence and apology, bluffs and vacillation, bolstered with a flood of contradictory declarations, discourse, and phrase making, have come the major part of the losses, insults, and outrages which our people in Mexico have suffered, and the spread and continuation of the reign of unspeakable demoralization and anarchy which has deluged that unhappy country.

The losses and wrongs suffered by Americans under a former administration during the revolution led by Madero were not only incomparably less frequent, widespread, or ferocious than those which have been suffered under the present administration, but they were of altogether different character. Those were, without exception, the class of occurrences inseparably connected with a condition of revolution and of the breaking down of civil government. They were not generally crimes against Americans as such, but the ordinary crimes of lawless and criminal bands or persons in the absence of restraining authority. The major portion of the innumerable lootings, confiscations, insults, outrages, and murder of Americans since this administration took control of affairs have, at least the most atrocious of them, been directed against Americans because they were Americans. They have been prompted and inspired out of exasperation over the attitude and acts of interference on the part of the American Government, and contempt born of the administration's acts of deliberate desertion of and abject failure to protect Americans in Mexico.

THE WAR AGAINST HUERTA.

The recognition of the government of Huerta as the de facto government in Mexico would not have been an absolute essential if a sound, sane, and sensible policy had otherwise been adopted. Such recognition in due and proper time would, however, have been in accordance with our uniform diplomatic practice for a century and in harmony with the subsequent practice of this administration in Peru and Haiti. In fact, it is the opinion of those well informed that the administration had no other thought or purpose for a considerable period of time than the ultimate official recognition of the fact that the Huerta government did control the machinery of government and the major portion of the territory of Mexico.

While, however, the Secretary of State journeyed the Chautauqua circuit busybodies and self-seekers brought to the ear of the President statements and rumors of uncomplimentary references alleged to have been made by Huerta to his intimates, or in convivial moments not so privately, relative to the President of the United States. Among these rumors was one that Huerta had expressed the opinion that he would be President of Mexico longer than Mr. Wilson would be President of the United States. Whereupon, or at least immediately thereafter, a complete change came over the spirit of the administration. The period of "watchful waiting" came to an end and the determination was entered upon not to recognize the Huerta government, but to destroy it and eliminate Huerta from all consideration as the head of the government in Mexico.

Smug and unctious phrases and elaborate dissertations on the cardinal virtues, and the blessings of constitutional government, were framed and fashioned in excuse of this indefensible interference with the sovereignty of an independent people, with their right to tolerate, their right to choose or select whom they saw fit. That interference, bolstered with the prayer of the Pharisee, cost us the respect of Mexicans who value the sovereignty and the independence of their Government; brought us the open enmity of all who favored the Huerta régime; the covert distrust and suspicion of even those who temporarily benefited by our act and attitude.

Even then, and to the day of its downfall, the Huerta government wherever it had the power, and with remarkable effectiveness in all the territory it controlled, protected our people and other foreigners. On the contrary, those whose cause the administration had thus openly espoused, the Villaistas, the Zapatistas, the Carranzistas, made but a feeble and perfunctory attempt to protect our people, and carefully avoided any danger

of testing or losing the loyalty of their outlying irregular and robber bands by any honest or earnest effort to control or prevent their lootings, outrage, and murder.

WHEN THE ADMINISTRATION INTERVENED.

Those who are belatedly aroused by the rising tide of public indignation are now clamoring to Congress for action rather than appealing to the White House. Have they overlooked the fact that the White House has the first and initial responsibility in our foreign relations? Have they forgotten that the White House can and has at one time acted vigorously relative to Mexico, culminating in the taking of Vera Cruz? That action was not, it is true, in defense of American lives and property. It was not, it is true, in response to the agonized cries of outraged and plundered Americans, or the mute appeal of American blood wantonly and criminally spilled. Every fact and circumstance surrounding that action evidences that it was taken because at that time the sole and single purpose of the administration's policy, the defeat of Huerta, might be further advanced by it.

Out of an incident, trivial in character, involving the formal placing in custody for an hour and a half of a small party of American sailors, in which no insult was offered or intended, not even a temper or uniform ruffled, came the request to Congress to be permitted to us the armed forces of the United States. Before Congress granted that permission our mighty fleet moved and our heroic men took Vera Cruz. Nineteen of them, just the number of those cruelly murdered the other day at Santa Ysabel, lost their lives that Huerta, who had protected American citizens, might be defeated. The next day our harassed and hunted countrymen, their wives and little ones, their lives placed in jeopardy by reason of the taking of Vera Cruz, were cruelly and wickedly abandoned, as I have stated, to the tender mercies of a Mexican mob. Their protection might in some degree have interfered with the President's determination to defeat Huerta.

FRIEND AND ALLY OF VILLA.

Continuing a plan of personal vengeance, ignoring past American practice in international intercourse, an embargo was laid against arms going to the government at Mexico City and its forces, while we flung wide open the gates of our northern border in aid and encouragement of the shipment of arms and ammunitions to the revolutionary forces in northern Mexico. In all probability we furnished the very guns and cartridges with which our defenseless citizens were recently foully slain at Santa Ysabel. The agents and emissaries, official and unofficial, of the administration kotowed to, hobnobbed and fraternized with, Villa and all his chieftains. Administration journals proclaimed Villa the only true patriot and the hope of liberty in Mexico. In the meanwhile Villa, through his subordinates, looted and confiscated the property of native and foreigner alike, and through his relatives and henchmen conducted or absorbed the profits of brothels and gambling dens. Outwardly he expressed friendship for and promised to protect Americans, and, no doubt, made some slight effort in that direction; but his control over his bandit bands in outlying districts was slight, and he declined to imperil or sacrifice their loyalty by limiting their lootings or adequately punishing their crimes. He realized his security against anything more than polite half-apologetic demands for the protection of Americans, and punishment of those guilty of outrage, lay in the fact that the administration could not afford to proceed to extreme measures against its chief ally in its campaign to defeat Huerta.

DESERTED VILLA, EMBRACED CARRANZA.

The administration's purpose to eliminate Huerta having been accomplished, and the reign of terror and chaos, of rapine and murder, having widely extended, there came the inevitable break between Villa and Carranza. Then, again the administration's fatuous and fatal policy of taking sides as an active ally, of intervening on behalf of, one of the forces in Mexico. Carranza, profiting as he did by our attitude toward the Huerta government, always resented that attitude as an unwarranted and impertinent interference with Mexican affairs. While taking advantage of our intervention against Huerta, he refused at all times our patronizing advances, but unquestionably did make some attempt to protect the lives and property of foreigners in the territory he controlled.

I am not disposed to criticize the recognition of Carranza's government, irregular, revolutionary, unconstitutional, and comparatively ineffectual as it is. The rule long since adopted as our guide in such matters is to recognize—at least to enter into official relations with—such government as at the time is or most nearly approximates the de facto government of a country, providing it be in position and evidence an inclination and disposition to fulfill its international obligations. Assuming that the Carranza government, among those exercising authority in Mexico, most nearly measured up to these requirements, and had given satisfactory assurances of its inclination and intent, the duty of recognition for the purpose of being in position to best protect our citizens rested with the administration. In the recognition of Carranza, however, the administration gave the clearest and most convincing proof of the indefensible character of its refusal to recognize the government of Huerta and of the hollow insincerity of its declarations that no government in Mexico would ever be recognized which did not have constitutional basis for its authority.

MEASURELESS INCONSISTENCY.

The Spanish mind is untrained in the diplomatic gymnastics of this administration and unable to follow the limitless and labyrinthian allocutions through which the administration demonstrates that what it detested, abhorred, and abjured last summer or last week is law and gospel to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.] They are unaccustomed to accept a phrase as a substitute for a fact, and do not move quickly to a realization that you may properly, logically, or honestly do to-day that which on yesterday you called on high heaven to witness you would never do. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Huerta—

Said they—

was, according to our laws and usages, entitled to at least claim the constitutionality of his government, though many of us deny its unquestioned constitutional character. But Carranza makes no claim, nor anyone for him, that his government is anything but revolutionary, and your President has theretofore declared that under no circumstances would any government be recognized that had not a constitutional basis.

TURNING ON VILLA.

Until we recognized Carranza Villa believed he would have a free hand, so far as we were concerned, to fight it out. He had not expected to be recognized as the head of government. He had the President's word that no one else would until some arrangement, at least nominally constitutional, could be had. But suddenly the administration, whose pet he had been, whose encouragement he had received, even after his break with Carranza, deserted him, and he found himself handicapped by the recognition of his rival. But Pancho Villa, with all his faults, appears to have some soldierly philosophy, and to have accepted with considerable self-restraint the conditions, which, in view of former assurances, he might properly have felt were thus unfairly created.

This, however, was but the beginning, for embargo on arms to Villa forces followed Carranza's recognition; our special representatives, Villa's erstwhile companions and compatriots, deserted him, and every device of restraint and embargo at our command was used against him. Even all this, while it led to violent outbreaks of protest, did not, it seems, wholly turn Villa against us and make him and his followers the open and sworn enemies of our people.

Against the handicaps and hardships we had raised against him Villa fought on against the Carranza forces, and seizing the opportunity while Carranza forces at Agua Prieta were less than his he planned a dashing campaign against them, believing there was no way that the Carranza garrison could be quickly reinforced. Stripped of the last ounce of surplus supplies or impedimenta, by forced marches over a barren country, Villa and his little force pressed on, and after incredible hardship, worn, hungry, tortured with thirst, a ragged remnant reached the outskirts of Agua Prieta; reached their goal only to find themselves confronted with several thousand fresh Carranza troops, who had been transported with their arms and accouterments over American territory by rail, while his men had been trailing through the desert. There they lay, well fortified in the trenches of Agua Prieta behind American barbed-wire entanglements, well provisioned from American sources, to meet his famished, thirst-tortured troops.

WHEN VILLA TURNED.

Had the men thus confronting the erstwhile victorious constitutional leader been Americans the shock could not have been greater or our open hostility more apparent. And yet, against all these odds, he fought valiantly and only gave up the fight when hunger and thirst and decimation of his forces made further attack impossible. Then Villa took to the hills, and his followers, in looting, murderous bands, took up the work that culminated in the gruesome horror of Santa Ysabel.

Thus by following, not a policy of "watchful waiting," but of mischievous meddling and impertinent interference, coupled with base betrayal and calloused indifference to the welfare and safety of American citizens, has the administration lost the respect and the confidence, and earned the contempt, of first one and then another and finally all the people of Mexico. By the

same process has the administration subjected our citizens in Mexico, and all who seek our protection, to the sort of treatment likely to be meted out to the citizens of a country whose authorities have by their acts brought upon them the ill will and distrust or hatred of a whole people.

THE RUMORED A. B. C. AGREEMENT.

Now, we hear strange and incredible rumors that the administration has entered into agreement with the governments of other nations under which we are bound to take no step by overt act to avenge the outrages upon, or to protect the lives of our citizens in Mexico, whatever may happen or occur there, until we have received the assent and approval of such nations.

I find it hard to believe that the administration has been disposed, or has dared or presumed, to enter into so humiliating an arrangement or alliance, at least without consulting the coordinate treaty-making branch of our Government, but this rumor has wide currency.

The administration went the limit, and beyond its authority, when it intervened in behalf, and became the ally of, the Carranza government in allowing our territory to be used as the theater of warlike operations by transporting the military forces of Carranza hundreds of miles over our territory. Surely the administration has not so far forgotten the limitation of its independent authority as to believe or assume that it may enter into agreements with foreign nations binding the United States not to maintain its honor, defend the integrity of its soil, uphold its sovereignty, or protect its citizens except on the assent and permission of a foreign nation or nations. The administration has gone far in jeopardy of our rights and honor, but, unless I mistake the temper of the American people, they will not for a moment tolerate such a surrender of our sovereign rights as that.

AS TO ARMED INTERVENTION.

These persistent rumors that the administration has made agreements not to use force in Mexico without consulting other nations have followed the revival of the demand in certain quarters for armed intervention.

There is an old saying relative to the futility of locking the stable door after the horse is stolen. It would be even more futile to propose to apply a match to the barn under such circumstances.

Three years ago there were, I understand, upward of 50,000 Americans residing and doing business in Mexico. They had done much to enhance our prestige and increase our business in that country; they had built homes, invested large sums of American capital, and had property worth hundreds of millions of dollars. I have repeatedly said, and I have from the beginning believed, that under a policy of absolute neutrality and noninterference in Mexican affairs and of stern and definite insistence upon the protection of American lives and property, there never would have been any occurrences which would have justified or seriously suggested armed intervention. To-day the major portion of American property that was destructible or get-at-able is destroyed; only a handful of Americans remain in Mexico, and they are leaving rapidly. If we did not intervene when we could have saved hundreds of lives and vast properties, shall we intervene now? As we did not intervene when intervention would have protected our people, sustained our honor, and preserved our prestige, shall we intervene now when intervention can have little other purpose than that of vengeance and a belated effort to restore the prestige that is lost?

If after bearing so long the humiliation and the ignominy of the administration's policy Congress now desires to take another course across the border, well and good; but Congress should remember that if it does it, it is done at the end of an ignoble record of inactivity, during which it has allowed the policy of the administration to create a condition in Mexico in which, so far as we are concerned, practically all has been lost, including honor.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman, in speaking about the happy opportunity of intervening which was so unfortunately missed, is doubtless referring to the administration of President Taft?

Mr. MONDELL. I did not yield for the gentleman to misquote me or misstate my position——

Mr. BORLAND. I am endeavoring to state it correctly——

Mr. MONDELL. Because I have never believed armed intervention necessary if a proper policy were followed. I have constantly, continually, and on numerous occasions called attention to the fact that the policy the administration was pursuing would lead to armed intervention or to a condition of affairs such as we now have in Mexico. I have frequently warned against the policy of interference and intermeddling, because I believed it would lead to the conditions that now exist.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman a few moments ago said that not having intervened—I do not know he said at the proper time, but at a time when it would have saved American life and property; that is what the gentleman said; that time was, I understood by the gentleman's reference, during the administration of President Taft, and that that was the time we should have intervened to save lives.

Mr. MONDELL. The administration of President Taft had nothing to do with a situation in Mexico such as has arisen during this administration.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MONDELL. I do not yield to the gentleman further, for my time is limited.

Mr. BORLAND. But this raises a very important question here.

Mr. MONDELL. I have gone over that and called attention to the fact there were comparatively few outrages before this administration; that they were not only few compared with those that have occurred since, but those which occurred were of a character that would ordinarily and necessarily arise in a country in insurrection, and none were directed at an American because he was American. They were the sort of crimes that come in a disordered country, and there were comparatively few of them. Nobody thought of intervening then but a few hotheads; but under this administration, as a result of its policy, outrages have multiplied by the hundreds, and in the main have been directed against Americans as Americans, because of the exasperation of first one and then another of these Mexican factions against our policy, not of "watchful waiting"—there has never been a minute of "watchful waiting" since our forces took Vera Cruz—our policy of multiplied interference with the affairs of Mexico, our policy telling the Mexican people they should not be allowed to have the government and ruler they approved, but the government we approved. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BORLAND. Now will the gentleman allow me to recur to the question?

Mr. MONDELL. How much time, Mr. Chairman, have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has three minutes remaining.

Mr. BORLAND. I would like the gentleman to confine himself to the question I asked him. Would he have advised intervention when American life and property could have been saved, as he says, during the administration of President Taft?

Mr. MONDELL. I have never advised intervention, but I have continually attempted to awaken the country to the fact that this administration is bringing us by its deliberate acts of interference—of intervention, if you please—was bringing us to a position where ultimately we must intervene if we are to save anything in Mexico, either for ourselves or anybody else. We could have avoided all that if the administration had pursued a proper policy.

The gentleman talks of intervention. The administration has intervened repeatedly. It intervened against Huerta in favor of Villa, Zapata, and Carranza. It intervened in favor of Villa against Carranza, and finally it intervened in favor of Carranza against Villa. These interventions went all the way from private assurances and personal promises from the President's personal representative to sundry bandit chieftains through acts of open partisanship, like the shipment of or embargo on arms, to open acts of intervention, such as the attack on Vera Cruz and the transportation of Mexican troops over our territory. Every act of intervention that could and would prejudice our standing or embarrass or imperil our people was adopted; but this intervention always fell short of any act or attitude that would establish our prestige or protect our people. Our Democratic friends have sought, and quite successfully, to create the impression among our people that the only alternative to the administration's policy was armed intervention and war. That has not been the situation at any time.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. If I can get two minutes more, I will be glad to. Can the gentleman from Illinois yield me two minutes more?

Mr. CANNON. I can not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I would ask the gentleman from Illinois for one more minute.

Mr. CANNON. I yield the gentleman one minute.

WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE.

Mr. MONDELL. Had the administration in the beginning, after waiting a reasonable season to indicate disapproval of the methods employed to bring about and detestation of the crimes which accompanied the change of government in Mexico, recognized the government of Huerta, or, having refrained from so doing, made it clear we would take no hand in Mexican affairs and play no favorites; had we insisted upon the protection of the lives and property of Americans and other foreigners in Mexico; had we firmly and definitely and emphatically given all factions and all leaders to understand that our people, as well as all foreigners, must be protected and respected in their person and property on peril of our proceeding at once against the guilty parties; if this had been our policy, my opinion is there would have been but little destruction of foreign property and little loss of life or serious crimes against our people or other foreigners, and the probability is that long ere this peace would have been restored.

HOPING FOR A RETURN TO TRUE AMERICANISM.

A review of this sad and sorry record is neither pleasant nor inspiring. It is necessary to be done lest we forget the chain of causes that have produced these horrid and gruesome effects. We can not bring back the lives that have been cruelly sacrificed; we can not restore the property destroyed; we can not cure the devastation wrought; and a generation can not restore the confidence or reestablish the prestige we have lost. We can only hope and pray that Providence may in the future deliver us from such as would so foolishly and cruelly serve us in our foreign relations, and restore to us the leadership of those who shall preserve our honor and our standing and protect our citizens in every land and on every sea. [Applause.]

Mr. EAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, at the very outset of what it is hoped may not prove a wholly unprofitable discussion of a momentous and vital question, which has been suddenly and, I believe, unwarrantably thrust upon the American people regarding the national defenses and the need of increasing them at huge expense and practically without limit, it is my desire to call the attention of this House and the attention of the country to the fact that since 1905 the United States has spent upon the Army no less than $1,071,515,401.68 and on the Navy the staggering total of $1,474,686,315.49. The grand total is more than two and a third billions. Yet we are told by the advocates of increased appropriations for Army and Navy that the country to-day is "utterly defenseless" and that it could not "for a day" resist the approaches of a foreign foe.

That the people of the country have been considerably alarmed by the false stories given wide currency in support of the jingo program can not be doubted. They have been plied with misinformation. They have been deliberately and most cruelly deceived by those who design thus to stampede them into compliance with the great plans which call for heavy and ever heavier drafts upon the substance of the toilers. They have been worked upon in the name of patriotism until in many instances they appear ready to do the bidding of that interest which is already reckoning its stock-exchange profits out of the moneys Congress is expected to appropriate for increased armament.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are multiplying evidences that the propaganda of deceit and misinformation was begun too early. The plain folks out in the country have been given time to think and to inquire. They have been afforded an opportunity to examine some of the facts—not all of them, by any means, but enough of them to give them some basis for conclusions. Among the facts which they have come to realize is the salient one that we have already been spending money most lavishly on our Army and Navy—more than two and a third billions in the last 11 years, as before noted. If we are still without defenses, what has been done with the money? If we are still at the mercy of a foreign foe, is there any possible assurance that if expenditures were doubled better results would be secured? If more than two thousand millions of dollars have been devoted to the Army and Navy and yet these are hopelessly inadequate in the hour of possible need, have not those who have supplied the money out of their labor and their self-denial a right to demand that before another penny shall be tossed into this ravening maw some accounting must be made of all that has gone before?

How many people six months ago knew that our Navy is the second most powerful afloat? Our metropolitan newspapers and our magazines and our defense leagues studiously befogged the facts. They were careful to keep from view the testimony of our own naval experts within the year. And what was that testimony? It was given before a committee of this House. It was printed in the hearings of that committee. And it tells us that our Navy ranks next to that of Great Britain and far ahead of the navies of France, Japan, Russia, Italy, and all other countries in the world. It outranks that of Germany, and to-day it may not be much inferior to that of England, for no one at this hour can tell what losses have been sustained by the British fleet. We know that these losses must have been heavy. We know that an inflexible censorship has been maintained by the Admiralty. We know that the German submarines have levied a terrible toll upon British merchantmen. Can it be that only these have paid the price? Can it be doubted that the fighting machines also have paid?

And if the British fleet has suffered, how has it been with the fleet of Germany? Has it gone scot free? Has it sustained no losses? Has it come through the terrible ordeal thus far unscathed? Who will believe that it has? Who will accept the hysterical notion that Germany is to-day stronger upon the sea than she was a year ago, when Admiral Fletcher and other naval experts told a committee of this House that our Naval Establishment was stronger than that of the Kaiser's?

I shall not undertake to deal with this subject, as I know it will be dealt with by the courageous and invincible leader of the majority on this floor. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] has left the Navy League of the United States without a leg to stand on in its attempt to rush the people of the United States into a mad rivalry with Europe in military and naval expansion. He has met every argument advanced by the league with irrefutable facts. He has exposed the duplicity of those who have sought to throw dust in the eyes of the American people. He has pilloried those who would commit the United States to the supreme folly of arming for an imaginary conflict, for a conflict which can only come on our own invitation and by our own devices. Too much honor can not be done this brave leader, this honest American legislator, this splendid citizen who has dared to stand up and challenge all the forces of privilege in the Republic and to confront them with the only weapon of which they are afraid—the weapon of truth.

I pay my humble tribute to this gallant leader, to this resourceful friend of the people, to this strong champion of genuine Americanism, to this man of the hour who stands between the toilers of the Republic and those who would saddle fresh burdens upon them. [Applause.] It is to him that the masses are turning in this crucial moment. They are learning to know him, to trust him, and to love him. He towers high above the sordid crew which is clamoring for more millions and more billions to carry Bethlehem Steel, Crucible Steel, Du Pont Powder, and all the rest of the "war brides" to new high levels on Wall Street. And I have the same confidence in him that I have in the cause which he has so splendidly adopted as his own; and as I believe that cause must ultimately triumph over the war traffickers whose propaganda has been sweeping across the continent, so I believe that the American people will stand by CLAUDE KITCHIN and vindicate the intrepid course which he has so wisely chosen.

Mr. Chairman, let no one on this floor deceive himself. The temper of the people of this country is not for war, nor is it for the things which make for war. And who can doubt that warships and standing armies do this very thing? Was it some mollycoddle, some little American, some pro-German, some coward and craven who said that "overgrown military establishments, under any form of government, are inauspicious to liberty and are to be regarded as peculiarly hostile to republican liberty"? No; it was the Father of his Country who so expressed himself long ago. And George Washington was at least as good an American and as brave a man as the tempestuous and explosive hero of San Juan Hill. He was at least as true a patriot as those officials of the Armor Trust and the munitions ring who are now engaged, through various defense organizations, in manufacturing sentiment in favor of a standing army on American soil and of a navy great enough to overawe the world. [Applause.]

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Did you ever hear of a man of real courage wanting to run a bluff on anybody?

Mr. BAILEY. I never did, sir.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Do you not believe that nations are just made up of individuals, and that a nation that had an iron down its back and had the right kind of courage would not want to overawe the people or want to bluff them?

Mr. BAILEY. Not any more than John L. Sullivan would want to overawe a little boy.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, the pretense is made by these evangels of peace at any price—and it is your jingo who alone

is entitled to be known as a peace-at-any-price man—that the Army and the Navy are wanted purely for defensive purposes. But is not the pretense altogether too bald? Does it deceive anybody? Can any discerning eye fail to perceive what lies behind? The organ of the Navy League of the United States in an unguarded moment gave the whole case away. It stated with blunt frankness that the Army and Navy are wanted not for defense but for aggression, for commercial adventure, for the conquest of markets, for world supremacy, for empire. And ignorance is responsible for this folly of follies. Were the plutocrats who constitute the guiding forces of the Navy League of the United States and its allies less blind than they are regarding economic truth they would understand that it is not necessary to subdue men in order to gain their trade. It is necessary only to win their confidence, to invite and earn their trust, to meet their wants and supply their needs, and to offer them a fair equivalent for whatever value or advantage they may have to confer. The United States might annex the whole earth in a commercial sense were it to open all its markets to the world as freely as the markets of New York and Chicago are open to all the people of the 48 States. More than half the jealousies and suspicions which separate the peoples of the globe to-day grow out of the superstition that trade is war, and that in order to gain markets we must conquer the country in which the markets are found.

Let me turn for a moment to the consideration of another phase of the general question of military preparedness. We are told that we must have an Army of 2,000,000 men. Well, accepting this at face value for the time being, let us consider whether we can get it. Are the young men of America ready to make up this huge Army? They have not been overready to make up the Army we now have. With the utmost exertion and only with the most flamboyant and deceptive advertisements is it possible to keep the present force recruited. Nearly one-fifth of the men who enlist become deserters, and in becoming deserters have a price set upon their heads. During recent years nearly 50,000 men have deserted from the Regular Army of the United States. These men have become criminals in consequence. They have sacrificed their citizenship. They have fixed upon themselves by their desertion an ineffaceable stigma.

May we reasonably hope for a better state of affairs when we shall multiply our standing Army by 20, raising it from 100,000 men to 2,000,000? Will the causes of desertion be diminished in inverse proportion? Shall we turn out fewer criminals than are now being milled from that mint? Are we to resort to fewer and less gross deceits in enticing the youth of the land to give up gainful employment and the life of home and family and widening interests for the purpose of wearing a uniform and carrying a gun? Or is the alternative to be that which is already being gravely urged—that of enforced military service? If we can not now recruit our Army fast enough to make up for desertions, how can it be possible to keep the ranks of a larger force filled unless we adopt the military systems of the Old World?

It can not be done. And the advocates of a huge standing army recognize the fact when they begin to couple with their demand a suggestion of compulsory military service. They are guilty of no self-deception. They know that if the army of which they dream is to be recruited it must be under compulsion. No country in all the tide of time has maintained a great standing army by other means. The youth of no land the sun ever shone upon were willing freely to give up the best years of their lives to military service, which meant nothing but hardship to themselves and perhaps enslavement for their country. Always and everywhere the ruling class have been compelled to resort to compulsion when they felt it necessary to buttress their power with a standing army. And the ruling class in this country are not blinking at the fact. They are meeting it fairly and are making no concealment of their plan to graft upon America a system which was the destruction of every free government of the past and that is the accepted instrument of every tyrant who now cumbers this old earth.

I want to ask my countrymen whether they are prepared to follow along this dangerous path. I want to ask them whether they are ready to sign the death warrant of free government in this Republic. I want to ask them whether they are themselves to rule or whether they are bent upon turning our institutions over to a class which feels even thus early the spur of necessity pricking it on to courses which the ruling classes of all history have pursued. Let no one tell himself that the proposals now before the country are final. They are only the beginning. Once fairly started on this road, there will be no stopping. Militarism never was satisfied; it never will be satisfied. It is always reaching out for more, always sighing, with an Alexander, for new worlds to conquer, always lamenting, with a Roosevelt, that there is not war enough to go around. If we yield now to those who would commit us to a policy strange to our ideals and incompatible with our liberties, does anyone lay the flattering unction to his soul that these ideals and these liberties will survive a contact so baneful?

There is a subtle poison in this preparedness which is breaking down the fabric of our thought and eating out the very vitals of our national spirit. In what terms are we thinking to-day? Not in terms of peace, not in terms of brotherhood, not in terms of international amity, not in terms of good will and justice, not in terms of charity and forbearance, not in terms of patience and generous allowance. Nay. It is in quite other terms—in terms of force, in terms of suspicion, in terms of jealousy, in terms of rancor and prejudice and ill will, in terms that make for misunderstandings and bitterness, in terms rankling with the acrid venom of hatred and shot through with the deadly distillations of unreasoning passion. This may sound like empty rhetoric. But is it? Read the daily press. Listen to the fulminations from pulpit and platform where jingoism finds voice. Dip into the literature of the hour. Mingle with those who catch their inspiration from the patriots for profit. If you do not in all these find proof of what is here said, then you are capable of making interpretations which are clearly denied to me.

Mr. Chairman, of whom are we afraid? Who is offering us any affront? Who is coveting our territory? Who is threatening our institutions? I do not forget, nor have you forgotten, that the President of the United States himself has declared that we are in danger from no quarter. Yet we are asked to prepare and very adequately prepare. For what? Against whom? On what account? Who has answered or even attempted to answer these very pertinent questions? Who indeed. There is no answer to them. To attempt to answer them is to render absurd all the hysterical talk with which the country has been deluged during recent months. We are to be attacked and overwhelmed by some unnamed power when the European war is brought to an end. That is one of the answers. But every power in Europe will be exhausted when the war is over. All Europe even now is on the verge of exhaustion. Both in men and in resources the nations now at death grips are nearing the point of collapse. Yet we are asked to believe that when this tremendous struggle is brought to a close through exhaustion—and it will scarcely close short of that—one of the nations, or perhaps a combination of them, will turn at once upon us to recoup the losses that war has entailed. Could absurdity go further? Could rational minds be more grossly insulted than they are when talk of this sort is addressed to them in support of a policy otherwise without support? For there is no support for the policy except this irrational and fantastic conjuring with the possible.

Of course it is possible for Germany and Russia to combine against us when this war is over. Equally, of course, it is possible for Britain and Austria to do so. It were even possible for all the nations now at war to forget their hatreds and their jealousies and their mutual scars and to make common cause against the United States. But we are not dealing with possibilities in this world of cause and effect. We are dealing, rather, with probabilities, with reasonable sequences and consequences, with logic rather than with dreams, with facts rather than with unbridled fancies. While it may be granted that there are many possible contingencies growing out of or merely following the great war, where is the human probability that any exhausted nation or any conceivable combination of exhausted nations will thirst for more blood and seek to slake that thirst at an American fountain?

Some of us in this crisis of the Republic find ourselves most unhappily out of touch with leaders we have hitherto followed unfalteringly and with glad steps. It is a grief to us that a difference of opinion has resulted in a momentary divergence of our paths. But here I am reminded of something written by Thomas Jefferson a long time ago. It seems to fit a situation which faces us to-day as it fitted the situation which he had in mind.

During the throes and convulsions of the ancient world—

He wrote—

during the agonizing spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberty, it was not wonderful that the agitation of the billows should reach even this distant shore; that this should be more felt and feared by some and less by others; and should divide opinion as to measures of safety. But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. Error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left to combat it.

And it is to reason that we who stand for peace are appealing to-day. We are not questioning the patriotism of most of those who differ with us in this hour of stress. We believe

them, or most of them, actuated by motives as high and as unselfish as our own; but we honestly and most sincerely question the wisdom of the method they have chosen in dealing with a great and momentous occasion. The United States has been mightily stirred by the awful conflict raging across the Atlantic. Nearly all of us have kin over there. No home is bereft there without a shadow falling across the threshold of a home in this haven of the oppressed.

The agitation of the billows of the Baltic and the North Sea has reached even this distant and peaceful shore and many emotions in American breasts have been the response—emotions of fear, emotions of sympathy, emotions of hatred, emotions of suspicion, emotions of sheer selfishness and greed. And out of these emotions have come many and varied differences of opinion. Some of us have been concerned with respect to our own safety. These have feared that out of the blood and fury of the mighty conflict in which Europe is weltering may come a fearful danger to our own land and our own institutions. And this fear has been played upon magically by some who nurse ambitions and by others who harbor sordid desires, and by still others who cherish race prejudices or national bigotries—all together conspiring, perhaps unconsciously, to bring about a state of the public mind which tends to find expression in terms of force, in battleships and air craft, in submarines and long-range guns, in shrapnel and men in khaki.

But, happily, reason is left to combat errors of opinion which may have obtained in connection with the great conflagration which has touched us with its searing tongues. We are not bound to accept the word of authority. Each of us is free to exercise his own judgment, to follow his own conscience, to consult his own convictions. Are we in danger? If so, there is no American unready to meet it, none who would pause to count the cost involved in meeting it. We have been told, and repeatedly told, that we are not threatened from without. But are we threatened from within? If so, will continentals and warships avert the danger? May they not indeed enhance it? Revolutions are not stopped by armed men. But a thousand revolutions might have been averted by turning swords into plowshares and soldiers into husbandmen. If we are endangered from within, the situation is to be met, not by building battle fleets and planting our harbors with mines; it is not to be averted by turning the Republic into a military camp; it is not to be disposed of by levying fresh taxes on the toilers of the land; it is to be dealt with successfully only by removing the causes which produce unrest and uprooting the injustices which provoke resentment and incite bitterness of class feeling.

May I not, in conclusion, appeal to reason and to common sense in the consideration of this vital issue? The poison of preparedness has undeniably crept subtly through our whole system of thought and national effort. It has brought a sort of madness upon many minds. It has obsessed thousands with the dread of some awful consequence to ourselves of the European struggle. Yet what I contend, to paraphrase the language of the great Richard Cobden, is that America is to-day so situated in every particular of her domestic and foreign circumstances that by leaving other governments to settle their own business and fight out their own quarrels and by attending to the vast and difficult affairs of her own enormous realm and the condition of her own people she will not only be setting the world an example of noble morality—which no other nation is so happily free to set—but she will be following the very course which the maintenance of her own greatness most imperatively demands. It is precisely because America is so strong in resources, in courage, in institutions, in geographical position, that she can, before all other powers, afford to be moral and to set the example of a mighty Nation walking the paths of justice and of peace. [Applause.]

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BAILEY. If I have the time.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I notice that the gentleman says in his remarks that this Nation should deal with probabilities and not possibilities. Why should not this Nation deal with possibilities?

Mr. BAILEY. Well, it is a pretty big job.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. But we are a pretty big Nation.

Mr. BAILEY. It is quite possible we may have an eruption here almost anywhere, maybe in Washington, like they had in the island of Martinique, but we can not guard against that.

Mr. Chairman, under the leave given me to extend my remarks it is my desire to append a table setting forth the annual appropriations on account of the Army and Navy from 1905 to 1916, inclusive. This table follows:

Expenditures on Army and Navy, 1905–1916.

	Army.	Navy.
1905	$77,070,300.88	$97,505,140.94
1906	70,396,631.64	100,336,679.94
1907	71,817,165.08	102,071,670.27
1908	78,634,582.75	98,958,507.50
1909	95,382,247.61	122,662,485.47
1910	101,195,883.34	136,935,199.05
1911	95,440,567.55	131,410,588.30
1912	93,374,755.97	126,405,509.24
1913	90,958,712.98	123,151,538.76
1914	94,266,145.51	140,718,434.53
1915	101,019,212.50	144,868,716.61
Total	969,556,205.11	1,325,024,450.61
1916	101,959,195.87	149,661,864.88
Total	1,071,515,401.68	1,474,686,315.49

It is also my desire to incorporate with my remarks a few extracts from a statement issued by Majority Leader KITCHIN to the press of North Carolina, respecting the strength of the Navy of the United States in comparison with the naval strength of other countries. In this statement the majority leader said:

MR. KITCHIN'S STATEMENT.

The five-year program increases our naval appropriation over forty times more than the increase by Germany in five years preceding the European war, and $200,000,000 more than the combined increase of all the nations in the world for the five years preceding the European war, and over $50,000,000 more than the combined increase of all the nations in the world for the whole period of 10 years immediately preceding the European war.

Add to this the fact that prior to the beginning of the European war we were expending annually on our Navy from $20,000,000 to $30,000,000 more than Germany or any other nation (except Great Britain) was expending on its Navy.

For the 10 years preceding the European war we had expended on our Navy over $300,000,000 more than Germany or any other nation (except Great Britain) had expended on its Navy. And yet the metropolitan press, the magazine writers, the "patriotic societies," and the jingoes and war traffickers would frighten the country into the belief that we have a little, puny, eggshell of a Navy.

The five-year naval program calls for an increase of $500,000,000—$100,000,000 increase a year—which, including the inevitable incidental expenses for expanding the whole Naval Establishment in order to accommodate the program, will reach $600,000,000 or over by the time the five years expires. This is all extra—in addition to the large appropriations we have been annually making.

The Army four-year program demands $450,000,000 increase, over $100,000,000 a year extra, being an increase of more than 100 per cent over our annual Army appropriations. All extra appropriation, be it remembered. Extra taxes must be paid by the people, be it remembered.

Before leaving the subject of the enormity of the proposed program, I desire to make a further observation:

At the expiration of the five-year period for the program this country will then be expending on its Navy and Army more than any nation in the world in times of peace ever expended on its army and navy; more than England, with her navalism; more than Russia or Germany, with their huge militarism. At the beginning of the European war Germany was expending for past wars and preparations for wars (on its Army and Navy) 55 per cent of the total amount of revenues collected; Japan, 45 per cent; Great Britain, 37 per cent; France, 35 per cent; the United States, over 60 per cent. With the proposed military and naval program enacted into law the United States will be expending over 70 per cent of its total revenues; that is, out of every $100 collected from the people over $70 will go into militarism and navalism, including pensions, leaving less than $30 for all other functions of our Government and for all other benefits of the people.

Equally interesting are some facts relating to the personnel of the Navy League of the United States and kindred organizations, which are so largely responsible for the remarkable agitation in support of increased appropriations by Congress for the Army and Navy. Under this head I take the liberty of quoting from a recent speech on this floor by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER]. That gentleman has made an exhaustive study of the activities of the organizations in question, and in the following has embodied some facts which the people ought to know. He said:

CONNECTING LINKS BETWEEN THE NAVY LEAGUE AND THE HOUSE OF J. P. MORGAN & CO., 23 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

The Navy League upon close examination would appear to be little more than a branch office of the house of J. P. Morgan & Co. and a general sales promotion bureau for the various armor and munition makers and the steel, nickel, copper, and zinc interests. At least, they are all represented among the directors, officers, founders, or life members of or contributors to the Navy League.

Especially are all forms of big business represented, and big business invariably heads in at 23 Wall Street, New York.

J. P. Morgan was formerly treasurer of the Navy League and is now a director and contributor. He is a director also of the United States Steel Corporation and many other corporations.

Herbert L. Satterlee, former Assistant Secretary of the Navy Department and a brother-in-law of J. P. Morgan, was one of the incorporators and founders of the Navy League and is the present general counsel of the league.

The late J. P. Morgan was one of the founders and principal contributors to the Navy League, and as late as June 10, 1915, $2,000 was subscribed on behalf of the Morgan estate.

Edward T. Stotesbury, a member of the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. and a director of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, and until recently a director of Cambria Steel Co., Phoenix Iron Co., Riverside Metal Co., Temple Iron Co., Wm. Cramp & Sons Ship & Engine Building Co., and 54 other corporations, banks, and trust companies, is one of the honorary vice presidents of the Navy League. The Wall Street Journal on July 26, 1915, reported that the Baldwin Locomotive Works had received a war order for $80,000,000 worth of shells and other munitions.

Robert Bacon, former Secretary of State and partner of J. P. Morgan & Co. and first director of the United States Steel Corporation, is a director of the Navy League.

Henry C. Frick, a fellow director of J. P. Morgan on both the United States Steel Corporation and the National City Bank of New York, is an honorary vice president of the Navy League.

Jacob H. Schiff, a director with J. P. Morgan on the National City Bank of New York, contributed $1,000 to the Navy League June 10, 1915.

J. Ogden Armour, a director with J. P. Morgan on the National City Bank of New York, was one of a committee which, under the auspices of the National Security League, issued a statement certifying as to the patriotism of the Navy League.

Cleveland H. Dodge, a director with J. P. Morgan on the National City Bank of New York and a director of the American Brass Co., Commercial Mining Co., Copper Queen Consolidated Mining Co., Detroit Copper Mining Co., of Arizona, Lackawanna Iron & Coal Co., Montezuma Copper Co., and the United Globe Mines, is a life member of the Navy League. Marcellus H. Dodge, a nephew of Cleveland H. Dodge, is a director on the boards of the Remington Arms-Union Metallic Cartridge Co., and the Remington Arms & Ammunition Co. Cleveland H. Dodge is vice president of Phelps, Dodge & Co. (Ltd.), a $45,000,000 corporation, which is one of the leading factors in the copper industry in the United States. Although the millions of Cleveland H. Dodge have been multiplied through the increased value of his copper holdings as a result of the European war, his firms appear unwilling to share their prosperity with the miners in Arizona. Some 5,000 copper miners are now on strike, and because Gov. Hunt, of Arizona, has dared to protect them against an invasion of lawless thugs and strike-breakers, the mine owners are circulating petitions for his recall. The leading corporation involved in the Clifton-Morenci strike is Phelps, Dodge & Co., of which Cleveland H. Dodge is vice president. The company in 1912 earned 23 per cent on its capital of $45,000,000 and paid a 15 per cent dividend. To-day copper is higher than at any time in nine years, yet the company refuses to grant its men a wage increase or to make any concession. The principal property of the company at Clifton paid in 1912 a dividend of 146⅔ per cent on a capital of $1,000,000.

Joseph P. Grace, a director with J. P. Morgan on the National City Bank of New York, is one of the contributors to the funds of the Navy League.

George F. Baker, jr., a director of the First National Bank of New York and a son of a director of the United States Steel Corporation, contributed $1,000 to the Navy League June 10, 1915.

Allan A. Ryan, a director of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, is a contributor to the Navy League, and George R. Sheldon, another director of the Bethlehem Corporation and also a director of the American Locomotive Co., both of which concerns have profited hugely from European war orders, is an honorary vice president of the Navy League. Considering that Charles M. Schwab, the president of Bethlehem, is one of the founders of the Navy League, it would appear that this war-trafficking firm has full representation in this organization. And it always has been well represented. Robert H. Sayre, a former general manager of Bethlehem, was a life member of the Navy League, and Lieut. J. F. Meigs, who left the Navy Department to go into the employ of Bethlehem, was also a life member.

Beekman Winthrop, a former Assistant Secretary of the Navy and now a director of the Lackawanna Steel Co., is a director of the Navy League.

Former United States Senator W. A. Clark, the "copper king of Montana," is a director of the Navy League and a director of the W. A. Clark Titanite Explosive Co., Colusa-Parrot Mining & Smelting Co., Equator Mining & Smelting Co., Henry-Bonnard Bronze Co., Mayflower Consolidated Mining Co., Moulton Mining Co., Ophir Hill Consolidated Mining Co., Original Consolidated Mining Co., Sunset Mining Co., United Verde Copper Co., and 26 other corporations.

Charles F. Brooker, honorary vice president of the Navy League, is president and director of the American Brass Co. and a director of the United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Co., Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Mechanics & Metals National Bank of the city of New York, and 15 other banks, trust companies, and corporations. On April 10, 1915, Mr. Brooker also owned 474 shares of Bethlehem Steel, which was worth $40 a share previous to the outbreak of the European war, and went as high as $600 on October 22, 1915.

Lewis L. Clarke, treasurer of the Navy League, is a director of the American Locomotive Co. The Standard Corporation Service on May 3, 1915, reported that the American Locomotive Co. had concluded negotiations with the British Government for the manufacture of 5,000,000 shrapnel shells to cost $66,250,000.

A. Barton Hepburn, honorary vice president of the Navy League, is a director of the American Car & Foundry Co., which has received large munitions contracts from the allies.

Henry B. Joy, vice president of the Navy League, who opposes Government manufacture of war munitions, is president of the Packard Motor Car Co., which has received large orders from the allies.

T. Coleman du Pont, president of the Du Pont de Nemours Powder Co., was formerly a vice president of the Navy League. The Du Ponts have managed to maintain a monopoly of the sale of smokeless powder to the United States Government, and have received some $25,000,000 worth of contracts in the last 10 years.

I do not desire to make the charge that President Thompson and Secretary Dadmun, of the Navy League, are deliberately falsifying in insisting that this purely patriotic organization is backed by "men who will not profit by the league's propaganda," because it is possible that they have reiterated this view so often that they have come to actually believe it themselves. I doubt, however, whether they can convice the American people that they have not been imposed upon.

It has seemed to me worth while, Mr. Chairman, to bring the question of the cost of this program as close home as possible. No one seems to know exactly what this cost is to be. Estimates vary widely. But that it will be very large and will not diminish as the years go by is certain. My own estimate is that the program of military and naval expansion which has been proposed will cost not less than $500,000,000 a year. Some have set a five-year limit upon it, apparently assuming that at the end of five years we may rest from our labors in the matter of defending our shores against some imaginary foe. But of course the work of "preparation" will go right on, just as it has gone on in the past, as the figures I have given above clearly show. However, I am assuming that sanity will repossess the Nation at the end of the five-year period and that the program will therefore call for a total expenditure of only two thousand five hundred millions. On this calculation I have apportioned this cost upon the people of my district on the basis of population as shown by the census of 1910. In that year the population of that district was 313,868. It includes three counties—Bedford, Blair, and Cambria. The population of Bedford was 38,879; of Blair, 108,858; of Cambria, 166,131. This burden of $2,500,000,000 means $25 per capita. And it must be remembered that every dollar of it must come out of the toil and self-denial of the workers. Not one penny of it will come from the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. Not a groat will be a fairy gift. The last mill will be produced by toil and will be collected by the taxgatherer. If this program shall be carried out it will cost Bedford County $972,025; Blair County, $2,721,450; Cambria County, $4,153,875. But that I may bring the thing still nearer home, I show in the appended table the distributive share of the burden by the minor civil divisions, based on the census figures of 1910. The table follows:

	Population.	Amount.
Bedford County:		
Bedford	2,235	$55,875
Bedford township	2,114	52,850
Bloomfield	673	16,825
Broad Top	3,752	93,800
Coaldale	311	7,775
Colerain	869	21,725
Cumberland Valley	996	24,900
East Providence	1,528	38,200
East St. Clair	1,122	28,050
Everett	1,725	43,125
Harrison	677	16,925
Hopewell	590	14,750
Hopewell township	1,261	31,525
Hyndman	1,164	29,100
Juniata	1,040	26,000
Kimmell	792	19,800
King	706	17,650
Liberty	1,574	39,350
Lincoln	410	10,250
Londonderry	1,260	31,500
Mann	830	20,750
Manns Choice	341	8,575
Monroe	1,640	41,000
Napier	1,446	36,150
New Paris	194	4,850
Pleasantville	191	4,775
Rainsburg	206	5,075
St. Clairsville	101	2,525
Saxton	1,195	29,875
Schellburg	314	7,850
Snake Spring	728	18,200
South Woodbury	1,667	41,675
Southampton	1,056	26,400
Union	491	12,275
West Providence	1,781	44,525
West St. Clair	838	20,950
Woodbury	255	6,375
Woodbury township	809	20,225
Total	38,879	972,025
Blair County:		
Allegheny	2,055	51,375
Altoona	52,127	1,303,175
Antis	2,658	66,450
Bellwood	2,277	56,925
Blair	1,134	28,350
Catharine	1,071	26,775
Duncansville	1,263	31,575
Frankstown	1,939	48,475
Freedom	1,321	33,025
Gaysport	917	22,925
Greenfield	1,507	37,675
Hollidaysburg	3,734	93,350
Huston	1,056	26,400
Juniata	5,285	132,125
Juniata Township	587	14,675
Logan	9,730	243,250
Martinsburg	920	23,000
Newry	380	9,500
North Woodbury	1,337	33,425
Roaring Spring	1,903	47,575
Snyder	2,458	61,450
Taylor	1,315	32,875
Tyrone	7,176	179,400
Tyrone Township	1,056	26,400
Williamsburg	1,523	38,075
Woodbury	2,129	53,225
Total	108,858	2,721,450

	Population.	Amount.
Cambria County:		
Adams	4,126	$103,150
Allegheny	1,088	27,200
Ashville	384	9,600
Barnesboro	3,535	88,375
Barr	2,586	64,650
Blacklick	3,190	79,750
Brownstown	1,300	32,500
Cambria	1,150	28,750
Carroll	4,946	123,650
Carrolltown	1,348	33,700
Cassandra	306	7,650
Chest	668	16,700
Chest Springs	174	4,350
Clearfield	1,182	29,550
Conemaugh	1,549	38,725
Cresson	1,470	36,750
Cresson township	1,219	30,475
Croyle	3,376	84,400
Daisytown	382	9,550
Dale	2,285	57,125
Dean	599	14,975
East Conemaugh	5,046	126,150
East Taylor	1,049	26,225
Ebensburg	1,978	49,450
Elder	2,338	58,450
Ferndale	514	12,850
Franklin	2,102	52,550
Gallitizin	3,504	87,600
Gallitizin township	1,644	41,100
Hastings	2,125	53,125
Jackson	2,492	62,300
Johnstown	55,482	1,387,050
Lilly	1,638	40,950
Loretto	246	6,150
Lower Yoder	2,765	69,125
Middle Taylor	426	10,650
Munster	405	10,125
Patton	3,907	97,675
Portage	2,954	73,850
Portage township	4,614	115,350
Reade	3,093	77,325
Richland	2,103	52,575
Rosedale	419	10,475
Sankertown	687	17,175
Scalp Level	1,424	35,600
South Fork	4,592	114,800
Spangler	2,700	67,500
Stonycreek	2,293	57,325
Summerhill	863	21,575
Summerhill township	3,842	96,050
Susquehanna	4,266	106,650
Tunnelhill	661	16,525
Upper Yoder	928	23,200
Vintondale	1,410	35,250
Washington	1,321	33,025
West Taylor	1,056	26,400
Westmont	1,468	36,700
White	599	14,975
Wilmore	314	7,850
Total	166,131	4,153,875

With these figures confronting them, I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether the people of the nineteenth district of Pennsylvania would sustain me were I to vote to fasten the program and its great burdens upon them. I am wondering whether, if the people of other districts throughout the country had similar figures presented for their consideration, other Members who may vote to fasten this program upon their constituents would be sustained. Of course no one can precisely know how the people feel about this great and costly plan. The President says he "thinks" the whole country approves it. Others sincerely question this fact. In the absence of accurate knowledge on the subject, why not refer it to the people themselves? The referendum is a familiar instrumentality in our Government to-day. It is embodied in one form or another in almost every State constitution in the Union. Why not employ it in this vital instance? Months ago I suggested this idea, and I am pleased to say that it has met with approval. Is there any insuperable reason why a joint resolution should not be adopted by Congress providing for placing the proposition on the ballot in November next? This proposition might very well take this concrete form, based on the moderate program of the President himself, a program, by the way, which excites the scorn of our jingo friends. Here is the definite proposition to be placed on the ballot:

REFERRED TO THE VOTERS BY CONGRESS.

Do you favor the general plan of increasing the Nation's Military and Naval Establishments, as proposed in the December 7, 1915, address of the President to Congress, namely: An increase in the Regular Standing Army from 108,008 (all services) to 141,843, and the creation of a volunteer enlisted citizen army of 400,000 men required to undergo discipline and drill not over two months a year for a three-year period; also, for the Navy, a five-year program of construction to provide 10 battleships, 6 battle cruisers, 10 scout cruisers, 50 destroyers, 15 fleet submarines, 85 coast submarines, 4 gunboats, 1 hospital ship, 2 ammunition ships, 2 fuel-oil ships, and 1 repair ship; and to enlist enough more men and educate more officers to man these ships, the total increase of said national armament estimated to cost, in five years, $500,000,000?

YES.	
NO.	

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. WILSON of Florida having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to sell skins taken from fur seals killed on the Pribilof Islands for food purposes;

S. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point René W. Pinto y Wentworth, a citizen of Cuba; and

S. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis Mr. Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán, a citizen of Cuba.

The message also announced that the President of the United States had approved and signed, on January 18, 1916, bill of the following title:

S. 1230. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Fox River at Aurora, Ill.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is recognized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] use his time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

MEMORIAL ADDRESS ON THE DEATH OF GEN. GRENVILLE M. DODGE.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, as the years go by the shadows of death are fast closing over the heroes of the Civil War. One by one its great leaders have passed away, and recently the grim messenger summoned Grenville M. Dodge, the last general who commanded a Union Army in that contest. As he was at one time a member of this body and most distinguished both in war and in peace, I have thought it not improper to ask the House to lay aside for a short period the business in which it has been engaged in order that a tribute might be paid to his memory.

Mr. Chairman, great men arise from great occasions. The tremendous struggle between the North and South which convulsed this continent created and brought forth great souls. Out of this time of storm and stress rose in the North Lincoln, Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, and other mighty men, among whom was Gen. Dodge, whose ability, forcefulness, and genius was such that no history of that great conflict would be complete without their names entering into it.

Mr. Chairman, it was a distinguishing feature of that war that the great men whose names were inseparably connected with its history were not upon either side influenced by the motive of military fame. They found no pleasure in battle and sought neither reward nor glory. The surpassing valor which was shown on both sides and the priceless sacrifices which they made came from devotion to principle and not through any love of slaughter. Thus it followed that the great armies which were formed were not dangerous to the liberties of our people, and when the war closed many of those who had so much distinguished themselves in battle became preeminent in the upbuilding of the Nation through the arts of peace. Among those who had acquired fame as commanders and whose genius manifested itself notably in developing our national resources, none holds a higher place than Gen. Dodge. Here he is second to none.

Born April 12, 1831, at Danvers, Mass., and dying full of years and honors January 3, 1916, few men have seen so much of life and had so remarkable a career. Like most of our great men he came from the common people, but he graduated at a military university in a neighboring State, after which he took a course in engineering. At the outbreak of the war he immediately enlisted, was appointed a lieutenant, and served until its close. By sheer force of merit, without any support or influence, he rose rapidly through the grades to a major generalship. He was a friend of Lincoln, an adviser of Grant, the reliance of Sherman, the builder of the first Pacific railway, the partner of merchant princes, the associate of Roosevelt. All did him

honor and he was an honor to them. In his military services from the beginning he attracted the attention of his superiors by his marked capacity as an organizer and the vigor and energy with which he pushed to completion every task which was assigned to him. If a railway was to be reconstructed, if supplies were to be found, if additional troops were to be furnished, at a time when mistakes or delays were fatal, Gen. Dodge was selected to direct the work.

Two great events stand forth in his life and no reference to his achievements would be complete without mentioning them. One of these events was connected with the decisive battle of the Civil War, the other was one in which his leadership in both war and peace was conclusively demonstrated.

Mr. Chairman, in such a varied and strenuous career inevitably there came times when the bravest might have faltered and the strongest yielded to the strain; but his was a mind that quickened with responsibilities, and his genius ever rose with the greatness of the obstacles. Never was he greater than on that fateful day of the Battle of Atlanta, when with a suddenness that was stupefying there burst forth the thunder of artillery that shook the heavens itself, and out from a wood there rushed upon the rear and flank of the Army of the Tennessee a furious charge of the opposing forces with all the valor of men who are determined to conquer or die. The brunt of this terrific attack fell upon the Sixteenth Corps, of which Gen. Dodge was in command. In this appalling crisis, when his superior, Gen. McPherson, was killed and all looked to him for orders, when his ranks reeled and staggered under the apparently irresistible onset, when every moment some new and desperate emergency arose, the master mind of Gen. Dodge met the swiftly changing situation as calmly and effectively as if holding a counsel of war in his tent. The tide of battle was turned and the Union Army saved from a defeat so calamitous that words could not describe it.

Later in civil life when it was sought to build a transcontinental line through what was then known as the Great American Desert, the difficulties seemed unsurmountable. In this wild country bands of hostile Indians roamed, which suddenly appeared out of some canyon or gulch, surprised and slaughtered the whites before they had an opportunity to resist, and then disappeared as if the earth had opened and swallowed them up. The engineers who began the work were driven away or killed. Laborers who had been brought together fled in terror. Teamsters could not be found to bring supplies, and the undertaking was suspended. It needed not only engineering skill but organizing and defensive ability of the highest degree to carry on its construction. Gen. Dodge was selected for the position of chief engineer and took personal charge of the operations. He hunted down and compelled the submission of the Indians, overcame the obstacles in the way of transportation, laid out the route, and supervised the construction of the road. It was a monumental achievement, which placed his name among the great builders of the Nation.

He served in this body in the Fortieth Congress, but commercial enterprises rather than a political life were to his taste and he declined a reelection. His admiring comrades of the Army, which he had commanded, elected him as president of the Society of the Army of Tennessee, a position which, although bringing neither power nor emolument, he seemed to value more highly than any he had ever held. He was also president of the New York Commandery of the Loyal Legion and president of the commission to inquire into the management of the War with Spain.

Personally, Gen. Dodge was modest and unassuming. In his great exploits he saw nothing of which to boast or to proclaim. Public spirited and philanthropic in the highest degree, no worthy object failed of his support, but it was never his desire that his benefactions should be made public. His interest in his home town of Council Bluffs never lessened. The great city of New York called him for many large enterprises and sought to lure him away, but he could not be induced to change his residence. The citizens of Council Bluffs will never forget his devotion to its interest, and that one of his last requests was that it should be his burial place. There where every citizen does him honor and every child is familiar with his achievements, among the hills that gave the city its name, not far from the spot where Lincoln and he had stood and selected the eastern terminus of the great railway he had constructed—there he was reverently laid to rest by the side of his old friends and comrades who had gone before.

Mr. Chairman, although the State of Iowa claims Grenville M. Dodge as her own and Council Bluffs was his home, such a man belongs not to any town or any State alone, but to the Nation. Monuments will be erected to his memory, but no marble or bronze will commemorate his achievements like the great railway whose bands of steel link the boundaries of our domain. The time may come when this Government shall dissolve, its warriors and statesmen be forgotten, and the mighty works of its builders crumble into dust, but as long as the history of the period in which he lived is preserved the record of his achievements will exist, his place among the great men of this Nation will be fixed, and his fame forever secure. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I was indeed interested in the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT]. He undertook to discuss this appropriation bill, and he let it come out very readily that he was not opposed to appropriations, but wanted it all to go into the pockets of the Steel Trust and the bunch over there from under whose smokestacks he comes, and wanted to wipe out all of the appropriations generally and to hold back for piling them all in for a big army and to be fitted up by his Steel Trust constituents. And next he amused me by saying that he was afraid of somebody coming over here and landing an army. I asked myself, "Who is likely to come here and land an army?" The only crowd that ever did was England, and we got out of our swaddling clothes and whipped her, and then we whipped her again before we cut our wisdom teeth, and I do not think she would come now. She does not have to. She has got Morgan serving as a resident envoy and minister plenipotentiary and has a judge advocate general in two Members from Massachusetts here on the floor. We are serving her as a base of supply now very nicely. She does not have to come. And Germany could not get here. And France has never wanted to come. She is too little to make much of a showing if she were to get here.

But over all this talk about German-Americans and Irish-Americans and the poison of the foreigner in this country I want to tell you when you will never hear any more of it. You let some foreign country land in this country with an invading army and there will not be a German-American here. There will be American Germans. There will not be any Irish-Americans, but American Irish; all the millions of loyal foreigners and the whole American citizenship will fall into a melting pot and come out militant Americans and they will march down like Abraham's army, 10,000,000 strong, and inside of a month one-half of that invading army will be in eternity and the balance of it will be begging God to save them from the wrath of outraged America. [Applause.]

I am not uneasy about their landing their troops. It is a pipe dream of those who feel the throb of war profits.

I have a few minutes left, and I want to say that the question of what I shall wear has become a national problem. [Laughter.] I have no antipathy or animosity toward the press gang. They can sharpen both ends of their pencils and punch me if they want to, but the New York World has seen occasion to put me up as a kind of a buffer while they very gratuitously seek to lambaste and belittle the farmers of Texas. And I want to say to the New York World that in Texas we have tarantulas, horned frogs, wolves, a whole lot of centipedes, and things like that. But all of them have never done us half as much harm as the New York World and the money changers of New York, and I am not going to let them lambaste farmers over my shoulder. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I just ask leave to extend my remarks in that connection in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, leave will be granted. There was no objection.

Mr. LONDON. Hit them hard now. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Thank you, my friend.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in the freedom of the press. Having owned newspapers for 17 years in Texas, during which time I had the honor of being president of the Texas Press Association, it is but natural that I should look upon the press as one of the great schools of progress and information. Yet when papers like the New York World undertake to use me and the clothes I wear to malign and slur the farmers of Texas by saying that these farmers had made me promise to never wear a collar in the event of my election to Congress, I say, with all kindness for the assiduous, erudite, and versatile young reporter, the World is carrying the esthetic taste of the eastern plutocrat a little too far.

Texas as a whole, leaving out myself, of course, will compare favorably in honor, honesty, morality, and ability with any

State in this Union, either in national politics or otherwise, and her farmers rank with the best people on earth.

It is true that many of them are poor, but when we consider them with the common man elsewhere, for 40 years under the domination of the money devil and money changers of New York, who have been the pets and partners of the New York World, it is much to their credit that they as farmers have been able to live at all.

Twenty years ago my elder brother, being subject to bronchial trouble, ruptured a bronchial tube while making a speech as district attorney and died of resulting hemorrhages. Physicians, in consequence, advised me to take good care of my throat and lungs, which I have endeavored to do by wearing in winter seasons what was then known as Waves mufflers.

This week I pulled off a silk muffler that cost $1.50 and put on a 15-cent collar, and it became a national sensation. But for the benefit of the very delicate, fastidious sensibilities of the New York "gentry" and diamond-decked dudes who read the World I beg to say that I have little regard for the flummery, frills, flounces, and furbelows that the world calls fashion.

I think comfort, decency, and health should be the governing factors in the selection of all dress.

'Tis not the leaves upon a tree
That make the timber fine;
'Tis not the vestry preachers wear
That makes their lives sublime.

'Tis not the raiment people don
That makes a glorious state;
'Tis not the jewels in a crown
That make a kingdom great.

Right is right, for God is God,
And truth will make us whole;
The hope of man must ever be
The goodness of his soul.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] use the balance of his time?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I think this bill ought to pass. The gentleman from New York has no speech to make except his own and proposes to close the debate?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; that is all.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I, and how much time has the gentleman from New York?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has 14 minutes and the gentleman from New York 20 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Frankly, if I made any remarks in general debate, I would sooner follow the gentleman from New York than precede him. Really 14 minutes is not time enough for any Member of the House to discuss extensively any of the public questions now being considered throughout the length and breadth of the United States. At a proper time, if I can get the time and the spirit moves me and I feel that I really have something to say, I will seek the opportunity.

This is a bill called the urgent deficiency bill, proposing to give in round numbers $12,000,000. In the main I agree to what is recommended by the committee and did agree when the bill was being made.

There are one or two items that I should have been glad to see in the bill but which were not included. There is one that I hope will go into the bill, but I can say in regard to it all I desire to say under the five-minute rule.

Now, if there is no gentleman who wants to submit some remarks during the remainder of my time upon this bill, I will yield the floor.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it had not been my purpose to make any remarks upon this bill, but it seems perhaps appropriate, after what has occurred, that I should make a very brief statement in reference to it.

This is a bill to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year 1916 and for prior years. It carries $12,500,000. The estimates submitted were for sums aggregating $13,565,000.

Three gentleman representing the minority, who are members of the Committee on Appropriations, have occupied the major portion of the time allotted to debate. They are not only members of the Committee on Appropriations, but they are three men of the longest service in the House of Representatives, and can fairly be said to rank among the most distinguished Members of the House. None of them has pointed out a single item in this bill that is subject to criticism. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] devoted almost an hour to a criticism of the Democratic Party for extravagance in the expenditure of public money, and he took up a discussion that was begun some time last month by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] as to the relative defenselessness of both parties with respect to the charge of extravagance. But he did not find it necessary to call attention to a single item in this bill, carrying $12,500,000, as an evidence or indication of extravagance on the part of the Democratic Party in its present control of the House.

I take this attitude of these distinguished gentlemen as an additional compliment to the very effective and efficient committee over which I have the honor to preside. It demonstrates that whatever may be said in the heat of political discussion about the conduct of the finances of the Federal Government, there has not been during the five years in which the Democrats have been in power in this House any just ground for criticism of the Committee on Appropriations for extravagance or improper action regarding appropriations for the support of the Federal service.

While this bill carries $12,500,000, very little of that money can be considered in the nature of deficiencies in appropriations to supply the needs of the various services. For instance, $250,000 is appropriated to pay a treaty obligation with the Republic of Panama. Under a treaty with that nation $250,000 is to be paid annually in perpetuity as part of the purchase price of the rights of the United States in the Canal Zone strip. That is one of the outstanding obligations of the Republican administration to which I referred when I answered the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], for which provision has been made in this bill and has been made during the five years in which the Democrats have been in control of the House.

Three million five hundred thousand dollars is for work in connection with construction of public buildings authorized at various times by Congress. Without any increase of force, the Supervising Architect's Office has been so much more efficient under a Democratic administration than it was under a Republican administration that it has so speeded that office up that this year it is turning out 99 buildings instead of 65 buildings as originally estimated. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And because of the speeding up of the program heretofore authorized by Congress, it becomes necessary to make provision for carrying on and completing the work on many buildings at an earlier date than originally was anticipated.

Two million four hundred and forty-eight thousand dollars is for the Postal Service. The Post Office appropriation bill failed of enactment at the last session of Congress. A continuing resolution, which made available sums similar to the sums appropriated for the Postal Service for the fiscal year 1915, was enacted in its place. As a result the department has had less money available for the various services than was agreed upon by the conferees representing the two Houses in charge of the Post Office appropriation bill. So far as my recollection goes, in no instance does the amount carried for the Post Office Department make, with the amount provided by the continuing resolution and what is carried in this bill, a greater sum than the amount agreed upon by the conferees on the Post Office bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. What are the particular items of deficiency in the Post Office Department that are provided for in this bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There are a number of them.

Mr. MANN. They are mostly for transportation.

Mr. MADDEN. I was going to say——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Railway transportation is a very large item; electric and cable service, purchase of twine and binding twine.

Mr. MADDEN. The department reports very large unexpended balances in a great many branches of the Postal Service, and I was wondering whether they had the right to come before the Committee on Appropriations for urgent deficiency appropriations under those circumstances.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They do not report any very large unexpended balances in these items, except the item for railway-mail pay, and that is not an urgent deficiency; but the appropriations that are available are somewhat more than a million dollars less than will be needed to make payments, and, as the estimates were transmitted at this time, the item was included in this bill rather than carried over into the general deficiency bill, so that the payments might be made promptly.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Under the circumstances I take it that there will be further deficiencies in the Post Office Department?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That was not inquired into outside of the items before the committee, and on some of these items it is quite possible that there will be further deficiencies.

Mr. MANN. I should assume that extending the appropriations of the prior year would not be sufficient to take care of the Post Office Department for the current year, with the addition of these items. I should think it would be much more than these items before the year is over.

Mr. FITZGERALD. These are the items as to which the department stated that there was necessity for immediate appropriations, and the investigation seemed to disclose that that was correct.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the First Assistant Postmaster General's division of the Post Office Department reported something like $5,000,000 of an unexpended balance in the salary account of the clerks, carriers, postmasters, and supervisory officers, notwithstanding the fact that he was operating under the appropriation of the year before; and, of course, that was largely due to the fact that he had reduced the compensation of a great many men from the figure provided by law to an arbitrary amount which he fixed upon his own authority.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Still, there are no items in the bill, as I recall, that come under the First Assistant Postmaster General.

In the Department of Agriculture there is $357,000, of which $57,000 is to reimburse appropriations which have been drawn upon because of the necessity of employing labor to fight forest fires. Three hundred thousand dollars is an emergency appropriation to combat the citrus-fruit canker, which is very prevalent in the citrus fruit growing States. One hundred and sixty thousand dollars is for the Bureau of Standards, to complete the chemical laboratory within the limitation fixed by law and to equip the building which will be completed very shortly. Two hundred thousand dollars is to make repairs to aids to navigation which were very seriously injured as the result of several cyclones on the Gulf during the present fiscal year, and $67,000 is to replace life-saving stations which were completely destroyed or very seriously injured as a result of the same storms.

Then there is an item of $210,000 to pay judgments of the Court of Claims, $59,000 to pay Indian-depredation judgments, and $924,000 to pay audited claims certified by the accounting officers under the law.

These items aggregate in all $10,305,000, so that the sums carried here which actually represent deficiencies are very small.

Mr. Chairman, I do not often indulge in political discussions as to expenditures by the Federal Government, or as to the manner in which its revenues are obtained; but the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] made one statement to which attention should be called. He said he did not criticize the Democratic Party for spending the money so much as he did for not obtaining the revenues to meet the expenditures, and that the Republican Party has always enacted legislation to provide adequate revenues to meet any expenditures it has made.

The gentleman overlooked one very important fact, and that is that during a period of three or four years the Republican Party supplemented the moneys received from its revenue-producing legislation, to the extent of $134,000,000, from the proceeds of bonds issued under the legislation affecting the Panama Canal. There have been expended on account of the canal sums aggregating $240,000,000, for which bonds under the law can be issued in order to reimburse the Treasury, and if the Democratic administration followed the policy initiated and adopted by the Republican administration, of reimbursing the Treasury on account of expenditures for the construction of the Panama Canal, and issued Panama Canal bonds so as to put into the Treasury $240,000,000, there would be little heard from the Republican side of the House as to the actual balance of available cash in the Treasury at any time.

Mr. GILLETT and Mr. LONGWORTH rose.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield first to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT].

Mr. GILLETT. I should like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that while the Republicans were in control they averaged more payments for the Panama Canal out of the general fund of the Treasury than the Democrats have paid out of the general fund for the same purpose?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is not my recollection.

Mr. GILLETT. My recollection is that they did.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They did not issue any more bonds in order to reimburse the Treasury on account of the expenditures that were made, because they were not permitted to continue in power. There is not any doubt that if the Republicans had remained in control of the Federal Government the bonded indebtedness of the country would have been very greatly increased, probably by $200,000,000, and some future Democratic Congress would be doing what this Democratic Congress is doing, raising and paying about $4,000,000 annually as interest upon the bonds issued by the Republican administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman let me finish?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. GILLETT. During the last two years you paid out of the Treasury about $20,000,000 a year for the Panama Canal, did you not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not got the figures in my mind. I do not know.

Mr. GILLETT. That is a fact. I think one year it was $19,000,000 and the other $21,000,000; and I will venture to say that in the previous years, after we began the canal, when the Republican Party was in power, we averaged much more than $20,000,000 a year out of the Treasury, to say nothing of the bonds.

Mr. FITZGERALD. When the Republicans saw that they were to continue in power they replenished the Treasury by the issuance of the Panama Canal bonds, to reimburse the Treasury for the expenditures on account of the canal. When they saw the handwriting on the wall, when they knew that they were about to get the judgment of the American people for their years of misdeeds, they expended these enormous sums out of the general fund in the Treasury, and instead of reimbursing the Treasury and leaving the money available for the Democratic administration they refused to issue the bonds, and now they cry out that we have created the deficit. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

So that if more money was expended during the years the Republicans were in power than when we were in power, it only emphasizes the statement that the present condition is due to the gross mismanagement of the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I desire to ask the gentleman a question touching the revenue, and I ask merely for information without any political motives. Can the gentleman state what action the party of which he is one of the ablest and most competent leaders is about to take with reference to following the recommendation of the present Secretary of the Treasury for retaining the duty on sugar?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Ohio is mistaken. I am not one of the responsible leaders of the party. [Laughter on the Republican side.] More than that, if the gentleman will content himself with patience he will find what the program of the Democratic Party is to be. Whatever it is, there will be no such conditions as resulted during the administration of a distinguished Republican President—a native of Ohio—during my service in the House. No Democratic President will ever send a message to Congress that it is their plain duty in the interest of justice and humanity to enact certain legislation for the relief of the people brought under our flag, and have our party, because of the greed and avarice of the manufacturers, refuse to carry out the recommendations of the President.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I desire to thank the gentleman for his categorical reply. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman wish to ask me a question or tell me something? [Laughter.] I will yield for a question, but I will not have any remarks of mine filled up by gratuitous inaccurate statements of Members on the Republican side of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. With all due courtesy to the gentleman, I want to ask him a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Very well.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman made a statement that I want him to correct.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, I will not permit the gentleman to correct what is already perfect.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit me to state the question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman from New York desire more time?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; if I can have time not only for the gentleman from Michigan to ask his question but time to answer it.

Mr. CANNON. I will yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman from New York made the statement in reference to the expenditures out of the general fund for the construction of the Panama Canal. During the Republican administration up to the 3d of November, when the

Democratic Party enacted the tariff law, there have been expended out of the general fund, and in addition to the sale of bonds, $191,000,000 on the Panama Canal. In addition to the $191,000,000 there were spent $138,000,000, which included premiums and the proceeds of the sales of the bonds, and yet, under the Democratic administration you have not sold any bonds, but you have spent $77,000,000 since that time. We left you $149,000,000 in the Treasury and you only have about $40,000,000 left.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I heard the gentleman from Michigan make that same statement in his remarks on continuing the war-revenue act. There is only one unfortunate thing about it, it is so tainted with error that it is not correct. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman state wherein I have erred?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not the time now. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Oh, it is easy for gentlemen to laugh; but I will make one statement to show that the gentleman is in error. I will not state views, opinions, or notions; I will state official figures. The gentleman said that we have expended $77,000,000.

Mr. FORDNEY. Since the 3d of October, 1913, up to the 10th of January, 1916.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman's figures do not jibe. He must have been reading Republican statements and imagined that they were Democratic statements. There were $134,000,000 of bonds issued and $240,000,000 of bonds available. The expenditures for the canal up to the present time are $378,000,000.

Mr. FORDNEY. The Treasury statement shows $390,000,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know the statement I make is accurate, because I have looked up the figures to put them in a report on a bill.

Mr. MADDEN. That does not include what has been expended for fortifications.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No.

Mr. MADDEN. I suppose the figures of the gentleman from Michigan include that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It does not, because they are always carried entirely apart. There are $240,000,000 of bonds that can be issued to reimburse the Treasury on account of the expenditures of the Panama Canal. The $240,000,000 were obtained to replace and reimburse the Treasury. It would give $149,000,000 that he is worried about——

Mr. FORDNEY. It is not me that is worrying.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This side of the House has not been weeping and wailing at the condition of the Treasury as have gentlemen on that side of the House. They seem to imagine that they are still in control of the Government, and they have restless nights and uneasy dreams, and then they come in here and give voice to them on the floor of the House. It may help them to sleep easier, but it does not alarm the country or disturb this side of the House at all. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. I see there are 49 or 50 items in the post-office division which are marked for commencing post offices. Have they been ordered before or are they ordered by this bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. These are buildings which they have reached for construction upon which no work has been yet begun. After sites are acquired and buildings authorized, the buildings are listed and taken up in their order. A number of buildings will be taken up which it was not anticipated would be reached. This bill carries the money that it is believed will be necessary on account of the work on these buildings between now and the 30th of June.

Mr. EMERSON. Then they were ordered by a previous Congress?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CONSTRUCTION, SITES, AND RENT.

For sites, commencement, continuation, or completion of public buildings within the respective limits of cost authorized by law, severally, as follows:

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 11, page 4, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That the appropriations for construction of public buildings made herein shall not be expended for commencing work on any building unless a contract therefor shall have been entered into prior to the passage of this act."

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], remarked that no member on the minority side had said a word in criticism of this bill, and he assumed from that that consequently we were all in favor of every item of the bill. That did not follow at all, and the gentleman, if he had reflected, would have known that there are some items in the bill to which I objected. But I am ready to admit that the Committee on Appropriations, in my opinion, does do more for economy than any other body of men in the House. I admit that I am not unprejudiced and perhaps my partiality for my own committee may lead me to think that, but the figures which the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] placed in the RECORD in his speech about a year ago, I think, fully substantiate the fact that somehow by precedent, which has come down through many years, there is an instinct of economy in the Committee on Appropriations, no matter which party controls, which, I am sorry to say, does not prevail throughout the House in general.

Here is an economy, Mr. Chairman, which the present Committee on Appropriations might have initiated. My amendment practically provides that no new building for which a contract has not already been let shall be begun in the coming year. That would save this year about $2,000,000, and the buildings which it would cover amount in the whole to some $7,000,000.

I do not wish now to suggest or go into the question whether appropriations for these public buildings were extravagant or not when the public building bill was passed. My only argument to-day is that in the present diminishing condition of the Treasury, in the deplorable lack of revenue, compared with the enormous emergency expenses which the administration has recommended, it is a time when the majority party ought to suggest that we do without some luxuries and get along on the plain necessities of life. It seems to me that new public buildings, desirable as they are to all of us individually, and possibly—although I do not wish to go into that—justifiable on public grounds, ought not to be entered into at this time of deficiency and stress, and it is for that reason that I offer this amendment, so as to give an opportunity which the gentlemen on that side seem to think the minority never does, and to point out to them a chance for that economy on which they so plume themselves.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is very clear to the Members of the House. If adopted, no money that is carried in this bill on account of the construction of buildings will be expended contracts for the construction of which have not been made prior to the approval of the bill. These estimates were transmitted to the Congress and referred under its rules to the Committee on Appropriations. For the fiscal policy of the Government I am not responsible. Whatever views I might have as to the desirability or advisability of recommending expenditures for any particular purpose at any particular session of Congress, I have no control or part in the submission of the estimates. I do know, however, Mr. Chairman, that during my entire service in this House, regardless of the control of the House by either political party, there has been an overwhelming majority in favor of appropriating such sums for the construction of public buildings as are requested and stated by the Treasury Department can be utilized with the time covered by the appropriations to be carried in the particular bill. Not only has there been an overwhelming majority in favor of such appropriations, but I have been strongly of the suspicion that there has been a very substantial majority in favor of appropriations in excess of those requested and those recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

In charge of this bill, under the uniform and unbroken practice of the House for half a century, I am charged with the obligation of explaining exactly what effect particular amendments may have, and with protecting the bills as spokesman of the committee. The members of this committee now understand the purpose of the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT], and it remains with this committee to determine whether the policy suggested by him shall be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Burlington, Wis., post office: For continuation, $500.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Where an appropriation of $500 for "continuation" is made, is it because we made a previous appropriation of $500, which was not sufficient for plans?

Mr. FITZGERALD. On what page is that?

Mr. MANN. Oh, there are a number of them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is for the work in connection with the preparation of the survey of the site, to enable the plans to be prepared. I think that is so in most instances.

Mr. MANN. This is for "continuation." We frequently make an appropriation of $500 or $1,000 for surveys, and for the preparation of plans, but where we make an appropriation for the continuance of a work for $500——

Mr. FITZGERALD. The word "continuation" would be used if the original authorization was for a site and building, but if the site were provided independently, the wording would be a little different.

The Clerk read as follows:

Yoakum, Tex., post office: For commencement, $15,000.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out line 8, on page 16. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if he can tell us why it takes the Treasury Department three years to select a public-building site when there is really no dispute about it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is a matter of administration, and I can not speak for the Treasury Department on matters of administration.

Mr. DILLON. Can the gentleman give any information on the subject, of why it should take so long to select a site in the absence of any dispute about the subject?

Mr. FITZGERALD. All might be in agreement on a site that would be a good one for everybody but the Government to have. For instance, I have heard it said that a site was sold to the United States in a western town which was completely covered by water. It might be everybody in that place was in perfect accord that it should be sold if anybody could be found foolish enough to buy it, and the United States Government probably was the only possible purchaser that could be induced, under any circumstances, to buy such a site.

Mr. DILLON. I would like to ask the gentleman——

Mr. FITZGERALD. But I am not in a position, let me say to the gentleman, to answer questions regarding the various departments of the Government which involve purely a question of administration. I am not administering them, and I am consulted very little about how they should be administered. I am not in a position to explain or advise regarding their motives and purposes.

Mr. DILLON. I would like to ask the gentleman one other question, and that is if the gentleman does not think the real purpose of the delay is not to withdraw funds from the Treasury that have already been appropriated?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, I do not think much about any of those things that do not come to me; but, judging from what happened since this Congress has met, and the fact that this bill is carrying about $3,000,000 of buildings that it was not believed would require money until after the beginning of the next fiscal year, and that provision was made in here for 22 buildings that it was not believed would be commenced within the next fiscal year, or before the 30th of June, 1917, it would not appear that the Treasury Department has been attempting to delay the work of public buildings for the purpose of preventing the withdrawal of money from the Treasury of the United States on that account.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in this connection that I think there are many of these appropriations made for public-building sites in the selection of which as much time as three years has passed and the Treasury Department failed to make any selection. Somebody ought to be able to explain why it takes so long to select a site.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why does not the gentleman ask the officials of the Treasury Department?

Mr. DILLON. I have, and I am told the reason why is that they do not wish to withdraw the money from the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired, and, without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Vaults and safes: For vaults and lock-box equipments and repairs thereto in all completed and occupied public buildings under the control of the Treasury Department, including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916, $10,000.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I notice this bill, on page 10, item 20, contains an appropriation for a public building at Logan, Ohio. I am delighted with the amount set out here, and I take it for granted that additional appropriations will be made as occasion demands. The building is in process of construction and has been for some time, and the people of that city are very desirous of having this building completed at the earliest possible date under the contract.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will tell his constituents that they should appreciate the efficiency of this office under a Democratic administration and show their appreciation at the next election.

Mr. MANN. They will show their appreciation of the gentleman who gets it in the bill—the gentleman who just previously addressed the House. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Improvements and repairs: The unexpended balances of the several appropriations for the construction of the bridge across Rock Creek on the line of Q Street, including the approaches thereto, contained in the District of Columbia appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1912, 1913, and 1914 are made available until June 30, 1916.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Why is it necessary in the matter of appropriations to make these old appropriations for the Q Street Bridge available until the end of this fiscal year? In other words, why are they not available now?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it is due to a decision either of the auditor or the comptroller that because a contract was made at a time between the making of the appropriations they could not pay the contractor, this man West. They are to make some additional contracts, and the question has arisen again. They made one contract which contained a provision that payment should not be due until the appropriation is made by Congress.

Mr. MANN. I am very willing to make the appropriations available. I think the buffalo they have up there are the finest things I have ever seen in statuary.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, I have seen them just as bad in the past and expect to see them a great deal worse in the future.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman usually sees and hears lions roaring over in New York, where they keep a herd of them, or tigers, where they are felt over in New York [laughter on the Republican side]; but these are American bison.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay: For pay of the Army, including the same objects specified under this head in the Army appropriation act for the fiscal year 1915, $1,200,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 19, in line 25, strike out the sum "$1,200,000" and in lieu thereof insert the sum of "$1,199,772.62."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I think this is real Democratic economy—you have cut down 25 cents.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. What, not that much?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know whether it is due to the gentleman's inability to either add or subtract, but there is a difference of something like twenty-eight dollars and something.

Mr. MANN. I said 25 cents; I was only off a few dollars.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is to correct an error in the total of the deficit in the pay of the Army.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman of the committee what is the cause of this large deficit in the pay of the Army?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, there were a number of causes. They had more officers and men than they expected to have during the fiscal year and they did not have enough money with which to pay them.

Mr. TILSON. Were there more men enlisted than they anticipated when the estimates were made?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Some more; yes.

Mr. TILSON. An increase in the Army caused by enlisting more men?

Mr. FITZGERALD. To some extent; and also it is stated by Gen. Aleshire that the appropriation was not sufficient for the number of men for which the estimate was submitted.

Mr. TILSON. Was the entire estimate last year appropriated for?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Three hundred and fifty-five additional men in the Hospital Corps; and the deficit in the pay of officers was due to the increase of officers because of the act of July 18, 1914, increasing the number of officers in the Signal Corps by 60. They had 16 more officers on an average than were anticipated when the estimates were submitted. Then

there were $26,586.72 due to an increase in the number of men drawing pay in the Philippine Islands and Alaska. They get the foreign-service pay, which is 10 per cent, I think, in addition to the regular pay. Then in the Corps of Engineers, pay of officers, there was $1,420; payment made to enlisted men on discharge for clothing not drawn, $528,663; interest on soldiers' deposits, $25,675; three months' additional pay for reenlistment, $132,035.

Now, those are things that can not be estimated for with any degree of accuracy, and the sums mentioned were needed in addition to the amounts requested and appropriated by Congress.

Mr. MANN. I can give the gentleman the information he asks for, if he has not already secured it.

Mr. TILSON. I have not received any information on the items, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. The amounts appropriated for the fiscal year were $429,575.58 less than the estimates on these items.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] does not understand what the gentleman from Connecticut desires. I was giving him the information furnished—the actual figures making up the deficit, furnished by the Quartermaster General.

Mr. MANN. But the appropriations were less than the estimate. I saw that the gentleman did not get the information, and I gave it.

Mr. TILSON. My attention was attracted to the item because of its magnitude.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not large at all. During the last year of the Taft administration my recollection is that the deficit in the appropriations for maintenance of the Army aggregated $2,900,000, and the statement of the representatives of the War Department before the committee were to the effect that they were directed to request less money than they knew would be actually required. That situation has not happened under a Democratic administration.

Mr. MANN. Every year it is just the same thing.

Mr. KAHN and Mr. FITZGERALD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] yield?

Mr. TILSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] for any information that he has on the subject.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am informed on that subject, for I asked the questions and got the answers from men who were serving under the Republican administration.

Mr. TILSON. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. KAHN. So far as the deficiency appropriation in the last year of the Taft administration is concerned, to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has referred, I want to call his attention to the fact that in that Congress the Democrats had control of the House. They cut the estimates suggested by the War Department to such an extent that subsequently it became necessary to appropriate the amount named by the gentleman from New York to make good the deficiency. That is the way that large amount came into this House. It was because of the failure of the Committee on Military Affairs, under Democratic control in the House of Representatives, to appropriate enough money to pay the Army, and likewise to cut the appropriations for other purposes of the Army.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Now, Mr. Chairman, so that there will be no misunderstanding of what happened, I will state that the last year of the Taft administration, when the House was Democratic, the deficit was $2,900,000. It was stated some time a little later in the session that the men who prepared the estimates of the amount of money required for the various purposes of the Army were directed, and against their protest were compelled, to make estimates which they informed the President were insufficient to meet the obligations.

Now, in the last year of a Republican House the deficits for this purpose that were submitted and supplied by Congress aggregated $1,800,000. The gentleman's statement about a Democratic House coming way below the estimates and not supplying enough money to carry on the service is just one of those idle, vain pieces of buncombe, which, I regret to say, so many of the gentleman on that side of the House have been indulging in since this session of Congress convened.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman is quite correct in what he says about the estimates having been cut in the War Department at the request of the President; but I still maintain that those estimates were still further cut, cut below a safe figure, by the Democratic majority of the Committee on Military Affairs when they reported out the bill. And the Democratic majority in the House approved that cut over the protest of the minority, who predicted there would be a deficiency if the cut were made.

Mr. TILSON. May I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. Did not the committee deliberately cut the estimates furnished last year by $425,000?

Mr. FITZGERALD. My committee?

Mr. TILSON. The Military Committee of last year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know what happened within the Committee on Military Affairs; and if I did, I would not be permitted under the rules of the House to state it.

Mr. TILSON. I mean in the bill they brought in.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I can say for the committee over which I preside that the practice is to recommend the sums that it is believed are actually required for the proper conduct of the various services of the Government, regardless of what the totals may be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment now pending, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let the gentleman speak on the amendment pending.

Mr. MANN. Yes. I will move to strike out the last two words of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt whatever, and we might as well be frank about it, that the Democratic side in the Sixty-second Congress, going into the presidential election, cut estimates quite freely where they knew the money would be expended, in order to make a very good showing about what they had appropriated, knowing that they would have to make deficiency appropriations thereafter. I have no doubt in a way that in connection with the so-called Smith amendment the same thing was more or less in the mind of President Taft. All committees may do that at times. The truth is, however, that amidst all the talk about extravagance and economy the fact stands out preeminently all the time that the administrative officers of the Government under every administration are grossly extravagant in their demands.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Add "practices" and I will agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Well, I do not know what the addition means.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I say, "Add practices" and I will agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Well, demands and practices. I am willing to make the addition. [Laughter.]

We hear a great deal of talk about what they call a national budget system, if anybody knows what that means. I do not know, and I have never been able to get a statement from anybody that claimed that he knew, a statement that was intelligible on the subject. But if there be any need of a national budget system, we have it now established, if the administrative officers would endeavor to practice economy. Every year Congress cuts down the estimates submitted to it by the administration under every administration, and the only place where economy is practiced under the Government is in the House of Representatives. It is not practiced in the administrative offices, and it is not practiced at the other end of the Capitol.

I think that amidst the criminations and recriminations between the two sides of the House as to which has been the most extravagant we might properly put some of the fault upon those who have been at fault instead of assuming that it all belongs to one side or the other of this House. The House, while it becomes very extravagant at times, while many Members of it are always willing to vote for every expenditure and against every proposition to raise revenue, still in the main wants to be fairly economical, and every committee of the House in charge of appropriations finds that its principal business is to resist the demands of the administrative officers and those outside of the Government service for larger appropriations. It is not here where the extravagance is started. The extravagance starts outside and finds its way here from the outside, and we try to resist the demands as well as we can.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT.

Bureau of Construction and Repair: For construction and repair of vessels, including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916, $48,950.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, there are included in this item two items under the Naval Establishment which provide for additional money in the Navy Department for draftsmen and an amount of money for making plans for battleships in the proposed naval program which is now being considered in the Committee on Naval Affairs, and it is not, of course, a deficiency. I do not believe that we ought to anticipate in the appropriation of money what Congress may or may not authorize hereafter.

It is true that in the hearings you will find that a portion of this money is to be used, as is contended by the Navy Department, in making plans for two ships now under construction; but there is about $14,000 or $15,000 in the two items—I have not the exact amount here before me—under the Naval Establishment which ought not to go into this bill.

It is utterly impossible for the subcommittee to absolutely segregate the items so as to determine just how much the Navy Department intends to use or needs on the two battleships now under construction, and for that reason I want the items eliminated, so that the Navy Department will ask for the additional draftsmen which they need for the work now under construction, so that Congress will not be placed in the attitude of making appropriations, having drafts made, and plans made for ships that may never be authorized.

Now, I am not going to take the time of the committee to read the hearings, but if you will take the hearings and read Admiral Griffin's testimony you will find that it is stated at that time that the need of these additional draftsmen was due largely to the fact that they were anticipating a program which was being considered by the Committee on Naval Affairs of this Congress; and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I move that this item be stricken from the bill. I reserved that right in the committee to make the motion. In the event that that is not done, then I want to reduce the item by the amount, as nearly as possible, that will be used for that purpose on new naval construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 21, by striking out the paragraph beginning with line 2 and ending with line 5.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the testimony before the committee does not show that any of the sum carried in this item is to be utilized in the preparation or performance of work in anticipation of any ships to be authorized hereafter. Congress at the last session authorized two battleships, *No. 43* and *No. 44*. Proposals were invited for the construction of those ships. The bids submitted by the private contractors were so much in excess of the limit of cost fixed that the Secretary of the Navy, under the authority conferred upon him by the naval appropriation bill, directed that the vessels should be constructed in two of the Government yards.

Admiral Taylor, the Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, in speaking of this item, made the following statement:

Part of the money was to be used for draftsmen in the two yards; the balance of it here in the bureau in Washington.

He was asked whether the amount to be used was on account of anticipated legislation. He stated that the building of these ships in the two yards necessitated the preparation of all the plans from the beginning. He says the material has already been contracted for, and that deliveries will commence within six months from December 1, 1915. In order to have the material delivered, certain plans must be prepared in advance, so that the material can be turned out and sent to the yards on schedule.

In the testimony of Admiral Griffin, the Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering, it appeared that for 15 or 20 years the practice of the Navy Department has been to do certain preliminary work in connection with the plans for ships that have been suggested or proposed in advance of the legislation authorizing the ships.

This work must necessarily be done in advance or else after the ships are authorized a very considerable delay will take place in the preparation of plans, the obtaining of bids, and the construction of the ships. The number of ships does not materially affect the work to be done, but work is done in the preparation of preliminary plans upon ships of general types, in order that the work may be utilized after it has been prepared. This practice has prevailed in the Navy Department for a great many years.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand this is only for temporary employees in the Navy Department, is it not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is only for the balance of the current fiscal year. Additional draftsmen, however, will be required in the two navy yards during the construction of the ships that are assigned there. For instance, the Mare Island yard has had assigned to it a battleship for construction. There are between 2,000 and 2,500 detailed working plans. These plans are prepared as the work on the ship goes on. The mechanics can not do their work until these plans are ready, and it requires a very large additional number of draftsmen to be employed during the period the ship is under construction, so that the plans can be carried on coincidentally with the progress of the work. Admiral Taylor stated that there was a delay of about six months in the launching of the *Arizona*, which was constructed in a Government yard, because of the lack of the necessary draftsmen to keep the plans prepared up to the progress of the work on the ship.

These men are per diem employees. Their services seem to be necessary. These ships are authorized and are to be built. It is an economy to build them as rapidly as possible, because we have a very considerable amount of money invested in them lying idle, and the overhead charges are a very considerable item. So far as the testimony goes, of these two items aggregating $86,000 there may be used in Washington in the Bureau of Steam Engineering on some preliminary work in connection with ships not yet authorized the sum of $4,250. It does not permit the employment of a very large number of draftsmen, and regardless of our views as to the number of ships that should be added to the Navy, if any ships are to be authorized at this session of Congress, then additional draftsmen are necessary to do the preliminary work as has been the custom since the Government has been engaged in building modern war vessels.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. If this Congress should order only two ships built, will these draftsmen be needed, and will the department need this appropriation?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Therefore it does not follow that it is in anticipation of a 4, 6, 8, or 10 ship program?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It does not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the estimates which the Secretary of the Navy transmitted to Congress through the Secretary of the Treasury provide in regard to this item:

Pay of additional draftsmen and other technical assistants needed to expedite the preparation of designs, contract plans, and specifications of the vessels which have been recommended to be included in the naval appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1917.

Then, there is an item about vessels 43 and 44. Then, in addition, for the purchase of equipment and supplies and the rental of quarters for the additional force referred to in the item which I first read.

If it be true—and I have no doubt that the statement made by the gentleman from New York is correct, since he makes it—that it has been the custom of the Navy Department to prepare plans and specifications for vessels before they have been authorized, I think it is a custom that ought to be abandoned. It is news to me. The department for many years has recommended more vessels than were finally authorized. I think there is no year in which a number of vessels—not always battleships, but other vessels—have been recommended which have not been authorized. And if it be true that the department has gone ahead, out of appropriations not intended for that purpose, and has provided the plans and specifications for these vessels which were never authorized, it has been an extravagant waste of money, whoever did it. Now, as far as I am concerned, I am going to vote this year for—well, I think I will wait until I make my speech on that subject before I state how many vessels I am for. But I can see no reason why we should go ahead and give to the Navy Department specifically an appropriation to prepare plans for vessels which have not been authorized, and which may not be authorized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think the gentleman understands the situation. The General Board is engaged continually in the study of the development of war craft.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The estimates submitted to Congress requesting the authorization of battleships of certain types are supplemented with information as to the size of the ships, the size of the guns, and their general characteristics. In order to reach those conclusions, to make the necessary studies preliminary to these recommendations, a very considerable amount of drafting work is necessary in connection therewith.

Mr. MANN. They have reached these conclusions in regard to the vessels which we have just authorized. They have not only finished reaching the conclusions, but they are putting the conclusions into effect. Now, if they want a sum of money to make investigations, they have that all the time. A part of this appropriation is for plans, and so forth, for ships 43 and 44, the contracts for which have just been let, or are about to be let to the navy yards. They are up to date on that. If they are not, those battleships ought not to be built.

Mr. FITZGERALD. None of the working plans are prepared yet at all.

Mr. MANN. Very well, that gives away the case. I am in favor of giving them the money to do that; but if, when they have just made a contract for the most modern battleship that is to be built, they are going to learn something new to-morrow, they had better wait until they let that contract. I do not know whether they have let the contracts, but they have received the bids.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They have decided to let the contracts.

Mr. MANN. They have decided to let the contracts, one in California and one in New York, on battleships that are supposed to be up to date if anything is. They are supposed to represent the best wisdom of the world in battleships now. They are preparing the plans and specifications for those ships. What do they need money for—to prepare plans and specifications for some other vessels to submit to Congress this month or next month?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I saw a statement that it was likely to press on the Committee on Naval Affairs the advisability of authorizing battleships of 36,000 tons rather than 32,000, with a main battery to consist of 16-inch guns instead of 13 and 14 inch guns, as at present.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman mean to say that they are going to prepare plans and specifications for battleships in advance of their authorization?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They do certain work and they have been doing it. It is not something that is new or peculiar to this situation. It is considered current work that has been done for 15 or 20 years.

Mr. MANN. But this item does not cover that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is mistaken. I read the estimate as it was transmitted, and it occurred to me that it was a very unusual proceeding to ask for money to prepare plans and specifications for ships in advance of their authorization by Congress. Admiral Griffin spoke of the sum required for steam engineering, and said $4,250 was desired to be used for the purpose. Admiral Taylor, speaking for the Bureau of Construction and Repair, did not say it was for such a purpose, but did say, In the conduct of the working of the Bureau of Construction and Repair for the past 15 or 20 years certain preliminary work on the plans had always been done before Congress had authorized any ships whatever.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt there is certain preliminary work always done before they make the recommendation, but for that they have a regular appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It all comes out of this appropriation.

Mr. MANN. They have $9,000,000, and they have always paid it out of that appropriation, and they can pay it now.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, the $9,000,000 is in the general item, and there is a limit put on that as to how much can be used for draftsmen. It amounts to hundreds of thousands of dollars, but it is limited both in the naval and the legislative bill.

Mr. MANN. That is true, of course.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there can be any question but that the item was asked for, and it was in the mind of the two admirals that came before this committee that that was the chief reason for asking for it. Take the $10,000 item for the purchase of certain tables for draftsmen which they have been needing for a long time and needed to perfect working plans for the two battleships 43 and 44, one to be built in California and one in New York. They said they needed the tables for that purpose, and certain other furniture in the office. While being examined on that question all of these items were in the minds of the committee. Now, on page 114 of the hearings you will find Admiral Griffin's statement, as follows:

Admiral GRIFFIN. We want to get the money as soon as we can, so as to proceed with this program.
The CHAIRMAN. Which program?
Admiral GRIFFIN. The one the Secretary has outlined.
The CHAIRMAN. The one the Secretary has recommended?
Admiral GRIFFIN. Yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. But that has not been authorized?
Admiral GRIFFIN. No, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. You want to go ahead with it before it is authorized—is that it?
Admiral GRIFFIN. Well, we have got to do a lot of preliminary work on these ships. The program carries eight or nine different types of ships; and if we waited until the bill passed, it might be 18 months before we would be able to advertise the ships.
The CHAIRMAN. Suppose there are no ships carried in the bill?
Admiral GRIFFIN. Then, of course, the time would be wasted.
The CHAIRMAN. You are asking us to anticipate that Congress is going to authorize certain vessels?
Admiral GRIFFIN. Yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. You want $2,500 for that?
Admiral GRIFFIN. That is for the Bureau of Steam Engineering.
The CHAIRMAN. What is that for?
Admiral GRIFFIN. That is for equipping the drafting rooms with drawing tables, filing cabinets, drawing instruments, calculating machines, and other office equipment, which we estimate to cost $2,500.
The CHAIRMAN. How long would it take to equip those rooms?
Admiral GRIFFIN. Oh, two weeks, perhaps.
The CHAIRMAN. You would not need this money until the money for the new program becomes available?
Admiral GRIFFIN. Oh, yes.
The CHAIRMAN. Why?
Admiral GRIFFIN. Well, if we waited until the new program is available we would lose just that much time in preparation.
The CHAIRMAN. But you can not start on these ships until they are authorized by Congress?
Admiral GRIFFIN. A great deal of it has to be done ahead—a great deal of it.
The CHAIRMAN. Before they are authorized?
Admiral GRIFFIN. Yes, sir; we have to do a great deal ahead of time.
The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose?
Admiral GRIFFIN. So that we will not delay the advertising of the ships.

Not only that item, but the items I am asking the committee to strike out, are to be used, or nearly all, in anticipation of what Congress may do.

Let the committee also keep in mind that all these employees in the city of Washington are provided for in the legislative bill that comes from this committee, but the draftsmen who work in the navy yards are paid by the Naval Committee. The last Naval Committee that considered the naval program made provision, or is presumed to have made provision, for what is needed to carry out the work that we authorized in that bill; so I think it is indefensible for money to be expended in any department of the Government in anticipation of what Congress may or may not do. The preliminary work they speak of is work that has to do with the type of vessel. That work is done in the city of Washington.

No detail plans and specifications are prepared, no working plans are prepared, but they simply agree on the type of vessel. For until an examination reaches that point it was nowhere intimated in this record that they needed to use it on these vessels that are being constructed in the mind of the Secretary of the Navy as proposed to Congress. Therefore I feel that the item ought to be stricken out. Nor do I feel that there will be any such delay as is contended for, because it is not conceivable to my understanding, if the naval bill shall go through in a few months, how it could delay the building of the vessels in the new program. It might delay it from now until the bill authorizing the vessels is passed, but why should you anticipate what Congress may do? It seems to be a total disregard of the right of Congress to control these appropriations. It was suggested in committee that they might take all the draftsmen and use them on the preliminary work and then come and ask us to give them an appropriation for draftsmen to do the work that they now have in hand. I do not presume that any department of the Government would do that, because if that is done Congress will find itself in doubt where the money has been spent for something not authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, it is the duty of the President to make to Congress such recommendations as he deems proper. To do that intelligently, especially touching the construction of battleships and cruisers of different types for the Navy, he should have some knowledge either himself or in the proper department. What kind of a fix would he be in if he recommended various ships and vessels without proper knowledge of what was required? You would call on the Executive or the Navy Department for information—what do you know about it? I do not know anything about it. How much will it cost? I do not know. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, and that is what I gather from the evidence, that for 20 years past this practice has obtained of making plans for vessels not authorized, so as to be able to give information to the Executive, whose duty under the law it is to communicate to Congress such recommendations as he sees proper to make. I became satisfied, and I am now, that this appropriation ought to be made, and I agreed to it, and I hope that the amendment will fail. Of course, if ships are authorized, then when the contract is let, and it can be let without the working plans being made, according to our information, the working plans must be made and made promptly. There are certain ships—if I recollect correctly, two of these great battleships—that are authorized. Those working plans ought to be made promptly, and there ought not to be delay of months for the lack of sufficient drafts-

men to make the working plans, as in the case stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. It is true that the last Congress last March did order the construction of two large ships of war, of 32,000 tons each. This action was in last March. It was anticipated then that within a few months the keels of these ships would be laid, and if there was any protection to be afforded by the construction of these ships, that the American Nation might have that protection speedily given it. But the keels have not yet been laid. Information has been given the Committee on Naval Affairs that they will not be laid for some time to come, six months at least, perhaps nine months and maybe a year. A ship is on one of the ways and has to be taken off before another can be put on. The *California* is on the ways in the New York Navy Yard; a second ship has been assigned to the navy yard at Mare Island. Ways must be provided in that yard before this ship can be constructed. The gentleman from Illinois is entirely correct. When estimates are submitted to the committee, the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Construction and Repair both indicate to the committee the design and character of the ship that it is desirable to have added to the Navy. Preliminary plans are made, and from those plans—I have seen them at times—we endeavor to reach a conclusion as to the character of ship. But the real working plans are not made until after Congress acts. Complaint is frequently made here and elsewhere of the delay in making the plans for ships after they are ordered by Congress.

This delay is supposed, Mr. Chairman, to delay the construction of the ship. I believe, from what I know, that the preparation of these plans has at times greatly delayed the construction of the ships, and, if these are the plans for the two ships we provided for a year ago, I would earnestly ask this committee to agree to this provision of the bill and make this appropriation of money. It seems plain to me they are. Do not let it be understood that I am advocating, directly or indirectly, a great program for the Navy. I reserve to myself the right to conclude in the end and after much consideration what I shall do in that respect. But if this money asked here is to hasten the construction of these two great men-of-war authorized a year ago, let us have these plans made, and let everybody employed for the purpose help to work them out. To relieve the apprehension of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON], although he is a member of the Appropriations Committee and would know more of the subject than I do, I believe that it was intended by Admiral Taylor to ask for enough money to employ draftsmen to work on these two ships already authorized. I read from his statement, to be found on page 119 of the hearings:

> Admiral TAYLOR. Of that $48,950, $19,700 is for expenditure for services in the Bureau of Construction and Repair of the 29 additional draftsmen; the remaining amount is for expenditure for draftsmen necessary at the New York and Mare Island Navy Yards in connection with the construction of battleships *No. 43* and *No. 44*.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. How much is that?
>
> Admiral TAYLOR. $29,250, sir.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. The $29,250 is not on account of anticipated legislation, is it?
>
> Admiral TAYLOR. No, sir. The last bill authorized the Secretary of the Navy to construct these ships in the navy yards, and in order to prepare the plans and push the work it is necessary to have an increase in the drafting force.

Admiral Taylor then proceeds in his statement before the committee to say that the shipbuilding in the New York yard requires the attention of draughtsmen already employed, and that the other ship to be built there to immediately follow the *California*, which is now on those ways, would require the employment of additional draftsmen. Furthermore, additional draftsmen will be needed in the navy yard in California, where *No. 44* is to be built. I think *No. 44* goes there. It seems to me it is not in anticipation of a much enlarged program for the Naval Establishment that this amount of money is asked, and let me suggest to gentlemen here, having had some knowledge of naval affairs as a Member of this House, this is not a drop in the bucket compared to what will be required if the program recommended by the President of the United States shall be adopted by Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I now move to amend this section by striking out the figures "$48,950" and inserting the figures "$29,240," reducing the appropriation $19,700.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Cerk read as follows:

> Page 21, line 5, strike out the figures "$48,950" and insert "$29,250."

Mr. SISSON. Now, gentlemen of the committee, this gives to the Navy Department every cent that Admiral Taylor said was necessary to do the work on the two battleships now on the ways, and the $19,700 is the money which would be used on the proposed new program not authorized by law.

Now, I was willing in the committee, and am willing now, to give to the Navy Department every penny that they want for this work, which it is authorized by this Congress to do and to expend, but I am utterly unwilling that they shall expend one cent on a program which may or may not be authorized. That matter ought to be handled by the Committee on Naval Affairs. It is in no sense of the word a deficiency, and we give to them all that they need under the present program.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. The President of the United States, as the gentleman knows, has recommended that four great ships of war be provided.

Mr. SISSON. Yes. I have a great deal of respect for the President of the United States, but I am not willing to represent a people and then permit him to assume the duties and functions of Congress on any matter. I think Congress ought to always retain its control over appropriations and the expenditure of money.

Mr. BUTLER. But I am not asking the gentleman to remove that control; I will assist him, so far as I am able, in maintaining it, but this program is recommended, and without committing ourselves to it, does not the gentleman think it is but fair that the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Navy should have an opportunity to prepare the preliminary plans for these big ships? There may be two of them; maybe there will be but two recommended by the committee and maybe there will be but two agreed to by this House; but is it not fair to the department that it should have sufficient money to prepare these preliminary plans?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further. Ah, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman need not be uneasy about preliminary plans. That Navy Department will give all the preliminary plans the Committee on Naval Affairs want. They will not have to have this $19,700 to prepare those plans. Let not the gentleman give himself any uneasiness about that matter. They will get all the preliminary plans that are necessary to have. What I am inveighing against now is that the department, without any warrant or authority, so far as the law now exists, and if you segregate the items and put this $19,700 in a separate item it will be subject to the point of order, because it is not authorized by law. But they put it in one item which has been authorized by your committee, to wit, to build the two battleships now under construction. It is a bad practice, to say the least of it, for the Navy Department, or any other department, to endeavor to take advantage of Congress and put upon them the necessity of withholding what the department may need in order that they might get what the department does not need because of the uncertainty in the item as to exactly how it is all going to be spent.

Here we have the testimony of Admiral Taylor, which the gentleman just read to the committee, in which he states specifically that this amount of money is needed on the two battleships now under construction, or soon to be under construction; and then it follows that this $19,700 is to be used on the proposed naval program which the Secretary of the Navy has offered to this House. I therefore ask the committee to adopt the amendment and give them all they need for the battleships and for the program now authorized by law, but not give them a penny for that which may or may not be authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] will not prevail. If this amendment be adopted, the money necessary to employ draftsmen in the two yards in which battleships *No. 43* and *No. 44* have been assigned for construction will be provided, but no money will be available to add additional draftsmen in the bureau at Washington. There is no doubt in my mind, and the Bureaus of Steam Engineering and Construction and Repair very frankly stated, that the purpose of obtaining this money is to employ draftsmen for the purpose of expediting the construction of whatever ships may be authorized at this session of Congress. If this money be not voted at this time and these men employed, it will delay for 18 months the invitation for proposals for the construction of these ships that may be authorized. Regardless of what number of vessels may be authorized, whether the largest number suggested by the most extreme big-navy man or the smallest number suggested by the most radical against any great increase in our naval force, I am convinced

that whatever vessels are authorized should be constructed as speedily as possible, and this appropriation is to enable that to be done.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In just a moment I hope. If any reason whatever exists for additions to our Navy, large additions or small additions, the necessity that exists for those additions requires the construction of those ships rapidly and the putting of them into condition to be used, and there will be a delay, and a long delay, in the construction of the vessels unless this force for employment in the department at Washington should be authorized. Now, it would have been easy for the Navy Department to have concealed this fact. This estimate could have been prepared and advocated in a manner that would not have disclosed that; and it was for the purpose of obtaining draftsmen to expedite the preparation of plans for ships to be authorized or contemplated at this session of Congress. The estimate is submitted in a form to compel the money to be used for that purpose, so that there will be no misunderstanding of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER]?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Did the gentleman learn in these hearings that it was proposed by the Navy Department to change the style of the ship and therefore, I presume, more elaborate plans would have to be made?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Admiral Taylor made the statement. I asked him. I said that the estimates have been submitted to Congress, and therefore these draftsmen could not be needed to prepare plans in order to enable the department to prepare the estimates. The statement is that the estimates are of a very tentative character and they wish to reduce them to more definite and substantial form in order to more intelligently discuss what the department desires to do. It is not possible for any men, no matter how competent they may be as naval architects, to give an estimate or to form any opinion that is of any value whatever as to a ship and its characteristics without some comprehensive preliminary plans which can be studied to determine displacement, the speed possibilities, and the ability of the ship to carry guns, ammunition, coal, fuel, and other things that mean weight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Just a moment more. These men ought to be in a position, whatever Congress does regarding the proposed naval program, to carry out the will of Congress in as expeditious a manner as possible, and build whatever ships that may be authorized as quickly as may be.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to understand just how, if the naval bill passes in the next four or five months, it would delay the construction of these ships 18 months. That is a remarkable statement to make, because it simply means that the draftsmen will be authorized there as soon as the ship is authorized by the naval bill, when it passes the House and passes the Senate, and whatever the delay may be between now and then, the time of its passage will be the only possible delay. Now, if it is so urgent as that, they should put this item in an urgent deficiency bill. Why not put the proposed battleships in the bill and authorize them now? I see no such urgent need, such untimely and undue haste, to get hold of this money.

Now, it is true, as I have understood, that they have demanded more draftsmen in the past than the Naval Committee would give them, but I do not believe it is the function of this committee or any other committee of the House, especially a deficiency committee, to overrule the decision of the Naval Committee, which is presumed to know what it is doing and, I presume, know more about the naval bill and what is in it than a deficiency committee making a short investigation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The part of this item that the gentleman proposes to strike out is the additional sum that would be given to the department in addition to what is carried in the legislative bill, and the part that remains in is the addition to the amount that is carried in the naval bill.

Mr. SISSON. That is true; but there is no necessity for it at this time, as I conceive it, unless this committee is willing to anticipate, as the Navy Department did, that we are going to get it anyway. Let the legislation be harmonious. Let the committee of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], who has just spoken, take jurisdiction of this matter, and let him handle it and put it all in a bill together. Then you will know how many draftsmen you will need. I do not know, nor does the gentleman here know, whether they have made provisions for draftsmen in addition to the regular appropriation or not—draftsmen to take care of four, five, six, seven, or any other number of ships. They have not gone into that matter. That is a matter they decline to go into. They do not know how many ships are going to be authorized, and yet they come and ask for this sum of money.

Will they prepare plans for one, two, three, four, five, or a dozen ships that may not be authorized? They do not know. I think it is an unwise, and so far as Congress is concerned an unfair, method of spending money until you know for what ships, for how many ships, and what will be done with the money.

By the way, I do not suppose it is a very sacred thing to you gentlemen when you go to appropriate money, but it is a little sacred when you try to collect it from the people, and they have to pay it. We ought to have more regard for the Treasury than to pay out money for the employment of draftsmen that may do work upon ships that are never authorized. For example, they might expend $19,700 on plans and specifications for battleships that would never meet the approval of the Committee on Naval Affairs or of Congress, and the money would be squandered and thrown away, because Congress may not authorize the very battleships that they ask to be authorized.

For that reason I hope the committee will reduce the item down to what is actually needed under the program authorized by law and under construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 36, noes 45.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Steam Engineering: For engineering, including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916, $38,620.40.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out this item. I do not desire to discuss the matter, because the same reasons that applied to the former item apply also to this one.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to expend the two foregoing amounts for the services of draftsmen or other technical assistants for the purpose of constructing battleships Nos. 43 and 44 in certain United States navy yards and of expediting the preparation of designs, contract plans, and specifications of new vessels, being additional to the sums authorized for such personal services in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the language of this section. Beginning with line 14, after the word "yards," strike out the following language: "And of expediting the preparation of designs, contract plans, and specifications of new vessels." Strike out the language that I have read, ending with "vessels."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 21, lines 14 and 15, by striking out the following language: "And of expediting the preparation of designs, contract plans, and specifications of new vessels."

Mr. SISSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, by eliminating that language you will leave the amounts as they are, but the Navy Department would not then be authorized to use any of this money in the preparation of plans for ships not authorized by law.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it might be a good thing to have a little test vote in the House. We have had a good deal of talk about those who were in favor of enlarging the Navy and getting the country in the proper state of preparation. A great deal of applause on the Democratic side was given to some few gentlemen who have spoken against preparedness. Now, we are going to have a show-down. Those who are in favor of a little Navy at this time will vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi. Those who are not in favor of a little Navy, but are in favor of some little preparation for national defense, can vote against the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi, and we will have a rising vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. MANN. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 6, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Alaska Engineering Commission: For carrying out the provisions of the act approved March 12, 1914 (38 Stat., p. 305), entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," to continue available until expended, $2,000,000.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, beginning on line 7, strike out all of the paragraph down to and including line 13.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to waste the time of the House in offering hopeless amendments, but inasmuch as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] succeeded a few moments ago in reducing an appropriation of $2,000,000 to $1,999,978, I am encouraged to point out to him an opportunity to make a real, substantial saving.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. COX. I want some information. What has been done under this paragraph already?

Mr. GILLETT. They have begun work there. They have expended about $2,000,000, I think, on the work. They have bought a road, you know.

Mr. COX. How much of a road did they buy? What road did they buy?

Mr. GILLETT. A road of 35 miles, I think.

Mr. COX. What did they pay for that?

Mr. STAFFORD. They have paid down $1,150,000 and the balance is $650,000.

Mr. GILLETT. They have paid, I understand, over a million dollars.

Mr. COX. Are they actually constructing the work on this road?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes. I understand they are proceeding favorably with the work. They expected that they would have to bring their labor up there, but I understand they have found the labor there, and they are at work.

My opposition to this paragraph is not on that ground.

Mr. COX. I want some information. I have not looked the matter up.

Mr. GILLETT. I am not on the subcommittee that has charge of this legislation.

Mr. COX. I understand the Government has bought 70 miles of road already. Is that correct?

Mr. LENROOT. I understand the Government has paid down $1,750,000.

Mr. COX. The Government has constructed some road in addition to what it bought, has it not? How much?

Mr. GILLETT. They have graded about 35 miles, I believe, and built about 10 miles. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] may be able to inform the gentleman exactly.

Mr. CANNON. I think they have graded about 35 miles. That is my recollection of the hearings.

Mr. GILLETT. I do not base my amendment on the ground that this work is superfluous, but regardless of the advisability of building this railroad, I simply offer to that side of the House a proposition and an opportunity of economy. When the Treasury is suffering, when we are losing millions of dollars every month, when we have recommendations for enormous emergency appropriations which must be given, there has got to be some method of providing the money. I think one method would be to cut off all kinds of luxuries, and admitting that this is desirable and most commendable, upon which I do not wish to express any opinion, yet unless that side of the House has some proposition by which they are going to bring in adequate and abundant revenue, of which I am very skeptical, I think they had better begin to save this year by cutting off luxuries.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Suppose this item is stricken from the bill, how will it affect the Government work there? Will it occasion any loss to the Government?

Mr. GILLETT. It would undoubtedly occasion some loss. The construction has begun to a certain extent. The road we bought is not in good condition, but in very poor condition. The road of 10 miles which we have constructed would probably deteriorate—it would be some loss——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GILLETT. I ask, Mr. Chairman, for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I would say that it would not be two millions only saved. This $2,000,000 is for work for this fiscal year, but the administration has recommended an appropriation of eight million and some hundred thousand for the next year, and consequently what is in issue here is over $10,000,000. If we are going to stop at all we had better stop now and do nothing till the Treasury has more funds, but if we are going to go on next year we had better not stop work now and begin again next year. So the only reason for adopting this amendment would be on the theory that we were going to wait until the Government had sufficient revenue to afford us the reasonable luxuries of life. It does not seem to me at the present that we are in that condition or that there is any reasonable expectation of it in the near future. I do not believe the party in power is able to put us in that condition, and so I suggest, as one of the means of helping the Treasury, to strike out this appropriation and then not continue it in the next regular appropriation, but to wait until we are in a financial condition where we can afford to spend money in hastening our territorial development.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day I had occasion, after the gentleman from Massachusetts had spoken, to call attention to the inadequate method of determining extravagance by using simply totals. The gentleman himself has furnished a splendid illustration of the futility of that sort of consideration. If this railroad is to be built, this money should be appropriated. Of course if the gentleman from Massachusetts believes that the railroad ought not to be built and that we have wasted what has already been done there, he is quite within his rights and reasonable in his position in denying any additional money. But for those who believe it should be built to now deny the money would not be economy, although it might make a good showing in the totals. The question of showing that seems to the gentleman the most desirable thing to accomplish irrespective of whether you have an actual economy or not. The fact is, if the work is to be economically prosecuted the money must be available now. The fact is that a good deal of material can be transported in winter over the ice cheaper than after the ice breaks up. Another fact is that you would lose economies through the dispersing of your workmen who are there now. In fact, all the reasons that would actuate a business man conducting in a businesslike way an enterprise of this kind require an appropriation for carrying on and maintaining this work. The gentleman's theory of economy consists in reducing present totals only, and I congratulate him on giving such a good illustration of what I said this morning.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky seems to think that striking out $2,000,000 is a matter of totals. It is a matter of expenditure. There are plenty of people who would like to have something but can not, first, because their salaries are too small, like ours, or for other reasons which prevent the purchase of them. I suppose that was what was in the mind of the gentleman from Massachusetts. However, Mr. Chairman, I rose to call the attention of the House to what seems to me a peculiarity in the matter of submitting an estimate. Under the law the head of a department prepares an estimate of appropriations to be submitted to Congress and then transmits it to the Secretary of the Treasury, who transmits it to the Speaker of the House. I hold three of these estimates in my hand—one for the item now under consideration of $2,000,000 for the Alaska Railroad, one for the increase in the Navy Department, which we have just been discussing, and one for the deficiency in the pay of the Army, which we were discussing a little while ago. The Army estimate comes to us signed "Lindley M. Garrison, Secretary of War," and is addressed to the honorable the Secretary of the Treasury, with no one's approval. The one for the Navy comes to us signed "Josephus Daniels," and under that "The White House, approved, January, 1916," without anyone's signature. That shows that that estimate was submitted to the President and was marked "approved" by the White House, but the President was not earnest enough about it to add his signature. The estimate for the Alaska Railroad comes to us, "The President, The White House. Earnestly approved, Woodrow Wilson."

Mr. Chairman, you can take your choice. The President does not approve the estimate for the payment for the deficiency in the pay for the Army. He approves, but will not sign, the approval for the increase in the Navy, to prepare plans for new battleships, and he "earnestly" approves the expenditure of $2,000,000 for the Alaska railroad, which, I suppose, probably unknown to him, is mainly for the purpose of paying the Guggenheims or Pierpont Morgan or some one else—I do not know who it is—for the railroad in Alaska which we have agreed to buy, and which we ought to have. I do not know just where the President draws the line, and I do not know that it is the President who draws the line. Probably he does not keep track of these things, but it does seem odd to me that, of the estimates submitted to Congress for appropriations, some of them are not submitted to the President and he does not approve, some of them he approves but does not sign the approval, and some he earnestly approves and adds his signature.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in these matters of receipts and expenditures it is interesting to note some of the difficulties which we find ourselves up against. We embarked upon the proposition of the income tax which the people did not want, and now find that in order to raise revenue we will have to continue that tax and probably extend it. Then we imposed a war tax upon the people, which nobody wanted, and now find that in order to carry out the programs that have been decided upon we must extend that war tax and continue the burden which the people do not like to bear. In the matter of the customs revenue, we find that from the point of view of the other side it is very much easier to levy a direct tax upon the people of the United States to pay for our various enterprises than it is to levy a tax at the ports of entry on the goods that are manufactured in foreign countries, thus making the foreigner pay the tax for the benefit of the consumer in the United States. In the matter of the Alaska Railroad and this appropriation we are now up against the proposition of having gone into an expensive enterprise, involving the expenditure of some $30,000,000, which at the time it was discussed in the House seemed to indicate that we were going to expend of the people's money about $1,000 for the benefit of every white man in Alaska, assuming, of course, that the money was to be for the benefit of Alaskans only.

I did not approve the project at the time it came into the House, because, it seemed to me, considering the financial status of the country and the fact that the Democratic Party was not altogether a constructive party, that we had better reserve our funds for such purposes as good roads in the United States, which we badly need for the benefit of the farmer, as we heard yesterday, and for the improvement of waterways, long neglected, before we ever suspected we had any assets in Alaska at all. I opposed the measure at the time because it seemed to me to be a project that might very well wait for a year or two until we could take care of some of our own needs in the United States, and I thought possibly the 30,000 white men up there might give in a little bit to the 100,000,000 of people in the United States proper until we got a few things here that we actually needed in the way of public improvements. But so long as we have gone into it and the majority has made itself responsible for the expenditure of at least $30,000,000 to buy these railroads that did belong to the Guggenheims and others, who were very much assailed in previous Congresses, I do not see very well how we can get out of it since we have already expended a million dollars or more and have started on the work. That which we have undertaken I suppose we ought to carry through, leaving the responsibility where it belongs.

One of my constituents, an active business man and an energetic hunter, has been in Alaska several times, and in a communication to me he has a good deal to say about the resources of Alaska. In order that his views on that subject may be set before the House, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the House by incorporating his letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, *January 13, 1916.*

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have made two trips to Alaska in the pursuit of big game and I contemplate going again this spring.

These journeys have opened my eyes to the enormous mineral and agricultural wealth of Alaska and of its marvelous fisheries. This Territorial wonder until recently has had but poor help from Congress; in fact, it has been harassed in many sorts of ways in place of having been helped. The last Congress, however, made a notably good start by deciding to build a Government railroad from Seward to the Tanana River, which will enable it to get to Fairbanks—the metropolis of the far North.

Now that a real start has been made to do justice to this mighty Territory, I hope that you will do what you can to push the work along.

The administration has asked Congress to appropriate $10,456,000 for Government improvements in Alaska for this year.

What little I have seen of the Alaskan Territory confirms me in the belief that with the help of Congress and of the Government, as noted above, and with the transportation facilities as now projected finally completed, a wave of unexampled prosperity is bound to set in, which will not only help Alaska itself, but it will have the reflex action of being helpful to the whole of the United States.

Since the purchase of the Territory in 1867 Alaska has given the Nation a grand total of $533,195,587, and for this enormous amount the Government has only contributed about $24,000,000 over and above the revenues collected in 47 years.

If every Member of Congress should spend, say, two or three months in the Territory and see for themselves what an untold wealth will be bound to follow the improvements now in process of being carried out, they would realize that to give Alaska her rights would in the end be productive of good to every State in the Union.

Very truly, yours,

THOMAS MARTINDALE.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a statement about the Alaskan Railroad to-night. I do not want the statements that have been already made in reference to the amendment to go by without a statement of the facts.

Congress authorized the construction of a railroad in Alaska at a cost of not to exceed $35,000,000, and directed the President to select a route from some all-year open port at tidewater to the interior of Alaska on the navigable waters of Alaska, and if he determined to purchase any existing railroads in Alaska to pay not to exceed the appraised value of the railroad. The route selected is from Seward, Resurrection Bay, to Fairbanks. The Alaska Northern Railroad, 71 miles in length, from Seward to Kern Creek, a distance of 71 miles, has been purchased for $1,150,000. The work was commenced at Cooks Inlet and at Anchorage, a right of way has been graded for 35 miles, and tracks laid for a distance of 15 miles. There was available for the work $3,000,000. The money has all been expended. There are at Anchorage between 500 and 1,000 men who were engaged upon the work, and who will be reemployed if money be made available to utilize their services. An appropriation is urged at this time particularly because it is desired to carry the work from Matanuska River, a point to which the grading has been completed, a distance of 35 miles, for 40 miles farther to the Matanuska coal field, and in addition to do some work on what is to be the main line toward Fairbanks, to commence work from Ship Creek Junction along Turnagain Arm toward Kern Creek, so as to connect the Alaska Northern Railroad up with this part of the work that is being done.

If the money is now appropriated, supplies can be taken up to a supply station along the line of the Matanuska coal fields over the ice at a cost of about a cent a pound. If the money be not available until after the ice goes out, it will be necessary to pack supplies on pack horses. The limit will be about 150 pounds to an animal, and the cost will be about 8 cents a pound. A certain portion of the work can be done much better and more economically during the winter season than in the summer season. Unexpectedly favorable labor conditions enabled the commission to carry on the work much more expeditiously than was originally anticipated. Under these conditions it would seem to be the part of wisdom, if this road is to be constructed at an estimated cost of $27,000,000, to provide the money to enable the work to be done as expeditiously as possible. There are certain overhead charges which go on regardless of work being done, and the greater the force that can be employed, the greater the work that can be done with the existing organization and the more economically the work will eventually be done. It is not economy, Mr. Chairman, to deny this appropriation at this time. It would be deferring an essentially public authorized improvement to a later day at a very considerably increased cost. I can understand why my colleague on the committee favors this policy. About January, 1915, former President Taft wrote a series of articles for the Saturday Evening Post upon the efforts of his administration to effect economy in the public service. He said that in order to do so he had declined to permit to be submitted to Congress estimates for a number of very important and essential public improvements which had been authorized, which, in his opinion, should have been carried out, but in order to effect certain economies he had deferred them unto a later day; and, although this had been done, the estimates submitted by his administration during that Congress were $72,000,000 in excess of the sums actually appropriated. That is a false economy. That does not save anything. Like the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT], I was one of those who did not believe the United States should commence the work of building Government railroads in Alaska.

That question has been settled. That policy has been fixed, and the wise and economical thing to do is to provide adequate funds to enable the work to be completed as rapidly as possible. Within 18 months it is anticipated that the Matanuska coal field, to which the work is to be carried under this appropriation, will be opened up, and this coal is the coal which has been examined, analyzed, and determined to be particularly valuable for the use of the Navy. Certain select portions of the coal lands are to be reserved for the Government, and the more speedily this coal becomes available the more quickly can very considerable savings be effected in the cost of fuel for the Navy upon the Pacific coast.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Let us go home.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I wanted to ask whether or not the Matanuska coal was not the coal that the Navy tests proved to be not sufficiently powerful to use in the Navy?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There were two expeditions to this coal field. The results of the first tests were not satisfactory. It was said that the coal had been taken in such quantities and in such a way that a fair test had not been possible. The result of the second test is that the coal is of a very fine quality and adequate for naval purposes.

Mr. MADDEN. Was there not a statement made at the time these coal tests were made to the effect that all warships were being built now to consume oil instead of coal, and that coal would not any longer be a factor?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There were statements to that effect, but the great bulk of the naval vessels now use coal. The cost of transporting coal from the Atlantic seaboard to the Pacific seaboard is very much in excess of the value of the coal itself.

Mr. MADDEN. I agree, if they are going to use coal, they should have that coal.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We contribute $6,000,000 annually for the transportation of coal. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRISON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 7617, the good-roads bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the road bill. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I shall not object. This is the second time we have granted leave to our distinguished friend from Indiana to-day to extend remarks, but they are always good.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the dyestuffs situation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLNEY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the dyestuffs situation. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis Mr. Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán, a citizen of Cuba; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point René W. Pintó y Wentworth, a citizen of Cuba; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR SUNDAY, JANUARY 23.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] to preside next Sunday at the memorial exercises for the late Representative GOULDEN.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, January 21, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6229) granting a pension to Burnetta K. Brafford; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1334) granting an increase of pension to Frances M. Hammond; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5898) granting a pension to John W. Munsell; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2976) for the relief of Patrick H. Murphy, alias Henry Watson; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 1539) granting a pension to James Duffy; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2975) granting an increase of pension to Ernest A. Cephas; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7496) granting a pension to Hugh Fitzgerald; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8745) granting a pension to Antoni Oltmann; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 9520) to repeal section 4716 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 9521) to amend section 245 of the Criminal Code to include motion-picture films; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9522) to enlarge, extend, and make additions to, fireproof, and further improve the post-office building at Shenandoah, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9523) authorizing the expenditure of $50,000 for the erection at Appomattox, in the State of Virginia, of a monument or memorial to the restoration of peace; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McCRACKEN: A bill (H. R. 9524) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to subdivide the southeast quarter of section 18, township 46 north, range 4 west, Boise meridian (the same being that portion of the town site of Plummer, Benewah County, Idaho, not yet platted), into 5-acre tracts for sale, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 9525) to establish a national park in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 9526) to provide for the erection of a public building at Lenoir, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 9527) to amend section 3 of an act to create a legislative assembly in the Territory of Alaska, approved August 24, 1912, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9528) for the protection, regulation, and conservation of the fisheries of Alaska; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 9529) to promote the safety of travelers and employees upon railroads engaged in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9530) to promote the safety of travelers and employees upon railroads engaged in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9531) to provide for the acquisition of a new site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Montgomery, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 9532) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Morganton, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 9533) to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 9534) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM (by request): A bill (H. R. 9535) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 9536) to regulate the sale of beverages containing alcohol in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 9537) to levy and collect additional income taxes, and to provide revenue for the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9538) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 9539) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station in Mobile County, Ala.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9540) authorizing a preliminary survey and estimate of cost of improving Bakers Bay, near the mouth of Columbia River, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9541) authorizing the Secretary of War to sell the timber on the Three Tree Point Military Reservation in Wahkiakum County, State of Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 9542) to amend the second paragraph of section 3264 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by section 5 of the act of March 1, 1879, and as further amended by the act of Congress approved June 22, 1910; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 9543) to acquire a site and erect a manufacturing plant for the manufacture of arms, ordnance, armor, and other military and naval appliances at Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 9544) providing for a further survey and examination of Absecon Inlet, Atlantic County, N. J.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9545) providing for a survey of Hereford Inlet, Cape May County, N. J.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 9546) to establish a fish hatchery and fish station in the fourth congressional district of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 9547) authorizing the acceptance by the United States Government from the Kenesaw Memorial Association of Illinois of a proposed gift of land on the Kenesaw battle field in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 9548) to regulate the wages of certain employees employed in or under the Navy and War Departments of the Government; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND: A bill (H. R. 9549) making an appropriation of $15,000 to enable the Secretary of the Navy to cause the smiths' and other shop buildings of the Norfolk Navy Yard to be remodeled and properly ventilated; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER: A bill (H. R. 9550) to provide for district courts of the United States at Brunswick, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 9551) granting to various States public lands for construction, repair, and maintenance of public roads; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BENNET: Resolution (H. Res. 100) requesting the Secretary of State to furnish certain information relative to misuse of the American flag; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAGGART: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 113) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the jurisdiction of courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial from the Legislature of California for providing for proper care in public institutions of patients afflicted with tuberculosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NOLAN: Memorial from the Legislature of California favoring the passage of legislation to provide Federal aid for indigent nonresident tuberculous patients cared for in hospitals which conform to the hygienic standard established by the United States Treasury Department; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 9552) granting an increase of pension to John P. Fullhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 9553) granting a pension to Sarah A. Eddy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 9554) granting an increase of pension to William Wildermuth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H. R. 9555) for the relief of the estate of Thomas N. Aaron; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9556) for the relief of the heirs of John Faulkner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: A bill (H. R. 9557) granting an increase of pension to Ademah W. Rich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURGESS: A bill (H. R. 9558) for the relief of the estate of Henry Merseburger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9559) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Ritchey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 9560) granting an increase of pension to William Llowellyn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9561) granting a pension to Emaline Catherine Lindner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9562) granting an increase of pension to Edward R. Turnbach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9563) granting a pension to Lucy F. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9564) granting a pension to William Ringlaben; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9565) granting a pension to Barbara Boyle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9566) granting an increase of pension to Peter Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9567) granting a pension to Margaret M. Dymond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9568) granting a pension to Richard Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9569) for the relief of George D. Biggs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 9570) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Summers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9571) granting an increase of pension to Perry C. McIntosh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9572) granting an increase of pension to Daniel L. B. Downey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9573) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Galyan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9574) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim Whitson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9575) granting a pension to Benjamin J. Burris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DANFORTH: A bill (H. R. 9576) granting an increase of pension to Gainham Ball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 9577) granting an increase of pension to James Wildes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON: A bill (H. R. 9578) granting an increase of pension to John W. Wiley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9579) granting an increase of pension to William L. Alyea; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9580) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Shepherd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9581) granting an increase of pension to William Seal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9582) granting an increase of pension to George W. Fleenor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9583) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9584) granting an increase of pension to Christina Leibecke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9585) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Lawless; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9586) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Ketcham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9587) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9588) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Diggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9589) granting an increase of pension to John M. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9590) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Hand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9591) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Pittman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9592) granting an increase of pension to William H. Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9593) granting a pension to Vance K. Stewart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9594) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette F. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9595) granting an increase of pension to John Schmaly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9596) granting an increase of pension to Robert McGill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9597) granting an increase of pension to Mary McKee Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9598) granting a pension to Mary S. Zuck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9599) granting a pension to Martha E. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9600) granting a pension to Elizabeth Broadhead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9601) granting a pension to Laura A. Cumback; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EAGLE: A bill (H. R. 9602) for the relief of the heir of C. A. Bellenger and the estate of David H. Armour; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9603) for the relief of the heirs of Andrew J. Tevis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 9604) granting a pension to Augusta M. Robins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9605) granting a pension to Edward Sweeney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9606) for the relief of the widow of William H. Thomas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 9607) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9608) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Metcalfe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 9609) granting an increase of pension to Nancy M. Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9610) granting a pension to Laura Luella Satterfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 9611) granting an increase of pension to James M. Fish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9612) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. McKeever; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9613) granting an increase of pension to Peter A. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9614) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Asher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9615) to reimburse certain Indians for labor done in building a schoolhouse at Queets River, Quiniault Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 9616) granting an increase of pension to Josephine A. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 9617) granting an increase of pension to William H. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9618) granting restoration of pension to Carrie Farnham Godfrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 9619) granting a pension to Eliza J. St. Clair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9620) granting a pension to Friederike Bauersfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 9621) for the relief of J. W. Dellinger; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 9622) granting a pension to David R. Locke; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9623) granting a pension to Charles E. Cowper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9624) granting a pension to Mary N. Seely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9625) granting a pension to George A. Dick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9626) granting a pension to Mary A. O'Donnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9627) granting a pension to Ida Gilhooly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OAKEY: A bill (H. R. 9628) granting a pension to Catherine Sullivan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 9629) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Bowers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9630) granting an increase of pension to Henry Peoples; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9631) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Opperman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9632) granting a pension to Elizabeth Denges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9633) granting an increase of pension to John A. Donnelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9634) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hague; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 9635) for the relief of the estate of Williamson Page; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 9636) granting an increase of pension to John Heimroth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 9637) granting a pension to Elizabeth Neil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9638) granting an increase of pension to Azariah Dennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 9639) granting an increase of pension to John H. Admire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9640) to correct the military record of Robert W. Marr; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9641) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Poe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 9642) granting a pension to Ann M. Coady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9643) for the relief of William J. Coady; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 9644) authorizing the issuance of a patent to the northwest quarter section 27, township 17 south, range 40 west, Dodge City (Kans.) land district, to George H. Lowrey; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9645) granting an increase of pension to Uriah T. Tapscott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 9646) granting a pension to Samuel W. Gilliland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9647) for the relief of Aaron Kibler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9648) granting an increase of pension to George Knapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 9649) granting a pension to Elizabeth Meyers, now Elizabeth Schwing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEDMAN: A bill (H. R. 9650) for the relief of the estate of John H. Breeze; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9651) granting permission to Lieut. Commander W. Pitt Scott, of the United States Navy, to accept and wear a decoration bestowed on him by the Sultan of Turkey; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9652) granting a pension to Phoebe A. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 9653) granting a pension to Matthew J. Burke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9654) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Batsford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 9655) for the relief of the heirs of Albert L. Berry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 9656) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Norman H. Watson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 9657) granting a pension to Frances W. Rumbolz; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Roanoke (Va.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of Manila Camp, No. 1, Spanish War Veterans, urging increase in pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also (by request), memorial of Los Angeles Branch National Security League, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of churches of Lebanon, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of 45 citizens of Coshocton and Mansfield, Ohio, protesting against an increased tax on beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASWELL: Memorial of Glenmore Socialist Local, relative to plan to bring the war to a close; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of Louis Gerties et al., citizens of Argonia, Kans., against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William I. Pearson, of Wichita, Kans., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET: Petition of Piano Manufacturers of New York City and vicinity, favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: Petitions signed by residents of Portage County, Marathon County, Shawano County, Waupaca County, and Waushara County, of the eighth congressional district of Wisconsin, favoring the enactment into law of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petitions of R. S. Rutherford and Herman S. Rosenbaum of New York, favoring child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of Harlem Board of Commerce, protesting against any Federal tax on mortgages and real estate conveyances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of piano manufacturers of New York City and vicinity, favoring the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Theatrical Protective Union of New York, protesting against any additional tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petitions of McCleary, Wallin & Crouse, of Amsterdam, N. Y., and the Gloversville Knitting Co. and E. S. Parkhurst & Co., of Gloversville, N. Y., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COPLEY: Papers to accompany House bill 9355, granting a pension to C. Jennie Stephens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COSTELLO: Petition of Penn Worsted Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., favoring an increase of one-half cent per pound in the tariff on lemons, oranges, grapefruit, limes, and pomelos; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DARROW: Petitions of Max Heinrici, of Germantown, and Rev. H. C. Schneider, of Roxborough, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of bill to prevent exportation of arms, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Flavell Bros., of Germantown; Corkran Bros., of Philadelphia; Bennett & Aspden Co., J. W. Barber & Co., and Jos. M. Adams & Co., of Manayunk, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Theatrical Protective Union of New York, protesting against tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Woman's Party of Cook County, Ill., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Piano Manufacturers of New York City and vicinity, favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of A. D. Varian, favoring passage of House bill 476, workingmen's compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Aileen Didesan, of California, favoring workingmen's compensation bill (H. R. 476); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEWALT: Petitions of sundry tradespeople of the thirteenth congressional district of Pennsylvania, favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of McCollom & Post, favoring passage of House bill 702, dyestuffs tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Baker & Schofield Co., favoring passage of House bill 702, dyestuffs tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Gautschy Silk Dyeing Co., Silk Dyers' Mutual Protective Association of America, Lanza Silk Dyeing Co., the Perfection Silk Dyeing Co., Wagaraw Silk Dyeing Co., Standard Silk Dyeing Co., Eli Mirandon, and C. De Grado, favoring passage of House bill 702, dyestuffs tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of James H. Farrar, favoring passage of House bill 702, dyestuffs tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of De Gise Silk Dyeing Co., favoring passage of House bill 702, dyestuffs tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. H. Brown & Sons Co., favoring passage of House bill 702, dyestuffs tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of Pacific Fisheries Society, relative to aid for commercial fisheries of the Pacific coast; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Traffic Club of New York, favoring repeal of the seamen's act; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of John Thompson and 27 others, of Colby, and Hubert Hochmuth and 25 others, of Lasalle, Wis., urging passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ELSTON: Memorial of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, favoring legislation for California-Oregon interests; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of California Cotton Mills Co., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of Theatrical Protective Association of New York, protesting against tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Iron Shipbuilders' Cooperative Association and Drillers and Tappers League, relative to more pay for workmen in Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of piano manufacturers of New York City and vicinity, favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of New York Post Office Laborers' Benevolent Association, Branch No. 1, relative to classification for post-office laborers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Burson Knitting Co., of Rockford, Ill., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEATON: Petition of John P. Ryan, of Pottsville, Pa., relative to national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HINDS: Petition of Cabot Manufacturing Co., of Brunswick, Me., favoring passage of bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Petition of Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Societies of the Bethany Presbyterian Church, of Trenton, N. J., favoring censorship for motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petitions of F. A. Strauss & Co. and Crescent Insulate Wire & Cable Co., of Trenton, N. J., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Low Moor, Davenport, Lost Nation, Wheatland, Calamus, Grand Mound, Conesville, Nichols, Lone Tree, Baldwin, Monmouth, Maquoketa, Charlotte, Goose Lake, Bryant, Sabula, Miles, Delmar, Preston, Dewitt, Welton, Le Claire, Bettendorf, Atalissa, Wilton Junction, Clin-

ton, Walcott, Solon, Iowa City, West Liberty, Dixon, Eldridge, Long Grove, Lyons, Princeton, Camanche, Muscatine, Victor, Ladora, Oxford, Parnell, North English, Williamsburg, Marengo, and others of the second district of Iowa, asking that tax be sage of bill to prohibit exportation of munitions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions of Wolff Worsted Mills and Stillwater Worsted Mills, of Harrisville, and Narrow Fabric Co., of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of the State of Minnesota, urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUD: Papers to accompany bill for pension for Carrie Farnham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of piano manufacturers of New York City and vicinity, favoring passage of Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of women of 76 chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of William H. Hubbell Camp, No. 4, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring pensions for widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Jennings Lace Works, favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of William H. Richardson and others, Standard Waste Manufacturing Co., Goodman Bros. & Hinlim, John Hamilton & Sons, Pine Tree Silk Mills Co., William Brown & Co., Hancock Knitting Mills, all of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Citizens Committee for Food Shipments, relative to refusal of France to allow shipments of condensed milk; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Comision Reguladera del Mercado de Henequin, relative to investigation of harvester combine in Yucatan, Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Workmen's Circle, favoring resolution offering mediation to belligerents; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Papers to accompany House bill 9185, granting a pension to Martha A. Knapp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9186, for the relief of George W. Davis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Southbridge Printing Co., in favor of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Rockwell Woolen Co., of Leominster, Mass., in favor of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Edwin Bartlett Co., of North Oxford, Mass., indorsing House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Perry Yarn Mills, of Webster, Mass., indorsing House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Naquoy Worsted Mills, of West Rutland, Mass., favoring House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWERS: Papers to accompany House bill 9390, granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Sexton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Henry P. Horton, president Associated Charities of Ithaca, N. Y., favoring passage of the Keating child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition relative to House bill 702, a bill to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Protest of members of Rice Creek Grange, No. 1470, against increasing the appropriation for a larger Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Michigan Carton Co. and Standard Paper Co., of Kalamazoo, Mich., favoring legislation to make the United States independent of any other nation for its dyestuffs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper from George E. Dean, Albion, Mich., favoring establishment of a nonpartisan tariff board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 5591, for relief of Florence Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petitions of H. A. Witthoft and others, of Pocatello; J. A. Schlictling and others, of Twin Falls; and Andrew Huber and other citizens, all of Idaho, favoring passage of bill to prohibit exportation of munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7409, to increase the pension of Alexander Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Hon. Theodore Turner, of Pocatello, Idaho, and 96 others, urging legislation providing for the relief of the unemployed; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Levi Slinker and 195 citizens of Canyon County, Idaho, protesting against law restricting use of the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Sandpoint, Idaho, urging legislation providing a world federation with the view of bringing to a close the war in Europe and secure perpetual peace throughout the civilized world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: Papers to accompany H. R. 8769, a bill for the relief of the heirs of James S. Rollins; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Memorial of Orange Grove Monthly Meeting of Friends, of Pasadena, Cal., protesting against any increase of armament for war purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Los Angeles Branch of National Security League, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Church of the People, of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against any increase of armaments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Easton Finishing Co. and Stewart Silk Co., of Easton, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petitions of citizens of first congressional district of Massachusetts, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Byron, Weston & Co., of Dalton; Crocker, McElwain & Co., Chemical Paper Manufacturing Co., and American Writing Paper Co., of Holyoke, Mass., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *January 21, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Joseph H. Crooker, D. D., of Boston, Mass., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God our Father, we worship Thee as the Maker of heaven and earth. We praise Thee as the Creator of all tribes and peoples. We honor Thee as the Ruler of all nations. We thank Thee most gratefully for all the gracious blessings of our daily life. And now, as Representatives of this great Nation here assembled in Congress, we ask for the guidance of Thy spirit, even the spirit of Jesus Christ, that we may enact wise laws; that we may promote and protect the sacred privileges of our glorious country; and that we do something to establish justice more firmly throughout the world. And unto Thy great and high and glorious name we give honor, glory, and thanksgiving, now and forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the resignation of a member of a committee. The Clerk will report it:

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS,
Washington, January 20, 1916.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am unable to attend to the duties as member of the Claims Committee. As chairman of the Pensions Committee I am overwhelmed with work, with a large personal correspondence besides, and I shall have to resign as a member of the Claims Committee, owing to the fact that I can not do justice to that committee.

I trust my place will be filled and my resignation accepted without delay.

Very sincerely, yours, ISAAC R. SHERWOOD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House another resignation, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1916.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives, Washington.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Recently the House of Representatives honored me with my election to a place on the Banking and Currency Committee, and also to a place on the District of Columbia Committee, and also to a place on the Patents Committee.

Because of the work I am both inclined and compelled to do upon the Banking and Currency Committee—particularly at this session, when it has under consideration the important matter of rural credits legislation—I am not able to attend the meetings and perform my share of the work upon either the Patents Committee or the District of Columbia Committee, and I accordingly hereby tender my resignation as a member of both the Committee on Patents and the Committee on the District of Columbia, and urgently request to be relieved at once from service on either or both of said committees.

Respectfully submitted.

JOE H. EAGLE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a statement from Mr. Breckinridge Jones, of St. Louis, in regard to a resolution for investigating sisal loans.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IGOE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Mr. Breckinridge Jones, of St. Louis, on sisal loans. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9416, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, with Mr. HARRISON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9416, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the emergency caused by the infectious nature and continued spread of the destructive disease of citrus trees known as citrus canker, by conducting such investigations of the nature and means of communication of the disease, and by applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary, and to pay such expense and employ such persons and means, including not exceeding $2,000 for personal services in the city of Washington, and to cooperate with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations of growers, or individuals as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purpose, $300,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. So that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] may make a short statement in reference to this canker-disease appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, Congress last winter appropriated $35,000 to enable the Department of Agriculture to initiate on a comprehensive scale the work of eliminating the citrus canker in certain States in the South. A disease of citrus fruit trees had been introduced to this country, and at the time the matter was called to the attention of Congress it was shown that the entire citrus-fruit industry was imperiled. The citrus-fruit industry in the State of Florida alone is valued at $200,000,000.

Last February or March the Legislature of Florida was in session, and, believing that this pest would be controlled and eliminated by the expenditure of $175,000, the Florida Legislature appropriated that sum. Certain fruit-growers' associations, State and local, as well as individuals, have expended large sums of money in this work.

The result of the investigations that have been made, however, discloses that it is necessary to make a systematic, organized campaign, and it is estimated that it will take at least $4,000,000 completely to eliminate this disease and protect the citrus-fruit industry of the country.

The Secretary of Agriculture submitted an estimate to the committee for the balance of the present fiscal year. It is estimated that $30,000 must be expended during each of the five months in the State of Florida, and $30,000 for the rest of the year in each of the remaining five States in which the citrus fruit trees are grown and which are affected by the pest. It seems that if any action whatever is to be taken, the appropriation should be adequate to do the work required and make the appropriation of value. The committee, accordingly, recommended the amount stated by the Department of Agriculture as necessary to carry on the work from now until the 30th of June.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] withdraws his point of order.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, on this item I want to say only a word.

This item, of course, was subject to a point of order. It was not made in committee, and it has not been made in the House. It was very fully investigated. I indorse all that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has stated.

It is a condition that is found in its worst form in Florida. The States of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, in the citrus-growing zone, also have this disease, but in a much smaller degree. It is a disease that has no respect for State lines. The Florida Legislature is not in session and will not be for a year. They have made an appropriation, which the legislature thought was sufficient, but it turns out that it was not sufficient, and many contributions have been made by private individuals. This is the critical time when the fight must be made—during the last half of the fiscal year—and it seems to me, while I am not in favor of rushing in on appropriations of this kind, that the condition is so serious and the threat so great that this estimate of the department for immediate expenditure and during the remainder of this fiscal year demands this appropriation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert a new paragraph after line 19, page 24:

"For the emergency caused by the prevalence and continued spread of the dangerous disease known as rabies among coyotes, wolves, and other animals in the national forests and on other public lands, by conducting such investigations of the nature and means of communication of the disease and for the destruction of wolves, coyotes, and other animals dangerous to the public health and injurious to agriculture and animal industry where the disease exists, $75,000, to be expended under the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, upon that I reserve a point of order.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, there is a very serious condition confronting the live-stock growers in the Western States through the outbreak of rabies among coyotes in California, Oregon, Nevada, and now introduced into Utah. The disease is rapidly spreading, and the Department of Agriculture is doing its best under the appropriations made for the fiscal year, but that appropriation is not sufficient. The matter has been placed before the Secretary of Agriculture, and he recommends that an emergency appropriation of $75,000 be made in order to enable him to more successfully cope with this danger that is menacing the live-stock industry and the health and safety of the people. In this connection I would like to have the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture read, which officially sets out the conditions which demand the appropriation asked for. No one should require any further argument as to the urgent necessity for this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 12, 1916.

Hon. JOSEPH HOWELL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HOWELL: I have your letter of January 6 concerning the rabies situation in Oregon, California, Nevada, and parts of Utah.

Rabies among coyotes and other wild animals in the Northwestern States appears to have originated in northeastern Oregon or southeastern Washington about 1910. Since that time it has spread toward the south through southeastern Oregon, northeastern California, Idaho, and Nevada, and is now threatening Utah. Reports agree that people

and also many domestic animals have been bitten. There appear to be considerable losses of live stock. The animals in which rabies were reported to have developed in that region are dogs, coyotes, cats, horses, cattle, sheep, and hogs.

The area in which rabies is now known to be present among coyotes covers a distance of approximately 400 miles from north to south and 250 miles from east to west. It is likely that the area will extend. It would be impracticable completely to destroy coyotes from this area, or even from a portion of it, in a short time without an expenditure that would probably be prohibitive. It is thought that the coyotes can be killed in sufficient numbers to reduce the danger from them, provided the State authorities will at the same time adopt adequate measures of control, such as a drastic muzzling law for dogs and the proper control of other domestic animals.

The appropriation act for the Department of Agriculture for 1916 carried an item of $280,000 for certain general purposes and provided that of this amount not less than $125,000 shall be used on the national forests and public domain in destroying wolves, coyotes, and other animals injurious to agriculture and animal husbandry. Under this appropriation the Western States have been divided into districts, each in charge of an inspector who is employing a force of hunters and trappers to destroy coyotes and other predatory animals. The work is being conducted in Utah, Nevada, Idaho, California, Oregon, and Washington. Owing to the extent of the rabies epidemic in Nevada the number of hunters employed in that State has been increased to 50. In all the States mentioned the employees of the department are cooperating, so far as possible, with local officials. The amount available for attacking the rabies problem is small and inadequate, and the plans already made exhaust our available funds. We can not discontinue the work we are now doing in the general field. In fact, our plans have progressed so far as to make it impracticable to abandon them, and, furthermore, the wording of the authorization would seem to preclude the department from devoting the entire appropriation to the destruction of coyotes. If the rabies situation is to be attacked properly, an emergency appropriation will have to be made. The department probably could efficiently expend for this purpose in the neighborhood of $75,000 by the beginning of the next fiscal year, and the experts are of the opinion that a continuing appropriation of $200,000 might result in such a reduction of the coyotes as to confer great relief, provided, of course, as I have stated, the States cooperate satisfactorily.

Very truly, yours,

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary.*

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, at a live-stock convention, held in Salt Lake on the 15th of this month, at which delegates from the surrounding States were in attendance, notice was taken of this condition, and the following resolution was adopted:

Whereas for many years the loss of sheep and lambs from the depredations of wild animals has proved a menace to the prosperity of western sheepmen; and

Whereas there exists at this time in several of the Western States a dangerous disease known as rabies, affecting the coyote, making this animal perfectly fearless and a dangerous menace to all classes of live stock and poultry (30 head of feeding young steers having been bitten in one feed yard, as reported by a representative of the Biological Survey). Also a dangerous menace to all human beings, especially women and children. Thirty-three persons, as reported by the same authority, are now being treated at Reno, Nev., having been bitten by affected animals: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urgently request all flockmasters to devote a portion of their time to the eradication of these dangerous pests, and that we petition Congress at the present session for an appropriation of $500,000 to be used by the Biological Survey in the eradication of predatory wild animals.

Mr. Chairman, the live-stock interests pay into the Treasury of the United States over a million dollars a year for grazing privileges on the national forests. The Government owns and controls more than 80 per cent of the territorial area where this disease is prevalent. It seems to me that it is a condition that calls for the careful consideration of the House because it not only affects, disastrously, the live-stock interests but it menaces and threatens the health and lives of the people. We feel that we have a claim that ought to appeal to the sense of justice and fairness of the House.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. What is the method employed in using this money to combat this disease?

Mr. HOWELL. The only method now employed is the employment of hunters in cooperation with various States to go out and kill these animals. My amendment proposes that the department shall take into consideration the adoption of other successful means by which these animals can be destroyed and the disease eradicated.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman kindly inform the committee what action the State has taken toward the eradication of this pest?

Mr. HOWELL. Recently there was held a convention of live-stock growers in my State, in connection with a convention of the various boards of health convened by the governor, where the imminent danger of this disease spreading in Utah was fully discussed and rigid regulations adopted to prevent, as far as possible, the spread of this deadly disease.

Mr. STAFFORD. How much money has been spent for this purpose?

Mr. HOWELL. In my own State there is an annual tax of 4 mills on sheep and goats and 2 mills on horses and cattle, which constitutes a county fund for this purpose. In addition to that there is an appropriation of $20,000 annually from the State funds to be used for this purpose.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I will.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know whether the States have authority to go into the national forests for this purpose? I suppose they might if they got the permit, but would they otherwise?

Mr. HOWELL. I am unable to answer that question. The rangers are all engaged in killing these animals on national forests, as far as they can. I hope the gentleman from New York will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I can not withdraw the point of order. If it were a matter that the department was interested in, it should have made an estimate and sent it to Congress for the money necessary to carry on its public work. If the purpose is to induce Congress to make appropriations by addressing communications to individuals of Congress, it is time it was ascertained. The citrus-fruit matter came before the committee without an estimate by the department. I stated to the gentlemen interested that the committee would not act on the matter unless the department submitted an estimate. None was transmitted, and the statement was made that however desirable it might be the department would not ask Congress to appropriate the money. There was a change of mind and the estimate came. The department has boasted at times that Congress has forced money upon it which the department did not desire, whereas the combined energies of the department were engaged in an effort to induce Congress to appropriate money for certain purposes without complying with the laws with reference to submitting estimates. If the department believes that this appropriation is desirable, it has ample time to submit an estimate and have it considered here and at the other end of the Capitol in a proper way before this bill becomes a law. Under the circumstances I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, before we leave this item of Bureau and Plant Industry I would like to offer an amendment, as follows:

Provided, That no part of this money shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property destroyed in the work of investigating or eradicating this disease.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will say to the gentleman that that amendment is not necessary, because there is no authority to do that. The amendment is so framed that the authority would not be conferred on the department, and, furthermore, the department does not desire the authority, because it is opposed to spending money in that way.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Is the gentleman sure that the paragraph is so drawn that it is not subject to the construction I put upon it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That matter was considered in the committee.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman from New York knows, as many others do, that there is a persistent demand for money to be used for the very purpose I speak of.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The authority was requested, and a provision was framed which gave that authority; but the department did not submit it in that form and does not wish the authority and does not desire to expend money for the reimbursement of property.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The provision now in the bill is:

For the emergency caused by the infectious nature and continued spread of the destructive disease of citrus trees known as citrus canker, by conducting such investigations of the nature and means of communication of the disease, and by applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary, and to pay such expense and employ such persons and means—

And so forth.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; but that is all limited by the previous wording, which authorizes investigation of methods of eradication and control.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. But in lines 12 and 13 we find the following language:

And by applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary.

A delegation from the State of Florida and from other States where citrus fruit is grown appeared before the Committee on Agriculture in one of the early days of this session, and one of their suggestions—yes; one of their insistent demands—was that money in large amounts should be appropriated by the Federal

Government for the purpose of paying the value of orchards destroyed, and to reimburse owners of orchards for losses they sustain by the activities of the department and the State authorities in checking the advance of the disease, those methods being partly the destruction of orchards some of which have not yet been affected by the disease.

It is clear enough to me that if this appropriation is made just as it stands an effort will be made to have a part of the money devoted to paying owners of orchards for property destroyed, and if there is any question whatever about the construction to be put upon this paragraph, it ought to be made clear. The amendment I suggest should be added so that it will be clear what the intention of the Congress is, and outline clearly the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture and the limits of his authority as to the use of this money.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The same gentlemen appeared before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I should like the privilege of offering the amendment so that fuller consideration may be given to the construction of this section, and as to the advisability of making sure the manner in which this money is to be used.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to recur to this paragraph to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I do not think the gentleman from Michigan is asking unanimous consent for anything of that kind, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The amendment having been offered as a new paragraph——

Mr. MANN. A new paragraph being offered does not prevent going back to the paragraph under consideration.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Personally, so that there will be no misunderstanding, the committee is unanimous that no money should be expended for the purpose mentioned.

Mr. MANN. I am not at all sure that the appropriation ought to prevent the expenditure of money for the value of orchards which it may be necessary to destroy in order to prevent the disease being spread.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I am. I am very positive about it from the information at hand and for this reason: The information is that in some rare instances it is considered desirable to destroy a few trees in the vicinity of an affected tree which are not affected, but which, as a matter of precaution, it is thought should be destroyed in order to destroy the germs in the surrounding soil. If an individual owns a grove of trees and there are one or two trees in it that are affected, if those trees are not destroyed his entire grove will eventually be destroyed. If to protect his entire property it is deemed advisable to destroy a few sound trees that are not yet affected the owner will have received such an enormous benefit from the destruction of those few trees in the preservation of his entire grove that there would not be any justification, in my opinion, for the Federal Government to reimburse him for the value of those trees.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am not so sure about that. I take it that the department would have the authority, as they have in the foot-and-mouth disease, under this appropriation, to probably pay all or, under the practice, a part of the value of affected trees which are destroyed. But it might readily happen that it would be a matter of precaution, a policy more wise to adopt, to destroy some trees which are not affected in order to prevent the spread of the disease, rather than to wait until the disease affects a large number of trees and then destroy them. I am not sufficiently familiar with the disease to be posted upon the subject, but I am sufficiently familiar with it to know that in the opinion of many it may be cheaper and wiser to destroy unaffected trees before they are affected rather than to wait until they are affected in large numbers, which would require the destruction of many more affected trees than the affected and unaffected trees combined in the first place. You have to stop the spread of this disease in some way. It may be that the States in the main ought to do that. That is one of the questions with which we constantly come in contact, but we have adopted all along the line the policy of giving national aid to prevent the spread of disease, which can readily pass from one State to another. This is not merely localized, although it may be local at a particular place. It can be spread, doubtless, by birds, and birds do not know State lines—just as the foot-and-mouth disease is spread. There we pay supposedly one-half of the ordinary value, not the fancy value, of cattle which are destroyed. While I do not think the cases are on all fours, or precisely alike, I can see that there might be good reason for the Government destroying orchards not affected, just as in the city of Chicago years ago, when they had the fire, they blew up houses which were not afire, just as they will do in every great conflagration—destroy property which is not yet afire in order to stop the fire. Which is it wiser to do, blow up a house to prevent the fire burning that house and many more or wait until the house is afire and the fire has spread over a large number of houses?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, in the statute relating to the foot-and-mouth disease authority is specifically given to reimburse by the payment of a certain percentage of the value, I think 50 per cent. Dr. Taylor was asked whether the estimate included any allowance for the payment of trees destroyed. In reply he said:

That is not contemplated by the estimate, and the language of the estimate does not authorize reimbursement for trees destroyed.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will.

Mr. GILLETT. I would like to ask the gentleman whether in his opinion line 12 does not give the department that authority? It says:

By applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The demand for reimbursement is based entirely upon the practice in connection with the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease, and in the statute which authorizes the Department of Agriculture to destroy animals specific authority is given to pay for animals destroyed. There is no such statute in this case; there is no such authority. This statute is construed to authorize the continuation of work that is now being done under it, and no demand can be made, and no demand, in my opinion, should be made from my knowledge of the facts.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion or question?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. The Federal Government has no power, as I understand it, to authorize the destruction of trees. It must be done by virtue of the police power of the State. There is no power authorizing the killing of cattle. It requires legislation, and we contribute one-half for the destruction of cattle under the authority of the State; but that requires legislation specific, which was given in respect to the foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. GILLETT. I would like to ask the gentleman whether under this language if the department can apply such methods of eradication as in its judgment is necessary, why can not they go and make an agreement with the owner of the tree that if the Government destroys it it will pay what it is worth? That is what looks to me to be the danger there.

Mr. CANNON. For this reason, that in my judgment we can not place any construction upon it that would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to destroy and pay for the trees. I think it would require specific authority to do that thing; and, as the gentleman from New York has well said, in the hearings, they had no desire for such authority, and I apprehend that the appropriation of $300,000 will be expended otherwise than through the destruction of property. In fact, that was the belief of the committee after it expressly considered the question of putting a limitation upon the appropriation. Sometimes it is not wise to deal with matters that do not require dealing with.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The CLERK read as follows:

On page 24, after the figures "$300,000," strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "no part of which shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property destroyed or damaged."

Mr. BORLAND. Does the gentleman want to discuss his amendment?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do, if the gentleman pleases.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what it means for me to differ from the distinguished gentlemen who have spoken as to the construction of the statute and as to the necessity of specific legislation if authority is to be conferred upon a department of the Federal Government. I do, however, differ from them as to the construction that can be put on this paragraph, the words in lines 11 and 12, "and by applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary," and so forth, and to cooperate with States and organizations in the methods that they think advisable to employ. These words, I think, may be so construed as to permit of payment of some of this money to owners of trees destroyed.

Now, I know something of the move that is made to induce Congress to make this appropriation. My table has been loaded

with letters from companies and individuals from the Southern States and from other parts of the country interested in the growing of citrus fruits in the Southern States, and in almost every letter there is suggestion or demand that the Government appropriate money to be used to reimburse owners of property destroyed, because the destruction of property is now thought to be one of the ways, and the principal way, of eradicating this very serious disease. As I stated a few moments ago, one day during the early part of this session of Congress a large delegation of southern gentlemen appeared before the Committee on Agriculture, whose duty it will be later in the session to recommend to Congress an appropriation for this work, and almost everyone who spoke on the subject spoke of the necessity of destroying trees and the duty of the Federal Government to reimburse owners of those trees for loss or damage inflicted upon the owner. And in almost every letter I received reference was made to the fact that the Government had pursued a policy similar to that now demanded respecting the foot-and-mouth disease, and that it was considered that this disease is somewhat similar to that, in that it affects property in more than one State, and the duty devolves upon the Federal Government, as in that case, to reimburse the owners of trees or orchards destroyed or damaged.

So, you see, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, there is a movement to have Congress appropriate money for the purpose of paying the cost or value of property destroyed, and it is clearly up to this Congress now to determine whether or not it shall embark upon a policy of paying the cost of damage to crops or property wherever or whenever it is thought necessary to destroy it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the appropriation means that there may be a direct payment to the owners of these trees destroyed by the citrus canker?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I mean that, in my judgment, an effort will be made by the owners of property, or associations, or State authorities in the citrus-growing States to have the Federal Government cooperate with the States and pay all or a part of the loss imposed as the result from the destruction of citrus orchards.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Was there cooperation in the matter of the chestnut blight?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There was some cooperation in the matter of the chestnut blight.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But there was no payment to the owners for losses sustained. It was simply to stay the spread of the disease.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Well, the gentleman refers to the chestnut disease, and I will tell you something of the history of that. The Federal Government was asked for an appropriation to study that disease, and if possible to learn its cause and source, and a means of overcoming and eradicating it.

The appropriation was made, and investigations were made, and it was determined by officials of the department that the only feasible method to be employed was to destroy infected trees. And that was all that could be done. For a long time officials of the Federal Government, from a highly scientific bureau, were employed in the actual physical labor of cutting down trees, and the expense of destroying the trees was paid out of money appropriated by Congress for the purpose of studying this disease. Later, Congress determined, on the recommendation of the Committee on Agriculture, to discontinue that appropriation, because the remedy had been found and because it was simply a matter of physical labor and of expense. And it is the policy of the Committee on Agriculture—it ought to be more than it is—that when the remedy has been found, and it can be applied simply by physical labor and by the outlay of money, the Government has gone as far as it ought to go; the rest should be left to the individuals or to the States in which the work is to be done.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There was no suggestion in the chestnut-blight measure that the owners should be reimbursed for their loss?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There was none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No provision was made for that?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There was none.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me, the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Agriculture?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSTER). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman, I believe, is a member of the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I am.

Mr. CANNON. Under the rules of the House that committee has exclusive jurisdiction touching appropriations of this nature, except in this bill, which is an urgent deficiency bill, where the Committee on Appropriations has jurisdiction. Is the gentleman seeking to get an expression from the House touching reimbursement by the Federal Government for the destruction of trees in advance of the consideration by the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will say to the gentleman that is not exactly my purpose. I consider the pending provision defective, in its present form dangerous, so have offered this amendment to correct the trouble. I think it is the duty of a Member who has given thought to this matter and sees the defect in the bill to call attention of the House to it. It is an important matter, a question of whether or not this Government is going to embark upon the policy of reimbursing owners for almost any loss they may suffer on account of failure of crops or from disease that may attack them.

The door has been opened, Mr. Chairman, by the course pursued by the officials of the Department of Agriculture, perhaps on the authority of Congress, to assist in reimbursing owners of cattle destroyed on account of being afflicted with the foot-and-mouth disease. Now, in my judgment, the two cases are not parallel. It was urged in justification for the use of money for reimbursing owners of cattle that it is an interstate question, that cattle are shipped in interstate commerce, and, therefore, it is proper for the Government to make such regulations and incur such expense as is necessary to protect interstate commerce. There may be some foundation for this contention, but that reason or excuse for use of money in paying for animals will not apply here. This is not an interstate matter. It does not become interstate, Mr. Chairman, simply because the disease appears in more than one State or because by infection or contagion the disease may be carried from one State to another. There is no interstate commerce in orange or lemon trees. There is no danger of spreading this disease if the fruit, the products of these groves or orchards, goes into interstate commerce. The disease is not spread in that way; the products of these orchards and groves and fields are not sent into States where the citrus-fruit industry is carried on. They are sent into States where the industry is not carried on and into which there is no danger of spreading this disease.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Suppose in the effort on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture to exterminate this disease this appropriation is made, and he should find it necessary to go into Florida and order the destruction of entire orchards or groves?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will say to the gentleman that the Secretary of Agriculture has no authority, and it can not be conferred upon him, to order destruction of these trees. He might recommend as a method of staying the ravages and possibly of ultimately eradicating the disease, that the infected trees, or near-by trees, be destroyed. He has no authority to order the destruction of the trees. That authority, if it exists at all, rests with the States.

Mr. AUSTIN. Suppose the State and Federal authorities found that it was absolutely necessary to destroy an orange grove in order to arrest the spread of this disease, could any of this money be used for that purpose?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I fear it could be, as the bill now stands. The demand will be made by individuals and authorities of the States for the use of money for that very purpose, and if the Secretary of Agriculture by any construction would be authorized to use the money for that purpose it would be used. The purpose of my amendment is to forbid it, and make impossible the use of money for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I object. I am going to support the amendment. There is no use of taking more time.

Mr. AUSTIN. We want some information on this side of the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This debate will never be stopped——

Mr. MANN. It is a very important matter.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman already has had considerable time. I hope he will not ask for more.

Mr. MANN. I think we ought to encourage some of the members of other committees.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This discussion may take all day if it goes on this way, because of the interest of Members in States affected. It is not necessary. This amendment does not do any more than to carry out what was contemplated when the appropriation was made.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] will save any time by denying us the right of full discussion.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal in what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN] has said on the question of paying for the destruction of these trees. The committee considered that question very carefully at the time they put this item in, and while the members of the committee did not deem the proposed amendment necessary, I do not think they have any particular objection.

As I understand it, no cure has been found, so far, for this citrus canker that has gotten into the citrus groves of this country and has rapidly spread over four or five of the States that have citrus groves. The only way that has been found to control it is to absolutely burn the infected trees—to destroy them by fire. Men go in there, as I understand, especially equipped with suits, and burn every portion of the tree with an oil spray or gas spray, or something of that kind, which destroys the entire tree. It may be that they will destroy more trees than is necessary in order to make a safety zone.

The only reason this amendment was not put in was because it might interfere with the purpose of the appropriation in cooperating with various States and institutions that are carrying on this work. But we have no power to pay for trees or to destroy trees except by a contract or agreement.

The only way we destroyed any cattle was under the police power of the State, and in cooperation with the State, or by an agreement with the owner. Under this law we would have no power. I take it that we may recognize by this amendment that Congress might have the power to pay for the destruction of this property which it does not have. Outside of that, I do not see any objection to the amendment. I think the Government ought to cooperate promptly in eradicating this citrus canker. If we do not do it promptly, we will lose a great deal of the benefits of cooperation.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. There was no purpose on the part of the committee to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize any portion of this appropriation in the payment of damages for destroyed orchards?

Mr. BORLAND. We thought we would leave that question entirely to the Committee on Agriculture. We were asked merely to give an emergency appropriation to cooperate with the States and organizations, which had exhausted the funds which had been given them by the State legislatures and could not at this time secure additional appropriations. We are only to cooperate with them in the work that they are now carrying on. We did not feel that at this time we could regulate or control the character of the work in which they would embark. But if the Committee on Agriculture entered upon a general policy, that committee would be the one to provide a substantive law to regulate it.

Mr. REAVIS. Was it not the purpose of the committee to leave it within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture as to whether any part of the appropriations should be used in the payment of damages for destroyed orchards?

Mr. BORLAND. No; it was to be used simply to help out the efforts of the local organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN] is a very proper one. The only difficulty is that it does not go far enough. The gentleman's amendment, if it were adopted, would prevent the use of these moneys in payment for trees destroyed, but the amendment would not prevent the laying of a claim at any time in the future against the Federal Government for the trees so destroyed.

There is just one way whereby the Federal Government may be relieved from responsibility, and that is by an amendment to this section, under which no part of the appropriation shall be used for the destruction of trees except upon the order of the State authorities.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has suggested that in no event will the Federal authorities have the power or the right to destroy trees unless the local authorities allow it to be done. And yet I feel quite confident that the gentleman would not support an amendment which clearly and definitely provided that no part of the appropriation should be used for the destruction of trees until the local authorities had ordered it done. Such an amendment ought to be adopted. Such an amendment is a proper recognition of the rights of the States; and if such an amendment were adopted, there would be no question about any future claim against the Federal Government for the destruction of trees.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I simply desire to say that in reporting this appropriation it was the purpose of the committee to make no provision for the payment of destroyed trees. Inquiry was made as to whether the estimate contemplated such a purpose, or whether the department desired to make such payments. The answer was that the department did not desire to make such payments, and the estimate did not cover such authority.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TOWNER. No. I wanted to occupy time in my own right, five minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I suggest to the gentleman to wait until I finish. The gentleman should not interrupt me in the middle of a sentence, to take the floor from me. I may have some views of my own.

Mr. TOWNER. I thought the gentleman had concluded.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary to take up very much of the time of the committee in discussing the matter. I prefer to eliminate all doubt as to the purpose of Congress in making this appropriation by adopting the amendment proposed.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, it may be that the gentleman from New York can eliminate all difficulty by admitting that this amendment ought to pass. However, I do not agree with him. I do not think that this amendment ought to pass. I believe you will hamper the efforts of the administration of the Department of Agriculture under this provision of the law if you pass this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt whatever that under the terms of this bill it will be perfectly proper for the Secretary of Agriculture, or those acting under him, to go down into the citrus-fruit country and purchase an orchard that may be along the line of the advance of this citrus-fruit disease. It may be within his power under the terms of this bill to go there and purchase such an orchard and destroy it, and, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment he ought to have that power. Certainly, if that may be considered as a probable or a possible method for the eradication of the disease, the Secretary of Agriculture ought to have the right to experiment and determine whether or not the destruction of certain trees might not stop the advance of this terrible disease; and yet if this amendment should be adopted the Secretary of Agriculture will be estopped from using that method.

Mr. Chairman, I judge that we want the Secretary of Agriculture to use any and all methods that in his wisdom may be deemed best for the purpose of stopping the further spread of this calamity, that may mean the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars to the South and that may mean the absolute ruin of a great many families.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the Secretary of Agriculture ought to have the right, if he so desires, to go down into that country and purchase any of these orchards that he desires, and make any experiments that he thinks will be best for the purpose of determining how to stop the ravages of this disease. If it shall mean the destruction of the trees that he may purchase—and that is the only way in which he could destroy them—then let it be done. I have no fear that this money will

be expended in any other way than legitimately for the purpose of honestly trying to see what effective methods can be put into operation for eradicating this pest. Therefore, I am against the adoption of this amendment that would, in my judgment, seriously hamper the department in its endeavor to ascertain and put in operation the most effective means to stamp out the disease and save to the South and to the Nation the citrus-fruit industry.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree at all with the statement just made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]. The proposition involved is a good deal bigger than $300,000, and, in point of fact, bigger than what might be involved in many times that sum. Stripped of its particular application it is this: Shall the Federal Government, when it intervenes to do a benevolent thing for a locality, be charged not only with the cost of doing that thing, but also be required to compensate the man who happens to suffer from the particular misfortune, in this incident the ravages of a disease affecting his trees?

Mr. TOWNER rose.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, just a minute. I have only five minutes, and I would like to state my side of the case.

Mr. TOWNER. I will not ask the gentleman the question which I had in mind.

Mr. SHERLEY. There is no reason in the world, except the stubbornness of individual men or the parsimony of States, why the Federal Government should be called upon to reimburse owners for the destruction of trees. Why is the Federal Government going in there? Is it going there for its own benefit primarily? No; it is going there because these localities are appealing to it to help them in solving a situation which involves their property. Now, it is exceedingly unfortunate when men find some of their property destroyed through no fault of theirs. It would be very unfortunate for them if they lost their property by fire or if they lost their fruit trees by a killing frost; but if this Government is not only going to take the position of aiding with its intelligence and with its experts in helping to eradicate a particular disease, but is also going to the point of reimbursing the people for the loss that they suffer, then we are entering upon a domain that will tax the capacity of any Government, no matter how rich it may be.

I submit that instead of the amendment going too far, it does not go far enough. If it were practicable at this time, I would like to see an amendment which would require that no tree should be destroyed until the owner thereof agreed that he would make no claim upon the Government. Now, what is the situation that has grown up out of the foot-and-mouth disease? Take the situation in my very State of Kentucky, where a number of very valuable cattle were destroyed. The Government of the United States has paid its half, and so far the State of Kentucky has not paid its half to the citizens of Kentucky, for the destruction of that property. Now, what does that mean? It means just what I spoke of yesterday, that all the time the States are talking about rights and are ignoring duties. They are trying to unload upon Uncle Sam the burden of taking care of the things which primarily belong to them to take care of. I want to use the intelligence of the Department of Agriculture in helping to stamp out this disease, but I am unwilling to see this Government taxed with what will amount to several million dollars by way of paying for trees that may be destroyed.

Why, the gentlemen who came before the committee in this matter did not ask for $300,000. They asked for two or three million dollars, and we have seen a propaganda over this country, extending to every part of it. Every merchant who had any trade down South with any people who were affected has been written to, and in turn has written to Members of Congress, in order to start a back fire to compel us to appropriate great sums of money. I think the Government goes to the extreme limit of generosity when it furnishes the funds to enable its experts to do down there, and by their advice and aid help these people to stop the ravages of this disease; but to say that we must go further, and compensate every individual who is unfortunate enough to suffer a loss, is to say that we are to enter a realm of paternalism beyond the dreams of anybody in America heretofore. We might as well undertake to insure all citizens against loss that may happen through no fault of theirs, whether it relates to trees, or property, or what not, and that is a theory of government that I will never agree to. For my part, I hope the amendment will be adopted, and I shall vote for it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To equip the new chemical laboratory building, including the construction, purchase, and installation of chemical desks, hoods, cases, special furniture, and other necessary equipment, including personal services in the District of Columbia, $35,000, to continue available during the fiscal year 1917.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have been called from the Hall of the House several times and missed a few paragraphs. I want to ask the gentleman from New York to look back at line 21, page 22, the item which relates to the Postal Service. Will he advise the House whether that appropriation "for regulation screen or other wagon service, $25,000," has anything to do with pneumatic-tube service?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not at all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It does not pertain in any way to curtailment of the existing contracts for the pneumatic-tube service?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not at all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am much obliged to the gentleman. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses: For contingent expenses, including the same objects specified under this head in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916, $20,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The contingent expenses of the Steamboat Service should cover the question of steamboat inspection. There has been some doubt in the minds of the American people whether the Steamboat-Inspection Bureau of the Department of Commerce has performed its duty in the way in which it should be performed. Last summer we had a terrible catastrophe in Chicago in which more than 1,000 lives were lost. The Secretary of Commerce came to Chicago during the investigation that was had in connection with that disaster, and he conducted himself there in such a way as to give everybody reason to believe that he was not in sympathy with a thorough inspection of steamboats.

The people of Chicago were appalled as a result of this disaster, and yet in the face of all the death and sorrow and suffering which resulted from that, it was apparent that no sympathetic ear was given to the people who were interested in protecting the lives of those who travel on steamboats by anybody connected with the Department of Commerce, and particularly that branch known as the Steamboat-Inspection Service. The hearings before the Committee on Appropriations in connection with this suggested appropriation indicated that this $20,000 is requested because of the number of additional ships that have been transferred from the foreign to the American flag. But there is no indication of any evidence in the hearings that any account has been taken of the needs of the service where life should be protected.

The statement made by those who came before the committee for this appropriation was to the effect that if they did not receive more money the sailing of the ships would be delayed. There was no suggestion from anyone in power as to the need for better protection of life. The people of the community from which I come feel justly aggrieved at the attitude of the Department of Commerce in the investigation caused to be made of this appalling disaster.

[The time of Mr. MADDEN having expired, by unanimous consent it was extended five minutes.]

We feel that the time has come when public officials in high places should be in sympathy with the people of America, and particularly in cases of the kind I have described.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; for a question.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman is not going to ask for an appropriation to pay damages for the loss of lives on the *Eastland?*

Mr. MADDEN. We are not going to ask for any appropriation, but we are going to ask for decent treatment by the officials of the Department of Commerce. [Applause.] When the people of a community are appalled by such a disaster as Chicago witnessed they expect their public servants, when they come to the community, to treat the people of the community with decency and respect [applause] and give some evidence of their sympathy with the sorrows of the people of that community.

I want now and here to protest against the attitude of the Secretary of Commerce in his investigation into the conditions that surrounded the disaster, and I want the executive branch of the Government having control over steamboat inspection to see that that inspection work is organized and carried on in the future so as to protect the lives of the American people. I want Secretary Redfield to know that we in Chicago, at least, do not approve of his attitude during the time that this investigation was being made by him, and if we had our way we would ask for his resignation from the Cabinet on account of the insulting attitude he assumed toward the people who had wives, daughters, brothers, and sisters lying dead on the decks

where this terrible disaster occurred. We want Mr. Redfield to know that he is only an individual, and that as an individual, a member of the Cabinet though he be, he is still a servant of the people, and we expect him to give the people whose servant he is the evidence of his sympathetic feeling and that character of feeling that the master has a right to expect from a man. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, there is no justification for the very severe assault made on the Secretary of Commerce. The *Eastland* disaster in Chicago was a most unfortunate one. A large number of women and children who had boarded an excursion steamer lost their lives. My recollection is that it was due to the fact that the water at the wharf where the steamer was tied up was quite shoal, and the officers in charge of the boat had emptied the water ballast tanks, so as to lie alongside this particular wharf.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In just a moment. So when a large number of persons went on the boat and got upon one side the boat careened, overturned, and a large number lost their lives. At any rate, whatever may have been the actual cause of the disaster, as soon as it was known the Secretary of Commerce, believing that it was a disaster of appalling extent, personally went to the city of Chicago with a number of his assistants in order to ascertain, if it could be ascertained, just what caused the disaster and who, if anyone, was responsible for it. The conditions in Chicago were not as calm and placid as they would be under ordinary circumstances. The Secretary and his assistants were very much misunderstood, maligned, and abused by the people whom he was attempting to serve.

Mr. MADDEN. We deny that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There were brought to Chicago from different parts of the United States steamboat inspectors who had no local interest whatever and were supposed to be entirely free from any bias or prejudice resulting from location, in order to make an exhaustive investigation and ascertain what the facts actually were. That investigation was conducted. A report has been made and transmitted to the Speaker of this House, and it is now an official document of the House of Representatives. As a result of that report, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] and his committee have reported a bill to add the necessary employees in the Steamboat-Inspection Service.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, that report, with the testimony taken, was referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and the report and all the testimony taken by the board in Chicago have been printed by the committee and are now available to any Member who may be interested in the facts. A bill has also been introduced, by request of the Secretary of Commerce, and is pending before the committee, on which hearings will be had in the near future, providing for the creation of a board of naval architects to superintend the construction of ships, the better to safeguard their stability and seaworthiness. The immediate cause of that disaster has never been officially ascertained. Judge Landis, United States district judge at Chicago, took the investigation out of the hands of the Steamboat-Inspection Service and had the witnesses all subpœnaed before the Federal grand jury and forbade the Steamboat-Inspection Service, under penalty of contempt of court, to further call these witnesses before them or proceed with the investigation. For that reason it was halted and only a partial investigation has been made. If the facts warrant, a congressional investigation may be made; but I think that in connection with this bill all of the material facts connected with that unfortunate and appalling disaster will be developed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, those who are acquainted with the Secretary of Commerce know that whatever differences men may have with him because of his political affiliations, he is a man of integrity, intelligence, high purpose, and desires to perform the duties of his great office to the very best of his ability. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is not surprising that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], if he had his way, would ask him to resign from the Cabinet. Mr. Chairman, if he had his way he would have every Democratic member of the Cabinet resign or eliminated in any way possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I feel that owing to the fact that I have known the Secretary of Commerce for over 20 years, I can not allow to go unchallenged the statements made about his investigation of the *Eastland* disaster. I wish to add my word to that of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] in commendation of the high character of the Secretary of Commerce. Though we may differ with him at times, as the gentleman from New York said, on his political opinions or convictions, I know him to be a man of exceptionally high character, and I can not for a moment allow to go without a challenge the statement that he would be hard-hearted or adamant to the sufferings of anybody, much less women and children. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I take exception to any general statement about any man—be he a Member of this House or a member of the Cabinet, be he of high or low degree. I think that when a statement is made about a man it should be backed up by particulars and that generalizations should not be accepted as true.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will back up the statement with particulars by asking an investigation. That is what we wish, and we will prove the statement that I made to be true.

The Clerk read as follows:

Claims for damages: To pay the claims for damages which have been considered, adjusted, and determined to be due to the claimants by the Commissioner of Lighthouses, under authority of the provisions of section 4 of the act of June 17, 1910 (36 Stats., p. 537), on account of damages occasioned by collision for which vessels of the Lighthouse Service have been found responsible, certified to Congress at its present session in House Document No. 541, $53.39.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a new section, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 2, on page 27, add the following:
"Rural sanitation: For special studies of, and demonstration work in, rural sanitation, including personal service, to continue available during the fiscal year 1917, $100,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to this extent, that it can not be introduced as a new section in the middle of another section. There is but one section to this bill.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer it as a new paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Then I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, this item was estimated for, and was before the subcommittee. The subcommittee differed with me about the item and it went out of the bill. The purpose of the item is to enable the Medical Department of the Government to establish a system of rural inspection, notably for the purpose of enabling the Government to successfully stamp out pellagra, the horrible disease which the Medical Department shows to exist in 44 of the 48 States of the Union. In the single State of South Carolina last year there were reported 56,000 cases. The medical authorities of the Government have stated the only cure for this disease is that the proper diet be given to the patient. Therefore, the purpose is to enable people to know how to prepare properly the food diet, to know what a well-balanced meal is.

The object of this appropriation is to take typical counties, and in cooperation with the health authorities of the State and county, make that county free from any of those conditions which would tend to produce disease. If the work which the Agricultural Department does as a whole is within the power and scope of the Federal Government, then, indeed, this work could be done by the Federal Government if in the wisdom of Congress it is a proper item of expense, because I do not believe the authority would be questioned now, although in the past it has been questioned, in reference to the Agricultural Department. All of the activities of that department are directed along lines similar to this in reference to crops, soil improvement, the proper care of animals, and unquestionably, if that is true, then the Health Department of the Government can, as a matter of education, as a matter of proper direction for the State authorities to follow, make such suggestions and aid and assist in this work. I do not know, nor can you find from any of the authorities, the number of cases of pellagra in the United States—it is in 44 of the 48 States—and as a matter of economy, as a matter of good business, this appropriation should be made, because that which tends to preserve the health of the people tends to promote their business activities and success. In the great cities where they have a congested population they have a thorough city inspection and sanitation, and the city authorities look after the matter. It pays there and it will pay in the country. It is not intended here that the Federal Government should establish the sanitation, but that they should aid and assist in endeavoring to get the people informed of what is proper sanitation around the country home. As soon as that is established the matter is taken up by the State and county authorities and they then continue the work of sanitation. What would become of the great cities if each home owner were left to himself?

If it were not for the fact that they have city health authorities who looked after the sanitation of premises and have the right to cause the owners of the premises to make them sanitary, the health of the city would be much impaired and the death rate greatly increased.

Now, as a beginning, information which the medical department of this Government has obtained in reference to country sanitation, in reference to the preservation of life, in reference to the discovery of diseases that are brought about by germ or infection—such information given to the various health bodies of the counties and States by the Department of Health in Washington would be a great step toward getting a proper rural sanitation through the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to discuss the point of order. I simply want to express the appreciation of the people of the State of Mississippi, particularly, and I think that is true of the other Southern States, of the great work which has been done by the Public Health Service, particularly that under the direction of Dr. Goldberger. This disease—pellagra—is of relative recent appearance in our part of the country; and while the doctors say it is not contagious, it has spread to an alarming extent and is a most deadly disease.

Dr. Goldberger, of the Public Health Service, three years ago began an investigation of it, and by a diligent, persistent, and scientific investigation he has practically demonstrated that pellagra can be prevented and can be cured.

That discovery, while it will save thousands of lives in the State of Mississippi and the other Southern States, will also add materially to the prosperity of those States by the prevention of the further spread of this disease.

I take this much time simply to pay this well-deserved compliment to Dr. Goldberger. I do not care to discuss the point of order at all.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am in thorough sympathy with the work done by the Public Health Service, a service which has always been a sort of pet of mine ever since I have been in Congress. In the last Congress the House passed a bill to give to the Public Health Service authority over rural sanitation. That bill did not become a law. Such a bill is now pending in the House before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. If that bill does become a law, then there will be authority of law for making this appropriation. There is no such authority now. That is one of the points of order I make. Another which I make, and which I know will appeal to my friend from Mississippi, is that orderly procedure in the consideration of appropriations is always desirable and required by the rules. This is a deficiency appropriation bill, and it provides under the heading of the Department of State for various deficiencies in the State Department. It provides under the heading of the Treasury Department for various deficiencies in the Treasury Department, among which is an item for the Public Health Service, and it provides for deficiencies in other departments until it gets down to the Department of Commerce, and in the middle of the paragraph relating to the Department of Commerce this amendment is offered for a deficiency in the Public Health Service, which is in the Treasury Department. It has no place in the bill. If it should be inserted in the bill in this place it would be an item of expenditure under the Department of Commerce and the Lighthouse Service for a bureau which is in the Treasury Department, and the Chair has always held every time such a question arose that gentlemen who wish to offer amendments on an appropriation bill must offer them in the appropriate place. The appropriate place for this amendment to be offered was on page 18, in line 5, and as we are now on page 27, in the Department of Commerce, following the Lighthouse Service, and just preceding the Department of Labor, the amendment is not in order in this place in the bill, and, there being no authority of law, would not be in order in any other place.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any authority of law for this appropriation, but I will state that the reason this amendment is not offered in the proper place in this bill is that I was not in the Chamber at the proper time, because the legislative bill was being considered, and I was in the room of the Committee on Appropriations, and that item had been passed when I came in. If no point of order is made and it is adopted, I will ask unanimous consent to put it in at the proper place in the bill, if the gentleman will give me an opportunity to take a vote on it, and I think the gentleman should not insist upon that point of order unless it is because he is opposed to the item.

Mr. MANN. I am opposed, Mr. Chairman, to inserting this item in this bill at this time at any place. I am in favor of passing a law, by the way, giving the Health Bureau the right to do this service.

Mr. SISSON. I will state for the benefit of the committee that there are a number of gentlemen who have been engaged in this work, as I understand, on another appropriation carried under another head, but that appropriation is a very small one, and the medical department has organized a number of young physicians, who have been through a course here in the city of Washington, and not to give them this money at this time would mean that this would cease. But if they can get the $100,000 at this time, and Congress will pass the law which the gentleman has in mind, then there would not have to be a complete reorganization of the service again.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the reason I make the point of order on this paragraph is because I think the departments of the Government should recognize the fact that when Congress makes an appropriation for a particular purpose it is their duty to expend it during the fiscal year and not to organize a service which will expend it in a few months, and then come to Congress and say, "We have this service organized under an appropriation which has been made, and if you do not give us more money than you intended our service will be demoralized and disorganized." That is not the province of the departments of the Government. It is their business to expend the money which we appropriate for them, and not tell us in the middle of a year that they have organized a service which is going to be demoralized if we cease giving more money. [Applause.]

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. MANN. No; I am not mistaken, because I know what this is. I have talked with these gentlemen.

Mr. SISSON. Now, the authority under which they did this work, however, was an item for the purpose of investigating the diseases of man, and this was the method under which they did that work. Now, in the expenditure of that money for the investigation of the diseases of man that fund became exhausted.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MANN. They knew whether it would become exhausted or not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They wanted to do more than they can do under the appropriation.

Mr. MANN. I have talked with the Public Health Service, which has been carrying on this work. I have no doubt it has been done well and that it is a valuable work. They have made sanitation surveys of a number of the counties throughout the United States—some in West Virginia, some in Kentucky, as I now recall, and some in other States. If this appropriation should become available, I am informed by the State health officers in the State of Illinois that a county in Illinois would receive this health survey. I will be very glad to have it made, but I think the departments of the Government, knowing what money they have to expend, even when they find that it is a good work, ought only to expend the money that we appropriate for them. If we want to appropriate a larger amount next year, very well. We can not appropriate enough to have a health survey in every county in the United States. That is an impossibility. The counties that get it get a special favor. While we do some of that, $100,000 will not do all. Let them live within their means. If the Public Health Service wants to develop its possibilities, it ought to lay its case before the Committee on Appropriations and abide by their judgment, and not seek to get Congress to appropriate money to which they are not lawfully entitled.

Mr. SISSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, if this item goes into this deficiency bill they become lawfully entitled to it, and if it were not for the point of order I do not believe that the committee would vote this item down. I may be entirely mistaken about it, but I do believe that this work appeals to every Member of Congress in the House, because if there is one thing that the Agricultural Department or the Medical Department can do in reference to animals and food, for the purpose of preserving them, then the Government can preserve those people for whom these very departments exist; and if this service is proper service, we ought not to permit work of this kind to suffer solely because it happpens to be that a point of order can be made against it. I have no censure against these gentlemen who make the points of order. I believe in orderly legislation, but in deficiency bills there is usually a great deal of disorder. A great deal of it may be occasioned by the disorder in the departments, but it has been the custom of Congress for years to pass these deficiency bills, and if in this bill at this time this money can be provided so that now in the winter and spring months, when the

disease is most easily arrested and the work can be most easily done, when the sanitation can be done at the earliest possible moment for the purpose of preventing the spread of the disease, then, indeed, this item ought to be included in this deficiency bill at this time until Congress can make provision for whatever activities they feel the Federal Government ought to enter into in reference to the preservation of the health of the country.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would not say a word more except that the gentleman says there are so many items in the deficiency bills which have no warrant of law. The gentleman must know that that is an extravagant statement. Nearly every item in this deficiency bill is an item where there is warrant of law and requirement of law that departments do something and there is not enough money to carry on the work that Congress has directed them to do. If that were the case here it would be perfectly proper to make a deficiency appropriation. One item of the bill where that rule does not apply is the citrus case, and that was a case of emergency. Now, in this case there is no emergency, no requirement of law. There is no special reason for making a deficiency appropriation except that the gentlemen think the work is a good thing. Well, it is no more valuable now than it would have been 10 years ago; it is no more valuable now than it will be 10 years hence, so far as that is concerned. It is valuable work that ought to be carried along progressively, a part at a time. It is impossible to do it all at once, and the Bureau of Health had no business to make a deficiency estimate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that he is very much in sympathy with the purposes of the amendment, but there being no authority of law for this appropriation, he is forced to sustain the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment of costs assessed by the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in the case of Ali Gegiow and another against Byron H. Uhl, as acting commissioner of immigration at the port of New York, $126.40.

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to charge against the appropriation "Expenses of regulating immigration" for the fiscal year 1915 not exceeding $15,000 for articles purchased for use during that period pursuant to orders placed during the preceding fiscal year.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] what that first paragraph means, and also the second, on page 27, line 19.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That was a case in which a writ of habeas corpus was sued out to obtain the discharge of an immigrant who was detained at Ellis Island. The matter was carried up to the United States Supreme Court and the writ was sustained. The costs, amounting to $126, were entered in the judgment against the individual who happened to be acting as Commissioner of Immigration. The writ so issued to the commissioner was really against the United States. The custom is for the United States Government to pay the costs in legal proceedings of this character, instead of letting them lie against the official of the Government for the performance of his official duties.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay, etc., of the Army, $119,833.89.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 32, in line 24, after the sum of "$119,833.89," insert the following:

"*Provided*, That the limitations on the time for filing claims for arrears of pay, bounty, or other allowances growing out of the service of Volunteers who served in the Army of the United States during the Civil War or the War with Spain are repealed: *Provided further*, That hereafter no agent or attorney shall demand or accept for his services in connection with the prosecution of claims for arrears of pay, bounty, or other allowances due on account of the service during the war with Spain of an officer or enlisted man of the Regular or Volunteer Armies of the United States filed after the passage of this act any fee for any service rendered in connection therewith. Whoever shall violate this provision upon conviction shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $500 or imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months, or both, and shall be disbarred from practice before the Treasury Department."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order upon the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, by a provision of the act of December 22, 1911, on an urgent deficiency bill—and this is an urgent deficiency bill—there was legislation that placed a limitation as to the filing and adjudication of claims for back pay and bounty for soldiers of the Union in the Civil War after December 31, 1912. It was also provided that no agent should receive compensation for acting as such on claims filed after December 22, 1911, and a severe penalty was provided as against agents who violated the provisions of that act.

There were 2,200,000 men enlisted in the Union Army before the Civil War ceased. Prior to the act of 1911 agents and attorneys, procuring lists of soldiers, sent to soldiers circulars advising them that they had claims for back pay or bounty, or both, and soliciting employment, exacting frequently from one-fourth to one-half of the amount that they alleged to be due, and frequently demanding an advance of $1 or more to pay postage and expenses of correspondence. These circulars brought a great amount of business to the agents soliciting employment, and in the aggregate a large amount of money was advanced to cover postage and expenses of correspondence. In many instances, perhaps a majority, there was nothing due to the soldier.

The act of 1911 cut off all such petty graft, and rendered unlawful the employment of agents in the premises. Such employment was never necessary; but in my judgment the limitation that was placed upon the filing and adjudication of claims by soldiers should not have been enacted, and I believe that act of limitation should be removed.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there is still some money due the veterans of the Civil War that they were unable to obtain by reason of this bar of the statute of limitations?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; for back pay and bounty. I have investigated two cases myself. There are possibly many thousands of just claims barred by this limitation. The gentleman must recollect that there were 2,200,000 men who were under pay, and a good many of them, perhaps the larger portion of them, were entitled to bounty as well. Most of them have been paid. I apprehend the amount will not be very large that is unpaid, but after waiting for the money, they ought not to be denied that which was due them for their service for the perpetuation of the Union.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I entirely agree with the gentleman, and if I understand the purpose of his amendment it is, first, to remove the bar of the statute of limitations created by the act now in force, and, second, to prevent the claims agents from absorbing most of the amounts.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; the act of December 22, 1911, as to soldiers of the Civil War contains that penalty, so that it is not necessary to reenact the same; but the latter part of the amendment removes the bar as to soldiers of the War with Spain and puts in a proviso "hereafter," and so forth. I apprehend we could not say "heretofore," because that might be interfering with the freedom of contract; but we can do it as to the hereafter, and we have done it in pension legislation time and again—limiting the fees.

I hope the gentleman from New York will not make a point of order. This amendment has been prepared with some care, after examination, and inasmuch as the legislation went upon the urgent deficiency bill in 1911, from the moral and equitable standpoint it seems to me it might be amended upon this urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the legislation referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] was incorporated in an urgent deficiency bill in December, 1911, as the result of statements made by the Auditor for the War Department, from which it appeared that very gross abuses were connected with the presentation and prosecution of these claims. If I recall what was stated at the time, it then appeared that practically none of the men who took part in the Civil War were presenting these claims, but their heirs were being drummed up by claim agents and exorbitant fees were being taken for the prosecution of the claims, when the only thing necessary was to write a letter to the Auditor for the War Department making the claim, and the amount due was computed by the auditor from the records in the department and certified for payment.

Congress determined to give an additional year in which these claims might be filed, and then to bar them. That gave 50 years from the time the claims accrued in which they might be presented against the United States Government. There may be some few cases where survivors of the war have ascertained that they have these claims and desire to present them. Personally I would have no objection to legislation by which these men might be taken care of, but I can not consent to repeal in this way and wipe out this bar and to start up the old practices. Regardless of the penalties, the men who make a specialty of presenting claims of this character will find some way to evade the statute. They are men who have had the

heartlessness to take 50 per cent of these claims simply for writing a letter to the Auditor for the War Department. While these claims aggregate very enormous sums, they are for very small individual amounts in the very great majority of cases, and in no instances are they for very large sums. I can not consent, as the gentleman well knows, to a provision repealing this law at this time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I fancy the gentleman will pardon me a little further. No claim agent or attorney could get one cent under this amendment, after the act of 1911, because by that act this kind of graft was cut out by the roots. This amendment leaves the law of 1911 still in force. It merely repeals the limitation contained in that act as to the time in which claims may be presented. The gentleman must recollect that there are from 400,000 to 500,000 of these soldiers still living.

I know about it, because in my own city there is a soldiers' home, and there are from 2,000 to 3,000 soldiers of the Civil War in that home. I have come in contact with them. I have made investigations in two cases. I suppose there are hundreds, and perhaps thousands, who are shut out by the legislation of 1911, by which legislation the Treasury is protected, as it ought to be protected, with a severe penalty against any agent or attorney who would prosecute such a claim. So there is no danger from that standpoint, and it does seem to me that if it is proper to waive the point of order to permit an appropriation of $300,000 to fight the citrus canker, it is proper to waive the point of order in favor of these men who fought to preserve the Union; and I think my friend will hesitate before making that point of order, especially as this legislation went upon the urgent deficiency bill in 1911 and was passed as we are now passing this urgent deficiency bill through the House. It seems to me, in equity and fairness, that as this limitation can be lifted safely it ought to be lifted, or at least that the House should have an opportunity to express its will. [Applause.] I hope my friend will not make the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this legislation to which the gentleman refers was incorporated in an urgent deficiency bill and it passed this House by unanimous consent.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It passed because of information as to the very gross abuses that were existing. There has been no complaint about that law.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Members of Congress have not found that it has been working an injuctice to the old soldiers. The gentleman from Illinois, with four or five thousand old soldiers in a home in his district, found two cases where he believed that an injustice has been done. Now, it may be possible to frame a provision on one of these other bills that will prevent any injustice being done to the old soldiers. No one wishes to do them an injustice, but I shall not consent to wipe out the statute of limitations and permit this money to go to persons other than the men who served in the Civil War.

Mr. CANNON. It does not permit it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It can; and under the law, if this be repealed, the most distant heir of a man who served in the Civil War could go and dig up these claims, as they have been digging them up, instigated by these claim agents.

Mr. CANNON. Not since the act of 1911.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; but the gentleman desires to repeal that act.

Mr. CANNON. I do not. I let the act stand.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. CANNON. I have the act here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This provides that the limitation on the time for filing claims is repealed. It is very apparent that this is no way to attempt to legislate. When these provisions are incorporated in these bills and pass the House by unanimous consent, it is the result of very careful investigation and consideration and preparation by a committee, where every phase of the matter can be considered carefully. I shall not consent, because under the obligations imposed upon me in charge of this bill I can not consent to legislation of such a sweeping character, and I insist on the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say to the gentleman in the greatest kindness that he grows vigilant where an honest debt is due.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I insist on the point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not propose to let the gentleman make such remarks as that about me. I insist on the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, it is almost impossible to get consideration from the committee that has jurisdiction touching this matter or from the House, with 30,000 or 40,000 bills soon to be pending, and with great numbers of public bills to take up the attention of the House. I can not make any further appeal to the gentleman. And I will not make any threats. On this very bill we have appropriated $300,000 to combat the citrus canker; and because of the great necessity for it, no point of order was made against it. I will not make any threats that I will make points of order, but I think the gentlemen might well have allowed the House an opportunity to vote upon that amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the pro forma amendment, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRISON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

There was no demand for a separate vote.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for an indefinite leave of absence for my colleague Mr. STEAGALL, on account of sickness in his family.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent for indefinite leave of absence for his colleague on account of sickness in his family. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RURAL POST ROADS.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Pending that I want to see if we can arrive at some agreement as to how long general debate shall run. Has the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN] any suggestion to make?

Mr. DUNN. I think that we on this side would be satisfied with eight hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri and the other half by myself.

Mr. MANN. Make it 10 hours.

Mr. DUNN. I will suggest 10 hours.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to agree to that length of debate, but if there are so many people who desire to speak I suppose we might as well accept it, one half of the time to be controlled by the chairman of the committee and the other half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN].

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 10 hours, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN]. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, which I do not know that I will do, I will suggest to my friend from Missouri that if he expects to pass this bill and to do anything for good roads, it looks as if we ought to get through pretty soon, because there is other legislation coming up, and it seems to me that the debate ought to close by to-morrow night.

Mr. MANN. When this bill was given a privileged status, it was stated—and that was the understanding—that there

would be liberal general debate allowed on it in view of the fact that there was nothing else coming before the House upon which much general debate could be had at this time. I am in favor of disposing of this bill.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we ought to pass it as early as possible.

Mr. MANN. I do not think a day or two will make any difference.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] object?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not.

Mr. BORLAND. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether he can allow me some time out of his time?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I presume that the gentleman from Missouri will be allowed time. I assured him privately that I would grant him time, but if he wants a public declaration, in order to bind me, I have no objection to giving him that security. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. RUCKER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the road question, as far as Federal aid is concerned, first came before the House while the Post Office bill was being considered on the 22d of April, 1912. The gentleman from Missouri, now chairman of the Roads Committee of the House [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], introduced an amendment to the appropriation bill for the conduct of the Post Office Department, providing for an appropriation of $25,000,000, to be used at the rate of $15, $20, and $30 per mile for the improvement, repair, and maintenance of roads over which the rural mail was delivered.

At that time the record showed that the United States was losing $28,000,000 a year on the delivery of rural mail. The addition of this $25,000,000 proposed as an amendment to the bill would make the loss $53,000,000. I was opposed to the adoption of the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Missouri, and I believe I made a speech against the proposition at that time. Later on the House agreed to the adoption of the amendment, and the appropriation bill for the Post Office Department that year carried this item.

When the bill went to the Senate the Senate disagreed to the item and suggested the appointment of a commission to study the question of Federal cooperation with the State in the matter of constructing roads. The commission, as a result of the Senate suggestion, was appointed, and I had the honor of having a place on that commission. The commission served for about two years, during which time it made an exhaustive study of road building throughout the world. It finally reached the conclusion that it would be wise for the Federal Government to cooperate with the States.

The report of the commission was made to the House and to the Senate. The House adopted a new rule providing for the appointment of a Committee on Roads, of which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] was made chairman. That committee reported another bill last year, in which it provided that roads should be classified, running all the way down from macadam, a high-class road, to roads that were made of ordinary dirt worked over by a scraper or drag. This bill provided that $25,000,000 should be authorized to be expended out of the Federal Treasury in cooperation with the States. The bill, however, was drawn in such a way that if it had become a law the States of the Union would be able to draw the money allotted to them out of the Treasury of the United States without being obliged to use one dollar of the money allotted to the State for the purpose of building roads. The Senate did not agree to this bill.

To-day we have before us a new bill recommending an appropriation of $25,000,000 to be distributed to the States.

I have not been an enthusiastic advocate of Federal cooperation with the States in road building. Indeed, before I become a member of the commission which made this comprehensive study of the question, I was really opposed to Federal cooperation. But after having gone carefully into the question, I reached the conclusion that if the country was to have the kind of roads to which it is entitled, the Federal Government must cooperate in some way, and so I have evoluted with the times, and to-day I am a believer in the wisdom of Federal cooperation in road building. I do not, however, agree that the bill reported by this committee is a wise bill, not that I have any criticism of the committee for reporting the bill in the form in which it is, for I believe that every member of this committee is patriotic and has done the very best that could be done under all of the circumstances. No bill reported by any committee of this House will ever be perfect. I say that not only of bills that refer to Federal cooperation in road building but to bills referring to any governmental activity. So when we legislate upon this question, as upon all other questions, we will find ourselves compelled in some way to compromise our views and take the situation as we find it.

This bill proposes to authorize the expenditure of $25,000,000, and it provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall be given the power to say whether he will pay 30 per cent, 40 per cent, or 50 per cent of the cost of the road to the State. I do not agree that the Secretary of Agriculture ought to have this discretionary power. What I fear is that, with this discretion placed in the Secretary of Agriculture, no matter how high-minded he may be, he will be influenced by people either in the House or in the Senate, or outside of the House or outside of the Senate, to do the things which he ought not to do. I believe that any legislation enacted for Federal cooperation with the States in building roads ought to be so guarded as to prevent the possibility of political scandal or pork-barrel manipulation, if you please.

The time has come when I believe the Government should cooperate with the States, and to that part of the bill providing that the States shall have the right to initiate the improvements I heartily agree, but I believe that the bill should be so drawn as to reserve to the Congress, the law-making body, whatever discretionary power shall be placed anywhere. Why should we say to the Secretary of Agriculture that we authorize him to use his discretion as to what part of this money shall be used upon any kind of road within the boundaries of any State? What we ought to do is to enact a law that will give to every State automatically, as its right, whatever contribution the Government of the United States pleases to make to road building within the State. What I mean by that is, that when we apportion a given amount to the various States of the Union, whatever amount may be apportioned to a given State should be placed to the credit of that State upon the books of the Treasury Department, and when that State itself has complied with the terms required by the law, the Secretary of the Treasury then automatically must as a matter of law pay to the State the amount so accredited. No State should receive any compensation out of the Treasury of the United States toward the the building of its roads until the State itself has expended at least double the amount placed to its credit on the books of the Treasury of the United States. We ought to so safeguard the expenditure of this Government money that no President of the United States, no Senator of the United States, no, not all of the Senators of the United States nor all of the Members of the House combined, should have influence enough to induce the Secretary of Agriculture, or whoever may be placed in charge, to grant any favor to one State and not accord it to every State; that when the States earn the right to the money it shall go to the States, regardless of what the Secretary of Agriculture, the President of the United States, the Senate of the United States, or the House of Representatives may say about it. Why do I say this? We are starting out on a great work. There are 2,300,000 miles of highways in America, and over 1,200,000 miles of those highways the rural mail is carried to-day. The time will come when every mile of these highways will be improved. The law should be so written that when we embark upon this enormous enterprise we will feel certain and the American people will be satisfied that there can be no political scandal as the result of governmental cooperation with the States.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Has the gentleman any doubt about the constitutionality of this bill as drawn?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, not being a lawyer, of course I do not enter into the constitutional questions involved, but I am assuming those who are lawyers have decided that question

in the affirmative. Whether we have constitutional authority or not, the time was, away back in 1800, when the returns from the sale of public lands were contributed to the construction of public roads within the States in which the land was sold, and so I assume that if we had the right to do that then we have the right to do it now. But whether we have the constitutional right or not, it seems to me that the time has come when the interests of the public everywhere are best served by united action between the Federal Government and the State government. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that this law, if enacted, will leave it within the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to say who shall and who shall not be favored, who shall receive 30 per cent, who shall receive 40 per cent, and who 50 per cent of the money, and that can only be determined as the result of influence that may be brought to bear upon him. I want this law to be so guarded that no man in public life may be able to go to his district and say, "I am influential with the Secretary of Agriculture and I can bring to this district more money than my opponent in this campaign."

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask my colleague on what basis he would apportion the funds?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not complaining about the apportionment. I am not saying whether the apportionment is correct or not. I am simply talking about the method that should be employed after the apportionment is made, the means by which the apportionment, when made, shall go into the treasuries of the States.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. If I understand my colleague, he would apportion according to the population, according to the number of miles in each State. Is not that the provision of the bill now?

Mr. MADDEN. There are three factors in this bill. One factor first gives $65,000 to each State because it is a State; the second factor is the number of miles of road, and the third factor is the population. The three combined make the basis of apportionment as recommended by the committee.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Now, my colleague would not permit the discretion to be vested in the Secretary of Agriculture, as I understand, but would have the money distributed or go to the credit of each State——

Mr. MADDEN. I would.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. To be paid out automatically.

Mr. MADDEN. Whatever the basis of apportionment may be I do not undertake to say, because I have not gone into that sufficiently thoroughly to justify my giving an opinion upon it, but once agreed upon, a basis of apportionment—and we know there is a certain amount of money coming out of the Government appropriations to a given State—that money should go to the State regardless of what the Secretary of Agriculture may say about it, and he ought not to be given the discretion to say whether 30 per cent of the cost of a given road or 40 per cent of the cost of a given road or 50 per cent of the cost of a given road shall be the proportion that he will pay.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the gentleman think that the method adopted in the bill last year, which passed the House last year, is a better method of dealing with the matter than the one provided by this bill?

Mr. MADDEN. I am frank to say I do not.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why?

Mr. MADDEN. Under that bill there was no requirement whatever for the State that got the money to use it for building roads. It could put the money into its own treasury and pay any kind of obligation in the world with it that it wanted to pay. It need not use the money at all, and the only penalty for failing to use the money in the construction of roads was that it could not get the next annual apportionment, and of course that would be outrageous, unjustifiable. But this discretion left in the Secretary of Agriculture is not justifiable at all. There is another provision in this bill which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to pay installments on the roads under construction by the State, but the authority which we grant does not require him to investigate whether the road has really been built upon which he pays the installment; and of course that is not good business. It is not wise, it is not just, and it leads to danger.

The main objection I have to this bill is that it opens the door to political scandal; not to-day perhaps, not to-morrow, maybe not a year from now or 10 years from now; but we are entering upon a system of expenditures which will grow year by year. To-day we propose an expenditure of $25,000,000. Now, every man here knows that $25,000,000 will not help to build many roads in all the States. You can not build a macadam road for less than $10,000 a mile, and a State that gets $300,000 or $150,000 out of this appropriation will not be able to build many roads; but if we prove that we are entitled to the confidence of the American people by the manner in which we safeguard the expenditure of this money the sentiment of the people everywhere, from coast to coast and from the Lakes to the Gulf, will be in favor of increasing Federal cooperation as time goes by and we will be spending for Federal cooperation not $25,000,000 a year but $250,000,000 a year; and I know of no money that can be as well expended, that will yield as good results as the expenditure of money for the construction of roads, for it will bring to the people who live in the rural districts of the country more happiness and greater prosperity than they have ever enjoyed before. [Applause.] There are 60 per cent of the people, however, in America who do not live in the rural districts.

This bill provides that all cities of 2,000 population and under may become beneficiaries of the expenditures under this bill, but all people living in cities of 2,000 or over are excluded from its privileges. Sixty per cent of the American people live in cities having a population of over 2,000 people, so that this bill, although it will tax the whole 100,000,000 of people, will have benefited directly but 40,000,000 of the 100,000,000. We men who come from great cities do not complain at this, for we realize that the time is coming when we ought to discourage the centralization of population in the great cities of America and ought to do everything in our power that is just, right, and reasonable to encourage people to go back to the farms [applause], where the life of the citizenship is healthful and where a greater degree of patriotism may be fostered and preserved. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is it not true that a large per cent of the people in the cities will either be benefited or will use these highways when constructed?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes; I am not complaining, and have not complained; and nothing I have said will justify any complaint on the part of any man, that I object to my contribution as a city resident for the development of the agricultural regions of the country, for I believe that the country is the safety valve of America; that there is the population upon which we must depend in time of stress, and I want to encourage every boy and girl of the coming generations to realize that on the farm, in the country, where God's sunshine prevails, and where men and women may grow to maturity without surrounding influences that are a detriment to American institutions—that there is the place we ought to spend our money for the development of that patriotism upon which we must depend in the years that are to come for the maintenance of our great institutions. [Applause.]

Mr. SLOAN rose.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska, if he wishes to interrupt me.

Mr. SLOAN. In the gentleman's construction of this bill I understood him to say that cities of over 2,000 inhabitants were excluded from the benefits of this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SLOAN. Perhaps I do not understand it correctly——

Mr. MADDEN. Up to 2,000 they have the privileges; above 2,000 they have not.

Mr. SLOAN. The bill says that rural post roads—

shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is, or might be, carried outside of incorporated cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000, and in such cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000 along streets and roads where the houses average more than 200 feet apart.

Which would be about 25 to the mile.

Now, then, is there anything in the statute that would prevent every dollar of the Illinois appropriation being used in approving or building post roads within the city of Chicago, beginning at its outside limit and running toward its center, if, in his discretion, the Secretary of Agriculture will say, "We will build up roads in the suburban portion of the city of Chicago and in that region where the residences are on an average of 200 feet apart"?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, you could not use a dollar of this money in a city of more than 2,000 people—not one dollar.

Mr. SLOAN. That is for construction by the House.

Mr. MADDEN. There is no question about it, absolutely. No dollar of this money could be used in any city for any improvement of any kind, on a post road or otherwise, of over 2,000 inhabitants, no matter whether the houses were 200 feet apart or 1,000 feet apart. But we are not complaining about that.

We people who come from the densely populated sections of America, as I have said, are willing to cooperate with all the other sections of America, because we believe we are doing the thing that is best for the people of America as a whole, and while we are not to be beneficiaries of this legislation, there is other legislation frequently enacted by the Congress that we do benefit from, whereas other sections of the United States do not benefit from them. So that in the long run the harbors of the great cities, the great buildings in the great cities, get their share of the public money for the development and maintenance of the public business, and we want every section of the Nation to feel that we are sufficiently patriotic to cooperate with them on any legislation that is bound in the long run to help America.

There is a feeling among the people all over the United States to-day that road building is the first and most important public activity in which the Government could be engaged. We are talking to-day a good deal about preparedness. But to be prepared to defend America's rights we must be able to move troops if we have them, and must have roads over which to move them. We are not going to be able to build these roads to-day and we are not going to require any troops to-day. And I hope that the day will never come when we will need to move troops to defend America's rights; but I do believe if the day ever comes we ought to be ready, and for one I am willing to do everything within my power to make every preparation to make us ready to defend our rights if they need to be defended [applause], whether it is by building good roads, buying harness, buying mules, cultivating fields; whether it is building large guns or defending the coast line, building battleships, maintaining armies, or any other thing that patriotic America believes ought to be done, not only to maintain America's present prestige but to be able to stand before the world with notice to everybody everywhere that we are not only ready now, but we will be ready always to defend America's institutions and hand down this Government unsullied to the generations that are to people this continent in the ages to come. [Applause.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask at this time leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appreciate this privilege and opportunity to address you upon the subject of Federal aid to good roads. I approach it modestly, not with the expectation of particularly enlarging your knowledge but with the hope that I may at least recall some things you have heretofore heard and emphasize some thoughts which may have been distinctly your own. The problem now before us is not a new one. It antedates many centuries, and has descended to us a heritage of ancient philosophy rather than a principle of recent deduction. It first appeared in our country as soon as affairs had adjusted themselves after the securing of our independence, and from 1802 until the present time nearly every Congress has had before it some phase of this subject, and during that entire period we have had a semblance of Federal aid to highway construction.

I was very much interested in and thoroughly enjoyed the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who presented opposition views to the passage of this measure. It seemed to me that his grounds were ill founded, and in the presentation of his opposition he very aptly illustrated his theory that under the provision of this bill roads would start from nowhere and go elsewhere. He deprecates the fact that some of the States will not be able to come within the purview of its provisions. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that his statement is without foundation and that in truth every State may enjoy the privilege of this bill without the trouble, the legal complications, and constitutional objections prevalent in bills upon the same subject heretofore presented to Congress. I do not think any bill has ever been presented which so completely covers the problem as does this. The gentleman from Massachusetts opposes the measure before us primarily, as he says, because in his State and in many of the Eastern States they already have completed their road systems. The gentleman is ill informed not only as to the other States but even with regard to his own State. Road systems are never completed, sir, in any sense of the word. I will concede that some of your Eastern States have made an excellent start and laid a splendid foundation, but only the gentleman's satisfied imagination supports his contention. Right to-day, upon the statute books of your State, there is a provision which requires all the revenues derived from automobile taxes, automobile licenses, and from fines, aggregating approximately $1,000,000 annually, to go into your good-roads fund. Only a year ago the gentleman's State legislature, under the provisions of law in his State, issued bonds to the amount of $2,000,000 for the good-roads system there. And so regardless of the modest enthusiasm of the gentleman concerning the roads in his State, there seem to be fair indications of opportunities still to improve the road system of Massachusetts. [Applause.]

The gentleman also insists that Federal aid in the construction of good roads is a plank in the Democratic platform and for that reason should not have the support of the Republicans on this side of the House. If the gentleman has discovered one plank in the Democratic platform which that party is endeavoring to fulfill, his efforts are not without value, but as an excuse for any opposition to this measure his statement is decidedly puerile. The truth of the matter is that this is not in any sense a party measure, neither is the bill an exclusive product of Democratic brains. The time has long passed when either side must accept or reject remedial legislation simply because it is fluently labeled with any party's appellation. [Applause.]

The magnitude and importance of the subject must fairly be conceded by its opponents. The Sixty-third Congress appointed a joint committee to consider the feasibility of Federal aid to good roads. That committee has made a most exhaustive and comprehensive report, which I trust will be read by everyone interested in this project. The personnel of the committee insures the authenticity and value of their statements. Permit me to read a few extracts from this report:

> From an economic standpoint the problem of good roads is not surpassed in importance by any other subject now before the American people. Experience has demonstrated that past methods are inadequate to accomplish desired results and the demand for Federal aid has become general and insistent. Viewed from the standpoint of financial returns alone, if the American people borrowed $8,400,000,000 at 6 per cent interest and invested it in permanent road improvements they would come out more than even and also enjoy the personal, social, and educational advantages of the good roads. Although the burden of national participation in highway improvement would fall most heavily upon city residents, yet inhabitants of cities have been among the most active advocates of Federal participation in highway construction and maintenance. Public opinion is overwhelmingly in favor of Federal aid. Replies representing 100,000 individuals came from every State in the Union, and, since the requests for opinions were made without discrimination and the answers received were from all parts of the United States, the responses show, with reasonable accuracy, the consensus of public opinion on the subjects mentioned. Ninety-seven per cent of the replies received favored Federal aid and 3 per cent were against it.

One of the members of this joint committee was the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who just addressed you so ably in opposition to the passage of this bill. I must confess that having heretofore read the favorable report, signed by the gentleman himself, his remarks to-day were somewhat surprising to me. Of course, having been a Member of this Congress for only 50 days, I realize that I have not yet enjoyed all of the surprises which await me. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will my friend yield there for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. I will yield to the gentleman in a minute.

Mr. MADDEN. Did I not say that in my speech?

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Yes; the gentleman interrupts me to ask if he did not say that in his speech. He did, and he ought properly to have added this: "I am in favor of aid to good roads, but I know of no man on earth, including myself, who is able to draft a bill which will meet with my approbation." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Now, Mr. Chairman, will my friend yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Very gladly.

Mr. MADDEN. Did I say in my speech anything that was contrary to what the gentleman read?

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. No.

Mr. MADDEN. That is part of my own report.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. That is true. But, Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to the gentleman, whose superior knowledge I grant, I contend that he is now very much in the position of the woman who wished to buy eggs; she knew little of their character, but remembered that good eggs when immersed in water either stayed on top or went to the bottom, but upon reaching the market place she had forgotten which. [Laughter.]

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. KELLEY. The objection of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] seems to start with line 14 of page 4, which limits the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture as to the

amount of aid given to any particular improvement which might, as the gentleman from Illinois says, lead to favoritism in the various States. Will my colleague state the reasons which led the committee to allow the Secretary of Agriculture that discretion?

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. I shall be glad to give the gentleman my judgment.

If we are to have Federal aid in the construction of our public highways there must be a comity between the several States and the Nation. In this bill the State is represented by the State highway department, if they have one, and by an appointee of the governor in the very few States who have not now a State highway department; the Government is represented by the Secretary of Agriculture. It appealed to the committee that the several State highway departments were best fitted and best able to represent the State, and that they were most responsive and subject to the will and wish of the people in the State. We deemed it inadvisable to make the present unit smaller than the State lest it might argumentatively be open to the pork-barrel criticism directed against former bills upon this same subject. In so far as the Nation is concerned the committee thought the Department of Agriculture was best equipped and fitted to care for the Government's interests. This is right along their line of work. The War Department now recommends, superintends, and accepts the improvements made under the Federal aid to the waterways. If this assignment is proper, and it has been in vogue these many years, certainly the Department of Agriculture could properly be charged with the discretion conferred under the terms of this bill.

In order to defraud the Government under the terms of this bill, it would be necessary for two things to exist concurrently. Those are a corrupt State highway department and a corrupt Secretary of Agriculture, and in that connection permit me to say that as long as departments in this, or any other Government, are supervised by human beings that possibility will always exist; but I am not yet ready to reject a good measure simply because under its provisions it allows the exercise of discretion on the part of State and Government officials. With the eyes of the entire country directed on one or two persons, I think it much easier to keep them honest and faithful than it would be if this discretion were delegated to a larger number of people. I can not conceive of any man being appointed Secretary of Agriculture by the President of the United States who would be so small, parsimonious, and unworthy of his honorable appointment as to evince favoritism in the disposition of the Federal aid funds. Under the terms of this bill, he could not give any part of a State's apportionment to another State; in fact, the worst he could do would be to allow one State its entire quota and disallow another State its entire quota; but, sir, the question now presents itself if that is not a wise provision. Some States will so demean themselves that they should properly receive their entire quota while other States may try to secure their share without having fulfilled their obligations under the terms of this measure; and if there was a mandatory instead of a discretionary provision herein contained, it would be more liable to abuse than is the present bill. If we concede to others the same honesty and integrity of purpose which we claim for ourselves, the workable flexibility of this bill becomes its greatest asset rather than a proof of its inefficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. This joint committee to which I referred obtained authentic information from all the foreign countries as to their road conditions over there. In that connection permit me to say that that report shows facts which are worthy of the consideration of every Member of this House, and I trust every Member will read it. It shows that every foreign country, with the exception of Russia, has anywhere from one and one-half to three and one-quarter times the road mileage per square mile than has the United States, yet we claim to be a government of the people, for the people, and by the people, while those foreign countries are simply overshadowing us in their accomplishments in so far as good roads are concerned. Why, gentlemen, I desire to call your attention to the fact that 300 years before Christ Appius Claudius built a road from Rome to Naples which is better to-day than the road from here to Annapolis or the road from here to Richmond; still we claim to be the most progressive of all nations.

During the past century this country has spent millions, yea billions, upon our public waterways. I do not deprecate that expenditure. In fact, I am in favor of it. Yet upon this floor only a few days ago a gentleman arose and said that at least one-half of that expenditure had been wasted. I rather doubt that statement; but even if it is true, what does it prove? It only proves that Congresses heretofore and this Congress and future Congresses, if they permit the waste, are at fault. It certainly does not by innuendo, inference, or otherwise prove the iniquity of the purpose.

Our attention is challenged to the fact that the Federal aid to the waterways is a contribution to a Government service over which the Government never loses control. That sounds well, but, analyzed, it means only this: In so far as the waterways are concerned the Government maintains the semblance of police authority for the enforcement of rules laid down by the Government, and they also establish protective stations to safeguard the lives and property upon this avenue of commerce. Nothing more can be claimed. I am glad that our waterways have had the care and attention of this Government; but in behalf of the 50,000,000 people who do not see or use the waterways I ask you why this Government should longer continue to discriminate as to our great highways of commerce. Until very recently the general road system of this country was a system of tolerance. It was one whose origin was almost legendary; one which we had copied from Great Britain, and to which we have tenaciously held, although it was discarded by our mother country over a century ago. We may differ on many phases of the Government's management, but in the effort to secure good roads we certainly can find a common ground free from party lines or political dissension.

A committee, whose membership represents the two great political parties of this country, have, with but a single dissenting voice, presented this bill for your favorable consideration. We do not contend that it is the best measure of accomplishment, but we do insist that it is a step in the right direction, based not upon fancy or idle theory but founded upon a system which, if properly followed and extended, must inevitably bring greater returns than any expenditure heretofore made by this Government. Ninety-seven per cent of all the people living within the confines of these United States favor Federal aid in the construction and maintenance of public highways.

The rural districts ought not to be compelled to do a work in which the whole people are in every way interested and in the reward wherefrom the rural resident is the lesser participant. In the bill before you we have made what we consider a fair apportionment of the funds. We have allowed the several State highway departments to continue their activities along their own particular lines, to which it must necessarily be conceded they are best advised, and certainly the magnificent highways of California, the Columbia River Road, and the beautiful highways in our Central and Eastern States must convince any doubtful hearer or student of the subject that the several States, under the terms of this bill, are well able to care for the task assigned. It is neither commendable nor logical for people who have enjoyed good roads these many years to oppose a plan which would make their enjoyment a possibility for our less fortunate citizens and countrymen. In ancient days the empire's resources were taxed to build great imperial highways, so that its armies might reach distant provinces to quell insurrections or collect tribute. To-day roads are not built for pillage or conquest, and we hope not for the needs of war, but these great highways are primarily constructed for civilization and trade. They are the avenues of uplift in our social, intellectual, and religious life. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I shall consume the time allotted to me in endeavoring to answer some of the criticisms leveled at this bill by my good friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. MANN. I do not want to impose on the gentleman from South Carolina, but I think I voted twice for a good roads bill in the House. I know I voted for one in the last Congress and I think I did in the one before that. The other two bills, I think, were alike. This bill is entirely different. Nobody has yet explained the difference or why the committee have changed their attitude. I hope that at some time somebody on the committee will do us the honor of telling us what caused the flop.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will answer the gentleman from Illinois. The fact is that the bill in the last Congress was not the same as the bill in the Sixty-second Congress. If my recollection is correct, the gentleman from Illinois voted against the amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill in the Sixty-second Congress, though I am not certain.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's recollection is not good.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I know the gentleman from Illinois in the last Congress voted for the bill and made a short speech in favor of it. That bill, however, was not the same as the bill in the Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. MANN. Practically the same.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can explain the difference to the gentleman. In the Sixty-second Congress the proposition submitted as an amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill was the proposed classification of the roads into A, B, and C, with a provision for the payment of a rental of so much per mile for class A, so much for class B, and so much for class C, provided it should be proved first that the State had during the preceding year spent a like amount on those roads.

In the Sixty-third Congress there was a bill introduced—I am familiar with it, because I introduced the bill—and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] likewise introduced a bill which was almost identical with the provisions of this bill. That bill was made section 2, and then the classification of roads—the rental proposition, as it was called by some—was made section 3, and there was another section giving to a State the alternative of electing under which section of that bill it would receive Federal aid. That was the bill in the last Congress.

As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] knows, both those bills met with strong opposition in the Senate. First proposed as an amendment to the Post Office bill, it was voted down, and finally we had an experimental appropriation of $500,000 added in conference. Then in the last Congress the bill passed this House, but was never even reported from the Senate committee. I know that it met with strong opposition in the Post Office Committee of the Senate, and there was no chance for its passage in the Senate.

This year the American Association of Highway Engineers met and appointed a committee to draft a bill providing for Federal aid. That bill is almost identical with the provisions of the bill now reported by the Roads Committee. When it was presented to the committee, we believed that it eliminated all of the features that had been objected to in the Senate, and in addition eliminated the feature that has met with the strongest opposition in this House, where it was charged that the proposition to pay a rental for the roads over which the rural carriers traveled would not demand of the States that the money be spent for the improvement of roads, and that there would not be that Federal supervision which is necessary to safeguard appropriations out of the Federal Treasury.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] was one of those who, with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], were particularly strong in their opposition to the classification road proposition. I heard the gentleman from Missouri say the other day that because that feature was eliminated he is now in favor of this bill. We were not so fortunate, however, with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], because, although he stated in the Sixty-third Congress that he was in favor of Federal aid and limited his opposition to that proposition providing for the rental, now, when we come to this Congress, he objects to a bill that is drawn in strict accord with the principles laid down by him in his speech, for he then said that he would favor Federal aid in cooperation with the States, provided that the States were required to spend the same amount before the Federal Government was called upon to spend anything.

The Association of Highway Engineers, composed of engineers from every State in the Union, are in favor of this bill. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois, too, that the Secretary of Agriculture is in favor of this proposition, and that the Director of the Office of Public Roads is in favor of this proposition, while both of them were opposed to the rental proposition that was in the last bill; and as we desired to report a bill that would stand some chance of becoming a law we eliminated the rental proposition. Having given it two trials we thought we were justified in making the change.

The rental proposition having been eliminated, the gentleman from Illinois now finds a new reason for opposing this bill. He says the Secretary of Agriculture is given too much discretion. He believes it would open the door for a Member of the House or of the Senate to influence the Secretary of Agriculture. If he really believes that, he would also object to the provision that before any amount is paid the Secretary of Agriculture should inspect the road to see whether it has been finished in accordance with the plans and specifications. He wishes us to believe that if a Member of the Senate or the House should go to the Secretary of Agriculture and say "It is true, Mr. Secretary, the road is not completed in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted and approved by you, but to please me I want you to approve of it and pay over this money," the Secretary would do it. If we are to believe that a member of the Cabinet, the Secretary of Agriculture, is going to use his office to please a Member of the House or the Senate and allow to a road a greater per cent than he should we may as well believe that under similar circumstances he would approve a road that does not come up to the specifications. We must place confidence in some official to administer the law, and I know of no reason why we should not assume that the Secretary will administer the law in the spirit in which it is framed.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman has covered the ground, but I am not sure. My recollection was that in the Sixty-second Congress we provided in the bill for the payment of $15, $20, or $30 a mile, which you call the rental proposition.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MANN. In the Sixty-third Congress we provided the same thing with an alternative about paying money to States. This bill leaves out the matter that was put in in the Sixty-second Congress entirely, or the particular methods we had in the Sixty-third Congress, and adopts to a large extent the alternative in the Sixty-third Congress.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is exactly right. The alternative proposition in the Sixty-third Congress is substantially the bill pending before the House. As a result of our experience in that Congress and of our more careful consideration we have thrown a number of safeguards around it and made it a much better bill than the alternative proposition in the last House.

Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] says that we ought to put double the amount which the States should pay. In several speeches during the last two Congresses he has never suggested that the States should be required to contribute twice the amount until to-day.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not mean that the State shall contribute twice the amount. I said the State should spend twice the amount placed to its credit before the Federal Government paid.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The criticism of the gentleman from Illinois was leveled at the discretionary power of the Secretary of Agriculture to contribute to any proposition from 30 to 50 per cent. I will tell the gentleman the reason the committee inserted that. In many States of the Union there is a considerable State road fund, while in some States the funds for road purposes are very limited. In the State of Illinois, for instance, you may have a road fund so large that you would rather have the Government contribute to the aid of a great number of roads with 30 per cent than to have it contribute to a few roads and pay 50 per cent. The gentleman overlooks the fact that no matter whether the Secretary of Agriculture allots the roads 30 per cent of the proposed cost or 50 per cent of the proposed cost, the State is entitled to its full quota under the bill.

If the Secretary of Agriculture says, in response to a given proposition, "I will allot you 30 per cent," it simply means that that State can receive aid on a greater number of roads than could a State which received from the Government 50 per cent. It was inserted because some wealthier States would prefer to have the Government contribute only 30 per cent to a great number of roads, whereas some States having only a few hundred thousand dollars to spend would prefer to have the Government contribute on a 50 per cent basis. But, in any event, whether it is 30 per cent or 50 per cent, the Secretary of Agriculture does not have the discretion or power to take away from the State the apportionment that it is entitled to under the basis of apportionment in this bill.

But the gentleman from Massachusetts, in his minority report, stated as to the basis of apportionment that if this is to aid the rural community the appropriation should be based on the ratio that the rural population bears to the population of the entire country. He does not believe that, I am satisfied. I think it was an oversight on his part when he inserted it in the minority report, because the provision in the bill which gives to a State credit for having within its borders a city with such a large population as Boston has results in the State of Massachusetts, from which the gentleman comes, getting a

larger amount than it would receive if its quota was based merely on the rural population of the State of Massachusetts. But he answered his own argument when in his speech he took the position not that the State of Massachusetts is allotted too much but it is alloted too small an amount when you consider the amount of taxes that the State of Massachusetts contributes to the Federal Treasury. I think he stated that last year the States of Massachusetts, New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio paid $31,140,000 of the total amount of the so-called war tax of $52,000,000. Of the States he enumerated I took the trouble to add up their allotment under this bill and I find they receive $8,363,750 by this bill; but that is no argument for or against the bill. The Congress can not adopt the policy of making no appropriation for any purpose in a State until it is ascertained that the proposed appropriation will not amount to more than the amount contributed by that State to the Federal Treasury. The gentleman would not favor applying that narrow policy to State appropriations. Suppose, for instance, the city of Boston, which city because of its wealth contributes in great measure to the taxable funds of Massachusetts, should say to the legislature of that State that public funds in proportion to the amount of taxes paid by the city should be spent in internal improvements in that city, the gentleman from Massachusetts, in behalf of his section of that State, would immediately complain.

It is too narrow a view. The people of the city of Boston know that their prosperity is dependent upon the country. Last summer I went to New Hampshire, and every time I attempted to cross the street in the little city of Bethlehem I was kept busy dodging automobiles bearing a license tag of Massachusetts. They do not contribute to maintaining the roads of New Hampshire, but New Hampshire, on the other hand, through its tourist hotels, does contribute to the prosperity of the city of Boston, because they buy all of their supplies there; and I am satisfied that if he would submit the proposition to the merchants of the city of Boston he would find that they were in favor of contributing toward building roads in New Hampshire and in all other sections, out of the National Treasury, in order that the country might be developed and thereby the city of Boston be developed. The road problem is no longer a local problem. The increased use of automobiles has resulted in the roads being used by persons residing in different counties and different States who do not contribute to their maintenance at all, and it is not fair to expect the entire cost of construction and maintenace to be borne by the adjoining landowner.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in like manner the gentleman complained that in New York State they had built their roads, that that State already had a magnificent system of roads. That is true. He said that, having completed those roads, they should not be called upon to contribute to the construction of roads in the West and in the South. But a few minutes thereafter I heard the gentleman ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] if it were not true that last year the State of New York expended $14,000,000 in the construction of roads. If he is correct, then it would appear that New York has not completed all of its construction work, and that a great part of that $14,000,000 expenditure last year could have been expended in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture through the Secretary, had this bill been a law. Another argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], which was agreed to by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], is that this bill would result in discouraging road building on the part of the States. But there is absolutely no justification for such an argument, the bill specifically providing that no appropriation can be made by the Secretary of Agriculture until the work has been completed by the State in accordance with the plans and specifications approved by him, or in case of partial payment, that in no case shall a dollar be paid unless the State has already paid a like sum in that construction work, and in any event the discretion is always placed in the Secretary of Agriculture, and instead of making a partial payment he need not make any payment unless he is satisfied that that work is done in accordance with the plans and specifications approved by him.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Evidently a great deal of money will be necessary to pay the expenses in Washington and the expenses of men to go over the country to inspect these roads. Is any part of that expense to be paid out of the allotment to the State, or is it to be paid out of the amount to be retained by the Secretary for the expense of management?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, my recollection of the terms of the bill is that they provide that it shall be deducted out of the fund by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. What fund?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Out of the gross appropriation; out of the total fund.

Mr. MANN. Section 3 makes provision.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will read the gentleman the language of the bill:

> That as soon as may be after the passage of any act making appropriations under the provisions of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare and file in his office a statement showing the amount of such appropriation he has set apart to defray the expense of his department in the administration of this act.

And he shall then certify to the States the amount of the balance available to each State.

Mr. SAUNDERS. And also in section 2 there is a provision that out of the general appropriation the Secretary reserves a fund sufficient to cover these expenses.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this is one bill that has never been discussed in a partisan manner in this House. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] the other day—I suppose for the purpose of influencing those on the Republican side of the House—said that the members of the Republican Party should not be anxious to assist the Democratic Party in redeeming one of its campaign pledges. The truth is that the Progressive Party in its platform unequivocally declared in favor of Federal aid, and the truth is that in the past not only has the leader of the Republicans, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] voted for this bill, but the great majority of Republicans on this bill have voted in favor of it, so that in no way can it be considered a partisan measure.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman have any idea that the Democrats in this Congress will carry out the pledge in their platform on this subject?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the belief of the gentleman is that the Democrats in this House will do it, but I would not undertake to speak for the Democrats in the Senate.

Mr. MANN. It would be so unusual for the Democrats to carry out any plank of their platform that I do not believe they will.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words about another objection that has been raised to this bill. I refer to the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that this bill forces a State to establish a highway department, whether it desires to or not. It is true that this bill will force every State by 1920 to establish a highway department, but I do not think he ought to entertain any worry because of that provision, for his State has one. If there is anyone who ought to complain about that, it ought to be the gentlemen from Indiana, from Texas, from the State of Georgia, from the State of Mississippi, and from my own State of South Carolina, because those five States are the only States that have no highway departments. I must say that I do not complain, because from my study of the subject I know it would be practically impossible for the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with every county and township in the United States of America.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman states that he has no highway department in his State. Does not this bill provide that the State shall share in the benefits just as much as though it did have a highway department?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Only until 1920; and by 1920 they must have a highway department.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It is paid by the Government to an official of the State government designated by the governor until 1920.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Until 1920.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If you do not want it by that time, send it up to Michigan.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Under the bill South Carolina is entitled to $415,000 a year, and there is no danger of our not placing ourselves in position to secure it. I want to say this provision has been made allowing them until 1920 so that

in case the legislature of any one of these States shall not convene for one year or two years that they will have ample time within which to place the State in a position to participate in this fund. As far as my own State is concerned, whether or not this bill becomes a law, I think it will be to the best interests of the State to have a highway department; but, even if I am wrong, certainly it is true if we are to have any Federal aid we could not expect the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the various townships. In some of the States the road work is in the control of township commissioners, and there are 30,000 townships in the United States of America and over 3,500 counties. It will be impossible to open up a set of books and keep accounts with all of those counties and all of those townships. Why, the bookkeeping expense would amount to so much that very little of this fund would ever reach the roads where it is most needed.

Again, how would the Secretary of Agriculture decide in which county or which township the road would be built? His lack of knowledge of the local conditions would preclude his doing that in an intelligent manner, and therefore we say that Congress should treat with each State as a sovereign State and give to that State through its highway department the power to say where that money should be spent and to propose a specific proposition to the Secretary of Agriculture for his approval. The work can then be done under the laws of the State, and jurisdiction over the roads remains with the State.

If in the discharge of their duties under the bill the State highway department officials are arbitrary, the people of that State can remedy it by getting rid of those officials at the next election. I believe that the effect will be that each of the five States without a highway department now will establish one within the next few years and place themselves in a position to participate. Another reason why it would not be practicable is that in some States, South Carolina for instance, the work is done by counties. I know that is also true of Georgia, Mississippi, and, I think, Indiana, and very few counties are able to employ road engineers. This bill provides that a proposition submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture shall have surveys, plans, and specifications. No township or county without a road engineer could ever submit to the Secretary of Agriculture plans and specifications and surveys in such a manner as would receive his approval, so it will necessitate the appointment of a highway department, with the employment of engineers who can assist the county and local township officials in the preparation of propositions to be submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture.

I do not intend to discuss the value of good roads, because every sane man realizes their value. I have for years hoped that a bill providing Federal aid could be passed here. In the Sixty-second Congress I found that there were more than 20 bills on the subject introduced, and as up to that time no bill had been reported by a committee of the House I concluded that by individual effort nothing could be accomplished. I therefore invited every Member who had introduced a bill on the subject to meet at my office. Nearly every one attended a meeting at which, acting as chairman, I appointed a committee of which the chairman of the Roads Committee, Mr. SHACKLEFORD, was made chairman; and this subcommittee drafted a bill which was afterwards agreed upon by us and introduced, and later was considered in the House as an amendment to the Post Office bill. I realized then, as I do now, that no man can hope to secure the passage of a bill on this subject the provisions of which are exclusively the product of his brain. All legislation is enacted as a result of compromises, and while this bill may not be what I would have it, if given power to write a bill, I believe it is more likely to pass this Congress than any other measure, and at the same time its provisions insure, if it shall become law, that an advanced step will be taken toward securing the construction of permanent roads that will not be open to the charge of starting nowhere and running elsewhere.

I wish to express the hope that, disregarding the expressed desire of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that this measure be considered as a partisan measure, the Republican Members of the House will join with the Democratic Members in placing upon the statute books this law, which will do more to promote the prosperity and the happiness of the people of the country as a whole than any other measure pending before this Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I was one of those who opposed the so-called good-roads bill in the Sixty-third Congress, and it would not serve any profitable purpose at this time to review the argument that I made at that time. It is sufficient to say that the present bill is, in my judgment, a very much better bill and a very much more practical bill than anything that has been presented to this House on the subject of Federal aid for roads. I have been a persistent advocate of Federal aid for good roads, and my advocacy has been on the ground not that the Federal Government was under any obligation to assume any portion of the activities or burdens or responsibilities now discharged by the local authorities in regard to roads, but rather to supplement and augment them and provide for a general improvement in all forms of roads.

I believe that is possible under the present bill and that an opening is made for Federal aid which will encourage the building of modern roads. I have no apology to make for having persistently advocated a higher type of road, the so-called permanent roads or modern roads, as against the mere expenditure of Federal money for the temporary upkeep of unimproved roads. I would not advocate a bill which would require or compel the expenditure of Federal money for the temporary upkeep of the ordinary unimproved roads. Such a bill, I believe, might be open to all the objections which have been urged against Federal road bills; that they would discourage local enterprise; that they would result in constantly increasing demands upon the Federal Treasury without an increasing response or cooperation by the States; and that they might not result in any distinct improvement in our present system of roads. The pending bill will permit, and I believe, encourage the building of modern highways. I am a believer in the principle of Federal aid and I listened with a great deal of attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who is on the Roads Committee, and to his objections to Federal aid. His argument was that some of the States of this Union have a very large taxing power and are able to and do provide themselves with a modern system of roads, and therefore all the States can do equally well. I congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts upon the increasing wealth of his State. He has every reason to be proud of it. But I desire to remind the gentleman that all of that wealth which demands and receives the protection of the Federal Government was not originated or produced in the State of Massachusetts. It is the centralized wealth of the Nation. I know that objection from the same source was made to opening the western territory, even to the acquisition of the Louisiana Purchase at the very beginning of our national history, that it might in some degree discriminate against the older States, and yet the very reverse has been the case.

The older States have grown in wealth and population and culture and refinement as the newer States have come in and added their quota of the general prosperity of the Nation. I believe that the same result will follow from the development of roads throughout the country. I might say to the gentleman that under this bill, which gives the States the initiative and permits them to expend the money upon a system of roads or a particular trunk-line road or certain individual roads, I do not know whether my State will devote immediately or in the very near future any portion of the fund coming to it to the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, because it so chances we have in that congressional district more improved roads to-day than in any other district in the State of Missouri. We have in the single county of Jackson over 300 miles of macadamized and oiled roads. But I support the bill because it will aid in developing every part of Missouri. My objection to the bill in the last Congress was that it was based not upon the necessity for roads but upon the question of the accumulation of taxing power in the districts where the roads existed.

It will help the committee to understand my point of view to say that that lies at the base of my whole idea on the subject of Federal aid to roads. Very frequently the districts which have the greatest need for roads and where the improvement of roads would be the most productive of benefit to the entire State and country have the least local taxing power to perform the responsibility. When I began to study the subject of roads I had an idea that a good road could be built and maintained by the adjoining landowners at their own expense, as streets are now constructed in the cities, but when I came to analyze that proposition I found to my surprise that it did not apply to rural highways.

The reason was this: City property is valuable solely for the purpose of location or accessibility, and which has no limit of value if it be well located and have the modern improvements. A farm is valuable for its power of production. Other incidents enter in, but that is the main value. The wealth that is produced on the farm can not stay on the farm. Before it becomes wealth it finds its way into the great distributing centers of the country. But the minute it leaves the farm and finds its way into the great distributing centers of the country, it to that extent reduces the taxing power of the local district where the

wealth was produced, and it never returns for the purposes of taxation to that local district. Yet we have the entire Nation basing its prosperity upon the prosperity of the farms, annually drawing from the farms the taxable wealth and concentrating it in the cities and great distributing centers, never returning that wealth to the farms and communities, and leaving upon those communities the entire burden and responsibility of keeping up the facilities which produce that wealth. For that reason we have been upon a false basis.

There has never been any one thing which has so militated against good roads in this country as the plan of isolated local control over roads. Our road district is the smallest political subdivision that we have, and that small political subdivision is supposed to take care to the best of its ability of the particular sections of roads that are in that political subdivision. The result is that some small divisions have magnificent roads; some States have magnificent roads, and other States, with large mileage and scattered population and immense needs for immediate development, have a burden which they are unable immediately to assume. This is true of the State of Missouri. Our business men recognize that the wealth that is now centered in Kansas City and St. Louis was not produced in Kansas City and St. Louis, but is a part of the accumulated wealth of the State of Missouri.

The wealth which is now centered in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore was not produced in those cities, but is a part of the centralized wealth of the entire American Nation. It demands the protection of the entire country on all Federal subjects, and it receives it. It demands it on the question of other transportation, rivers and harbors, and properly so, and there is no reason why it should not respond, on the same principle, when it comes to the improvement of rural roads, which are as much a vital part of our prosperity as the improvement of the rivers and harbors or any other part of our national activity. [Applause.]

If the transportation across the Alleghenies were severed for 30 days, New York and Boston, with all their boasted prosperity, would be on the verge of starvation. There would be no possibility of feeding the great population of those centers without the immediate facilities for transportation from the West.

It is the isolated system of local control of roads which has militated against a general improvement of the highways. We borrowed that system from England, as we did most of our common law, but we borrowed it at a time when England was a hermit nation, with her forests full of outlaws and 95 per cent of her young men going to the Continent for an education. We have adapted it to a country 3,000 miles in extent, under necessity for immediate development, with a sparsely settled population and at a time when England and every other nation of the world have abandoned a system of local, isolated control of roads. Every man knows who has given the subject any study that all of the other civilized countries of the world have a national system of roads, supplemented by provincial and local roads. I do not think the time is far distant when in this country, by the cooperation of the State and Nation, with the local authorities cooperating with the State, we will have a system of interstate highways as wide and as great in its ramifications as the present system of railroads, and as useful.

I know that we have had to weather a storm of abuse and considerable ridicule in advocating a system of high-grade, improved highways, and yet even the experience of two years since this bill was before the House has demonstrated the growing strength of that sentiment. There was formed a few days ago in a central Missouri city an association of permanent road associations. These road associations believe in through roads—a system of roads, permanent roads, all-the-year-around roads. The sentiment is growing in every State of the Union, and particularly in the State of Missouri. Every business man in every small town in the State of Missouri to-day, almost without exception, belongs to some road-improvement association designed to connect the roads of his town with the great centers of the State and with interstate traffic. The present sentiment in favor of good roads was largely created and is fostered by these road associations, who are working in the interest of high-grade interstate highways. Although I have been ridiculed and abused for supporting this business sentiment on the floor of Congress, I have no apology to make when I see Congress coming to our view. What the farmers and business men want is roads, not politics. As the business men have awakened to the need of a system of permanent roads, the ideas of Congress have changed to conform to the advancement of public opinion.

That is the present tendency of the times. To my mind it accounts for the great improvement in this legislation which we now have before the House to-day over that which was offered to us two years ago. We have not given all the attention to this subject that we could. We certainly did not know a great deal about it when we started in to legislate upon it. The public has also educated itself considerably on the subject, and we are getting nearer to a working system now than ever before.

We believe we ought not to confine our aid to local roads, and ought not to confine it to post roads, or confine it to mere rental of roads. We have the right under the construction of the Federal Constitution to provide for commercial roads, roads carrying interstate traffic.

When the building of the Panama Canal was proposed some gentleman brought a suit against Leslie M. Shaw, then Secretary of the Treasury, to restrain him from paying out any money for the construction of the canal, on the ground that the Constitution gave to Congress no power to construct such a canal; but Judge Brewer, in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court, said the Constitution was as clear in investing the Congress with the power to authorize the construction of a canal for interstate commerce as in the power to authorize the construction of a road, and that the latter proposition was now clearly settled in the jurisprudence of the United States.

What is interstate commerce? When does it begin and when does it end? We all recognize the fact that the free interchange of commodities is the greatest method of disseminating and diffusing wealth. The largest amount of interstate commerce begins its journey to the market on the rural roads; all of the supply of the food products of the country and much of the great raw material which enters into manufactures and forms the great bulk of our exports and turns the balance of trade in our favor begins its course to the markets on the rural roads. We believe that the great harbor of New York is an agency of interstate commerce. We know that when a ship sails out of that harbor carrying a cargo of American wheat abroad it is engaged in interstate commerce; but I believe that the minute the farmer turns on a public road with a load of wheat on its way to market, that wheat has as certainly entered the commerce of the world as when the ship clears the lights of Sandy Hook and starts on its way to Europe. We can not differentiate between them. That wheat is just as certainly on its way to the great commerce of the world when it started on the first road to the market town as when it started on its voyage across the ocean.

We must begin at the beginning, at the very base, to build up the prosperity of the country. But, in addition to the commercial argument, the social and intellectual conditions of the rural sections all invite at this time the serious attention of Congress to the subject of good roads. Not only does the taxable wealth leave the country districts but the working power of the community also leaves the country districts. What is it that has made farm life open to the charge of loneliness and isolation? That charge has been largely removed by the rural free delivery and the telephone and the daily delivery of mail. The next great step toward the socialization of farm life is the rural highway. [Applause.] The rural highway will build up the local church. It will build up the local school. It will build up the local town and trading point. It will turn the stream of life and travel and commercial wealth back into the country districts from which they originally came. It is the only tendency of modern life that will have that effect. All other tendencies of modern life have been to put a blight upon country life and small town life. The great railroads, the great department stores, the great mail-order houses, and all of the distribution of wealth and capital have tended to sap the life-blood of the smaller communities and leave them nothing upon which to build. But the good roads, enabling the farmer to haul his products 365 days in the year, enabling him to get to the market town, enabling him to go to the country church, enabling his children to get to school, enabling his neighbors and relatives to visit, to come in and sup with him, will bring back the social life to the community.

What is it that brings the young people trooping into the cities? What is it that they see or think they see under the bright lights of the cities? Is it the opportunity for the indulgence of vice? No man who knows the young people of the country believes any such statement. They see, or think they see, under the glittering bright lights of the cities the opportunities for social and intellectual stimulus which the young people need; in short, the things which these good roads, with the interchange of social life, will encourage. If the social opportunities and opportunities for intellectual advancement could be had in the rural communities, the young people would be content to stay on the farms and in the small towns, whereas

they are now flocking to the cities. We are able to comprehend at this time the effect that a general system of good roads will have on the general social life of the community.

I know that in most of the States, and particularly in the Middle Western States, the cities and urban population have grown at the expense largely of the rural population. The rural population in many places has fallen off, while the city population has gained. We can talk all we choose about the back-to-the-farm movement and how independent the farmer is, but until we are willing to provide a general system of good roads by a general system of taxation, reaching all the wealth of the State and Nation, and giving an equal opportunity to the man who stays on the farm and in the small town with the man who goes to the city, we talk in vain. We must let him know that he is to have an equal opportunity for the development of his section with those in the cities, and in order to do that we must lay our hand upon the accumulated wealth of the Nation, whether it be on farms or in the cities, for objects like improved roads, which are for the general good of the whole community.

Now, it may be true that some portion of the taxes collected in one part of the country will be expended under this plan in another part. I have no doubt that a great deal of the tax collected in Kansas City and St. Louis is expended throughout the State of Missouri under the system of State taxation, and a great deal of the wealth of Massachusetts will be expended in the rural States from which that wealth originally came. Yet that will not prove a disadvantage to those great wealth-concentrating centers. Does that mean that there is an unequal distribution of the burdens of taxation and government? Not necessarily so, because if the business men of the cities are wise they will recognize, as I think my constituents do, that their wealth originally came from the country districts, and that the improvement of the country districts will indirectly improve the cities.

This principle is recognized universally by the States. The State of Missouri with its great cities of St. Louis and Kansas City, and the State of Illinois with its great city of Chicago, taxes the whole property of the State for the improvement of roads and for other general State purposes. The improvement of the roads of Missouri, Montana, and the Dakotas is just as much a charge on the accumulated wealth now centered in New York, Philadelphia, or any large city. There is no injustice done to any section of the country. The main question before the people is whether the benefit is general, whether it be national in its character, whether it is so widely diffused and comes so fully under the general-welfare clause of the Constitution as to be a proper subject of national legislation. I believe it does.

Nor have I any complaint in regard to the control to be exercised by the Secretary of Agriculture over the expenditure of this road money. As members of the committee have said, we must entrust this power somewhere, and we must proceed on the assumption that an officer clothed with power will exercise it with discretion and good faith. In addition I see this advantage. I know that men in the rural districts charged with the administration of road funds and road laws, however conscientious and earnest they may be, can not in many cases be skilled road engineers. For this reason the recent road legislation of Missouri extends the aid of the State highway department to the local road authorities.

The highway commission, upon the application of a road district, will send an engineer to provide a scientific plan of road construction and give advice as to the utilization of the best material for road improvement. Without that the rural-road official is often helpless; he must pursue the archaic methods of constructing roads, which, as we know, often resulted in no improvement of the road system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. I would like two minutes more.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield to the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. What is now being done under the modern legislation by State highway commissions is proposed to be done under this bill by the Federal road department, and will result in real road improvement. All of the scientific knowledge which has been gathered by the Office of Good Roads will become available for the people. The Secretary of Agriculture will be able to put at the service of the local road officials in the State the services of experts familiar with the construction of roads brought from different parts of the country; familiar with the quality of road material available in the different sections; familiar with the processes of drainage which is an important feature in roads; familar with all the details which reduce the cost of the roads and result in a more economical upkeep. I take it that the aid to be thus given will be of great benefit. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does not the commissioner of agriculture make a certificate to be joined in by the director of highways? Must not the director of highways join in a certificate before the Treasury is obliged to pay any of this amount?

Mr. BORLAND. I suppose the gentleman means the director of highways in the State. He has the opportunity of initiative himself. Any plan which he desires approved by the Federal Government he can present, and then the Federal Government can have an opportunity to approve of it, and if it does, he will get aid in carrying out the improvement, maintenance, and providing for the roads.

Good roads are the golden chain that binds the Nation together for prosperity or defense. They lighten the burden of transportation, reduce the cost of living, raise the value of farm lands, increase the national efficiency, provide for the common defense, build up the church and school, banish the isolation of rural life, and spread prosperity, intelligence, and social advantages throughout the length and breadth of the land. We are just entering upon an era of road improvement which will make our national wealth and strength available, and I am glad to have had a part in the formation of this legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts the other day referred to the fact that there were some States that were favoring this bill that had been derelict in the duty they owed the public in road building. The State from which I come has not been slow in building public roads. The State of Indiana has more miles of improved roads than any other State in the Union. [Applause.] We are not content with the roads we have, we want more and better roads.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. GORDON. I will ask you the question I was going to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] when his time expired. Does the gentleman know of any precedent in national legislation for taking public money out of the Treasury of the United States and using it on township roads such as is proposed under this bill?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; there is ample precedent for the expenditure of public money for the improvement of public roads. The United States Government, for the purpose of encouraging the diffusion of agriculture and the knowledge pertaining to agriculture, is contributing to-day to every agricultural educational establishment in the United States a certain amount of money for every student that enters the agricultural department. [Applause.]

Mr. GORDON. But that is not roads. I am talking about township roads.

Mr. MANN. We are building roads now out of an appropriation of $500,000 made last year, in the Post Office bill, which the gentleman from Ohio and myself both voted for.

Mr. SLOAN. The Constitution of the United States expressly provides for the establishment of post roads throughout the United States.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. But that is not the only precedent.

Mr. KELLEY. There is the Cumberland road.

Mr. GORDON. And that was built by an appropriation of public land.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The United States is likewise paying to every technical school in the United States where there is a military establishment as an incident thereto a certain amount of money for each student there engaged. But that is not the only precedent where the same principle is applied. Some of the States of the Union have seen fit, out of their generosity, to establish old soldiers' homes, where an old soldier and his wife may spend their last days together, and for the encouragement of that kind of philanthropy the United States Government contributes for every male in those institutions $100 per year. The General Government has no claim upon those institutions and has no claim upon these agricultural colleges except the general good that the general public receives. Nor has the United States any claim upon these young men who graduate from these institutions or receive their military education there except that in time of war it may have an educated yeomanry from whom it may draw in defense of the country.

The only objection I know of that can possibly come from the State of Indiana is because of the fact that we have some people there who believe that we should not be encumbered with a State highway commission. To my mind that is one of the best possible things that can result to the State of Indiana by reason of this legislation.

As I have stated, we have built in the last 25 years more roads than any other State in the Union, but we have built

them in a sort of slipshod manner, without any system, and there should be a system. In order that the greatest and best results may be obtained from the money invested there should be some central system, some scheme whereby the roads are built according to a common plan. That, to my mind, is one of the great benefits that is to be derived from this system. We are not complaining because the State of Indiana will contribute more money than she gets back by reason of this legislation. We do not feel that we in the State of Indiana are independent any more than the people in our adjoining States to the west are independent of one another. We feel that we are dependent and interdependent, each one of us striving as best we can to assist the others. If this idea of isolation advanced by some gentlemen here in opposition to this bill were to obtain, what would become of our educational system in this country? Take, for example, the State of Indiana. The great centers of population there contribute by far the greater amount of money that goes into the educational fund of the State; but it all goes into one pot and it is divided among all the school children throughout the State, so that the child living in the remotest district has the same educational advantages as the child who lives in a congested center.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GORDON. You do not know of any law that takes money out of the United States Treasury, though, and contributes it to the States for the education of the youth of the States, do you?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Why, certainly I know of a law, and it is a most wholesome one. I referred to it a while ago. Money is contributed by the United States Government to every agricultural school in this country, so that this country may be a better one to live in, and so that the people of the United States may have diffused among them a greater amount of knowledge on the subject of agriculture and be able to use to better advantage the opportunities which they have.

Mr. GORDON. But the National Government has never contributed any money to support the common schools of the State, has it?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It might do it. There is no reason why it should not.

Mr. GORDON. Of course it might.

Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS. It gave public lands for the support of the common schools in the States.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It did; yes. For the purpose of supporting the common schools in this country she gave thousands and thousands of her broad acres. [Applause.] Is not that a contribution worth while? We want to encourage other States in the improvement of their highways. Take the great State of Illinois, for example, that lies to the west of us—disgraceful, so far as her lack of road improvement is concerned. It is a fact known to be true that gentlemen who live in the southern part of the State of Illinois will go across the Ohio River into Kentucky and go on east until they get to a point south of the Indiana line, and then go the whole length of the State of Indiana to the city of Chicago. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand the gentleman to say that there is a road traversible leading through Indiana to Chicago on the Indiana side of the State line?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. And if it were not for those roads on the Indiana State line, by automobile, nine months out of the year, the people in the southern part of the gentleman's State could not reach Chicago.

Mr. MANN. Well, if the gentleman has not been over the road I will forgive him, but if he has I am afraid he has forgotten something. I have been there a good many times, and a man takes his life in his hands if he travels over those roads in the northern part of Indiana in any way.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know of any reason at all why anybody in Indiana would want to go to Chicago on any kind of road? [Laughter.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Perhaps that is an answer to the gentleman's question?

Mr. BARKLEY. If the gentleman's statement is true, and also the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, is it not an additional reason why this bill ought to pass?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to represent a district in the extreme southern portion of the State of Illinois, and I bear witness that the statement of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] is absolutely correct.

Mr. MANN. I think that is a strange statement to come from a gentleman from the great State of Illinois.

Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS. It is true all over the State of Illinois.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, it was my good fortune to be present at the Dixie Highway Convention held in Chattanooga during the past summer, and it was one of the grandest conventions that I ever attended. One would have thought it was either the national Republican or Democratic convention, so great was the enthusiasm. The gentlemen who represented the State of Illinois urged that a line or a branch line be established through the State of Illinois for the reason, and for the sole reason, that they might be encouraged and their citizenship encouraged to better road building. I did not refer to this matter to make any invidious comparison or to cast any reflection upon the great State of Illinois, for it is one of the greatest States in the Union, and their farm lands are unsurpassed by those in any other State because of their richness, and because of that fact she ought to be ashamed that she has not better roads alongside of them.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Has the gentleman ever been up in Michigan?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; and there is room for improvement up there. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Well, they have good farm land up there.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; they have. So, I say, there is every reason why this bill should be enacted into law. I am happy in the thought that there will be no partisanship manifested here in consideration of the bill. Republicans have ever encouraged this character of improvement for the purpose of keeping the young men and the young women on the farms and away from the congested cities of the country. They encouraged and, if you please, made possible the first rural post route in these United States, and they did it for that purpose. Rural post routes had their preliminary trial under a Republican administration when Mr. Harrison was President of the United States. It was killed by the second Cleveland administration and permitted to slumber until the administration of McKinley, when it was revived, and it has gone on doing the work for which it was intended since that time; and I am sorry to say that it remains for this present administration to so revolutionize the Rural System of the country that they are depleting it, so far as its efficiency is concerned, and taking away from the farmer the benefit that it was intended he should receive by reason of it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the gentleman if I understood him to say that the only thing lacking in order to stimulate the people of his State to more activity in road improvement is a contribution on the part of the Federal Government of over $1,000,000, which his State would get under this bill.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No, sir; if the gentleman understood me to say that, he understood wrong; but I do say, sir——

Mr. WALSH. I so understood the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do say that we are not a hermit State. We are willing to make our roads good, that the pleasure of the Bostonese may be made the greater in going from Boston to the city of Chicago. There is not a day when weather is passable but what there are passing, not only one, two, but dozens of them, through the center of the State of Indiana, automobiles from New York City, from Boston, and, strange as it may seem, there were untold thousands of this character of tourists who made the trip this year from Boston clear through to San Francisco. We are past the days when State lines bind citizenship. We are arriving at a time when local citizenship, by reason of the growth of our transportation system, is becoming national in character. [Applause.]

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do.

Mr. GORDON. Why not confine the contributions of the Federal Government to interstate roads, which would answer the very purpose the gentleman has described?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Every State road will become after a while an interstate road. [Applause.] Every State road is now an interstate road, for all these little feeders——

Mr. GORDON. There is a mistake there. This bill does specifically provide that this money is authorized to be used for local township roads leading to and from the county seat.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; it does not provide for anything other than——

Mr. GORDON. Let me read to you, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Let the gentleman take and study that while I progress, and then I will answer. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORDON. I have read the bill, and I will ask the gentleman what this provision in the bill means:

That the roads which may be constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act shall include earth, sand-clay, sand-gravel, and other common types of roads, as well as roads of higher classes, one of the purposes of this act being to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming communities.

Is not that a local system of roads, purely?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Its main purpose is to make these roads feeders for these larger roads, and there could not be a complete system of roads by simply a grand trunk line; there must be a system of roads to reach it to make it comprehensive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Can the gentleman yield me five minutes more?

Mr. DUNN. I yield the gentleman five minutes additional.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. All classes are interested in the question of transportation, interested in getting the thing desired from the place of its origin to the place of its consumption as expeditiously and as cheaply as possible.

Our great arteries of transportation are the railroads, rivers, lakes, and canals. The wagon roads are the veins and feeders. All are interested in having these veins and feeders so numerous and so well improved that the great arteries of trade may prove the greatest success possible to all the people. All classes, therefore, are interested in good roads.

It has been offered as an objection to this character of legislation that the rich automobilist is the one most interested in the construction of good roads, but I undertake to say that this gentleman has not as much real interest in the construction of roads as the workingman in the great commercial centers, who, perchance, never travels upon country highways at all. True, the tourist and the automobilist who go on pleasure bent are interested in good roads, and through their advocating the same much interest has been aroused throughout this country, and through this agitation much legislation in different States looking to the betterment of country highways has been enacted into law. But in the last analysis the real and lasting benefit derived from this character of improvement is not to the tourist. He is rather to be looked upon as a contributing member. He toils not, but he spends his money along the line over which he travels, which results in benefit to the butcher and the baker, and puts more money in circulation for the benefit of the community in general.

Every merchant is interested in good roads, for the reason that they increase his trade by putting him in closer and more immediate touch with the farmer.

The workingman who lives year in and year out within smoke-begrimed cities and factory districts and who does not use the public highways at all is interested in good roads, because every article that he consumes is affected more or less by the condition of the public highways throughout the country. The cost of living is influenced by the roads of the country, and to a greater degree than most people realize.

The railroads, rivers, lakes, and canals are all interested in good wagon roads, for they depend for their very existence upon these byways and highways of transportation.

Transportation begins at the place of original production and ends at the place of final consumption. So our great cities and great export centers are also interested in good roads and in their construction and maintenance.

The farmers of this country are vitally interested in road betterment, and anything that affects the farmer affects the citizen in every other walk of life. Farming is the greatest science in the world and has been practiced since the beginning of time, yet it seems there is the least known about it of any of the sciences. This fact is just beginning to dawn upon the farmer himself. The great agricultural schools, located in many of the States of the Union and assisted by the United States Government, through their scientific researches, are bringing home to the farmer the possibilities of the soil. They are teaching him how to revivify farm lands long since considered worthless, and to make these farms produce more than they did when they were first turned from virgin soil. They now fully realize that they can not constantly take away from soil productiveness and put nothing back to replenish, and expect a continuation of good crops. In consequence, through crop rotation and scientific fertilization, the soil is growing constantly more productive. Through the marvelous ingenuity of the inventor, farm life has been revolutionized in the last quarter of a century, and it is not now the drudgery it once was. Gasoline and electricity have been wonderful factors in farm improvement. They have revolutionized the work on the farm, until to-day we have in this country farms that are actually conducted without horses; and it will not be 10 years until the great farming interests of this country generally will be conducted from start to finish, from the planting of the seed to the harvesting of the grain and to the hauling of that grain to market, without the intervention of a horse. And with all these changes in the life of the farmer has come the desire for better roads, has come the knowledge of the necessity of better roads, has come the demand that must be met in their building and maintenance, if we are to secure from the farm the greatest good for the greatest number.

The farmer now realizes that it is necessary for him to keep books; that it is necessary for him to know the cost of production, to know the productive value of everything upon the farm, from the egg-laying value of the hen to the butter-fat producing capacity of the cow. He knows how and when to get rid of the drones. In arriving at these conclusions he must of necessity know the value of good roads for the accommodation of his farm.

One of the greatest items of expense to the farmer is that of transportation, and that expense is not alone to the farmer, it is to the consumer as well. It costs so much money to haul a ton of produce from the farm to the railroad station, and that sum of money results either in a loss to the farmer or else is contributed by the ultimate consumer. The time once was when this item was not reckoned by the farmer at all, but that time is past with the successful farmer. It may be of interest to know that it costs from 25 to 30 cents per ton per mile to handle the farm produce of this country from the farm to the railroad or wharf. Railroads handle the same produce on hauls of 30 miles and less at 2 cents per ton per mile, and where the haul is 150 miles or over it is made at a cost of one-half cent per ton per mile.

Great ado has been made about the freight rates charged by the railroads of the country and because of the effect of that charge upon the high cost of living. These railroad freight charges are practically nothing when compared with the wagon-road freight charge. And if the people will study this proposition of public-highway betterment from an economic standpoint as well as a purely selfish one, all will agree that money expended in highway improvement is a mutual benefit.

France has the greatest roads of any country in the world. She has 400,000 miles of macadam country road. She looks upon them as one of her greatest assets, as avenues of cheap transportation from factory and farm. In consequence of these splendid roads the product of the factory and farm in France is carried to market for less than one-third of what it costs to carry to market in this country.

It took centuries for France to build these good roads, and in getting them she went through all the primitive forms and trials that our country has and is going through in its endeavor to get good roads, and no doubt wasted as much money as we have wasted before they learned how best to build their roads and to get the greatest results from the money expended thereon. Originally France had no road system. Everybody made his own road. After a while a few neighbors organized a road district; after a while a few neighborhoods joined in a highway district; after a while turnpike acts were passed authorizing the creation of toll roads; and after long years came the agitation for national assistance, which was finally granted and national supervision exercised over the building of roads. All roads were built with reference to a system under scientific methods, and the result, the wonderful road system of France.

If this bill is enacted into law it will be the beginning of a Nation-wide system of good road building in the United States. Through it, and the additional legislation that will come from year to year as necessity demands it, road building will be reduced to a science.

Some of the older States are far behind some of the younger States in the roads that they have built. This law will awaken these old States from their lethargy and inspire within them a State pride to be up and doing in the matter of road building, that they may not longer be subjected to criticism by their neighboring States.

The State and the Nation should act together in making these improvements for they are of like interest to the State and the Nation, and every road built under this law will be a new bond binding closer the relation of State and Nation.

In these times of war and rumors of war the Nation should awaken to its interest in good roads everywhere throughout all the States, for there is nothing that facilitates the progress of an army as much as good roads and there is nothing that re-

tails it more than bad roads. The item of transportation is the greatest with which a nation has to do in time of war.

The era of good road building is at hand. It is being taught in the agricultural schools throughout many of the States. It is being taught in farmers' institutes all over the land. It is being advocated by commercial clubs in every city of any consequence. Good-road congresses are being held in every State. All of which affords convincing proof that the people throughout the country are in favor of this character of legislation, for they realize that the progress of a State or Nation is best evidenced by its good roads. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I was one of the comparatively small number in the Sixty-third Congress who voted against a similar proposal that was before the House about two years ago. I think there were only 42 at that time who were recorded in the negative. I am inclined to think there will be a considerably larger number when a vote is reached upon this measure. I am still opposed to the bill. I see no reason to alter my opinion as a result of the changes which have been made in the text of the measure. Nevertheless, I do not think it is wholly bad. There are some provisions in it which are worthy of the attention and the approval of the House. For instance, the requirement that the States themselves must contribute before they can share in the disposition of the Federal fund is a highly desirable thing. There would be less agitation to-day against river and harbor measures, less clamor that they are nothing but pork-barrel and logrolling legislation if every State had to back up its own projects by substantial contributions before it could receive a penny from the Federal Treasury. While the principle of contribution contained in the present bill is sound, the percentage which the State must contribute is much too small. Instead of the Government being pledged to put in from 30 to 50 per cent, as the measure requires, it should probably not be pledged to put in more than one-third or one-half that percentage—say, 10 to 25 per cent of the total cost of the road making.

In other words, the measure ought so to be designed as to stimulate to the greatest possible degree activity by the States themselves. If there were a larger percentage required of the States, it would have that effect and would extend the making of roads much faster than is likely to be the case under the present measure, because the same amount of Federal money would go so much farther.

Mr. BLACK. Does the gentleman mean to state that this bill provides that the Federal Government should pay from 50 to 70 per cent?

Mr. ROGERS. No; 30 to 50 per cent.

Mr. BLACK. That is right.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not think there is a great deal of force in the suggestion put forth by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] and concurred in the other day by my colleague [Mr. WALSH] that the passage of this measure would tend to have a paralyzing influence upon State activity in road making. I think it would have a stimulating rather than a benumbing influence; to my mind that objection is not sound.

My fundamental objections to this measure are three: The Federal Government should not embark upon this project at all; it certainly should not, in any event, be undertaken at this time of stress or unless we can afford it; the basis of distribution is illogical and unfair.

In the first place, this is not a proper activity for the Federal Government to undertake. Why? I can not answer any better or any more succinctly than the committee has done in its report recommending the passage of this bill. On page 4 of the report it says:

> Roads are local concerns, and primarily it is the duty of the States to provide them for their people.
>
> "Roads are local concerns." It is true that under the Constitution, stretched and strained, it may be within the power of Congress to enact a bill of this sort; but, after all, if we examine the question fairly and carefully, we must recognize that roads are local concerns and should be treated as such. I think there could not be a better illustration of that than the fact that in all of the years of this Government only one proposal for Federal construction of a road has been adopted by the Congress, and that was something like a century ago.
>
> "Roads are local concerns." Yet the administration of this bill will result in the creation of a horde of Federal road inspectors, prowling over the country to look at a corduroy road, and incidentally giving the more patronage to the party in power. It is one more and a long step toward bureaucracy and indefensible centralization.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Was the gentleman speaking of the Cumberland road?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Does not the gentleman know that all the public lands in the States through which that road passed were charged with the contribution of 5 per cent of all the proceeds of sales, for the express purpose of making that road?

Mr. ROGERS. There was a contributory scheme in that measure, just as there is in this. I do not think it is a precedent, however, for the passage of legislation like this. Here we have a measure involving a yearly expenditure by the United States of $25,000,000. Yet "roads are local concerns."

Whether roads are good things or bad things is not the question. If that were the issue before the House to-day, there would not be a man who would speak or who would vote in opposition to this measure. Everybody would be for it, for of course they are good things. But that is not the same as saying that it is desirable for this Federal Congress to aid them by the expenditure of a very large sum of money.

There is often a tendency in this House and in every other legislature to decide a matter involving expenditure as if the sole question were whether it was a desirable thing. Whether or not it is attractive seems to be the test, not whether we can afford the expenditure. We are all agreed that good roads are desirable. They tend to bring the city and country together. They tend to assist people in leaving the congested centers and going out through the countryside, and, indirectly, in thus reducing the high cost of living. Of course they are a good thing, but that is not saying that we should undertake them through the aid of Federal appropriations. That, it seems to me, is the real test of this measure, and that is primarily why I am opposed to it. Schools are a good thing. Shall we therefore take schools out of the hands of the State or the city and town and turn them over, together with one-third or one-half the expense of the school system throughout the country, to the Central Government?

A good deal has been said on the floor, and the same is clearly to be inferred from the committee report, to the effect that we are paying rental for these post roads. I quote again from the report of the committee. On page 4, it says:

> It would be less expensive and more expedient to use the roads of the States as post roads than it would to construct and maintain an independent system. In such case it would seem but just that the General Government should make some contribution to the construction and maintenance of the roads which it thus uses.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Would it be asking too much for the gentleman to read the paragraph from the beginning? It is very short.

Mr. ROGERS. I will read the rest of it if you wish.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. The part you want to read is in the beginning.

Mr. ROGERS. The part before that which I have read?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. It reads:

> To carry and deliver the mail is a function of the Federal Government, and it is its duty to provide itself with the facilities necessary to a proper performance of this function, such as postmasters, post offices, and post roads. A post road is just as truly a postal facility as is a post office. As in most rural communities, it has been found less expensive and more expedient to rent post offices than to build them, so it would be less expensive and more expedient to use the roads of the State as post roads than it would to construct and maintain an independent system.

The point I want to make is that this language is predicated upon a rental idea; the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], who has spoken this afternoon, very clearly and specifically put it upon that same ground. But look at the percentage that we are paying toward the cost of these roads under the guise of rent. In rural sections the carrier will, it is true, go over a country road once a day, or perhaps twice a day, for the delivery of his mail. But if from that circumstance, so

mightily useful to the local communities, flows an obligation to pay rent, it necessarily follows that every use, however trivial, of city or State or county instrumentalities by the Government should be likewise compensated for by something in the nature of rent. Take, for example, the delivery of mails in our cities. The city carriers go about the streets 5, or perhaps 10, times a day for the delivery of the mail. If it is true that we should pay on the basis of rent for country roads which are traversed perhaps once or twice a day by rural carriers, why does not it necessarily follow that we ought to pay much heavier rent for the use of the city streets and city sidewalks by city carriers? I see no escape from that conclusion.

But even if the rental idea is to be defended at all, can anybody seriously urge that from 30 to 50 per cent of the total cost of the roads ought to be borne by the Federal Government for its trifling uses of them? I think that question carries with it its own answer. Yet that is the only theory, under the Constitution, by which Congress gets jurisdiction and has power to enact this law.

It is natural, of course, that the measure should be popular. Any measure which involves a "grab" is always popular. We all know how difficult it is to secure any specific economy. Somebody wants an appropriation, and the rest of us are pretty prone to help him get it, because we may need his help later. I do not think it is fair to say in justification of this bill that it is desired by a large proportion of this House or perhaps by a large proportion of the States of the Union. Of course they want it. But it is our duty to consider that this $25,000,000 a year—a very large sum of money—is being called for at a time when the Nation is already being very heavily taxed, and at a time when we all know that vastly greater taxes are likely to be put upon the people in connection with the program for national defense. Assuming that this bill should have been passed years ago, or that it, perhaps, should be passed at some time in the future, I can see no more inopportune time than the present to bring it before this House and make it a part of the law of the land—at a time when we have so many critical conditions confronting us, and when we have such need of enormous revenues with which to carry out the necessary plans for the security of the Nation.

Of course that argument will not appeal to certain Members like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAILEY], who spoke yesterday, and perhaps not to the majority leader of the House [Mr. KITCHIN] and those who follow him in certain points of view which he entertains. But from the point of view of the vast majority of this House, who, I hope, are believers in large appropriations for national defense, I do not see how, either on the majority side or on the minority side, they can consistently and conscientiously advocate a measure of this sort.

Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, no one can oppose good roads. The primary questions are, in the first place, whether we can, at the present time, afford, as a Government, to expend $25,000,000 a year for good roads; and, in the second place, whether it is a proper activity for the Federal Government to undertake at all. There is also the consideration of whether or not this measure is equitable in its distribution of funds among the several States.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. ROGERS. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS. I will yield to the gentleman for a brief question.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman is talking about preparedness. Does he know of any way by which $25,000,000 could be used for preparedness to better advantage under the present circumstances and at the present time than by the building of good roads?

Mr. ROGERS. Oh, I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] made a complete answer to that inquiry in his questioning of the last speaker. The bill does not contemplate using this money exclusively, or at all, for military roads or even for interstate roads. That would be a different proposal. But here every lane and highway and byway of the Nation may be the recipient of Federal funds. The very first sentence in the bill says:

> That for the purposes of this act the term "rural post roads" shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is or might be carried.

Any little cow path is just as much entitled to this aid as the Lincoln Highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to discuss this question upon the basis of whether or not the apportionment among the States is as fair as it might be made. Members favoring the bill admit that it is purely arbitrary. I realize that it is a difficult matter to make the apportionment upon any accurate and scientific basis, and I think that very difficulty suggests one of the inherent objections to the bill itself. That phase of the question was very fully handled and very adequately analyzed by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and I do not care to go into it at this time. The proposed division is based upon a combination of three tests—ratio of population, ratio of post roads, and a fixed sum. But, after all, the population of the several States does not in itself constitute a proper basis for this division. Neither is the proportion of post routes in a State a fair basis of distribution; and the giving of a fixed sum outright to each State—Nevada and New York alike—of course has no possible defense. It was not even carried in the bill as introduced by the chairman of the committee in the last Congress.

I suppose if we were to have this apportionment made along logical lines the fairest method would be based upon the amount of mail carried in each State. That would entail consideration of the Federal use of the roads in the several States, and it seems to me would have a more direct bearing upon the proper division than any one of the three tests proposed in this bill.

This bill is not a desirable one for Massachusetts and similar States. Gentlemen favoring the bill have generally admitted that, but, very sincerely, no doubt, have asserted that Massachusetts thrives in other ways at the expense of her sister States, and that her sister States ought in this legislation to thrive at her expense. Of course, that is not a reason why we in Massachusetts like it, although it may be an excellent reason why we may have to see it passed. Massachusetts is a rich State, and we are proud to have it a rich State. I dare say it is fair for her to pay more than her share, but of the $25,000,000 that is to be raised yearly under this bill Massachusetts will contribute about 7 per cent of the total, according to the best estimate I can obtain, and the figures submitted by the committee show that in the aggregate she will get about 2.1 per cent in return. In other words, this bill costs Massachusetts about $1,250,000 a year. We are willing and expect to do more than our share, as we have always done, but we submit that the disproportion in this bill is out of all reason.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE].

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I have sat and listened with great interest to the able, eloquent, and erudite speeches made by the Members of this House on the important questions with which the Sixty-fourth Congress will have to deal in the next few months, and questions which are so vital to the people of this country; but, gentlemen, I do not think Congress will have a question as important and one that affects so much the happiness, prosperity, and welfare of as many of the American people as this bill now pending for your consideration.

This bill is a cooperative measure and authorizes an annual appropriation of not exceeding $25,000,000 from the Federal Government to all States, contingent upon the various States expending a like amount, and then apportions the $25,000,000 among the States in the following manner: Sixty-five thousand dollars to each State and one half of the remainder in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the population of all the States as shown by the latest Federal census, and the other half of such remainder in the ratio which the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes in such State bears to the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes of all States, as shown by the latest available report of the Postmaster General.

The building of good roads in this country is wholly an internal improvement, and the main purpose for constructing them is to make thoroughfares over which to transport the products and the people of the country. Improving the rivers and making them navigable is for the same purpose, but let us see how public roads have been discriminated against by the Federal Government in the appropriation of its money. I am not criticizing reasonable appropriations for rivers and harbors, but merely want to draw the contrast.

There are only 26,000 miles of navigable rivers in the Republic susceptible to improvement, while there are 2,228,042 miles of road, and yet the Federal Government has appropriated since it was organized $475,211,250 on rivers alone, exclusive of harbors and canals, and it has not appropriated scarcely anything for good roads. Is this just or fair to the people?

It costs the American farmer more for hauling his products from his farm on unimproved roads to the depot or river landing

than from the depot or river landing to the market. His haulage on unimproved roads in the United States per ton per mile costs him on the products named below as follows: Corn, 19 cents; wheat, 19 cents; tobacco, 20 cents; cotton, 27 cents; hay, 19 cents; and potatoes, 19 cents. It costs him on an average of 23 cents per ton per mile on all the products he raises to haul them, and it costs the farmers of Europe with improved roads only as follows: France, 10 cents; England and Wales, 10 cents; Belgium, 9½ cents; and Germany, 8½ cents. The American farmer pays from 40 per cent to 95 per cent more for hauling his products from the farm to the railway station or river landing than the farmers of Europe. A ton of freight can be carried by steamer on the Great Lakes 1,000 miles for $1.25; it can be carried by railroad 250 miles; it can be carried by electric conveyances 25 miles; and on an unimproved public road it can be carried only 3 miles for that price.

There are 878,798,000 acres of farm land in the United States worth $28,475,674,000. The average per cent increase in the value of farms contiguous or in close proximity to good roads is from 75 per cent to 100 per cent. But let us be very conservative and say the average per cent increase is only 25 per cent. Now, if we had good roads all over this country, then instead of farm land being worth $28,475,674,000 it would be worth 25 per cent more, or $35,594,592,500, an increase in the market value of $7,118,918,500. Would this not be a good investment for the Government?

Let us take an item of the Government business. There are now 1,073,099 miles of rural free-delivery routes and 147,480 miles of star mail routes in this country, a total of 1,220,579 miles of both. The cost of service of rural free delivery in 1915 was $49,825,000, and the cost of the star route service for 1915 was $8,675,000, a total cost of $58,500,000. Everyone knows if all these rural and star routes were over good roads the year around the services could be maintained with the same efficiency for half that amount. If this is true, the Federal Government would save annually the sum of $29,250,000 on these miles of rural and star routes, and besides the rural and star route carriers, whose consistent friend I am, would have good roads the year around over which to transact the Government's business. Is this not a saving of sufficient magnitude to appeal to the American people?

If this bill becomes a law, it would mean at least $75,000,000 would be spent on the roads of this country every year, because every State in the Union, with the exception of Florida, Indiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas, have State aid road laws to the counties, and every State has a highway commission, except Indiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Texas. Take as an example my State, Kentucky; in 1914 the State legislature passed a State aid law for the building of good roads by levying a 5-cent road tax, and segregated this tax together with the license tax on automobiles to the road fund. This fund amounted to about $700,000 the first year. The act further provides that this money is available to the counties of the State for road purposes when the counties would expend a like sum. As a result, the first year after the law went into effect 104 out of the 120 counties of the State took advantage of the law, and as a result there were built last year over 400 miles of good rock road. [Applause.] The Committee on Roads estimates that Kentucky's proportion under this bill will be $580,274. This amount being available, it means that the State of Kentucky will expend this much, and the counties in the State will expend this amount, consequently three times the amount of $580,274 will be spent on good roads in Kentucky each year, and the same rule will apply with every other State whose law is like or similar to that of Kentucky. This law will not only aid and improve the rural communities of this country, but the cities and towns as well. Good roads will make the cities and towns more accessible, consequently more people will visit them, the same people will go more often, and by so doing will spend more money with the business enterprises of the cities and towns, and the natural result will be the market value of town and city property will increase, as well as the business of them.

There is a great talk of ample preparedness in this country. If we should be thrown into war with some foreign foe, and God forbid that we ever will, what would better prepare us for a successful combat with this enemy than to have good roads over which to transport our artillery, our armies, and our commissaries? There is nothing, in my judgment, that would prepare us better if war should ever come than to have splendid roads throughout this country.

I think it is high time the Federal Government was enacting some wholesome legislation that will be of direct benefit to the American farmer. The appropriations to the Agricultural Department of the Government, the establishment of rural and star mail routes, and the induction of the parcel post have been about all the direct legislation that the Federal Government has enacted for the American farmer in many years. Why should we not legislate in the interest of the farmer? He owns $69,467,124,000 of the wealth of this country, and pays more county, State, and Federal taxes in proportion to his worth than any other class of citizens of this Republic. The prosperity of the whole country depends upon the farmer. When he is prosperous, every other business thrives, and when he fails, bankruptcy inevitably follows. He is a wealth producer of this country, and not a parasite on its body politic. The American farmer added $9,872,936,000 to the wealth of this country in 1914; give him good roads and he will add more. The last census shows that 49,348,833 people live in the rural portions of this country, one-half of its population. If good roads only benefited these, would not it be a good investment?

What is the main objection offered against this bill? It is the one urged by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. He opposes it because he thinks some States per chance would pay a little more of the pro rata of the appropriation authorized by this bill than they should, and in return would not receive quite as much of the apportionment as is due them. Is this the circumscribed view that shall be taken on national legislation coming before this Congress? For over a hundred years the rural communities have been furnishing New England the raw material which has fed her spindles of industry and made them hum the tune of prosperity to her people. We were glad to be able to do this. We rejoice with you upon the progress and advancement you have made, and congratulat you on the grandeur of your achievements. We are all proud of the great cities of the East, because they are in America, and thanks to an all-wise Providence, the same flag that is kissed by the sea breezes as it floats over smoky New York and Boston is caressed by the gentle zephyrs of summer in Kentucky and other rural States of this Republic. I now want to extend an invitation to my good friend from Boston [Mr. WALSH] to come and visit old Kentucky. I want him one time to breathe the pure air of the country; to look one time at Heaven's cloudless dome; to gaze with delight one time at the brilliancy of the stars in a smokeless sky; to meet and mingle with her brave, loyal, and hospitable people, in a State where chivalry and hospitality are prerequisites to a successful career, where gallantry is the yardstick with which all men are measured and judged, and where pure womanhood is always respected and defended. When the gentleman shall have done this and returned to the "Hub of the Universe," I am satisfied that his views on national legislation will be broadened and his provincial viewpoint will be greatly magnified. [Prolonged applause.]

But above all benefits that will accrue to this country in dollars and cents, as I have tried to show, yet, in my judgment, there is a better and more lofty reason why we should have good roads in this country—the social benefit that will be derived. I was born and reared on the farm, a farm by which ran unimproved roads, and I know the disadvantages and hardships which surround it. However, I am glad of my early environment, as it brings experiences to a boy that will benefit him in after life that he can get nowhere else.

Let us have good roads so the bright-eyed boys and girls of the country, on whose shoulders soon will rest the perpetuity of this great Republic, can attend the country schools and prepare themselves for this great task without getting into the mud and mire. Give us good roads so the splendid farmer and his family can attend the country church and enjoy that great prerogative, which was bought by the patriotic blood of our forefathers, to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience, and to do so out of the mud and mire.

Good roads would prevent the high cost of living to a great extent. We hear so much these days the slogan, "Back to the farm." When a stalwart young man leaves the farm and goes to the city or town the power of production is impaired that much and the consuming class is increased in that proportion; hence the high cost of living. What could be a greater inducement for the farmer boy to return from the city back to the farm than for him to know that the farm is now accessible by good roads? What could add more to the happiness and comfort of the farmer than good roads? If we had good roads, that boy would go back to the farm. When he grew tired of hearing the whir of the spindles of industry of the great cities and when he grew weary of the congestion of people in the crowded marts of trade he would go back to the farm. He would stop, think of and contemplate the happy association of bygone years spent on the farm, and he would go back. He

would cherish the happy recollections of the long ago in the sentiment of the poet, when he said:

Long, long be my heart with such memories filled,
Like the vase in which roses have long been distilled;
You may break, you may shatter the vase if you will,
But the scent of the roses will hang 'round it still.

On behalf of over 12,000,000 industrious farmers of the country, I appeal to you to support this bill. I believe you will, and when this bill shall become a law of this great Republic over 49,000,000 of people around their family firesides in the rural portions of this great country will pronounce heaven's choicest benediction upon every Member of this House who gave his support to this important measure. [Loud and continuous applause.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I am amazed that a committee of this House, a committee presumably controlled by friends of the administration of President Wilson, should bring in a bill of this character at this time. If there were no shadow of menace upon our prosperity and no serious foreign complications that threaten the maintenance of peace with foreign nations, and if at the same time there were an abundant surplus in the Treasury, there might be some excuse for such a bill. But none of these conditions are present. Our continued prosperity and the maintenance of peace are threatened, and the country is already burdened with extraordinary direct taxation of such a nature as to cause much criticism and complaint.

Nor is this all. The President in his address to the Members of the two Houses of the Congress on December 7 told us that the most important matter before the country to-day, the matter that lay at the very front of his whole thought as he addressed us, is the matter of national defense. He outlined a program, and then he added in words that ought to be burned into the minds of every patriotic American citizen:

At least so much by way of preparation for defense seems to me to be absolutely imperative now. We can not do less.

We can not do less, Mr. Chairman; we can not do less and continue to dwell in safety, and the President clearly implies that we ought to do more. The program of military and naval expenditures which the President outlined as the least we could do, the program that he regards and that every patriotic American citizen who has given the subject any serious study regards as the least we can do, as "absolutely imperative now," calls for an additional expenditure of almost $100,000,000, the estimate given being $93,800,000.

This will involve still more extraordinary taxation, direct taxation; yet gentlemen claiming to be friends of President Wilson and supporters of his administration bring into this House, and have the temerity to advocate a bill of this kind, a bill to distribute $25,000,000 from the Federal Treasury among the States, $25,000,000 that is not in the Treasury, and can not be got there unless by still more and higher extraordinary direct taxation.

I am amazed, as I have said, Mr. Chairman, that any committee controlled by Democrats should bring in such a bill at this time. The fact that it is now before us and that its passage has been strongly advocated by Democrats on the floor of this House points directly to one of two conclusions—either the Democrats who advocate it are not friends of President Wilson and are seeking to do everything they can to embarrass and retard the program that he regards as of the highest importance, or else they are utterly reckless and willing to place their petty, personal district interests above the interest of the country. There are Republicans, Mr. Chairman, who will vote for this bill on the theory that theirs is not the responsibility for the taxation that must follow. In accordance with the political ethics of the day, they have no hesitation in voting to embarrass an administration controlled by the Democratic Party. The country will probably have no high regard for their patriotism, but their districts may forgive them if some of the pork finds its way into local barrels. But what shall be said of Democrats who pursue such a policy? Will they not be regarded as traitors? Will the bribe of a few paltry dollars for their districts procure them forgiveness?

Mr. Chairman, this distribution of money which we have not got masquerades as a good roads bill. As a good roads bill it is a humbug. It does not distribute enough money in proportion to the mileage of roads in the country to scrape the mud off the roads once a year. There are some 2,000,000 miles of highways in this great country, for the alleged "improvement" of which this $25,000,000 might be used—a little more than $12 a mile. Why, Mr. Chairman, really good roads, according to present standards, cost a thousand times as much as that, and even bad roads cost a hundred times as much.

There are 1,204,262 miles of roads, according to the report of the committee, over which rural-delivery carriers or star-route carriers travel in the Postal Service. If the distribution of this money were confined to these roads, which the bill does not require, it makes only $20 a mile—a sum not worth considering. But gentlemen who advocate this bill will say the money is not to be distributed on each mile of road. It might be so used under the terms of the bill, but suppose it is all used in new construction. In that case all the money allotted to more than half of the States might well be used in one county of those States. As a sop to the small States the $65,000 minimum has been put in, but even with that sop only 17 States receive more than $500,000. One county in Michigan bonded itself for $600,000 not long ago for improved roads, and I have no doubt that the same thing has been done in many other States. In my own State we have spent four times this whole $25,000,000 in the past four or five years on our roads, and the amount allotted to New York will not match our maintenance charges alone. In short, in whatever way this money is spent, it is not enough to make a showing. If you want the Federal Government to do something for the roads of the country that the people can see, you must at least multiply this annual authorization in this bill by 10 and make it $250,000,000 instead of $25,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, the report of this Committee on Roads accompanying this bill says that "a post road is just as truly a postal facility as a post office," and goes on to say that "it would seem but just that the General Government should make some contribution to the construction and maintenance of the roads which it thus uses"; that is, for rural routes. Pure humbug! In whose interest are the rural delivery routes maintained; in the interest of the General Government, considered as a business corporation, or in the interest of the people who receive mail on the routes? Does the General Government make money out of the rural routes, or does it, on the contrary, lose money and maintain the routes for other than reasons of profit? Everybody knows that there is a tremendous loss in the Rural Delivery Service which is maintained, and rightly so, to give our farmers and dwellers in the open country that daily touch with the cities and the world which they ought to have. Every rural community gladly maintains its rural delivery roads at such a standard as the Post Office Department sees fit to set as a condition precedent to the establishment and maintenance of the routes, and if the department desires better roads it has only to raise the standard. Hence there is not only no necessity for any such distribution of money as this for the purpose of facilitating the distribution of the mail, but no sense in it whatever.

The bill is properly characterized as a "pork-barrel" bill. It it just that and nothing else. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committe do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RUCKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7617, and had come to no resolution thereon.

PARCEL POST.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the parcel post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—SANFORD TIMMONS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. ASHBROOK to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Sanford Timmons, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR VARDAMAN.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein an address made by Senator VARDAMAN to the people of the State of Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River; and

H. R. 4716. An act to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 22, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury submitting a change in estimate of appropriation for salaries, office of Assistant Treasurer at New York, as printed on pages 58 and 59 of the annual Book of Estimates for the fiscal year 1917 (H. Doc. No. 611), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. LEVER, from the Committee on Agriculture, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9419) to appropriate money to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to license and inspect warehouses, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 60), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEWALT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 515) providing for the purchase or construction of cutters for the Coast Guard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 64), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAYBURN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7613) to authorize the Terral Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Red River near Terral, Jefferson County, Okla., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 61), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8233) granting the consent of Congress to the Republic Iron & Steel Co. to construct a bridge across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 62), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6854) permitting the Wolf Point Bridge & Development Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River, in the State of Montana, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 63), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8068) for the relief of E. C. Hornor; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 9450) granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Allen; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7132) granting an increase of pension to William W. Tinch; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7123) granting a pension to Joel Dyer; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8985) to correct the military record of Robert M. Adams, deceased; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 8567) granting an increase of pension to Edward H. Brown; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9658) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Saginaw, Swan Creek, and Black River Band of Chippewa Indians in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9659) providing for the purchase of lands for an aviation school; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 9660) for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: A bill (H. R. 9661) to reimburse the State of Illinois for money expended by the State of Illinois for payment for stock destroyed under direction of the United States and the State of Illinois to check the spread of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 9662) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Elk City, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9663) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Clinton, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9664) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Mangum, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 9665) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Hawkinsville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 9666) to authorize the Catawissa Railroad Co., its lessees, successors, and assigns, to construct a railroad bridge across the west branch of the Susquehanna River from the borough of Milton, Northumberland County, Pa., to the borough of West Milton, Union County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9667) to authorize the Shamokin, Sunbury & Lewisburg Railroad Co., its lessees, successors, and assigns, to construct a railroad bridge across the Susquehanna River from the borough of Sunbury, Northumberland County, Pa., to Monroe Township, Snyder County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 9668) to create a department of the Public Health Service for the prevention and propagation of tuberculosis in the prisons of the United States, both Federal and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 9669) to authorize the Washington & Maryland Railway Co., successor to the Baltimore & Washington Transit Co., of Maryland, to operate its lines within the District of Columbia by using an electrical circuit, which may be completed through the earth; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9670) to authorize the Washington & Maryland Railway Co. to use for its tracks, without any payment to the Treasurer of the United States on account thereof, the subway on Cedar Street under the tracks of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 9671) to protect the public against dishonest advertising and false pretenses in merchandising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 9672) for the purpose of expending the unexpended balances and surplus postal revenues on rural post roads; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 9673) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Osage Nation of Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 9674) to prevent the sale or transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of articles of food held in cold storage for more than the time herein specified, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9675) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain lands to be used as a sanitarium by the Loyal Order of Moose; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9676) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain lands to be used as a sanitarium by the Order of Owls; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 9677) prohibiting the issuance of permits, licenses, or receipts for special tax authorizing the sale of intoxicating liquors in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 9678) to exempt from compulsory pilotage the barges while in tow of steam vessels navigated by Government pilots; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9679) making an appropriation for a series of investigations and experiments for the purpose of devising a system of frost prevention in the fruit-growing sections of the Rocky Mountain region of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9680) to provide for the surveying of the unsurveyed lands in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9681) to advance funds for the construction of the Silverton-Durango public highway within the San Juan National Forest in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9682) granting to the State of Colorado 1,000,000 acres of public land within the State for expenses incurred in suppressing Indian disturbances from 1865 to 1888, including the Ute War of 1887; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9683) authorizing and directing the Director of the Geological Survey to cause to be made a complete topographic and hydrographic survey of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9684) conveying Trappers Lake to the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9685) concerning the mineral springs of Colorado; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9686) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to more effectually suppress and prevent the spread of diseases of potatoes known as black scab and wart disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9687) making an appropriation to prevent blight and to exterminate pests destructive of the potato and alfalfa; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9688) providing for the expenditure of 25 per cent of the receipts from the national forests on road and trail construction; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9689) requiring pensions to be paid monthly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9690) granting pensions to the survivors of certain Indian wars from the year 1865 to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9691) authorizing leave of absence to homestead settlers upon unsurveyed lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9692) to provide for a homestead entry on water-power sites; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9693) providing for camping grounds along public highways through forest reserves and other public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9694) defining procedure in case of protested or objected final proof on public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9695) to increase the compensation of rural letter carriers and granting them 30 days' leave per annum; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9696) for the benefit of railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9697) to prevent the desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9698) to declare Lincoln's birthday a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9699) authorizing and validating certain exchanges of land between the United States and the several States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9700) to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called "Columbus Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9701) to make "The Star-Spangled Banner" the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 9702) authorizing the construction, equipment, and operation of a research and experiment laboratory, to be located at a point to be selected by the Secretary of the Navy on the east or west shore of Narragansett Bay, R. I.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 9703) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 9704) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Flushing, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9705) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Far Rockaway, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9706) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Jamaica, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9707) to increase the limit of cost of a Federal building at Long Island City, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9708) for the restoration, under certain conditions, of lands included in power-site withdrawals; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 9709) providing for the appointment of a board of survey for the purpose of selecting a suitable site for a naval armor plant at or near Paducah, Ky., and submitting an estimate of the cost thereof; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9710) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Cumberland River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9711) making an appropriation for rebuilding, improving, and strengthening the levee on the Mississippi River at Columbus, Ky.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 9712) providing for the issuing of patents; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 11) authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 114) to create a commission which shall determine the advisability of establishing a "summer capital" of the United States and the location and cost of the same; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring the passage of House bill 6798, authorizing the distribution of the proceeds of the sale of timber from public lands to the State in which the timber is cut; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 9713) granting a pension to William A. Sims; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9714) granting an increase of pension to Benton Merrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 9715) granting a pension to Nettie L. Saunders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9716) granting a pension to Mark Curtsinger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9717) for the relief of the estate of William J. Sailing, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 9718) granting an increase of pension to Caroline A. Starbuck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 9719) granting an increase of pension to Harry M. Batty; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9720) granting an increase of pension to Maria J. G. Hammack; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9721) granting a pension to Jesse Trower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 9722) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Weller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9723) granting a pension to Alpheus R. Bascom; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 9724) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Hutchison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9725) for the relief of Thomas Riley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9726) granting a pension to Alice A. Parrait Garner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9727) granting a pension to Charles Augustus Cline; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 9728) granting a pension to Robert P. Ausbrooks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 9729) granting a pension to Chester A. Morang; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 9730) granting a pension to Anna McD. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 9731) granting an increase of pension to Eugene B. Guild; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 9732) for the relief of William Schafer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 9733) granting an increase of pension to John A. Boggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9734) granting an increase of pension to Hannah J. Stahl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 9735) granting a pension to W. J. Tanner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 9736) granting a pension to F. M. Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9737) for the relief of John A. Bingham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 9738) granting an increase of pension to Edward Walsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9739) granting an increase of pension to Martha Tibbitts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 9740) granting an increase of pension to James West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9741) granting an increase of pension to William A. Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9742) granting an increase of pension to Charles Van Ostrand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9743) granting a pension to Phoebe J. Lincoln; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9744) granting a pension to Etta E. Vinn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEATON: A bill (H. R. 9745) granting a pension to Sabina O'Donnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 9746) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Anastacio C. de Baca, administrator of Francisco C. de Baca, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9747) for the relief of the estate of Francisco Montoya; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9748) granting a pension to Bernard Higgins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9749) for the relief of the New Mexico Insane Asylum, of Las Vegas, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 9750) granting an increase of pension to Rhuamah Vincent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9751) granting an increase of pension to George D. Seelye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9752) granting an increase of pension to Laura B. Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9753) granting a pension to John P. Burrow, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 9754) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Harvey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9755) waiving age limit in appointment as chaplain in the Army in the case of Isaac Edwin Munger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9756) for the relief of Mary Ellen Thompson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9757) granting a pension to Mary E. Dawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9758) granting a pension to John W. Munsell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9759) granting a pension to William C. Winslow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9760) for the relief of James T. Petty, Charles W. Church, and others, executors of Charles B. Church, deceased; Jesse B. Wilson, and George T. Dearing; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 9761) for the relief of the legal representatives of Owen Thorne, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 9762) granting a pension to Jonah E. Hill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 9763) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Herbst; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 9764) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9765) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9766) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 9767) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Hagerstown & Middleburg Turnpike Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 9768) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9769) for the relief of Harold Holst; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 9770) granting a pension to Samuel E. Simerly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9771) granting an increase of pension to W. B. C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9772) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Kitts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9773) granting an increase of pension to John Carey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9774) granting an increase of pension to John N. Bayles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 9775) for the relief of Davis & Lawrence Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9776) granting a pension to Katharine Wilkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9777) granting a pension to Johanna Burke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9778) granting a pension to James L. McPherson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 9779) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Shultis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 9780) granting an increase of pension to William H. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9781) granting a pension to Sylvania Engle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9782) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Maddox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 9783) for the relief of the heir of Josephus Wallace; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9784) for the relief of the heirs of Amos R. Harrell and John Brady, jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9785) for the relief of the heirs of John O'Kelley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9786) for the relief of the heirs of H. L. Harvey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 9787) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9788) granting an increase of pension to Dunois M. Beman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 9789) granting a pension to Frank E. Saxon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 9790) for the relief of Dr. J. W. Stokes; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9791) granting a pension to Louisa Way; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9792) granting a pension to Serelda Pargin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 9793) granting a pension to Louis Winbray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 9794) granting a pension to Clara S. Ickis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 9795) granting a pension to Hannah J. Seccombe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9796) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Slater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9797) granting an increase of pension to Attison W. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9798) granting a pension to Anna E. Pagett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9799) granting an increase of pension to Charles van Auker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 8508, for relief of Hannah Sawyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9441, for relief of Dorcas A. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: Petitions of Rev. Clayton B. Wells and other citizens of Wichita, Kans., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of citizens of McPherson, bankers and other citizens of Canton, bankers and others of Wichita, bankers and others of Newton, all in the State of Kansas, protesting against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petitions of Howland Croft, Sons & Co. and William G. McGuire, of Camden, N. J., favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petitions of sundry tradespeople of Pennsylvania, favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of monthly meeting of Friends at Ercildown and Lansdown, Pa., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petition of citizens of St. Paul, Kans., protesting against any amendment requiring revenue stamps to be placed on individual bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of citizens of Hepler, Kans., protesting against any amendment to the internal-revenue law as applied to affixing revenue stamps to individual bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Columbus, Miss., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of Fownes Bros., Amsterdam, N. Y., relative to increase in price of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring an embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRISP: Petitions of business men of the third congressional district of Georgia, favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEWALT: Petitions of Schuylkill Silk Mills and Wernersville (Pa.) Hosiery Mill, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DILLON: Memorial of Commercial Club of Huron, relative to congestion of freight at ocean docks; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Madison (S. Dak.) Merchants' Association, protesting against amendment to the Parcel Post System to do away with the zone system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of A. D. Varian, in favor of House bill 476, workingman's compensation bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of George H. Fortson Camp, No. 2, of Seattle, Wash.; Jack Foster Camp, No. 3, United Spanish War Veterans, of Hot Springs, S. Dak.; and Foreign Service Camp, No. 26, of Newark, N. J., in favor of granting pensions to widows and orphans of men who served in the Spanish-American War, Philippine insurrection, and the China expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Chagres Camp, No. 1, United Spanish War Veterans, Canal Zone; Bennington Camp, No. 20, United Spanish War Veterans, San Diego, Cal.; Major W. M. A. Kirk Camp, No. 12, United Spanish War Veterans, Sioux City, Iowa, in favor of granting pensions to widows and orphans of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of General Henry W. Lawton Camp, No. 4, United Spanish War Veterans, of Washington, D. C., favoring the granting of pensions to widows and orphans of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of William McKinley Camp, No. 33, of West Hoboken, N. J., favoring granting of pensions to widows and orphans of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Guy V. Henry Camp, No. 3, United Spanish War Veterans, of Grand Rapids, Mich., favoring granting pensions to widows and orphans of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Ben E. Rolph Camp, No. 22, of Coldwater, Mich., in favor of granting pensions to the widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of General Joe Wheeler Camp, No. 2, of Tampa, Fla., favoring granting pensions to widows and orphans of veterans of Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of Walter L. Hake and 30 others of Curtiss, and Fred L. Strauss and 12 others of La Crosse, all in the State of Wisconsin, favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of Woman's Party of Cook County, Ill., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany House bill 8543, for the relief of Abraham Boudn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petitions of merchants of Lostant, Ill., favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of American Association for Labor Legislation, favoring House bill 476, employee's compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rockford (Ill.) Mitten & Hosiery Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of Archibald I. Levy, of New York; Edwin Boess, of South Norwalk; Dunlap & Co., of New York; Penn Knitting Co., of Philadelphia, Pa.; J. D. Stowe & Sons, of Scitico, Conn.; W. D. Ball and E. L. Cooper, of Carthage; Alberta Knitting Mills, of Germantown, Philadelphia; Brontz Textile Mills, of Brontz, N. Y.; St. George Pulp & Paper Co., of Norwalk, Conn.; and Saugatuck (Conn.) Manufacturing Co., favoring tariff on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IGOE: Petitions of Lieut. Edward J. Ruf, Lieut. George A. Bilsbarrow, Capt. E. J. McMahon, and other officers and men of the National Guard of Missouri, favoring passage of the militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Harrison Bros., of Woonsocket, R. I., favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Papers to accompany bill for pension for Robert A. Herbst; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Woman's Party of Cook County, Ill., relative to peace; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKENZIE: Memorial of Hanover (Ill.) Woolen Manufacturing Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Henry J. Hiller, John Hess, George A. Kokat, and others, of Philadelphia, favoring bill to prohibit shipment of munitions to Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Ontario Spinning Co., Arrott Steam Power Mills Co., Franklin Hosiery Co., and Bender, Rochie & Ward, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OAKEY: Petition of C. H. Dexter & Sons, of Windsor Locks, Conn., and Cheney Bros., of South Manchester, Conn., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Windsor Locks Chamber of Commerce, favoring the improvement of the Connecticut River between Hartford and Holyoke and making it navigable between said cities; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of the De Witt-Boag Co., B. C. De Witt, president, of Hornell, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 702, entitled "A bill to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. C. Murdock, of Ithaca, N. Y., favoring the passage of the prohibition amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWE: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of State of New York, favoring retention of duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of department of education, borough of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of Women of '76 Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring permanent nonpartisan tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of Daniel Lee Jamison, of Albany, N. Y., favoring bill for censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of tradespeople of Troy, N. Y., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Papers to accompany House bill 5592, for pension for Sarah H. Benedict; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of William J. Emery and other citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., favoring pensions for widows of Spanish-War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of G. L. Calkins, of Battle Creek, Mich., favoring Federal censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7975, in pension case of Jonathan D. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions of Supreme Underwear Co., Climax Underwear Co., and Ritesize Underwear Co., of Utica, N. Y., for tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of Moving Picture and Projecting Machine Operators' Local Union No. 150, protesting against tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of Easton, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Lutheran Church of the Atonement, Easton, Pa., favoring Federal motion-picture commission; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. STINESS: Petitions of Rhode Island Processing Co., of Coventry, and Waurego Co. and Quinebaug Co., of Providence, R. I., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of L. I. Slocum, Lucy A. Slocum, H. L. Clark, R. E. Ayers, J. W. Smith, Eva Irene Smith, H. C. Bunker, and Mrs. Bunker, members of Dover local, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, Dover, Weld County, Colo., opposing increase of national armaments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: Petitions of Contoocook Mills Co., of Hillsboro; Granite State Mills, of Guild; Ashland Knitting Co., of Ashland; C. J. Amidon & Son, of Hinsdale; Hillsboro Mills Co., of Hillsboro; Henry Paper Co. and J. E. Henry & Sons Paper Co., of Lincoln, all in the State of New Hampshire, favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petitions of business men and others of Worcester County, Mass., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Millbury, Mass., favoring restoration of rural free delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *January 22, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, our Father in heaven, that through the terrible conflict now raging in half the world the good in man is pouring itself out to alleviate the sorrow and suffering of war's desolation. And we most earnestly pray that the good may reach the ascendancy in every heart; that wars may cease and man learn anew the lesson that where hate abounds strife, contentions, and wars abound, but where love abounds peace, joy, and harmony abounds; that the religion of brotherly love may have its sway and make the Old World blossom as the rose, and glory and honor and praise to Thee swell the mighty chorus round the world, "Peace on earth, good will toward men," forever and ever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent Mr. TILLMAN was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Charles W. Reeves, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, upon the request of Mr. WILSON of Louisiana, Mr. H. GARLAND DUPRÉ was granted leave of absence for 10 days, on account of important business.

RURAL POST ROADS.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7617.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, with Mr. BORLAND in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON].

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, Government aid to the States in the construction of roads has been a subject of controversy ever since the thirteen original States formed the Union. For 30 or 40 years after this Government was established it engaged in road building. Something like $14,000,000 was expended on the Cumberland Road, and the work on this highway did not cease until after, or about, the beginning of the era of railroads.

For the past 80 years nothing of any importance has been done in that line by the General Government except the creation in the Department of Agriculture of the Office of Public Roads. This bureau, it affords me pleasure to testify, incidentally, has not only given very valuable object lessons in the construction of experimental roads, showing the best materials for different kinds of roads and the best methods of using them, but has materially aided the several States in their work of road building.

In the great scheme of Government aid to public-road construction, however, this is but a drop in the bucket. The States spent $249,055,067 in road construction in the year 1914, and each year the amount increases. Meanwhile Congress has done nothing but talk about the matter. Bills enough have been introduced—some good, some bad, some indifferent—but none reached the point of enactment. Action, definite, conclusive action, has been too long delayed. It is high time something was done.

The State of Alabama, which I have the honor in part to represent, has made great progress in road construction within the last few years. The constitution of that State was amended by a vote of the people in the year 1901 so as to authorize the legislature to appropriate the net proceeds of the State convict department to aid in road building. Five years ago the legislature created a State highway commission and made an appropriation of $2,000 per annum to each county out of the funds of the State convict department to aid in road building. I had the honor to be the author of this legislation. Up to that time but little interest had been taken in substantial road improvement in many of the rural counties in Alabama. Under the provisions of that law the county was required to put up an equal amount to that appropriated by the State. While these amounts were small and only a few miles of model highway could be built in each county, it was enough to demonstrate to the people the advantages of good roads and aided in the creation of a better sentiment for good roads. There were only 3,780 miles of improved roads in Alabama when this State highway commission was created on the 1st of April, 1911, and four years later there were 7,195 miles of improved roads in the State, an increase of more than 90 per cent. This was chiefly the result of the small amount of State aid. Alabama is taking the lead among the Southern States in road building. [Applause.]

If such a small amount of State aid accomplished this much, a larger amount of national aid, as provided by the bill under consideration, would accomplish much more. This refutes the argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that national aid would impair interest on the part of the States in road building. National aid will strengthen sentiment and interest for better roads in the States.

Several bills providing for national aid to roads have been introduced at this session. The one under consideration was introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Roads, and reported by that committee, of which I am a member. Some features of the bill I do not like. The old Members of the House who have been working for years for national aid to roads, a number of whom are members of the Committee on Roads, favor this bill and say that it is the best one that has ever been before Congress, and the only one that can pass both Houses of Congress

at this time. I intend to vote for it even if it does not suit me in every respect, and when this bill is put on its passage I believe that every Member who favors national aid will vote for it and that it will pass the House by an overwhelming majority. It can be easily amended hereafter by Congress. But very few new laws are perfect. When Congress once adopts the policy of Federal aid to roads a good system will soon follow.

If the Department of Agriculture, as the representative of the National Government, and the State highway commissioners, as the representatives of the State, do their duty, and we must presume they will, every public road in every vicinity will receive its pro rata part of the money appropriated by Congress under the provisions of this measure.

This bill is, of course, only an authorization measure, which is the only kind the Roads Committee has jurisdiction to report. But as everyone knows the appropriation provided for in it will be reported by the Appropriation Committee and made by Congress if this bill is passed. The allotment to Alabama under the provisions of this bill amounts to $578,750 per annum.

The idea has been expressed in various forms that a people's progress and civilization can be measured by the degree of attention it gives to the building and maintenance of public highways. If this were a truism and applied to the United States we would certainly rate low in the scale of civilization, for, taken as a whole, the condition of our public roads is pitiful, indeed. According to the latest bulletin issued by the Office of Public Roads, the total of all public roads in the United States is 2,273,131 miles, and of those only 247,490 miles, or 10.9 per cent, are surfaced. All the rest are old mud roads. Rather a disgraceful showing, is it not, for the wealthiest Nation in the world, that prides itself upon its up-to-date methods in everything that goes to promote the activities and comfort of the people.

It is demonstrated by history that no country has good roads except where the government has aided in their construction and maintenance. In European countries all of the public roads were completed many, many years ago. Of all civilized countries, it is said that this country has the poorest roads. In almost everything else it stands first; in natural wealth, agricultural products, in the manufacture of steel and iron, and in the number of miles of railroads we stand first; still the farmers who contribute so much to the greatness of our wealth have received less consideration and have had less done for them than any other class of our people.

The National Government, from an economic standpoint, can well afford to aid in road construction. There are 1,073,099 miles of rural free delivery routes and 147,580 miles of star mail routes in the United States, a total of 1,220,579. With good roads the service could be improved and extended, where it is very much needed, for the same amount of money; besides, it would be worth so much to those who carry the star route and rural mails, and who, in my opinion, are paid less for their services than any other class of employees in the service of the Government for the same amount of work, and who, I think, should be paid more than they are at this time. There are 878,798,000 acres of farm land in the United States, valued at $128,475,674,000. Put the average increase by reason of good roads to farm lands at 50 per cent, which is very conservative, and it means an increase of about $29,000,000,000 in the value of farm lands in the United States. Is not this worth while? It will not be amiss, Mr. Chairman, to point out another very material advantage from good roads. In these days home seekers prefer to travel in automobiles where the roads are good rather than on railroad trains. It affords him an opportunity to get more information about the soil, climate, and social conditions in the various communities than he could acquire by traveling upon the trains, and in this way furnish the communities which have good roads an opportunity to advertise the advantages of their country and to sell their surplus farm lands to desirable settlers at good prices.

As Members of this Congress we owe the people of the United States no greater service than to provide national aid to roads and a system of rural credits that would meet the demands of the times. [Applause.] The people have waited long enough for this legislation. They not only expect national aid for roads at this session of Congress, but the establishment of a system of rural credits that would meet the needs and demands of our people. Such a system as they have in many other countries, and which will enable our farmers to borrow money on a long-term installment plan at a low rate of interest, with which to pay off the mortgages on their farms, and enable those who do not own a farm to buy one, securing the money on a long-term installment plan at a low rate of interest that would enable him to pay for a home in a few years' time with less money than he would pay as land rent during that period. Time, however, will not permit me to make further reference to that subject, but I shall have more to say on it when that measure comes before the House.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the leader on the Republican side, has expressed the opinion that the National Government will at some time go into the business of aiding in road building, and that when it does the appropriations will increase from year to year for that purpose; but that he does not think this is the time to begin. I fear if we leave it to those who oppose national aid to roads to say when we shall begin there will never be a beginning. [Applause.] Those who oppose this measure assign various reasons. Some say the condition of the Treasury will not permit of an appropriation for this purpose. This great Government can well afford it, and, if necessary, I would favor reducing other appropriations in order to secure money to aid in road building. [Applause.]

The most of the opposition to this bill, however, seems to come from Members of Congress representing districts in large cities, who base their opposition chiefly on the ground that it would be of benefit to the farmers alone. This would not be a valid objection, if it were true, but it is a mistaken idea. The cities of the country are dependent upon the products of the farms for their growth and maintenance. The products of the fertile farms of the Western States built and sustain, in a large measure, Kansas City, Chicago, and St. Louis. It can not be denied that the prosperity of the country depends upon the farmer. It is well known that when he is prosperous every other class prospers and when he does not all others suffer. Some of the Congressmen from city districts have suggested that Congress has done enough for the farmers in making provision for rural mails and parcel post. They seem to forget that these things are of as much interest to those who live in the towns and cities as those who live upon farms. If there should be an effort to abolish rural mails and parcel post, it would meet with as much opposition from the mail-order houses, publishers of newspapers, periodicals, and other business interests in the cities as from the farmers. They seem to have forgotten that millions of dollars have been spent by the National Government in the erection of post-office buildings in the cities, and that it was done under the same provisions of the Constitution of the United States that authorizes the Government to build roads. These post-office buildings are necessary, and the farmer makes no complaint; then, why are these gentlemen from the cities so narrow in their views as to oppose this measure, because it will be of some benefit to those who live in the country? They seem to forget that whatever is of benefit to those who live in the country is of benefit to those who live in the towns and cities. But even if this measure was only of benefit to farmers, which is not true, that would justify this Congress in making the appropriation, for more than half of our population live upon the farms, and they produced about $10,000,000,000 of the wealth of this country last year. They own more than $70,000,000,000 worth of property of the Nation, and pay more taxes—State, county, and Federal—than any other class of our citizenship. I am glad, however, to see a number of Members from the city districts, on both sides of the House, take a broader and more liberal view of the subject, and are supporting this bill.

According to calculations made by the Department of Agriculture, it costs the American farmer about 23 cents per ton per mile to carry his products from the farm to the railway station or river landing, and the annual charge for hauling of the 300,000,000 tons of products is estimated at $600,000,000. A frightful burden, indeed, on the initial process of marketing the crops. If our public roads were in approximately as good condition as those of most countries of Europe this charge could be easily reduced by one-half or more. If ever they reach the perfection of the highways of France, two-thirds of this expense can be saved to the farmer. Just another illustration. It is shown by reports of United States consuls in Europe that the lowest cost of hauling produce from farm to market is in Hanover, the average running 4½ cents per long ton per mile; in Italy about 9 cents; in France, 11¼ cents; in parts of Germany, other than Hanover, from 11 to 13 cents; in England, 12 cents. In the United States the hauling ranges, according to the products handled, from 19 to 27 cents per long ton per mile, the highest rate being on cotton. In other words, the American farmer pays from 40 to 95 per cent more to carry his products from the farm to the nearest railway station or river landing than the farmer in Europe. The only cause for this enormous advantage to the French or German or English or Italian farmer is the splendid highways which traverse these countries from one end to the other.

Let me make another striking comparison. I have already stated, and we all know, that this question of public roads has been discussed from every possible angle for years. In the course of one of these investigations about 20 years ago—and let

me say that the basic facts of the statement I am going to quote are as true to-day as they were then—Stuyvesant Fish, president of the Illinois Central Railroad, wrote a letter to Gov. Lowry, of Mississippi, in which he said: "Circular 19, Office of Road Inquiries, bears date April 4, 1896. The grand total of the annual cost of hauling farm products and lumber on public roads in the United States, there given as $946,414,665, is based on data for the year ending June 30, 1895. In that year the gross sum received by all the railroads in the United States, from not only hauling all the freight but for also providing in addition the highways (railroads), the vehicles (cars), the motive power (engines), and drivers (trainmen), and paying taxes thereon, was only $729,993,462; that is to say, it cost the farmer and the lumberman of the United States alone $216,421,203, or, say, 30 per cent more in one year to haul their products on public roads than all of the railways received from freights of all kinds." [Applause.]

And as a clincher let me tell you that the cost of transportation per ton for 1,000 miles by steamship on the Great Lakes is $1.25, by steam cars for 250 miles it is $1.25, by electric power for 25 miles it is $1.25, and by horsepower on any public road for 3 miles it is $1.25. Does not this show the awful expensiveness of the farmer's work?

This Government has not been niggardly, Mr. Chairman, in the matter of appropriations for public improvements; roads, of course, being always excepted. The appropriations for irrigation projects in the fiscal year of 1914 were, in round figures, $106,000,000. For improvement of rivers and harbor there has been appropriated from the beginning of our national existence to August 1, 1914, the sum of $819,000,000, and on rivers alone $475,211,250. To aid in the construction of the Pacific railroads the United States Government gave its credit for hundreds of millions of dollars in bonds and in land grants along the right of way of these railroads. The appropriation by Congress to the Panama Canal to June 30, 1915, amounted to $394,399,149. Looking at these exhibits the proposition to appropriate $25,000,000 annually as the Government's contribution to aid the States in the building of public roads appears excessively modest.

Why, Mr. Chairman, it will require little more than half of what the Government has granted for rivers and harbors to give the States necessary funds to improve every public road in the United States.

The farmers have not made much objection to these great appropriations to which I have referred, even though many of them did not derive much immediate advantage therefrom. They have realized all along that the commercial and industrial needs of the country require pecuniary sacrifices which must fall alike upon all people. They know a great part of our commerce must be carried by water because of the cheaper mode of this kind of transportation and that rivers should be made navigable to this end. Nay, more, it has been preached to them by every public speaker in and out of Congress that the prosperity of the Nation, the expansion of its domestic and foreign commerce, the increase of transportation facilities by land and by water makes for the farmer's benefit no less than for the manufacturer's and merchant's. While they have paid and are still paying their share of the huge expenditures involved in these operations of the Government they have complained, and do still justly complain, that Congress has not at the same time aided in building roads. The farmer has asked himself, as well he might, how he is benefited by the building of railways and the improvement of rivers if the roads that lead from his farm to the river landing or railway station or other market are in such wretched condition as to wear out his wagons and teams, and at times made impassable by heavy rains and freezes. The farmer will not reap full benefits from the expenditure of all these hundreds of millions of appropriations to which I have referred until the country roads are put in good condition.

Thus we see, no matter from what viewpoint we look at it, that the expense of marketing the products of the farm must remain inordinately high until all the roads are improved.

The National Government, Mr. Chairman, has not been chary in the expenditure of large sums of money for building public roads in our island possessions ever since we acquired control of them.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield?

Mr. GORDON. For a question in reference to our island possessions.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I am forced to decline on account of the limited time allotted to me.

The latest annual report of the Philippine Commission shows that in the five and a half years ended December 31, 1914, there was expended in the islands on public-road improvement the very respectable sum of $3,250,000. As to Porto Rico, the report of the Government for 1914 shows that the cost of construction of roads and bridges from the time of our taking possession of the island until June 30, 1914, was $7,537,000. Not so bad for a territory little less in area than one-fourteenth of the State of Alabama. And the last Congress was generous enough to authorize the expenditure of $35,000,000 for the construction of a railroad in Alaska. I confess, Mr. Chairman, that I am somewhat at a loss to account for the reluctance heretofore evinced by the Congress of the United States to make adequate money grants in aid of public-road building in the States, which in one single year have spent several hundred millions in this work. Why not be at least as liberal with the States which have waited for lo, these many years as with these outlying Territories that came under our beneficent domination only a little while ago?

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, I attach the greatest possible importance to that provision of this bill which takes care of the improvement of the little county roads. It is all very well to talk of the great trunk highways which it is hoped will be built; but, after all, of what avail will those great highways be if their feeders, all the county roads, are not put in condition to enable the farmer to reach the greater arteries? The roads that run straight from the farm are the important links in the chain of road improvement; and just as the chain is no stronger than its weakest link, so the whole scheme of public-highway construction will be faulty unless the byways are first taken care of.

There is another fact in connection with this matter which must not be lost sight of, and that is the increase in the value of farm lands by reason of road improvement. Without going into detailed figures I will only state that the experience of landowners is to the effect that, in sections where roads have been properly constructed and properly maintained the value of the farms have doubled and sometimes quadrupled. It will be indeed a joyful day for the American farmer when he finds not only the cost of marketing his products reduced by one-half or two-thirds, but the value of his farm materially enhanced. Incidentally, it may also be pointed out that with the increase in the market value of the land will come increase in the treasuries of the county and State, while the cost of maintenance is reduced to a minimum.

One of the vitally important effects of good public roads is the improvement of the social conditions of the rural population. It has been shown, for instance, that school attendance has been materially increased; social intercourse between the units of farming communities has become more frequent; the interchange of opinions on political, economic, and educational problems has been stimulated. In counties favored with good roads all the social activities of the community have received an impetus in a forward direction. So we see that the improvement of roads is not a question of material interest alone.

Another question of transcendent interest enters into the consideration of this matter of public-road building. It is the cost of living, not to the rural population merely, but to the dwellers in the city and town as well. We have all noted regretfully the steady and, I fear, ever increasing exodus from the farm to the city. The cause of it lies at the very threshold of the conditions surrounding farm life. The young people isolated from social intercourse, by reason of bad roads, are lured by the manifold attractions of the city, and the farmer has to pay more for his help, and the cost of production is increased. Either his already slight profits are still further reduced or, what is more likely to be the case, the cost of his product must be increased. This increase, of course, will grow in exact proportion as the producing class is lessened and the consuming class becomes more numerous. If some of our economists would figure out just how great are the losses sustained by this outgoing from farm to city, they would make a valuable contribution to the contemporaneous history of socio-economic conditions.

In this day and time, with rural route mail facilities, telephone, and improved conditions of our schools and churches, if our public roads could be made good our lands would not only greatly increase in value, but country life would be more desirable, and the tendency of immigration from the country to the towns and cities would abate, and our young men and young women instead of going to the towns and cities would stay upon the farms.

From whatever point of view we regard this question of Government aid to the States in the construction and maintenance of good roads, we must be impressed with its exceeding importance. It embraces practically every relation of the human family. It enters into the commerce of the Nation, the taxation of property, the education of the children residing in the rural sections, the social relations of farming communities, the com-

fort of rural homes, even the religious activities of the people on the farm. There is hardly any one other subject which so nearly concerns all the people; for if it be true, as the great Napoleon declared, that agriculture is the chief concern of the State, then, indeed, nothing that Congress can do to further its development can be objected to.

It is not, therefore, so much a question of whether or not anything shall be done, but what is the best means to be employed to bring the largest possible benefits to the greatest number of our people. With this conviction firmly rooted in my mind, I shall give my heartiest support to the proposed legislation, which, in my judgment, promises to contribute in the fullest possible measure to the prosperity and happiness not only of the farmers, but to all our people. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON]. [Applause.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I also yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, this question of good roads has been permitted to entirely obscure the important question involved in the consideration of this bill.

Now, I think I am as strongly in favor of good roads as any man in this House. Good roads are vitally necessary to every civilized people. Bad roads operate as an export tax upon the product of the producer [applause], and if they are bad enough they absolutely destroy the value of the products of toil. So I want to record my position here and now as being heartily in favor of good roads, and at the same time, if I can, make clear to this House why I am strongly opposed to the passage of this bill.

Now, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON] who just preceded me referred to the good roads which were being built in the Philippine Islands, one of our colonial possessions; but I call the attention of the committee to the fact that those roads are built at the expense of the people of those islands, not at the expense of the people of the United States, and that makes all the difference in the world in the consideration of this question.

Members should not be confused by the different forms of government between that which is provided under the Constitution of the United States and that which is provided for the control of our colonial possessions. We are the sole governing power in the Philippine Islands, and this Congress, under the anomalous situation which obtains, is required to appropriate the money for all the expenses of those islands, but money for roads and other local improvements is raised by taxes imposed on the people of those islands.

Now, several gentlemen who have spoken upon this bill, attempting, I suppose, to give it some color of justification by the precedents in the history of the United States, have cited the one case which, it is contended, does furnish a precedent for this legislation, to wit, the Cumberland Road.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the legislation and the refusal to enact legislation by the Congress of the United States in connection with the Cumberland Road is the strongest possible argument against the enactment of this bill.

Now, what was the Cumberland Road, and when was it authorized, and under what circumstances?

The Congress of the United States, at the instigation of the President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson, in 1802, and at the time the admission of the State of Ohio into the Union was actually pending, passed a law authorizing the construction of a public highway from Cumberland, Md., to the Ohio River near Wheeling, W. Va., and in 1820 the act was amended to extend it to the Mississippi River and authorizing a survey of the route. In 1825 the first appropriation was made by Congress of $150,000 to extend it west and extend the survey to the permanent capital of Missouri, and provided that it should pass through the capitals of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. On April 30, 1802, Congress passed an act enabling the people of Ohio to form a State government and seek admission into the Union. Section 7 contained the following provision:

That one-twentieth of the net proceeds of the lands lying within said State sold by Congress shall be applied to the laying out and making public roads leading from the navigable waters emptying into the Atlantic, to the Ohio, to the said State, and through the same, such roads to be laid out under the authority of Congress, with the consent of the several States through which the roads shall pass.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand the gentleman to say that he thinks this bill is unconstitutional.

Mr. GORDON. I have not said so yet. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON. Does the gentleman think that this bill is as constitutional as the bill which was up in the Sixty-third Congress with reference to good roads?

Mr. GORDON. Well, on that particular point, perhaps it is.

Mr. HARRISON. Did not the gentleman vote for that bill in the Sixty-third Congress.

Mr. GORDON. I did, sir. Now, that may be important; and if it is I will digress at this point to explain my change of attitude on this bill. [Laughter.] I voted for the bill in the Sixty-third Congress. These specious arguments that we have been listening to here, which never touched the real, vital objection to this bill, and my very strong predilection in favor of good roads and the lack of consideration of the merits of the proposition is my excuse and reason for having voted for it. So many questions commanded my attention at that time that I did not give this piece of legislation that careful investigation which I ought to have done before voting for it; but I have been endeavoring to make up for that since, and I think I now know something about my reasons, and the reasons which should impel others, to vote against this bill.

I was speaking of the Cumberland Road when I was interrupted. That was a very great improvement. But in 1822 the President of the United States, James Monroe, vetoed a bill the provisions of which undertook to impose tolls upon persons traveling upon that highway for the purpose of keeping it in repair. And I commend to the consideration of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], who interrupted me, the language of that veto message. The veto messnge itself is very short, but it was followed by a dissertation upon the powers of Congress and the relations of the Federal Government to the States which would well justify every Member of Congress and every intelligent citizen to read.

I will, Mr. Chairman, ask unanimous consent now to insert in the RECORD the short veto message of President Monroe upon that bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting the matter referred to. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

VETO MESSAGE.

WASHINGTON, *May 4, 1822.*

To the House of Representatives:

Having duly considered the bill entitled "An act for the preservation and repair of the Cumberland Road," it is with deep regret, approving as I do the policy, that I am compelled to object to its passage and to return the bill to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, under a conviction that Congress do not possess the power under the Constitution to pass such a law.

A power to establish turnpikes, with gates and tolls, and to enforce the collection of tolls by penalties, implies a power to adopt and execute a complete system of internal improvement. A right to impose duties to be paid by all persons passing a certain road, and on horses and carriages, as is done by this bill, involves the right to take the land from the proprietor on a valuation and to pass laws for the protection of the road from injuries, and if it exists as to one road it exists as to any other, and to as many roads as Congress may think proper to establish. A right to legislate for one of these purposes is a right to legislate for the others. It is a complete right of jurisdiction and sovereignty for all the purposes of internal improvement, and not merely the right of applying money under the power vested in Congress to make appropriations, under which power, with the consent of the States through which this road passes, the work was originally commenced and has been so far executed. I am of opinion that Congress do not possess this power; that the States individually can not grant it, for although they may assent to the appropriation of money within their limits for such purposes they can grant no power of jurisdiction or sovereignty by special compacts with the United States. This power can be granted only by an amendment to the Constitution and in the mode prescribed by it.

If the power exist, it must be either because it has been specifically granted to the United States or that it is incidental to some power which has been specifically granted. If we examine the specific grants of power, we do not find it among them, nor is it incidental to any power which has been specifically granted.

It has never been contended that the power was specifically granted. It is claimed only as being incidental to some one or more of the powers which are specifically granted. The following are the powers from which it is said to be derived:

First, from the right to establish post offices and post roads; second, from the right to declare war; third, to regulate commerce; fourth, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare; fifth, from the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution all the powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof; sixth and lastly, from the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property of the United States.

According to my judgment, it can not be derived from either or those powers, nor from all of them united, and in consequence it does not exist.

Having stated my objections to the bill, I should now cheerfully communicate at large the reasons on which they are founded if I had time to reduce them to such form as to include them in this paper. The advanced stage of the session renders that impossible. Having at the commencement of my service in this high trust considered it a duty to express the opinion that the United States do not possess the power in question and to suggest for the consideration of Congress the propriety of recommending to the States an amendment to the Constitution to vest the power in the United States, my attention has been often drawn to the subject since, in consequence whereof I have occasionally committed my sentiments to paper respecting it. The form which this exposition has assumed is not such as I should have given it had it been intended for Congress, nor is it concluded. Nevertheless, as it contains my views on this subject, being one which I deem of very high importance, and which in many of its bearings has now become peculiarly urgent, I will communicate it to Congress, if in my power, in the course of the day, or certainly on Monday next.

JAMES MONROE.

Mr. GORDON. Now, what was the condition of the country at the time the Cumberland Road was built and what were the circumstances of the construction of that great highway? The Northwest Territory had been ceded to the people of the United States by the State of Virginia. The first State to be carved out of that great Territory, Ohio, was then engaged in preparing a constitution and applying for admission to the Union under the authority of Congress. The State of Indiana was not admitted until 1816, Illinois in 1818, Missouri in 1821, Michigan in 1837, and Wisconsin in 1848. By subsequent legislation the Cumberland Road act was amended so as to extend its western terminus to Jefferson City, Mo., the home of the distinguished author of this bill, Judge SHACKLEFORD. The circumstances attending the enactment of that legislation furnished absolutely no precedent for this, and the considerations of James Monroe in his veto message, in which he forbade the use of the money of the United States Government for the purpose of maintaining this Cumberland Road, seem to me to furnish unanswerable reasons against it.

The road, as you know, was subsequently——

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. GORDON. I will in a minute. The jurisdiction over this road was subsequently transferred, as you know, to the States through which it passed, who thereupon imposed tolls for the purpose of defraying the expenses of keeping it in repair.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the Cumberland Road was built exclusively from the proceeds of the sale of public land?

Mr. GORDON. You did not. If you did, you misunderstood me.

Mr. MONDELL. That was true of the first legislation, I understood the gentleman to say.

Mr. GORDON. The act providing for the building of the road contained the provision that 5 per cent, one-twentieth of all the proceeds of the sale of public lands in the State of Ohio, and I believe the other Territories through which the road was to pass, should be appropriated to defray the expense of the construction of the road. The provision cited from the act of April 30, 1802, authorizing the people of Ohio to organize a State government, is referred to in the first act of Congress for building the Cumberland Road.

Mr. MONDELL. But the road was not built exclusively from that source?

Mr. GORDON. I am not prepared to say whether or not the proceeds of the sale of the land reimbursed the Government. Of course, appropriations were made directly out of the Treasury of the United States as the work upon the road progressed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GORDON. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Was it the custom at the time of which the gentleman speaks for the Congress to authorize loans upon public lands, the loans that were secured as a rule by foreign nations, partly for the construction of roads and sometimes for the construction of canals?

Mr. GORDON. I know of no such act of Congress.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is giving us an interesting historical discourse, and I am very much pleased with it. If it will not divert him too much, I would like to ask him whether he knows that prior to the reading of the dissertation of President Monroe, which is quite a lengthy message, as we know, that the Congress of the United States was asked to permit of the use of public lands for the purpose of raising funds to build a canal to bring the Great Lakes to the sea, and whether, Congress having refused to make such a grant, the State of New York embarked upon that enterprise itself and constructed the present Erie or State Barge Canal?

Mr. GORDON. I am not prepared to dispute the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Considering many requests made of the Congress of the United States, I can believe almost anything might have been requested in times past. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I merely wanted the gentleman to know as a historical fact that Congress did reject the proposition to build the canal, and that it was built by the State of New York.

Mr. GORDON. I thank the gentleman. That furnishes, of course, another precedent against this bill.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman's legal objection to this bill that it provides for the building of roads within the States and not for interstate roads?

Mr. GORDON. That is just one of my objections to it; yes. My principal objection to this bill, Mr. Chairman, is stated in the report of the majority of the committee recommending the bill for passage, that it is purely a local matter for which you propose to ram your hands down into the Public Treasury of the United States and take out money. That is my principal objection to the bill, which I will elaborate as I progress.

Mr. KELLEY. Your objection is not legal, but you object to it as a matter of policy?

Mr. GORDON. Oh, I do not care what you call it. I suppose this House has a perfect right to pass upon the constitutionality of a measure when it votes upon it. I think it does pass upon its constitutionality.

Mr. KELLEY. I understood the gentleman was making a legal argument, and I wanted to make clear in my mind to just what point it was directed.

Mr. GORDON. I thank the gentleman for the compliment, if he considers what I have said in my time is a legal argument. It is not cohesive, and I am not depending so much on the law as I am on the logic of the undisputed facts.

Mr. CROSSER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to his colleague?

Mr. GORDON. I will.

Mr. CROSSER. Not indicating my own position, I agree with you that we ought to regard the matter from the standpoint of philosophy and argument rather than figures. How far would the doctrine—this idea of having each locality build its own roads—take us? Supposing that we should pass a law in the States requiring each township or ward to build its roads and not requiring it to build any other ones. Would not that cause disastrous results?

Mr. GORDON. No. That is the law now in every State in the Union that I know anything of.

Mr. CROSSER. Another question.

Mr. GORDON. Very well.

Mr. CROSSER. Suppose some of the counties in the State would build and others not. Would it not prevent a free access from one county to another?

Mr. GORDON. Undoubtedly; but let those counties stew in their own juice until they get ready to tax themselves to build it. [Laughter.] If that interferes with interstate commerce, then I grant you that we might consider the question.

Mr. CROSSER. That is the point I am coming to.

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Now, this bill itself, in order to make it perfectly clear that it is purely a local bill and that it is intended to use this money to build and improve township roads, contains this provision:

SEC. 5. That the necessary culverts and bridges shall be considered as parts of the roads constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act; that the roads which may be constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act shall include earth, sand-clay, sand-gravel, and other common types of roads, as well as roads of higher classes, one of the purposes of this act being to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming communities.

Now, those roads are very desirable, Mr. Chairman; but those are roads of the kind that in my State and in every other State, so far as I know, are built by assessing a part of the cost upon the local community which receives the primary benefit from the construction of the road. We have in my State a system of road laws under which the State pays a portion and the local community pays a portion. We have a State highway commission which qualifies us to receive our apportionment under this act, but in the construction of roads our State highway commission does not pretend to go into townships and construct purely local roads. It does not understand its function to be any such thing as that. These local roads are built by taxing the

local communities. They are local improvements, just as this report says, and I know of no State in which they tax the people of the whole Commonwealth to build purely local roads.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The gentleman says that the State cooperates with the counties?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The local subdivisions of the State?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the gentleman think that policy a wise one?

Mr. GORDON. Yes; a very wise one.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then why can not the same policy be applied to the United States cooperating with the States and counties?

Mr. GORDON. I do not say it could not. Otherwise, I would not be here making this speech. I am trying to prevent its being applied. [Applause and laughter.]

Now, the question of the gentleman from Tennessee illustrates my point for me quite as well as I could do it myself. The relation between the States and their local subdivisions are entirely different from the relations between the Federal Government and the States. The latter relations are defined by the Federal Constitution, and the gentleman from Tennessee knows enough to know that there is no real analogy between the relations existing between the States of this Union and the Federal Government and the relations existing between the States themselves and their local subdivisions. They are local creations. For convenience the States, acting through their legislatures or their constitutions, subdivide for convenience the States into counties and townships, and enact the necessary legislation to give as nearly as may be in local affairs home rule and local self-government. The wisdom of that system has never been successfully challenged. And as an incident to their local control and self-government, they require them to pay their local taxes.

This talk that it is a nice thing to have good roads and that therefore you should vote for this bill is exceedingly fallacious. It is a nice thing to have these farms out in these States drained. Drainage is quite as vital and as essential as anything else.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. GORDON. I do.

Mr. WHEELER. If this bill should become a law and appropriations should be made, does the gentleman think that in the near future, or in the future at any time, it would affect his district? Or, in other words, are there any farmers in his district?

Mr. GORDON. Well, in answer to the gentleman's question, I will say that there are no farmers in my district, but all the roads in my district were constructed and paid for by the people of my district. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Is that the reason why the gentleman is opposed to the bill—because there are no farmers in his district? [Laughter.]

Mr. GORDON. Well, that is one reason, and a pretty good one, too. [Laughter.] Now, inasmuch as the gentleman called my attention to that fact, I think I understand my duty as a Member of the National Congress. I do not permit mere local considerations to control my attitude upon public questions; and if I did not think that this bill was a bad bill, regardless of its immediate effect upon my own constituents, I would not be here talking against it. [Applause.] I think it goes very much further than that.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. I understood the gentleman to say that the last time he voted for the roads bill and that this time he is very much opposed to it.

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. And the gentleman has given us some reasons why he has changed?

Mr. GORDON. Yes. And I will give you some more if you will give me the time. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON. The gentleman has just stated that he has no rural population in his district. I want to ask the gentleman what the farmers in his district, that were in his district in the Sixty-third Congress, think of this proposition? [Laughter.] I notice that there were three rural counties in the gentleman's district at that time. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORDON. I will say, in answer to that, that so far as the farmers living in my former district are concerned, they have, most of them, had their roads improved by the city of Cleveland. We have county-road laws in our State under which they have constructed in the county of Cuyahoga over 400 miles of brick roads outside of the city. We have more good roads than any other county in the United States.

This question is not new to us, and the reference of the gentleman to my former constituents is answered, I think, by my previous observation. I am not controlled by any such consideration as that. I think the reasons against this bill are very much deeper than any mere matter of local concern. I might just as well charge these gentlemen here, who represent rural constituencies, with voting for this bill solely and only because their constituents are in favor of good roads. [Applause.] That is the way some of them talk, and I believe it. [Laughter.]

Now, I read from the report of the majority of the committee, recommending the passage of this bill:

> Roads are local concerns, and primarily it is the duty of the States to provide them for their people.

Now, I agree to that. I say that is a strong argument against this bill. In fact, there is the foundation of my objections to this bill.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. GORDON. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GORDON. No; I will not yield. You see my time has all been taken up by these questions and I have not been able to say what I wanted to say.

> Jurisdiction over roads—

I still read from the report of the majority of the committee—

> Jurisdiction over roads belongs to the State and local authorities.

Yes; and James Monroe, in his veto message, said that Congress could not lawfully confer power and jurisdiction on the National Government in the matter of the repair and maintenance of roads by collecting tolls.

> This jurisdiction should never be disturbed by the General Government.

I fully agree to that. It never will be disturbed, either, until you amend the Constitution of the United States. Now, as we have no jurisdiction over these roads, no power to supervise their maintenance, why should we take money out of the Treasury of the United States to build them? I wish the gentlemen on the floor of this House who are strongly in favor of good roads and who are supporting this bill would answer some of these vital objections suggested by their own report in support of the bill. That is the question that is bothering me. It is not a mere question of whether or not my district will get some of the "pork" that this bill provides for. I suppose my State will get its share. That is a very small consideration, however.

But in connection with the money involved I call your attention to the fact that they provide at the end of the bill that not more than $25,000,000 shall be used the first year. You see this is providing a continuous performance of taking money out of the Treasury of the United States and expending it upon matters which are admitted and conceded by the committee itself to be purely local. I want you to understand, gentlemen, that this is a very serious proposition. When you enact this measure into law you are establishing a precedent for almost every conceivable form of local improvement to be made at the expense of the Public Treasury of the United States. [Applause.]

Furthermore, the law removing the rural counties from my district and enacting the present redistricting law was approved by the governor of Ohio on May 6, 1913, and the Shackleford road bill, which passed the House in the Sixty-third Congress, was not voted on until February 10, 1914, nine months and four days after the rural territory was separated from my district, so that the imputations involved in the questions, ascribing to me a desire to "pander" to the interests of my rural constituents in voting for the bill in the Sixty-third Congress, fall to the ground.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I have great sympathy for my friend from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] who has just taken his seat. Like all fresh Democrats when they come into this House, he has trouble with the Constitution of the United States. They

all do at first. Now, the Republican Members, new or old, never have any trouble with the Constitution of the United States if it gets in the way of doing something that they want done. Their protective tariff proclivities show exactly the measure of their ideas upon the Constitution of the United States; that is, their regard for it. If they would write into a tariff bill these words, "The object and purpose of this bill is to prohibit the importation of foreign merchandise into this country to be sold in competition with our own," it would be unconstitutional; but although that is the real purpose of it, if they say in the law it is to raise revenue, although it accomplishes an unconstitutional purpose, of course, the courts say, "We can not say that it will not produce revenue, we can not say that revenue will not follow from the operation of this act, and therefore it is constitutional."

Now, I want to say to my friend from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] that I have as much faith in him as anybody with reference to the effect upon him of the demands which his former constituents may have made upon him; but we are the creatures of our constituents, and if he, without having given a former bill thorough study, when he had three rural counties in his district, voted for it, and afterwards, when they were cut out of his district, gave it such further study as to enable him to arrive at his present conclusion, it is no reflection on him; we all give the benefit of the doubt to our constituents unless study or conviction rises higher with us than a desire to please our constituents. So I do not blame him, so far as I am concerned.

But let me say to my friend that the appropriation of money out of the Public Treasury for the purchase of garden seeds to give to private individuals is not a Government function.

Mr. GORDON. No; and I voted against it.

Mr. SIMS. Why, certainly; but does not the bill pass every time, and do the people not get the seeds, and do they not take them and make good use of them as individuals, but not in the performance of any Government function?

Mr. GORDON. Oh, well, that is no answer to my position.

Mr. SIMS. I myself believe in confining Federal appropriations to the maintenance of strictly Federal Government objects and purposes; but is taking care of the earthquake sufferers of Messina and Martinique a Federal Government purpose? Why, not at all; but it is within the purposes and impulses of humanity and human sympathy, and, after all, if we violate the Constitution in such an act, I have never known the Attorney General of the United States or anybody else to begin a suit to enjoin the payment of such an appropriation.

This bill is not my bill. In fact, I opposed, as vigorously as I knew how, the bill that came from the Agricultural Committee which provided for the payment of money for the use of roads by rural carriers to local authorities in the States at so much per mile, according to the quality and standard of roads. That proposition, as I regarded it, was simply a subsidy, upon condition that the States or local authorities appropriated the same amount for the same roads. I fought that bill all the way through, and voted against it on a yea-and-nay vote. Since then the Roads Committee has been created, and when the bill came from that committee last Congress, which provided for the possibility of the use of the money in the only way that it ought to be used, I voted for it.

Mr. Chairman, on the 10th day of December last I introduced the following bill, which is my scheme for the construction of Federal post roads. I want to say to you that in legislation no man can get exactly what he wants, and when I can not get my bill, but can get something to take the place of it, and out of which a great system may be established, I will not stand here in the pride of authorship and oppose a bill which accomplishes many of the objects and purposes of my own measure. Now I will read my own bill:

A bill to provide that the United States shall construct rural post roads between the county seats of the several States.

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to construct and maintain rural post roads the Postmaster General is authorized to designate all highways connecting county seats in each of the several States as rural post roads.

SEC. 2. That the Postmaster General, after making deductions hereinafter provided for, shall apportion the appropriations made under the provisions of this act for each fiscal year, among the several States in the following manner:

One-third in the ratio which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States; one-third in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census; one-third in the ratio which the mileage of rural post roads of each State bears to the total mileage of rural post roads in all the States.

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, the sum of $25,000,000. So much of the appropriation apportioned to any State for any fiscal year as remains unexpended at the close thereof shall be available for expenditure until the close of the succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 4. That so much of the appropriation made under the provisions of this act as the Postmaster General may estimate to be necessary, not to exceed 5 per cent, shall be deducted by him at the beginning of each fiscal year for administering the provisions of this act, and any portion of such amount unexpended at the close of any fiscal year shall be made a part of the appropriation for the succeeding fiscal year and reapportioned according to this act. Within 60 days after the final passage of this act, and thereafter on or before January 20 next preceding the commencement of the fiscal year, the Postmaster General shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount which he has apportioned to each State for such fiscal year. All payments under this act shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury on warrants drawn by the Postmaster General.

SEC. 5. The term "rural post road" as used in this act shall be deemed to include all public roads over which the United States mails are or may be transported, that connect the county seats of contiguous or adjoining counties. The Postmaster General shall cause to be made such surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates as he may require, and shall advertise for bids for all of the work or do the work as may otherwise be provided for by the laws of the United States.

SEC. 6. All road work in the several States done under the provisions of this act shall be under the direct supervision of the Postmaster General. The final cost of the work shall include a reasonable expense for engineering, inspection, and unforeseen contingencies not to exceed 10 per cent of the total cost of the work.

SEC. 7. That out of the appropriation provided by this act the Postmaster General is authorized to employ such assistants, clerks, and other persons, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, to rent such buildings in the city of Washington and elsewhere, to purchase such supplies, material, equipment, office fixtures and apparatus, and to incur such travel and other expenses as he may deem necessary for carrying out the purpose of this act.

SEC. 8. That the Postmaster General is authorized to make rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. That the Office of Public Roads, Department of Agriculture, shall be transferred to the Post Office Department.

SEC. 10. That in order to carry out the provisions of this act, the Postmaster General is authorized, by contract or condemnation, to acquire all needed rights of way, and to pay for such rights of way out of any moneys appropriated under this act.

SEC. 11. That roads constructed under this act shall be of uniform standard of width and quality and of hard surface, and upon an average shall not exceed in cost the sum of $10,000 per mile.

I confined the construction of roads by my bill to such roads as lead from one county seat to county seats of each adjoining county under the idea that there necessarily must be a large amount of mail, including the parcel post, moving between county seats. And, it being a postal facility, the moving of mail matter, I have placed it where I thought it ought to be, under the Postmaster General, because all these bills that have been introduced have been in the nature of preparing post roads.

I propose that the Government of the United States, out of its own money, without any cooperation or consent of the States or the counties, shall build post roads from each county seat in each State to each and all adjoining county seats, even where State lines had to be crossed. That is a real Federal road and performs a regular Federal function. I never believed in State aid for the Federal Government in performing an exclusively Federal service. What is going to be the result of the increase in the parcel post? It is purely a transportation service. The carrying of a letter is purely a transportation service. If you can carry one pound of ordinary merchandise as a Federal function, as far as constitutional authority is concerned, you can carry a ton or a thousand tons, and if you can carry a ton you have a right to provide facilities for most economically and cheaply moving that ton of freight. This bill we are now considering in effect potentially covers every road in the United States, covers all the State public roads, covers all the county public roads—in fact, may cover all the public roads. One of the objections I have to the bill now being considered is that the title misleads. In the latter part of this bill is expressed the real object and purpose of it, and it should not be limited in the title as this bill is limited. The title of this bill is:

A bill to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

I hope the committee will offer an amendment that will so amend the title of the bill as to include all purposes for which these roads can be used, and not limit it to postal use only, because upon that we might have questions of construction and a controversy arise. The Secretary of Agriculture might say, when a proposed plan was put up to him, that we did not need all the roads proposed for the Postal Service only. A mere declaration that all roads may be so used is different from the practical application of such a declaration to all the roads. Why not let it go under the general-welfare clause that covers everything under heaven and includes every national purpose for which roads may be used? I hope the title will be so amended that the use of money will not be restricted to postal roads.

We southern Democrats are very much afraid of paternalism; we are in favor of State rights, but when the States are not able to give their citizens such improvements as will enable the people themselves to rise in the scale of civilization and national usefulness, and if it should be deemed necessary we ought to introduce a resolution to amend the Federal Consti-

tution, so that the National Government may be enabled to do that which the States, at least some of them, can not do for themselves, that is necessary to be done in order to have uniform national development.

I am in favor of any proposition that can be enacted into law that will give good roads to the whole Nation, but if the Constitution stands in the way of so good a thing we ought to amend it. We have done it before and we can do it again. But I take it that the lawyers on the committee have investigated this matter and find that it will stand the constitutional test. All I ask of the committee is that, if you can not get your bill through another body in the present form and you can get mine through, or something like it, to do so, so that good-road legislation will not be an absolute failure. I voted against a former bill, and I am glad I did and that it failed, for this is the best bill that has ever been reported to the House. It distributes the fund according to the population and road mileage, and I do not believe there is a Secretary of Agriculture living, or ever will live, that will dare to approve automobile roads laid out in a State and deny people who haul corn, wheat, cotton, and other farm products an opportunity to have their roads improved.

Of course this $25,000,000 is just a starter. It ought to be a starter. We have got to have time to prepare for the work on the roads and to acquire road machinery and to put our things in working order; but the day will come when instead of spending $25,000,000 a year we will spend $200,000,000 a year, perhaps $500,000,000 for this most justifiable purpose. [Applause.] But the more we spend economically and scientifically, the sooner will the country be redeemed from its present condition of primitiveness.

In the Southern States the bridges were all destroyed—nearly every one of them—during the Civil War. Our courthouses were practically all destroyed—burned up—our public buildings of every kind, including colleges and schoolhouses, lodges, and churches were burned or destroyed, so that we could not with our limited taxable resources improve our roads like the Northern States have improved theirs. We had to first restore these absolutely necessary structures. I hope and pray that however much you may love the Constitution, and nobody loves it more than a Democrat, that we will not let a constitutional doubt stand in the way of that which will benefit every section of the country in the United States. Let us give the people the benefit of the doubt, and if the courts should eventually solve the doubt against the validity of the law, its execution in the meantime will have redounded to the greatest general public good.

The construction of highways is one of the public purposes for which, I believe, both National and State Governments exist, and, I think, it is prudent and wise if necessary to issue bonds for their construction. If the construction is good, maintenance cost will be correspondingly light, while if the construction is poor, maintenance will be a burden almost beyond the power of the States or the Federal Government to bear.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOOHER). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this legislation. It has been my pleasure to support a measure somewhat similar to this one; it passed the House but nothing was done toward its passage in the Senate, but I trust that a better fate awaits this one at the other end of the Capitol. Many years ago this Government realized the importance of railroad building, and it donated to railroad companies for that purpose millions of acres of public land. These railroads have greatly developed the country and provided splendid agencies for commercial intercourse between the various sections of the country. But, Mr. Chairman, the work of road encouragement and road building is only half done and the good to be derived only half realized until we build a system of public roads throughout the rural sections of this great country. [Applause.]

The railroads are not doing the amount of good or rendering the highest measure of service to the people generally because the means of communication between railroads and the great farming class of our people are poor and inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, when this country can boast of a splendid system of country roads leading from the homes and farms of the rural districts to the railroads traversing the country, bringing the producer into quick and easy reach of the marts of trade, we will have contributed to the material prosperity, the well-being, and happiness of millions of American people. [Applause.]

This Government is now expending vast sums of money teaching the farmer how to increase the productivity of the soil and how to farm under scientific methods, and now it is incumbent upon us to set ourselves to the task of removing the difficulties and obstacles that stand as barriers between the farmer's produce and the markets on the railroad. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if the time should ever come when we would need these highways in case of war they would serve us well. We would then need such roads as they have in Germany and France. Napoleon did no greater service to France than that rendered in building a system of public roads in that country. Our country is too great, powerful, and rich to longer permit these roads in the rural regions of the country to remain as a handicap and hindrance to the growth and development of our rural population. [Applause.]

The completion of such a system of roads as this bill contemplates will bring to the farmer new opportunities, promise, and possibilities, and bring to him comforts and conveniences long desired, and bestow blessings and benefits that can come through no other governmental action. [Applause.] It will enhance the value of his property and make life on the farm more attractive, and by the passage of such a measure, Mr. Chairman, we will contribute to the substantial growth and development of our agricultural classes and enable those who toil to produce that which feeds and clothes the world to reach with their produce the markets of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE].

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I have no particular desire to attempt to make a speech, but I do wish to express my views upon this bill, not in any spirit of criticism, but rather as representing what I deem to be the sentiment of the district which I have the honor to represent. I want to say also that I am proud to be a humble Member on this side of the aisle, with these veteran Republican leaders, and particularly our great leader—leaders able, astute, farsighted, having only and always at heart the public interest, leaders who in their distinguished careers in this House have frequently and persistently pointed out the clear and sure way to general prosperity in this country, not prosperity that is spasmodic and unhealthful, but prosperity based upon the healthful commercial, agricultural, and industrial activity of the people.

There are many reasons why I oppose this bill. One of them is because, in my judgment, Federal aid in the construction of roads under this act would be a form of paternalism that ought not to be instituted nor fostered by the Federal Government. I am in favor of good roads. We all are. The great State that I represent in part has in the last few years spent upward of $100,000,000 in constructing and improving the roads in the State. We are preparing to expend millions more this year and expect to spend millions hereafter every year. I think, perhaps, that one great incentive to this road building in my State was the agitation of the automobilists and the tourists. They certainly gave us no rest, and I think that in the agitation which they started and continued it must be conceded that they rendered a great public service.

I think that this bill has been very skillfully drawn in the interest of those who expect to participate under its provisions; but so far as the bill itself is concerned, so far as getting any practical results from the working of the bill, in my legal judgment it is as full of holes as a sieve. As I understand it, under this bill—and if I am in error I will stand corrected—the State of New York would get as her apportionment about $1,500,000, and in return her proportion which she would ultimately stand, based upon an annual appropriation of $25,000,000, would be something like $4,500,000, or upward of $5,000,000. In other words, the State of New York under this bill would contribute each year for the purpose of building roads in other States—1,000, 2,000, or 3,000 miles away—something over $3,000,000 a year.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully decline to yield. I have sat here now nearly 40 days listening to an almost continuous talkfest, and I think I am entitled now to 10 minutes.

Mr. HULBERT. I ask the gentleman to yield for one question.

Mr. MAGEE. I want to say further that I decline to yield. All the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle might as well understand that all the ballast in the ship of state is not contained in one section of the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, it has been suggested here that the Northern and Eastern States, California, perhaps, and other States are opposed to this bill. It has been insinuated that they are niggardly, narrow-minded, and all that sort of thing. Now, so far as the

State of New York is concerned, I will eliminate that part, and I do not put my objection upon that ground.

If you can mulct the State of New York that is willing to build her own roads, if you can mulct her to build roads 2,000 miles away in other States, and get away with it, why, I will take off my hat to you. But what I say is that I base my opposition upon principle. New York State has always been generous. She built the Erie Canal and made it free, thus conferring great advantages on many other States. We are now building as a substitute therefor the new Barge Canal which will cost the State upward of $130,000,000. We have expended millions upon millions of dollars upon our highways, and I want to say that the great State of New York, with its 10,000,000 of people, being substantially one-tenth of the population of this Republic, with its unlimited wealth and boundless resources, with its great liberality and its intense loyalty, yields to no other State in this Union.

The instance cited here that the Government contributed in building the great transcontinental railroads is not analogous and can not be applied to this bill. Those were great transcontinental railroads joining with links of steel other roads for extension across the continent, great inland arteries of commerce binding the States together into an indissoluble union. If the purpose before the House was to build a Federal road for the purposes of the Federal Government, I would not rise in my seat and object. If it were to build a great road across this continent for automobilists and tourists and purposes of general traffic, I would not rise to object. Even if it were to build a road between the States, joining great centers of population, where you might say it would serve the purposes of interstate commerce, I would not object. But that is not this bill. This bill is to provide for an indiscriminate building of roads in the States, the building of a road from some railroad station to some farmer's home. That is what it means.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAGEE. Can the gentleman from New York yield me five minutes more?

Mr. DUNN. I yield five minutes additional to the gentleman.

Mr. MAGEE. And, Mr. Chairman, before I forget and conclude I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAGEE. Now, I do not believe, while I have not examined the question carefully from a legal standpoint, that the Federal Government has power under the Federal Constitution to build a road from a railroad station to some farmer's home.

There is no connection between this bill and the Post Office Department. There appears to be a sort of inference from this bill that ultimately it might improve rural post roads, but there is not anything that the Post Office Department or the Postmaster General has to do with the building of these roads. This is entirely clear, as shown by section 2 of the bill. The real purpose of the bill, in my judgment, is shown at the end of section 5, which provides for the building of private roads from railway stations to farmers' homes.

Again, this act, in my opinion, is not a workable act in the public interest, in that it fails to fix upon some authority an affirmative and imperative obligation to maintain a constructed road in a reasonably safe condition for public use.

The maintenance of a road is fully as important as the construction thereof. In the maintenance of a road in a reasonably safe condition for public travel it is not practicable, in my judgment, for a State highway department to submit to the Secretary of Agriculture surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of the cost of maintenance as a basis of agreement for the final determination as to what proportion of such cost the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, will consent to pay. When a culvert or bridge or roadway needs repairs, public safety demands that such repairs shall be promptly made and that the responsibility therefor can not be shifted nor evaded. The primary responsibility to maintain a constructed road in a safe condition should be fixed and determined as a reasonable guaranty of prompt action by some duly constituted authority. When an act in reference to maintenance authorizes dickering as to cost and discretion as to action no practicable results in the public interest can, in my judgment, be attained thereunder.

Again you appropriate $25,000,000 a year, or authorize it. It is only a starter. Ten years from now, if you institute this form of paternalism, you will be asking for $250,000,000. There are 1,200,000 miles of rural post roads, as stated here yesterday, and about 2,000,000 miles of roads in the entire country. Why, what could you do with $25,000,000? If you deduct the amount deemed necessary for the administration of the act, say, $5,000,000—it does not make any difference whether you say one million or five million, but say $5,000,000—you will have twenty millions left; or, on all of the roads of the country an average of about $10 a mile, not enough to fill up the spring mudholes.

So when you talk about this building of roads as a method of preparing the Nation for national defense, why, I would like to ask you, if this is your plan of preparedness, how many centuries it would take to get the roads of this country in a condition for national defense? [Laughter.]

Now, I am for national defense. I think we ought to do something. I think we have a great Government here. I think that this Nation to-day, as in the days of old, is a Nation of patriots, as the world will see if the test shall ever come. Now, let us do something. Let us give our energy and our resources in solving wisely the serious problems confronting this Government. We want a strong modern Navy for national defense. [Applause on the Republican side.] A Navy, and a strong Navy, is the best safeguard for peace. We need a Navy deemed sufficient by our naval officers and experts to defend and uphold at any time or place the honor, the dignity, and the traditions of this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DUNN. I yield two minutes additional to the gentleman.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I will not take more than one minute. I simply want to say that I would not feel that I was worthy to be a Member of this House, Republican as I am, and I have even been called a black Republican, unless I could place loyalty above my party and the interests of my country above every other consideration, and I look into the faces of you gentlemen across the aisle and take you by the hand and say: Let us act together, let us work harmoniously, zealously, and earnestly in the performance of our duty in placing this great country of ours in a state of reasonable preparedness. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In my judgment we have a Government not only worth fighting for but worth dying for, and any American who is unwilling to fight for his country in her defense, and, if needs be, unwilling to die for his country in her defense is, in my judgment, unfit for American citizenship. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Has the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN] another speaker?

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS].

Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am aware of an unwritten rule which prevails in this body that a new Member should not with unseemly haste inject himself into the deliberations of the House and that he should not assume to take part in the discussion upon this floor until he has at least acquainted himself reasonably well with the rules and practices of the House. I do not find fault with this rule, as I believe its observance is alike beneficial to a new Member and to the House, and I do not wish to seem to violate even the spirit of this very sensible rule; but in view, Mr. Chairman, of the fact that I have the honor to be a member of the Committee on Roads, which has considered and reported this bill to the House, I have felt that I would be justified in making a few remarks in favor of its passage. [Applause.]

The legislation proposed in this bill is of very great importance to the whole country and is of vital interest to the people of the State of Illinois, and particularly to that section of the State which I have the honor to represent upon this floor.

The bill under consideration provides that the General Government shall extend aid to the various States in the construction and maintenance of public roads, applying particularly to post roads and roads over which the mails are carried by the Free Rural Delivery System.

By the terms of the bill an amount not exceeding $25,000,000 shall be appropriated annually and shall be disbursed by the Secretary of Agriculture. The amount apportioned to each State is to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following manner: Sixty-five thousand dollars to each of the States and one-half of the remainder to each State in the ratio which the population of such State bears to the population of all the States as shown by the latest available Federal census, and the other half of such remainder in the ratio which the mileage of rural free delivery and star-mail routes in such State bears to the mileage of rural free delivery and star-mail routes of all the States as shown by the latest available report of the Postmaster General.

The bill is constructed upon the theory that public roads are local concerns and that it is primarily the duty of the States to provide them for their people. Jurisdiction over the roads is not sought to be disturbed by any provision of the pending bill, but is left where such jurisdiction now lies, with the several States. It is merely proposed to grant aid and assistance to the various States for the construction and maintenance of public roads, leaving the States free to build and construct their own public roads of whatever character they may desire and in their own way, subject, of course, to the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture on each road where Federal aid is granted.

The plan adopted for the distribution of the aid to be granted to the various States is, in the judgment of the members of the committee, the most equitable and satisfactory of any suggested to the committee. No plan that was considered by the committee was wholly free from objections, but the plan finally adopted by which each State receives a minimum of $65,000 with its pro rata share of the balance of the fund based on population and miles of public road in each State, over which the mails are carried, appeared to be the most acceptable and workable of any considered by the committee.

Under this plan of distribution the State of Illinois will receive $1,372,330.

There is a very general and wide-spread demand throughout the country for legislation of this kind. The sentiment for Federal aid in the building and maintaining of our public roads is not confined alone to the residents of the rural communities, but exists among all classes of our people. Some of the most enthusiastic advocates of the proposition for Federal aid in road construction being large-minded and public-spirited professional and business men residing in the cities.

It has been urged against the enactment of legislation of this character, that an appropriation such as is contemplated in this bill can not constitutionally be made. This argument, however, is not seriously urged of late years, in view of the ever-expanding activities of the Federal Government, covering such exercise of power as the purchase of Louisiana and Alaska, and the immense and ever-recurring appropriations for the improvement of our harbors and interior rivers, for reclamation service, for educational work, and the many and varied activities of the Government in other fields.

The Constitution provides that the General Government may establish post offices and post roads, may regulate commerce between the several States, may provide for the common defense, and may do those things that promote the general welfare. This appropriation can be constitutionally made under that section of the Constitution giving the Congress the power to establish and maintain post roads, and upon the broad, general ground that the proposed legislation will promote the general welfare and provide for the common defense. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing that will conduce more to the general welfare of the whole country than the improvement of our country roads. Good roads are not only a necessity and an inestimable blessing to the residents of the rural communities but are a powerful factor in the growth, development, and prosperity of every section of our common country. From an economic standpoint, the problem of good roads is not surpassed in importance by any other subject now before the American Congress. The problem of transportation goes to the very foundation of the development and prosperity of any nation. Better, cheaper, and additional transportation facilities in the United States must benefit every inhabitant and result in more development and greater productiveness of our natural resources, meaning more and cheaper food and necessities of life.

All the great nations of the past of which history gives any account were builders of great systems of public roads. The histories of ancient Egypt, of Babylon, and of Rome tell us of the building and construction of great public roads by those historic and powerful peoples. These roads were used in the transportation of goods and merchandise in times of peace and for the use of great armies in times of war. When Rome was at the height of her glory under the reign of Augustus Cæsar, 29 great military roads, reaching every part of that great world Empire, radiated from the capital city. It is estimated that at that time the total mileage of improved roads in the Roman Empire was at least 50,000 miles. Many of these roads remained in fair repair for centuries, and long after the star of Roman greatness had ceased to shine in the firmament of nations these roads remained a monument to Roman power and achievement. [Applause.]

The greatest and most lasting exhibition of the genius of the first Napoleon was the magnificent system of public roads he gave to France. These roads constructed by Napoleon have been improved and kept in repair by the Government of France, and it was due to their splendid condition that the rapid and easy mobilization of the armies of France and their speedy transportation to points was made possible at the outbreak of the present war in August, 1914.

The inestimable benefit of a system of highly improved public roads in time of war was demonstrated in the most striking manner in the instance just cited. France was absolutely saved from destruction by her thoroughly adequate and highly improved system of public roads.

In the contest between the armies of Germany and Russia along the eastern front of the present great war in Europe the part played by a system of good roads in war has also been most forcibly demonstrated. Germany, with her admirable system of improved public roads connecting every part of the Empire, has been able to handle her troops, shifting them to and from different fronts, at a very great and telling advantage over Russia, whose public roads, from the best information I can gather, are very similar and in about the same condition as the public roads in the United States.

When the history of the present war in Europe is finally written it will be seen that there has been no more important factor in the whole conflict than the transportation facilities of the various nations over their public roads. I would not at all be surprised if it should be the verdict of impartial history that this was the most important, if not the determining, factor of the whole war.

So, Mr. Chairman, at this grave crisis in the history of the country, when our people are thinking and talking so much about "preparedness" and the "national defense," the Congress can not afford to ignore the important factor that a system of good roads will be in any comprehensive plan of defense that may be considered.

The money that we spend at this time and in the future in developing a system of good roads throughout the Republic will prove to be of the greatest value as a means of defense in time of war, should that sad day ever come. It will not only be a bulwark in time of war but will add greatly to our prosperity, growth, and happiness in time of peace.

It must be admitted that in the building of public roads the American people have not kept pace with their splendid progress along almost every other line of growth and development. We have the greatest and most efficient railroad system in the world, a system that in most of the States reaches almost every important center, and in many places reaches every nook and corner of the State. The several States and the General Government for decades have encouraged the building and extension of our railroads, and in many instances have rendered the railroads great assistance by giving to them large and valuable portions of the public domain and by subsidies and concessions of one kind and another.

The development of our magnificent system of railroads has been one of the main factors in the marvelous growth and prosperity of the country, and no one seriously questions the wisdom of the policy that has lent the aid and encouragement of the General Government and of many of the States to this great work.

While we have been doing this the Government has almost entirely overlooked the very important duty of encouraging and assisting in the building of the public roads of the country. This highly important duty should now be recognized and assumed by the Federal Government.

The farmers of the country are unanimously in favor of the legislation proposed in this bill. They feel, and justly so, that the cost of building and maintaining a system of improved roads throughout the rural districts is too great a burden to be carried by them alone. They believe also that, inasmuch as the public roads belong to and are used by all the people of the country, the general public should bear a reasonable proportion of the great burden of their building and cost of maintenance.

If a public road running past the home of a farmer belonged to him personally, or if it was constructed for his own exclusive use and benefit, there might be some logic to the argument that it is his duty to build and maintain the same. If the highways of a given community in a rural district belonged exclusively to those who live in that particular community and if they had the exclusive right to the use of them, it might with some force be contended that the general public should not be called upon to assist in the cost of building and keeping in repair such highways. But such is not the case. A public road is such in fact as well as in name, and every citizen of the country has a legal right to its free and unrestricted use.

The country roads belong to all the people.

Until recently the whole problem of building country roads has been considered a local problem and a local burden for each separate rural community to work out for itself, and as a conse-

quence of this neglect and this shortsighted policy on the part of the Federal Government and of the States there has been comparatively little progress in permanent road building in many of the States. This neglect has operated to the very great injury of the rural sections and has hindered and delayed the proper growth and development of those sections more than any other one thing.

Recognizing that the making of country roads was more than a local problem for each of the many thousands of rural communities to solve each for itself, there has been in recent years legislation in most of the States establishing State highway commissions, and in many of the States legislation has been enacted providing State aid to the local subdivisions in the construction of permanent good roads. In some of the States where State aid is not granted the State highway commissions, however, are granted powers authorizing them to work in harmony and conjointly with county or local road officials in some general scheme or system of road building and road improvement.

Legislation of this character in the various States has proven very beneficial in stimulating a widespread interest for better roads. It has also resulted in many States in considerable progress being made and much work actually being done in the construction of improved roads.

State aid has naturally led to a more insistent demand for aid of the Federal Government, and this sentiment for Federal aid has now grown until it is, as I said before, widespread, and there is nothing this Congress can do in the way of general legislation and that will prove as popular with the people or that will be as far-reaching in the benefits it will bring to the whole country as to pass this bill and enter upon the policy of national aid in the construction of country roads.

This policy, if adopted now, will not be changed nor receded from in the years to come. Future Congresses will improve upon this legislation, and the amount appropriated will grow from year to year, and the various States and the local subdivisions of the States, encouraged and stimulated by the generous aid and encouragement of the Federal Government, will take up this great work in earnest and carry it forward until all the main roads in every rural section of America become improved roads, and this great network of improved country roads will radiate from every city in the Union to every country village and rural community, and our rural population will be able to avail themselves of every advantage of city life and the people of the cities and villages can readily avail themselves of all the benefits and all the pleasures of close and easy contact with the wholesome influences of country life.

Mr. Chairman, the Government of the United States uses every day in the year 1,200,000 miles of country roads in the carrying of its mails by the star route and the Rural Delivery System. The Government certainly owes some obligations toward the upkeep and construction of this 1,200,000 miles of public roads that it uses daily. No one, it seems to me, can seriously contend otherwise.

In presenting this bill to the House, the chairman of the committee, Mr. SHACKLEFORD, says in his report:

> To carry and deliver the mail is a function of the Federal Government, and it is its duty to provide itself with the facilities necessary to a proper performance of this function, such as postmasters, post offices, and post roads. A post road is just as truly a postal facility as is a post office. As in most rural communities it has been found less expensive and more expedient to rent post offices than to build them, so it would be less expensive and more expedient to use the roads of the States as post roads than it would be to construct and maintain an independent system. In such cases it would seem but just that the General Government should make some contribution to the construction and maintenance of the roads which it uses.
>
> In times past, when the volume and weight of the postal matter were negligible, the interests of the General Government in the roads were not substantial, but with the advent of rural free delivery came a Federal necessity for better roads, and with the now rapidly expanding parcel post that necessity has become acute.

The language of this report sums up in a nutshell the duty of the Government in regard to post roads, and to me it appears unanswerable. It is just as reasonable and just as logical to contend that the cost of the erection of a Federal building to be used as a post office in a city should be borne by the citizens who happen to live in that city as it is to say that the whole cost of the burden of making and maintaining public roads over which the mail of the Government is carried in the country should be borne by the farmers who happen to live along those roads.

The absurdity of the former proposition is apparent at first blush and the latter will appear equally so when it is once considered. No one would think or say that the citizens of New York, Chicago, San Francisco, or even any of our smaller cities, should, at their own expense, put up the necessary buildings and furnish all the facilities for handling the mails in such cities.

Should the farmer, then, be required to bear all the burden in building and maintaining the public roads over which the Government carries its mails into the rural districts? To single the farmers out as the one class that Uncle Sam requires to bear this burden looks like discrimination. It is discrimination gainst the 45,000,000 of our population who live in the country. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the farmers pay a very large part of the revenues of the Government that go into the Federal Treasury—a larger part in proportion to their wealth than any other class of our citizens. They have received in return from the Federal Government in the way of appropriations for their benefit less than any other class. Uncomplainingly, year after year and decade after decade, they have seen their millions go through Federal appropriations to the aid of rivers and harbors, for the erection of great and imposing public buildings in all our cities, for expensive and elaborate coast defenses for the citizens living along the seaboard, and for a thousand other purposes.

Not only have they borne a large part of the burdens of Government in taxation, receiving very little, if anything, directly in return, but in times of war they have unstintingly given to the Nation their sturdy sons, who have loyally defended the flag on land and sea. [Applause.] I heartily concur in the sentiments expressed by my friend from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], when replying to the criticism made against this bill, that it was special legislation in the interest of the farmers, he said:

> I do not admit that the statement is true; but if it were, it would not be for an unworthy or ignoble purpose.

Why should Congress not legislate for the farmers after all these years of neglect and discrimination against them, especially when the legislation desired will not only benefit the farmers as a class, but will also, at the same time, bring untold benefits and happiness to all classes of our people.

The Free Rural Delivery System will no doubt be extended in the future. It can not be stated with absolute accuracy just how many people are served daily by the Rural Delivery Mail Service, but it is safe to say that it is well upward of 25,000,000.

The establishment of the Free Rural Mail Service was the first act of legislation by the Federal Government that was a direct benefit to the farmers as a class. That it has been of inestimable benefit can not be denied. This service has not only benefited the farmer but it has also at the same time benefited the whole country. It is a very useful and a very popular service. Any act of Congress that will tend to make more efficient this service or to extend its untold benefits will meet the hearty approval of the farmers of the country.

And, Mr. Chairman, any act of legislation here that will benefit the great agricultural classes of the United States will be a benefit to every other class of our people and to the whole country.

It is marvelous what free rural mail delivery has done for the rural districts of the United States. Although this great system has been established and developed largely within the last dozen years, its influence in the development and progress of the agricultural communities has been wonderful.

In many sections of the country it has completely changed country life.

To-day 45,000 rural mail carriers, in round numbers, are daily delivering to farmers of America at their front doors the great metropolitan daily newspapers, the best magazines and literary publications of the country, and first-class mail matter many times double in volume that received by them before the institution of this service.

The educational value of this service to the farming communities is incalculable. I remember very well in the country community where I was reared when but a single city newspaper came to the local post office. It was a weekly publication, and I can well remember how almost that entire neighborhood depended upon the substantial old farmer who enjoyed the luxury of a weekly newspaper for their information about current events.

A daily newspaper or a high-class magazine was a thing unknown in that community. That community was not any different from the average country community of that day.

That has not been so many years ago, and yet there has been a wonderful transformation in that neighborhood. Three rural mail routes now deliver mail to the citizens residing in that township. One of the carriers told me he delivered on his route alone 56 daily newspapers, several weekly and monthly publications, including church papers, farm journals, and magazines; that almost every one of his patrons took one of the local county papers, and many of them two or three. I have no doubt that

he also delivered daily more letters and first-class mail than the entire community received at the local post office in a week 15 years ago.

The change that has taken place in conditions in that community has taken place in the 45,000 other rural communities scattered throughout the length and breadth of these 48 States.

In addition to this we now have the parcel post, which has enhanced the value of this service manyfold. The volume of business now transacted through the parcel post is enormous and is growing, and will continue to grow by leaps and bounds in the future. A very large per cent of all the parcel-post business is handled by the rural mail carriers. It is now a great source of revenue to the Government and will be greater as the years go by.

The installation of the free rural mail-delivery system on more than 1,000,000 miles of country roads certainly creates, on the part of the Government, a very vital interest in the question of roads, and also lays upon the Government the sacred duty of contributing at least its just and equitable part in improving and maintaining these roads.

The enactment of the present bill into law commits the Government to this policy. I submit, Mr. Chairman, it is a wise, a just, and a patriotic policy, one that necessarily follows the adoption of the policy of free rural mail delivery and a policy that will bring a greater measure of good to the whole country than any act of legislation in recent years.

It will certainly be an act of belated justice to our great farming population, who have contributed so much toward the development, the greatness, and the prosperity of the Republic.

I regret, Mr. Chairman, the position taken in opposition to this bill by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who is our colleague upon the Committee on Roads. The doctrine announced by him upon this floor, that in legislating upon great questions of national concern we are not to look beyond the borders of our own State to consider the general good of all the people of the Nation, is, to say the least, a strange doctrine to come out of the historic old State of Massachusetts.

It was a great son of this splendid Commonwealth who more than any other of our statesmen taught the American people to think in national terms. His clear and patriotic vision reached far beyond the boundaries of his much-beloved Massachusetts in considering questions of national import. His patriotic, prophetic, matchless words, "Liberty and union, one and inseparable, now and forever," uttered upon a memorable occasion have become the national watchword in Federal legislation and is the rock upon which those of us who support this and kindred measures base our argument in support of the proposition that the power and duty of Congress are commensurate with the requirements of the national welfare. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, there is no question of greater interest to the people of the United States, my State, and district than that of good roads, which is sufficient justification for my taking the time of the House for a few minutes. Everyone recognizes the importance of good roads. This question more nearly affects every citizen of the United States than perhaps any other bill pending or which may be introduced in this session of Congress.

In the first place, there are, in round numbers, about 6,500,000 farmers in the United States, according to the last census, and, including women and children, there are about 45,000,000 depending upon them. Everyone who owns a farm is deeply interested in this question, because a good road running by a farm, connecting it with a market or railroad station, greatly enhances the value of the land. The owner of the farm and those dependent upon him are not alone in being interested in this subject, but the tenants who live upon farms are also interested, because statistics show it costs 23 cents per ton per mile to transport farm products to market in the United States, while in continental Europe, where they have good roads, it costs but 8 cents per ton per mile, a loss to the farmer on account of bad roads of 17 cents per ton per mile.

I saw it stated in a newspaper not long ago that it costs a farmer more to haul a bushel of wheat 9½ miles from his farm to a railroad station, over the average road, such as we have in the United States, than it costs to ship a bushel of wheat from New York to Liverpool, a distance of 3,000 miles.

It is estimated that the railroads carry annually about 900,000,000 tons of freight and that at least 200,000,000 tons are hauled over the country roads to market, wharves, or railroad stations for shipment. It can be readily seen, therefore, what a great loss the farmers of the country sustain by reason of bad roads throughout the country.

The Department of Agriculture is doing a great work in collecting data and publishing bulletins, inviting attention to the great economic value of good roads, educating the people throughout the country how to build them, and stimulating the farmers themselves to take greater interest in this movement for bettering the roads of the country.

There are in the United States about 2,250,000 miles of roads, and to improve them all is a gigantic task. We have to begin somewhere. It is true that it will take years to build them, but the building of good roads means more to the rural community than the time and money saved in transporting farm products to market. Good roads mean better schoolhouses, increased attendance at school, more "moonlight schools," and less illiteracy. [Applause.] They mean more churches and a larger attendance upon Sunday schools and church services; they mean combined country high schools.

Good roads make it possible to extend the Rural Mail Service to the door of every farmer throughout the United States, carrying the daily mail to him and enabling him to take daily papers, and bringing to him the same mail advantages enjoyed by those living in cities and towns.

Good roads by bringing these comforts and conveniences to the rural population will have a tendency to stop the farmer's boy and girl from desiring to remove to town, and will greatly stimulate the "back to the country movement." We who were reared upon the farm believe that this will greatly strengthen the citizenship of the United States.

The people who own the farms and make their living direct from farming are not alone in being interested in this subject, as laborers, carpenters, professional men, bankers, merchants, and, in fact, everyone who resides in cities and towns are also deeply interested in the question of good roads.

In my State of Oklahoma the merchants, bankers, and professional men take the lead in every good-road movement. They are always at the head of petitions for improving roads leading into the towns in which they live, subscribing money to buy material, and on road-working days close up their places of business to help build them. They appreciate that as the farmers are made more prosperous they have more money to pay bills, more money to buy clothing, more money to deposit in banks, and more money with which to build better houses and barns, which will require more lumber and hardware and the services of carpenters, and that they will invest more money in live stock. In other words, as they become more prosperous they will add to the general prosperity of the entire country. Hence in considering this question to-day our vision should be broader than looking at the question from a selfish standpoint, and we should appreciate the great importance that stimulating road building is to the entire citizenship of this Republic.

I have often thought that if the farmers of the country were educated to better farming and marketing methods, had the advantages of Rural Mail Service and good roads over which to transport their farm products to market, we could little dream of the wonderful prosperity that would come to them and the entire country within the next decade.

I am not on the committee which reported this bill, but no man in this House is in deeper sympathy with the question of good roads than I am. I have not the time now to critically analyze it. However, it provides that the building of good roads may be assisted by the Federal Government to the amount of not more than $25,000,000 for any fiscal year, to be expended in the following manner:

Sixty-five thousand dollars to each State, and one-half of the remainder in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the population of all the States, and the other half in the ratio which the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes of each State bears to the total mileage of all the States.

I am not so sure that the bill is specific enough. Perhaps it should be more specific, but I want to say to the House that although this bill may not be the best bill that could be written, and it may be imperfect as to the details in some or many particulars, yet this or any other bill which has for its purpose aiding and stimulating the people in the building of good roads will have my unqualified support.

On January 12 I introduced a bill upon the same subject—H. R. 8819. It provides an appropriation of $25,000,000 annually, divides the roads up into four classes, and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to expend a certain sum per mile upon each class of road.

There are three views with reference to road building in the United States: The first, I might say, is opposed to any

Government aid whatsoever; the second wants great highways built across the country connecting capitals, important cities and towns; and the third class, to which I belong, believes that the money should be used to aid and stimulate the farmers of the country to appreciate the importance and necessity of building good roads from the farms to the markets.

The bill which I drew gave every civil subdivision in each State of the United States the option of using a pro rata part of the money appropriated by the Federal Government.

The bill under consideration, as I construe it, leaves this question to the State highway commissioner of each State. I think it ought to be so written in the law that no favoritism whatever could be shown, either by the Federal or State authorities, against the weaker citizens of this country.

What I would like to guard against is making it possible for any State authority to discriminate in favor of the larger highways and against the less influential citizens of the country.

The bill introduced by me contains a provision giving each civil subdivision the right to its share of the money, conditioned that at least an equal amount should be made available for the same purpose, and that in the event any civil subdivision did not avail itself of the money to which it was entitled, then the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to expend all of the money to which said civil subdivision of any State was entitled upon the larger highways of that State, if the subdivisions through which said highways ran should make an equal amount of money available for the same purpose.

In the bill under consideration the State of Oklahoma will receive $532,138 if it becomes a law. It would receive about an equal sum under the terms of the bill introduced by me.

I am glad to know that doubt no longer exists as to the constitutional power of the General Government to lend its financial aid in the construction and maintenance of good roads.

While, of course, I would not do violence to the Constitution of my country, but if its constitutionality had not already been tested, and I entertained a reasonable doubt about it, I would resolve that doubt in favor of the bill and permit the Supreme Court to finally pass upon the question.

The State of Oklahoma, anticipating that this or similar legislation might be enacted by Congress, on March 15, 1915, passed a comprehensive road law creating a department of highways and providing for the appointment of a commissioner of highways and defining his duties in detail. Among his other duties it is provided that he should—

> Fifth. To cooperate with the Federal Government in all matters pertaining to the improvement of public highways, and all funds provided by Congress and appropriated for the improvement of the public highways in this State shall be expended under the supervision of the commissioner of highways.

It authorizes the commissioner of highways to appoint a State engineer—

> Who shall be a civil engineer of established reputation and qualified in road and bridge construction.

It also provides for the appointment of county engineers, and requires that they shall have a practical knowledge of civil engineering and of road building, and that no person shall be elected or appointed to this position who does not hold a certificate from the State highway commissioner or who has not stood the examination required by his department.

The act is a very comprehensive one, providing for cooperation between the State highway commissioner, the county engineers, and the county commissioners, and for designating, laying out, and the platting of a complete system of roads in every county throughout the State. It also provides a means of State and county taxation of one-fourth of 1 mill ad valorem, as well as a tax of 50 cents per horsepower on each automobile.

I cite this to show that our new State is alive to the great importance of this question and will gladly welcome the enactment of this legislation by Congress.

Oklahoma is peculiarly interested in this legislation, because of the fact that the eastern half of the State was formerly occupied by the Five Civilized Tribes, and when these tribal lands were allotted a large part of them were made nontaxable either by agreement or by acts of Congress.

But this bill, Mr. Chairman, has more in it than the financial assistance we extend to farmers and more than stimulating the farmers in good road building; it will do more than give better school facilities, more than increase the attendance upon Sunday schools and churches, and greatly improve the Rural Mail Service. Over and above all it will restore confidence to the farmers of this country and bring them to realize that their Representatives in Congress have their welfare at heart, and that while the farmers of the country bear so much of the burdens of this Government in the way of taxation, Congress is ready and willing to give them recognition and to give them some of the benefits of this Government. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest that when I heard the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] talking about the Cumberland Road and then gritting his teeth and opposing this bill because it was unconstitutional, I remembered when that road was being built. Thomas Jefferson was President of the United States and a man by the name of Hodge was attorney general in Pennsylvania, and Pennsylvania undertook to dictate where the road should go or veto its right to go through the State. And Thomas Jefferson sent a message saying he was willing to recognize counsel of Pennsylvania as to where it should go, but the right to go through every State and any State was a governmental right that he would not yield. So if there was nothing else in the Constitution on this road question, I would much rather risk Thomas Jefferson than the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GORDON. I would like to say that every State through which that road passed gave its consent.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Sure. It had to, because Thomas Jefferson notified them it was going on, anyhow. And so the question of constitutionality is lodged upon the proposition that the Constitution says Congress shall have power to establish post offices and post roads. That word "establish" has been construed in divers decisions to give Congress the right to build roads, build post offices, buy mail sacks, make contracts, and ten thousand—yea, a million—other things, under the one word "establish." And we build thousands of post offices all over this Republic under that one word "establish." And the same word "establish" that gives the right to build a post office gives the right to build post roads—governs both in the same proposition.

Then the next point of constitutionality is founded upon the fact that they say it is under the general-welfare clause. I have never been a stickler for the general-welfare clause, but I can find thousands of very munificent and splendid institutions in this Republic that had no other method of getting in. For instance, I challenge the gentleman, who is such a stickler for constitutionality, to find me one sentence in the Constitution that authorizes Cincinnati to have a national bank. I challenge any man to do it. And in the constitutional convention, when the power to create a corporation was up for discussion, they voted it down three times, and Mr. Morris of Pennsylvania said the reason they voted it down was because they were afraid somebody would establish a bank.

But I am going to get back to my friend from New York [Mr. MAGEE]. He is gone. I wanted to say something. I was amused when that exuberant, volatile, good-looking fellow got through with his speech. I really was. He looked over to our side of the House and said he did not consider that the whole ballasting power that held the ship of state properly poised was on that side of the House. And I agreed with him. And I decided that I would watch hereafter, and if it takes a massive, ponderous brain to balance the ship of state we will have to keep our side pretty well filled up to hold his side level. He wound up by saying that he was not opposing this matter so much on its merits, but was wanting to save the whole financial appropriation business to put into a lot of big gunboats and an imperial standing Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TILLMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TILLMAN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Chairman, this seems to be quite a field day for the freshmen. Quite a number of new Members are plunging in this afternoon, and it is well enough to give them an opportunity to be heard.

I was somewhat disappointed by the speech of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE]. I speak with respect of him and of his great State. But the doctrine which he enunciated if applied to the South would be considered by us an unfortunate one, and would be considered by many citizens of New York as an unfortunate doctrine. The gentleman used the expression that New York ought not to be mulcted in the sum of $3,000,000 for the purpose of building up highways thousands of miles from New York. If we applied that doctrine to Arkansas, to the Southern States, where the negro population is large, we would be criticized by the gentleman from New York, and properly so. Down in our country, down in the South, the negroes unfortunately pay but little tax, pay but a small school tax; and yet, whenever an effort is made by a

southern legislator to segregate the taxes paid by the white people for the benefit of white schools only, Democratic legislatures always vote such measures down overwhelmingly.

You ought not to despise States because they are small or because they are poor. The starry heavens are more beautiful because the little stars shine there along with the big stars, and no one would want to blot out a star because, though it is bright, it is small, and because there are larger and more brilliant constellations.

New York has received much at the hands of the Federal Government, as have other States whose Representatives criticize this measure. Millions of dollars have been expended all over the country by pouring into streams that are dry half the year millions of dollars and by pouring millions of dollars into harbors that are never whitened by the sail of a ship or blackened by the smoke of a steamer; and now, when the country asks for a meager appropriation for good roads for the purpose of building up the whole country, we find gentlemen in the larger States, where millions of Federal money have been wasted as above stated, raising the question that they ought not to be required to spend more money than can be used in their own bailiwicks or in their own sections.

This is by far the most important bill that has been considered by this Congress, or that will be considered by the present Congress. More people are interested in this measure and more people desire its speedy passage. My only objection to this bill is that it does not go far enough.

I introduced a road bill, H. R. 479, on the first day of the session that was considered too radical by the committee, perhaps, asking for $1,000,000 for each State annually until $1,000,000,000 should be consumed in road building. Such a measure as that would furnish employment for the unemployed and would bring happiness and prosperity to all the people. I know of nothing so important to the country as the bill I had the honor to introduce. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to be allowed to insert the bill in the RECORD. It is not lengthy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to insert the bill named by him in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the bill referred to:

A bill (H. R. 479) to provide for Federal aid to good roads, to aid the States in maintenance of roads, and to create a national highway commission.

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to establish, improve, and maintain public roads that are now or may hereafter be needed for use as post roads, military roads, or for interstate commerce, there be, and hereby is, created a fund to be known as the United States highway fund. Said fund shall be raised in the manner herein provided, but the Treasurer of the United States is hereby authorized to receive and place to the credit of said fund any money that may be constributed from other sources and to expend the same upon the order of the United States highway commission or in accordance with the conditions of the contribution.

SEC. 2. That for the purpose of providing money for the United States highway fund the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to issue and sell on and after January 1, 1918, at par, with accrued interest, coupon or registered bonds of the United States in such form as he may prescribe, in denominations of $20, or multiples of that sum, said bonds to be payable in coin 50 years from the date of issue and to bear interest payable in coin semiannually at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, the total amount of said bonds not to exceed $1,000,000,000, and the issue and sale of same not to exceed such amounts as may be necessary from time to time to enable the Treasurer of the United States to make payments of salaries of officers, agents, engineers, and employees, and for expenditures in the preliminary work and in the work of laying out, construction, repairs, and maintenance of the highways to be built under the provisions of this act. Bonds issued under the authority of this act, or the income therefrom, shall not be subject to taxation of any kind for any purpose. Bonds authorized by this section shall be first offered at par as a popular loan under such regulations, prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, as will give opportunity to the citizens of the United States to participate in the subscriptions to such loans, and in allotting such bonds the several subscriptions of individuals shall be first accepted, and the subscriptions for the lowest amounts shall be first allotted. Any portion of any issue of said bonds not subscribed for as above provided may be disposed of by the Secretary of the Treasury at not less than par, under such regulations as he may prescribe, but no commissions shall be allowed or paid thereon; and a sum not exceeding one twenty-fifth of 1 per cent of the amount of the bonds herein authorized is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay the expense of preparing, advertising, and issuing the same.

SEC. 3. That as soon as practicable after January 1, 1918, the sum of $1,000,000 shall be expended annually in each State under the direction of the United States highway commission, hereinafter constituted, without regard to population, taxable property, or extent of territory in said States, in the construction, maintenance, and extension of public roads as before mentioned and for the purposes before mentioned, and such construction, maintenance, and extension shall be continued until the fund above provided for shall be exhausted.

SEC. 4. That there is hereby created a United States highway commission, to carry out the provisions of this act, to be composed of competent experts in road building, four of whom shall be selected by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and three members from each State to be appointed by the governor and confirmed by the highest legislative body of said State, the first four members acting with the last-mentioned members to constitute the United States highway commission for the different States respectively. Each of the first four named commissioners shall receive as salary the sum of $10,000 annually, and the last-named commissioners to receive $5,000 annually, each commissioner to receive his necessary expenses when traveling in the performance of his duty as such commissioner. Members of the commission shall give bond for the faithful performance of their duties in whatever sum the Secretary of the Treasury shall require.

SEC. 5. The four members of the United States highway commission first mentioned in this act shall have power to make all needful rules for the proper administration of this act, the payment of salaries, expenses, for materials, labor, and the safeguarding of all funds under its control, and shall be empowered to employ and fix the salaries of all clerks, engineers, and employees.

SEC. 6. Said commission shall have its head office in the District of Columbia, but shall maintain one public highway division in and for each State where the local members of said commission shall have their offices. Said commission may require the assistance and cooperation of the officers and employees of any department in its work.

SEC. 7. That before any State shall receive the benefits of this act, the legislature of said State shall assent to the provisions of this act by resolution duly passed and approved by governor of the State.

SEC. 8. That said highway commission shall, as far as practicable, construct the roads contemplated in this act so as to serve and benefit the people of each State fairly and equitably and without unjust discrimination, and said work shall be carried on in each State simultaneously.

SEC. 9. That this act shall be in force from and after its passage.

Mr. TILLMAN. I prefer my own bill to any other, but I am willing and anxious to vote for the pending bill or for any other bill that proposes to build up the great highways of the country. I prefer good roads to giant navies or to mighty armies.

Mr. Chairman, the dirt road is used by the farmer a hundred times where the railroad is used by him once. As was stated here by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS], all the great nations of the world have been road builders. The greater the nation, the greater road builder it has been, and these roads have been built by public moneys; by moneys taken out of the national treasury.

Highways range from the narrow path made by the savage to the graded turnpike. Highway history is both interesting and instructive. The Athenian senate bestowed much care upon good roads. The Carthaginians were good road builders. In Peru the Incas built lasting highways, the remains of which attest their magnificence and advanced civilization. The road from Quito to Cuzco, in Peru, was 2,000 miles in length, 20 feet wide, paved with stones 10 feet square, and had a running stream and shade trees on each side. The great highway leading from Babylon to ancient Memphis was paved at an early date, and along this road rose the cities of Nineveh, Tyre, Damascus, and Antioch.

In 312 B. C. Appius Claudius, a Roman patrician, became censor of the Roman Commonwealth and gained enduring fame by beginning, in 313, the construction of a remarkable road, which was named the Appian Way. It has been called the "queen of highways." The width of this road varied from 15 to 18 feet, and the method of construction was as follows: A trench was excavated the entire length and breadth of the roadway. In the trench the road materials were placed in four layers, having a thickness of 3 feet. The first layer consisted of large flat stones laid in lime mortar. The second was composed of broken stone mixed with one-third their quantity of lime, packed and made solid by ramming. The third layer was made of a mixture of broken brick, tiles, gravel, and lime, and the top pavement was a layer of regularly shaped stones about 6 inches thick, closely jointed and fitted with the utmost nicety. This road was eminently durable, but the poet Horace, who wrote concerning it, states that it was fatiguing to travel over it slowly. This road led direct from the gates of Rome to Capua, and was finally extended to Brundusium, 350 miles from the imperial city. It commands a beautiful prospect, embracing Campania, while on both sides of this great highway are numerous tombs, among which are the tombs of the Scipios.

The greatest of the Cæsars, the princely Julius, traveled over this "queen of roads," as did Cæsar Augustus and the war-lord Trajan, as did Marcus Brutus and the golden-lipped Cicero, as did the fascinating Cleopatra and the soldier-orator Marc Antony, and the greatest man of the ancient world, St. Paul himself, traveled with bare feet along this same Appian Way when he visited the wonderful city of the Cæsars.

To-day this durable road, long after the death of the blue-blooded Claudius, is in good repair, and now the swift and noiseless motor car glides gracefully over its dustless surface, pressing the same stones that felt the martial tread of great Pompey's legions more than 20 centuries ago. Rome built many other highways and became great by the help of these roads, which were built with money taken from the public treasury. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] is recognized.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to make any elaborate speech on this bill; in fact, I could not do so within the time allotted me by the chairman of the committee. Its merits are so manifest, however, that it furnishes its own defense. I do not think that there will be a more important—perhaps I should modify that by saying a more meritorious—bill come before this Congress than the one that we are now considering. I want to see this bill passed, and I hope that the Committee on Appropriations, after it is passed, will see its way clear to bring in a bill appropriating the amount of money authorized by this bill and that the good work will start. It does not take a student of affairs to see that the question of improved highways is one of ever-growing importance. A study of the historical feature of this interesting subject is not without its value in this connection, and in reading data on the subject in the Library of Congress I find:

HISTORICAL DATA.

The first American road law was passed by the General Assembly of Virginia in 1632, and the first American road built by white men was at Jamestown a few years later; in New England the path between Boston and Plymouth was begun in 1639; in the province of New York laws for road building were passed in 1664; two years later the first Maryland road law came into existence; and Pennsylvania followed in 1692 with a road act, placing the control of highways in the hands of townships, and this State is credited with the first important macadam road built in America—the Lancaster Turnpike, from Lancaster to Philadelphia—which was constructed in 1794.

The earliest authentic record of permanent roads is found in Egypt. A little to the east of the great Pyramids were discovered the remains of the giant causeway more than a mile in length. This is supposed to be a portion of the great highway built by King Cheops for the purpose of affording a passage across the sand for the transportation of the stone used in the construction of the great Pyramids. This is doubtless the road on which Herodotus tells us the great king employed 100,000 men for a period of 10 years. It was built of massive stone blocks 10 feet thick and was skirted on each side with mausoleums, temples, porticos, and statues.

The Persians probably learned the art of road building from the Babylonians, who built the first stone bridges and constructed a system of military roads throughout their Empire. There were two branches of a great road leading from Babylon to Syria, and historians say that a moderate toll was exacted.

The Romans were the first systematic road builders of the world. The first of their great roads was constructed from Rome to Capua, a distance of 142 Italian miles, by Claudius Appius, about 312 B. C., and is known as the Appian Way, or "The Queen of the Roads." This road was later extended to Brundisium, about 360 miles, and was probably completed by Julius Cæsar. About 220 B. C. the Flaminian Way was built. This road is of great interest because of its stone arch bridge across the River Nar, 60 miles from Rome. The central arch had a span of 150 feet and a rise of 100 feet, and has been pronounced the stateliest ruin in Italy. After the completion of the Flaminian Way, road building progressed rapidly until Rome reached the height of her glory, when there were 29 great military roads centering in the city. They represented the visible efforts of a nation for the preservation and extension of her national glory. The majority of the main Roman highways were built by contract at public expense. They were maintained in part by labor of soldiers and convicts or slaves, or by enforced service, which, in some instances, took the form of taxation. The supervision of the roads was intrusted to men of the highest rank. Augustus himself seems to have made those about Rome his special care. Crossroads were placed in charge of the local magistrates, although occasionally portions of the road were assigned to some landowner to maintain at his own cost.

The present road system of France, which is perhaps the finest in the world, was founded by Napoleon. He built many roads through the Empire, among them the road over the Simplon Pass, which was commenced in 1800 and required six years for completion. It was under him that the work was systematized and placed in the hands of a permanent body of engineers. In 1775 Tresaguet, a French engineer, published a treatise on broken-stone roads. His work preceded that of Macadam and Telford by about 40 years.

The first record of road legislation in England goes back as far as 1285, and it provides that the trees and bushes on both sides of all roads for a distance of 200 feet shall be cut away to prevent robbers from lurking therein and rushing upon victims unawares. In 1346 Edward III authorized the first toll to be levied for the repair of roads. This commission was granted to the master of the Hospital of St. Giles and to John Holborn, authorizing them to levy toll on vehicles passing on the roads leading from the hospital to the old Temple of London, and also on an adjoining road called the Portal. In 1523 Parliament passed its first act relative to the repair of roads; but it was not until the middle of the eighteenth century that highway legislation became active.

RECENT ACTIVITY.

This activity has grown with the passing years, and more so in recent years than ever before. In fact, nearly every State of the Union is actively aroused to the need of good roads and is making large expenditures for that purpose, either in the way of State appropriation or by means of local taxation. A study of the figures for the year ending December 31, 1914, will clearly display this activity. For the whole United States there was expended for the year 1914, by State funds, local funds, and joint funds, the total sum of $249,055,067. Every State in the Union was engaged in some degree in this good work. Some of the larger expenditures were: New York, $29,890,473; California, $14,670,614; Indiana, $13,258,761; Iowa, $11,437,000; Ohio, $11,261,882; Pennsylvania, $10,424,580; Michigan, $9,516,224; Wisconsin, $9,118,708; Texas, $8,750,000; and so on down the line, every State being actively alive to the importance of improved highways.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, as I have said, there has never been a time in American history when our people have been so keenly sensible to the importance of this internal improvement than to-day, and I think we have reached that point where the Federal Government should lend its aid; not in any sense to relieve the States and their localities of their duty and responsibility in the matter, but to supplement their good work by cooperation and intelligent assistance.

Section 8 of Article I of the Federal Constitution provides that Congress, among other things, shall have the power to "establish post offices and post roads"; and it is, therefore, not only within the power of the National Government to do so, but it is its manifest duty to do it.

NATIONAL AID.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Party in its platform at Baltimore in 1912 had the following to say on this important question:

We favor national aid to State and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post roads.

And the Progressive Party in its platform adopted at Chicago June, 1912, said:

We recognize the vital importance of good roads and we pledge our party to foster their extension in every proper way, and we favor the early construction of national highways.

And the Socialist Party in their national convention in 1912 went on record in specific terms as favoring national aid to the development of highways and waterways system.

But the Republican platform, so far as I have been able to find, was silent on this important question; and no wonder that it fell from an electoral vote of 321 in 1908 to an electoral vote of 8 in 1912—Vermont and Utah, I believe. But I am glad to note that there are many Republicans in this House who, despite their training to the contrary, know a good thing when they see it and will vote for this bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who has filed a minority report on this bill, seems to think that this is a bill designed to help certain sections of the country at the expense of the others. Why, Mr. Chairman, nothing could be further from the truth. I know of no measure that could possibly pass this House that would be of more general benefit to the entire country than the one that we now have under consideration. A comprehensive system of public highways will add more to the wealth of the United States and the prosperity and happiness of its people than any other improvement of which I can conceive, and it is unworthy of the gentleman from Massachusetts to say that it is a sectional matter and ought not to be passed.

Now I read from the minority report which he has filed the following excerpt:

The States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, and Pennsylvania will pay into the Federal Treasury the larger proportion of the sum appropriated in this measure, and will receive in some cases less than one-quarter the amount paid in, while other

States will receive relatively twice as much as they contribute to the Federal Treasury.

Now, what does that argument of the gentleman mean in its final analysis? It simply means that when this Congress goes to appropriate money to carry on this Government that it must be careful to see that each State receives as much money as it pays into the Public Treasury. How does the gentleman from Massachusetts think that rule would work as to rivers and harbors, public buildings and grounds, pensions, Army and Navy expenditures, appropriation for the Post Office Department, and all the other activities of the Federal Government? Under such a rule as that I am sure that the gentleman would concede that we Representatives from the Southern States would have a grievance. But there is no such rule, never has been, and could not be in the orderly conduct of the affairs of this Government. Now, let us apply the gentleman's standard of measure which he prescribes to the matter of pensions, for instance, and see how it works out. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, the report of the Commissioner of Pensions shows that the sum of $171,337,455.61 was paid out of the Treasury of the United States for pensions, and of this amount the six States which the gentleman mentions in his minority report, viz, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, received a total of $60,200,566.36, or a little more than 35 per cent of the whole fund. Does the gentleman think that the other 42 States of this Union should oppose pensions in worthy cases merely because 35 cents out of every dollar appropriated for that purpose goes to the six States which he has named? Why, of course, he does not. He would reply at once that the reason that these six States get so large a portion of the pension money is because they have the pensioners who are entitled to receive it.

And so I say, in regard to this bill, the reason that some States will get more money, relatively, than others is because they have more population, more mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes, all of which are used as a basis of consideration in this bill and are just and equitable. The bill does not provide for any particular amount for any particular State, except the $65,000 that is arbitrarily given to each State regardless of its size and population, and then the balance that it will receive will depend entirely upon its population, together with mileage of rural routes and star mail routes. Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts mentioned the State of Delaware in his remarks on this bill, for the purpose of comparison—that State of which ex-Senator John J. Ingalls, I believe, once said "had three counties at low tide and two at high tide." Now, I have not anything against the State of Delaware; it is all right. It has one Representative in Congress—Mr. MILLER—and I think he is a fine young man, and I like him and hope he will vote for this bill. He ought to, because he will find that Delaware fares all right under this bill.

Let us see how Delaware fares under this bill. If it becomes a law, Delaware will receive $103,290, and I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that Delaware had a total mileage of 3,000 miles of public roads within her borders on January 1, 1915. Figuring, then, from a mileage standpoint of public roads, Delaware would receive $34.43 for every mile of public road within her borders. Now, let us see how my own State of Texas fares under the bill in this respect. Under the bill it is estimated that Texas will receive the sum of $1,070,386. On January 1, 1915, the State of Texas had 128,971 miles of public roads; therefore we would receive under this bill $8.30 for each mile of public road that we have in Texas.

In other words, the State of Delaware, which the gentleman used as an illustration to fortify his complaint, receives $34.43 for each mile of public road that it has and Texas only receives $8.30 for each mile of public road that it has. Suppose we take the gentleman's own State of Massachusetts. Massachusetts will receive under the provisions of this bill $535,420. On January 1, 1915, the State of Massachusetts had within its borders 17,272 miles of public road, and would therefore receive $31 for every mile of public road they have, against $8.30 per mile for Texas. And take, if you please, the State of the chairman of this committee, Hon. DORSEY W. SHACKLEFORD. Certainly if the committee had wanted to favor any State it would not have overlooked the chairman of the Roads Committee of this House. Under the terms of this bill it is estimated that the State of Missouri will receive the sum of $974,114. On January 1, 1915, the State of Missouri had 120,000 miles of public roads, and therefore will only receive $8.12 for each mile of public road that she has within her borders, as against the figures heretofore given as to Delaware and Massachusetts. And going further, let us take, if you please, the other five States to which the gentleman referred: Connecticut would receive $20.56; New York, $19.90; New Jersey, $29.50; Ohio, $14.32; and Pennsylvania, $16.70 for every mile of public road which they have within their borders. The general average for the six States which the gentleman names would be about $22 per mile, whereas the general average for the 48 States as a whole is, in round numbers, $11 for each mile of public road in the United States.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman ought to congratulate himself that these States have fared so well. If the committee had framed this bill so that the amount available for each State would have depended upon its mileage of public roads, then the States mentioned by the gentleman would not have fared so well and he might have had cause for complaint. But the bill is not framed that way. It first apportions $65,000 to each State irrespective of size and population, and then apportions the balance according to population and rural-route and star-route mileage; and so, instead of complaining at the bill on that score, the gentleman from Massachusetts should be shaking hands with himself that the States in which he seems so much interested have fared so well.

Now, the gentleman named Texas as one of the States which did not appropriate anything directly for the aid of public roads last year, and, strictly speaking, I think the gentleman is correct, for we have as yet no State highway commission. But it would perhaps not be out of place to say that in 1914 the various localities of Texas spent $8,750,000 in building roads, which was only exceeded by eight of the other States of the Union, viz, Colorado, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin; and we to-day have nearly 1,000 miles more of hard-surfaced roads than the State of Massachusetts. But, of course, we have a much larger State and we need many more miles of hard-surfaced roads yet, and will surely get them as time rolls on.

THIS BILL WILL NOT HINDER STATE AND LOCAL ACTIVITY BUT WILL ENCOURAGE AND HELP.

Now, another phase of this matter which I desire to notice for a moment is the inquiry propounded by my colleague from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. The inquiry was this:

Does not the gentleman think that if the appropriation is once made out of the Federal Treasury for the construction of highways, it will absolutely paralyze all local movement and that no community will ever thereafter be willing to do anything for itself?

The gentleman from Massachusetts made quick reply to this inquiry by stating that he thought it would have such effect. Now, it seems to me that that is a far-fetched conclusion and not supported by any process of logic or reasoning. In my opinion, if no other results followed the appropriation of $25,000,000 authorized by this bill than the stimulus that it would give to the improvement and development of postal highways all over the United States, it would be the best $25,000,000 that this Government has spent in many a day. The time has come, Mr. Chairman, when one of the most serious problems that exists in our social and economic life, is the crowding of our people into the cities and the complex problems of poverty and unemployment that so naturally follow this condition. Why, sir, in 1790 only 3.35 per cent of our people lived in the cities; 30 years later, in 1820, only 4.93 per cent of our population lived in cities; 30 years later than this, in 1850, the percentage had increased to 12.49 per cent; and still 30 years later, in 1880, the percentage had grown to 22.57 per cent, and to-day more than 40 per cent of the entire population of the United States live in cities of more than 2,500 inhabitants.

Is it any wonder that the cost of living is mounting higher and higher? It is bound to do so so long as our consuming class increases so out of proportion to the producing class. Why, if this condition of affairs is not remedied by wise foresight and prompt action and is allowed to go on as it now is—

> The lamb that followed Mary
> Will no longer be seen around,
> For she'll sell the little critter
> At 20 cents a pound.

What are we going to do about it? I contend that the best remedy in the world is to build good roads, improved school facilities, an efficient and sufficient system of rural credits—such as I believe this Congress is going to pass—and encourage our people back to the farm and make farm life agreeable and desirable.

THIS BILL IS NOT CLASS LEGISLATION.

But the gentleman said yesterday that this would be class legislation because forsooth it would benefit the farmers in a more direct way than any other class. Indeed, that is a strange argument to use in a body possessing the collective intelligence of the United States Congress. Does the gentleman think that the money appropriated for the improvement of our great harbors is class legislation, because perchance it will more directly benefit the ships that sail the seas? Does he think that the great Federal reserve act, that will surely prove a safe anchor

in every time of financial storm, is class legislation because it operates through our banking system and does not overturn it? In fact, did the gentleman think at all when he said that this was a piece of class legislation? This is a strange statement to come from a Member possessing the intelligence of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have found that reckless statements are sometimes made in this House. I heard the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], on Thursday of this week, while speaking during consideration of the urgent deficiency bill, indulge in about 40 minutes' verbal exercise criticizing the President of the United States for his dealing with the Mexican problem, and in to-day's Washington Post I notice an extract from a speech delivered by a distinguished private citizen of the United States, ex-President Roosevelt, at Philadelphia one day this week, in which he says:

> Individuals and nations who preach the doctrine of milk and water invariably have in them a softness of fiber which means that they fear to antagonize those who preach the doctrine of blood and iron.

Indeed, that is a fine-sounding phrase to be uttered by an ex-President of the United States. Indeed, one would be led to think from remarks like these that we are a Nation of cowards. Now, it is my good fortune to be a Representative in Congress from Texas, and I hope I may be permitted to say that Texans are neither afraid to fight nor too proud to fight. The State that gave to history the story of San Jacinto and the Alamo is not of the milk and water variety, but Texas does not want any war with Mexico or any other country. We want peace. And we hope that President Wilson will continue in the future to disregard the jingoes as he has in the past and continue to exercise the patience, judgment, and forbearance that has thus far led us safely into paths of peace. Every patriotic American citizen should be giving him his sympathetic cooperation instead of hurling at him a lot of harangue that means nothing and possesses less than no merit at all. Such intemperate utterances as some of these we are hearing now remind me of an anecdote that the late ex-Gov. Bob Taylor used to tell in one of his lectures when referring to these fellows who are always spoiling for a fight. He said that back in Tennessee they had on trial a negro who had posed as a "bully" among the members of his race and that the prosecuting attorney brought in an old negro servant who lived in the community to testify as to this "bad nigger's" character.

When the old negro was asked as to "Bill's" reputation for being a fussy, quarrelsome, and dangerous "nigger," he said, "Well, boss, Bill is very vivid in verbal exercise and is powerful active in his linguistics, but," said he, "when it comes to personal adjustment he is not so eager for de contex." Well, now, my friends, when it comes to verbal exercise and activity in their linguistics, some of these gentlemen who are so viciously attacking the President are very proficient, but if it should come to a matter of personal adjustment, I do not know that they would make any greater rush for the front than any of the rest of us.

But I hope, Mr. Chairman, that I will be pardoned for having made this digression at this point, and will now return to a further discussion of the bill which we are considering. When I digressed I was discussing the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], to the effect that this good-roads bill was a matter of class legislation. I have never had any of that disposition to array the city against the country or the country against the city. "A man's a man for a' that," whether he lives in the city or the country. "But there is neither east nor west, border nor breed, nor birth, when two strong men stand face to face, though they come from the ends of the earth." Just as one stone laid well upon the other makes the massive structure when completed, with all of its symmetry and proportion, just so does the citizenship of the city and the citizenship of the country blend together and make our Commonwealth what it is to-day; and any legislation that contributes to the progress and welfare of our rural communities is bound to benefit the city, and it is idle to talk about it being class legislation.

CONCLUSION.

And now, Mr. Chairman, in closing I wish to express the hope that the pledge of the Democratic Party made at Baltimore, to extend national aid to the States in the construction and maintenance of good roads, will be redeemed by this bill becoming a law. And if it does become a law, it will take its place alongside the other notable constructive legislation of this Democratic administration, and we will go before the country in 1916 with a record of achievement unsurpassed in the political annals of the United States. We will have accomplished things and not merely talked about them. And, Mr. Chairman, I have no fears but that a grateful and appreciative people will reciprocate by giving their unreserved indorsement at the polls.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I will ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN] to use some of his time.

Mr. DUNN. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a good deal of attention to the arguments advanced by those who favor this bill, and likewise to the very splendid address of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and others in opposition thereto. It is apparent that a favorable sentiment exists in this House toward this measure, and this fact, in connection with the almost unanimous recommendation of the committee, indicates that the bill will pass. Notwithstanding these facts, I take my stand with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and others in opposition to the bill.

During my brief experience in this Hall I have been impressed with the continuous and insistent demand for selfish legislation. The cry for increased paternalism is most persistent. No one who is advocating the passage of this bill will pretend that the advantages by way of increased commercial facilities to those who will be obliged to pay the bulk of the taxes will be in any manner commensurate to the benefits of those who live in the neighborhoods where the improvements are made. It is a proposal, under whatever name you put it, to tax the people who in many cases have already burdened themselves for improvement in their own localities to build roads for others in localities where the people will not pay the expense of their own improvements. You are asking that the people who do not have the advantages of good roads, either from neglect or inability to provide them, be given improved roads at the expense of localities already burdened in many cases with heavy bond issues for their own local improvements. In the county which I have the honor in part to represent we have issued road bonds which remain unpaid to the amount of $12,250,000, and in addition to this sum for the freeing of toll bridges additional bonds amounting to $5,200,000, making in all $17,450,000 which was done as much for the farmers in our community as for any other class of people. And now you propose to lay additional burdens upon us to build roads for those who will not pay the expense of their own road building.

You say that the communities in which you are interested are not able to pay for extensive road improvements. Even so, ought you to ask others to do that work for you? Remember that the older communities have passed through the same conditions through which the newer ones are now passing. Remember that increased population brings with it increased burdens, and in the natural order of things there is a sort of equalization, as the larger communities must pay extra taxes in order to make the necessary improvements to accommodate the larger number of people. That is the reason why France and other countries with dense population have the better roads. It is in the natural order of development.

In this debate much concern is shown for the farmer. Now, we are all interested in the welfare of the farmer, just as we are interested in the welfare of every other class of the American people; but I do not think it out of place to suggest to you that the National Government in recent years has done much, and perhaps more for the farmer than for any other class of our people. [Applause.] Look over the increased expenditures of the governmental departments during the past 10 years, and you will find that the Agricultural Department has increased its expenditures 250 per cent, largely in the interest of the American farmer. It was surely considered a great boon when the Rural Delivery Service was extended for the benefit of the farmer, and Uncle Sam carried the farmer's mail over the farmer's own muddy roads to his door, and instead of receiving the thanks of the farmer for tramping through the mire, Uncle Sam is now asked to build improved roads in order to keep his feet clean.

But while we are discussing the farmer let me call your attention to the fact that there are a respectable number of these honored gentlemen in the Eastern States who have given of their means to build roads in their own neighborhoods, and you have no right to ask them now to give further of their means to build roads in localities hundreds of miles away. As I have already stated, you propose to lay additional burdens of taxation for road improvements on those who have done their duty for the benefit of people who in the exercise of their rights of local self-government have refused to tax themselves, and now want to tax other people to do what they refuse to do for themselves.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN. I will.

Mr. FIELDS. Does the gentleman believe that the harbors of our country should be maintained by the Federal Government or by the citizens along the coast?

Mr. COLEMAN. I believe that they should be constructed by the Federal Government, because they are controlled by the Federal Government, as every Federal improvement should be controlled, and not for the benefit of any local community.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLEMAN. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. Does the gentleman contend that the only benefit derived from roads is the benefit derived by the people who live immediately upon the roads?

Mr. COLEMAN. That is not the only benefit.

Mr. FIELDS. If the gentleman did believe that, would it not be a proper argument to apply to the ports and harbors of our country?

Mr. COLEMAN. No.

Mr. FIELDS. I suppose the gentleman must live near one of the harbors of our country?

Mr. COLEMAN. No; I do not live particularly close. I live over in the western part of Pennsylvania, and we are not particularly close to a harbor.

But, gentlemen, this attempt to further tax people who have already taxed themselves in the performance of a local duty is most unjust. You may argue that the distribution you propose is an equitable one, but the facts will not sustain you. Let me call your attention to the inequality of the tax you purpose levying upon the people. The total amount of taxes raised from internal revenue during the fiscal year of 1915 was over $415,000,000, made up as follows: Ordinary, $335,000,000; corporation income, $39,000,000; and individual income, $41,000,000. Of this total of $415,000,000, the States of California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, 8 in all out of the 48, paid $249,000,000, or approximately five-eighths. And of the corporation-income tax the same States paid two-thirds and of the individual-income tax three-fourths of the whole. After taxing them thus heavily you propose by this bill to levy an additional burden, and out of the extra tax raised, of which these States will pay approximately five-eighths of the whole, you will give back to them $8,000,000, or less than one-third. That I say is most inequitable and unjust.

Is it any wonder that Democratic papers like the New York World should say:

> This is potentially the fattest pork barrel ever rolled on the floor of Congress for an emptying among hungry patriots and bucolic statesmen.

Is it to be wondered at when the Fort Worth Recorder, a Democratic paper down there in the home of the gentleman from Texas, should say:

> A Federal appropriation for roads under the circumstances is a pure gratuity to the State, for which Congress has no moral right to collect revenue and no legal right according to the honest intent of the Constitution.

I do not wish you to understand that I desire to raise a constitutional question. I do not. I am Hamiltonian in my principles, and believe in the power of the centralized government, but I take this opportunity to direct the attention of Congressman DAVIS, who a little while ago referred to Thomas Jefferson in 1806 and the appropriation for the Cumberland road. I say to him that there is a vast difference in the conditions that existed under the reign of that ancient leader of Democracy and under the rule of President Wilson in this day of modern Democracy. Then there was an overflowing Treasury, and the National Government did not know what to do with the money; but to-day there is a wonderful difference in conditions.

But I desire to call your attention further to the fact that in 1825 Thomas Jefferson, at a later period than when he was President, wrote like this:

> We declare to be most false and unfounded the doctrine that the compact in authorizing its Federal branch to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States has given them thereby a power to do whatever they may think or pretend would promote the general welfare, which construction would make that of itself a complete government without limitation of powers.

In that same article Jefferson is placing himself in opposition to the internal improvement of roads which he had advocated in 1806. So, in the beginning he was for it and at a later period against it. But when for it he argued that the Constitution be amended to give the Federal Government authority.

The Fort Worth Recorder said, in speaking of this measure:

> Looking to the National Government is bad enough when the aid is in the form of assistance in administrative affairs, but it is vastly worse in the form of a gift or gratuity, for it weakens the sense of self-reliance which States as well as individuals must preserve if they would maintain self-respect and develop their best qualities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. COLEMAN. Now, I agree that good roads are most desirable, but, in my judgment, they should be paid for by the local communities, for if there is any proper local function belonging to the State and the subdivisions of the State it is the improvement of their local highways.

Is it not apparent that if you open the door of the Federal Treasury, allowing some localities to take from the Treasury many times over what they pay in, their demands will be pressed year after year with increased vigor, and that it will necessarily result in the redrawing of sectional lines, an unfortunate condition, away from which in recent years we have been steadily traveling, as the States less able to make local improvements, arguing from the inequality in this bill established, go the further length of demanding that the wealthier Commonwealths pay still larger sums for the advantage of their weaker sister communities?

Somebody said on the floor to-day that the bill would increase the development of road building. I think it is more reasonable to contend that it will deter road building, because if the Federal Government is going to hold out the hope to communities that have not been active in self-improvement that they will get money from the Federal Treasury, will they not naturally put off local improvement until they can send some persuasive Congressman to this floor who will bring back home a large appropriation? Will it not necessarily result in electing men to this body on an issue of good roads, instead of upon what would be for the general benefit of this country? [Applause.]

Let us in this body rise up to the height of being national and not local representatives. [Applause.] Congressman SAUNDERS, of Virginia, in his eloquent speech in favor of this measure the other day, said, in effect, that we had passed far from the old idea that improvements of this kind were not within the limits of the Constitution, and while I most heartily agree with him in his statement, I would call his attention and the attention of others to the fact that we have passed far from many of the ideas of the fathers, and from none of them further than this, that the cheapest government is the best government. And whatever the justification for our having passed away from it, there were some people as recently as the Baltimore convention who adhered to it in part when they wrote in their platform, "We demand a return to that simplicity and economy that befits a democratic government." Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have wandered far from this old theory, and it may not be out of place at this critical stage in our history, with Federal taxation rising higher and higher, with a corporation and individual income tax added to our heretofore customs and internal duties, and the burden of an emergency war tax piled thereon, and an inheritance tax advocated from this floor, to suggest that we pause a little and take stock of our political conditions before traveling further in the direction of either European paternalism or European militarism.

Now, observe that the Federal Government has recently departed from its hitherto long-established custom of raising needed revenue at the customhouse and from the indirect internal duties, and has proceeded to collect a tax from corporations and on individual incomes; that by the corporation and income tax it has taken from the States, whatever the justification may be, important sources of revenue; that having trespassed upon the taxable property of the State and applied the revenue obtained, perhaps, in some measure of equality to the people of the entire country, you now propose to take these same revenues and apply them in a most unequal manner to a purely local problem. When you think of the $80,000,000 being raised from the Federal income tax and the $52,000,000 from the emergency revenue tax, and this amount added onto our heretofore accustomed sources of revenue, and the Treasury in an almost bankrupt condition, had you not better go slow before opening up new avenues into the Federal Treasury?

I am opposed to the measure because it is an unwarranted departure on the part of the Federal Government from its established policy and an entering upon a work heretofore considered as a purely local problem. I am opposed to the bill because it proposes a most unequal distribution of the Federal taxes for purely local purposes. I am opposed to it because at this time, with taxes already burdensome, no additional demands should be made on the Federal Treasury. I am further opposed to it because unwilling that the Federal Government should be given any additional sources of income than those already enjoyed, by which I mean the customs and internal taxes and the corporation and individual income taxes, believing that no further encroachments on the taxable property of

the individual States at this time should be permitted. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take notice of what the last speaker said, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COLEMAN]. What is the proposition before this Congress? It is, according to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the people of this Republic should not have beneficial legislation in their behalf because the money comes out of the Treasury. The gentleman from Massachusetts the other day, and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] yesterday afternoon, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] this afternoon, stated to this House that the farmers of this country are not entitled to this legislation. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] said that our Republic has given the rural route system and carried mails through muddy roads to the farmers. He thinks that is a great favor which the Congress has conferred upon the people. I just cite the gentleman to the great cities of this Republic where nine mail deliveries are made a day and nothing is thought about it, and he thinks it is a great favor of the Government to carry mail once a day, or perhaps three times a week, to the man out in the country, the great taxpayer and supporter of this Government. It is a right that he has. He is entitled to good roads, and the Federal Government, with all of its activities, should give the farmers of this country roads over which to haul their produce to town.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen who are speaking against this bill and against the farmers of this country have never in their lives heard the notes of a whippoorwill. Gentlemen like that do not know the necessities of the agrarian classes of this country. I believe the Congress of this Republic ought to go as far as it can, and I am honest in that belief, within the bounds of constitutional limitations, to give the agricultural class all privileges and all legislation that will benefit them. I believe that they should have a rural-credit bill establishing a banking system for long-term farm loans at a very low rate of interest, with direct aid from the Federal Government. I believe that the great farming class of this Republic should have all the aid this Republic can give through its Congress, under the Constitution, to further the interests of the farmers. What more would good roads do? They would not only aid the country districts, but to a great extent aid the cities, because of the fact that the wealth comes out of the agricultural class into the cities; and we all recognize the fact that the great manufacturing and farming classes of this Republic must work hand in hand. One can not exist without the other. Surely the man who is fortunate enough to live in a great State like New York, Massachusetts, or Pennsylvania should not for one moment want to hold their fore feet in the Federal Treasury all of the time and keep off a few of these Western and Southern States. The South has been for years paying great pension bills where the people of other sections of the country have had their feet in the long trough drinking all of the slop. Do you mean to say that this road bill, that might take a little revenue from some of the great States of the East that have been preying on this Republic all of these years, should, forsooth, not pass for that reason? My friend from New York said that it would interfere with the "preparedness program." There has been an excuse for the last 50 years to keep the farmers of this Republic from coming into their rights, and at last they have come up with a great scheme to build unwarranted numbers of battleships and establish great armed camps in this Republic to trample on the rights of the farmer and say that he shall not have even a good road to travel over. [Applause.]

I am convinced that the farmers are the last people to be considered when it comes to legislation. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COLEMAN] said the farmer had been considered more than any other class in this Republic. I agree with him in part, but I wish to state that the farmer has been considered mostly as the man to get taxes out of—to pay for all the legislative schemes to further enrich the few.

How can you gentlemen in good faith oppose this bill to have the Federal Government aid in building good roads in every county in Mississippi and every other State of this Union, when you have been voting money out of the Treasury all of these years for every conceivable scheme for the benefit of a few?

The Southern States came out of the war with great debts, and the people impoverished, and heavy taxation has kept them from being able to build the roads you gentlemen from the Eastern States boast of. I am proud that you have such fine roads, and if my people had been situated like your people, we would have just such roads as you are now blessed with.

The $25,000,000 carried in this bill will do more good than any other similar sum that this Congress could appropriate. I believe in economy in Government, and have always been a strong advocate of it. I further believe in internal improvement of this country, and am going to vote for all measures that help the people and at the same time add assets and blessings to our country. If we had a splendid system of good roads in every county in the United States, our Nation could have no better asset except the splendid citizenry who would travel the roads.

Mr. Chairman, the farmer is put to a burdensome expense in marketing his crops. I claim that the Government not only owes it to him to help get a good road to haul it over, but I think the Government owes the farmer the further aid of extending the Bureau of Markets and getting in a good state of "preparedness" to help market the product of the farm. The city man and the farmer must be brought closer together. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COLEMAN] thinks the parcel post is for the benefit of no one except the farmer. He is mistaken in that idea, for the very reason that the farmer must be connected with some one on the other end of the line. His connection with the town or city man is going to benefit the town or city man as much as it benefits the farmer. The parcel post is a fine thing for the farmer, but it is not the only thing Congress ought to do to help him. I know this good-road business is not altogether the duty of the Federal Government, but it is manifestly the duty of this great Government to give reasonable aid in constructing roads to carry mail over to the farmers of the rural districts.

The Government has given subsidies to railroads and great corporate interests; now, why should it be prevented from helping the people who need help—the country people of this great Nation? [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on this bill, which proposes to authorize an appropriation of $25,000,000 to a public-roads fund to be distributed among the States, which I heartily indorse, for which I shall vote, and which I earnestly hope may soon be enacted into law; for there is no question in which the country is more interested than in the question of better roads, and no investment that the Government can make that will yield the return, either immediately or in the future, that an investment in road construction will yield. This statement is substantiated by the fact that the most prosperous communities and the most contented communities of our country are those communities which have a system of model roads.

And it is my fond hope, Mr. Chairman, that the day is not far distant when every section of this great country of ours, from the most densely populated sections to the farthest and most remote and most sparsely settled communities, may enjoy all the blessings that go with, and all the prosperity that accrues by, a thorough and complete system of public highways over which the farmers, the merchants, the lumbermen, the stockmen, and all other classes can convey their products at a minimum cost. All men will profit by an improvement of that kind, and no man will suffer as a result of it.

But a few of our city brethren object to this bill because, as they believe, it will benefit the farmers only. Well, let us analyze the proposition and see if their contentions are well founded, and to do this we must ascertain the relation of the rural community to the city, and the relation of the city to the rural community. Without the city the rural community can not develop and prosper, for its development and prosperity are measured by its markets for its farm products, timber, coal, and other raw materials, the large bulk of which find their markets in the cities. On the other hand, the city can not exist without the rural community to draw from. It must have the timber from the forest with which to build its factories, its storehouses, and its homes. It must have coal from the mines to heat them, and the produce from the farm on which to live. Destroy the cities and the farms will suffer. Destroy the farms and the cities will perish and die. Then, Mr. Chairman, we who come from the farms, we who belong to that strong and mighty army of 12,000,000 farmers upon whom not only the prosperity, but the life as well, of the cities depends, have a right to be proud of the part that we contribute to the life of the Nation, and of the position that we occupy among its men. Not only do we have a right to be proud, but we have a right to be heard in this Hall of national legislation, and a right to be recognized at the disbursing counter of the Federal Treasury. This right has been overlooked by the powers that have heretofore been in control. Until recently the farmers have petitioned the National Congress for recognition, and their petitions have

been disregarded. They have whispered tenderly, and their echoes have fallen on deaf ears.

But, Mr. Chairman, the day has come when they petition no more for recognition, but demand their rights instead. They whisper no more, but speak in positive and certain terms. They are now receiving recognition in this body, and in my candid opinion will likewise receive it at the other end of the Capitol; and, mark my prediction, it will be fatal to those responsible if they fail to receive it. It is true that that we passed a bill of this character through this House in the last Congress which failed of consideration in the other body. But that failure was due to congested conditions and limited time, for which no one was to blame and for which no one was criticized. But conditions are different now. There is plenty of time; there is every reason why this bill should became a law, and not a single valid reason why it should not.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] told us on yesterday that the bill should not pass because it would call for additional expenditures of the people's money. Well, who are the people? Do they reside in New York only? No; they cover this country from ocean to ocean, and from the Lakes to the Gulf; and thousands—yea, millions—of them have never been directly benefited one penny by the Federal expenditures except though the Postal System. And I desire to add here, Mr. Chairman, that the passage of this bill will breathe anew the spirit of life into our Postal System, which is one of our greatest and most advanced agents of civilization, and in which the people are most deeply interested. It will result in the establishment of rural routes all over the country as a result of adequate roads for their operation. It will give the farmer his daily paper, his market report, his magazine, and his parcel post, delivered at his home instead of his having to travel 2, 3, and 4 miles to receive them, as many are forced to do under existing conditions. But, Mr. Chairman, when we mention improved postal facilities for the rural communities, some gentlemen from some of our great cities who have their mail delivered at their doors nine and ten times each day from a magnificent post-office building with stone surface and marble trimmings and floors, constructed and maintained by the Federal Government out of the public funds, remind us in agonizing terms that the postal receipts from those rural communities do not justify the expenditure necessary to their maintenance.

We concede the fact that a very large per cent of the Postal Service of the rural sections is operated at a cost much greater in volume than the revenues derived, while, on the other hand, the service in the cities is not only self-sustaining, but renders a return to the Treasury. But listen, gentlemen: Have not your cities any interest in those rural communities? From whence do these communities draw their wares and merchandise? Why, from the city, of course, either through the mail-order houses by parcel post, or through the local merchant, and he through his local jobber from the factories of the city; and, Mr. Chairman, at this point I venture this suggestion, and do it without fear of successful contradiction, that if the commerce to and from those sections of the country where the Postal Service is not self-sustaining should be withdrawn from the commerce of America, every city throughout the length and breadth of this land would seriously feel the effects, and many of them would be thrown into a panic. Therefore, as we read in Holy Writ, that no man liveth to himself alone, so do we read in the economic history of the nations that no community liveth to itself alone, either city, town, or county. Their interests are mutual and are so interwoven that they can not be distinguished in a commercial sense one from the other. Many of the European nations have long since recognized this fact and through governmental methods have inaugurated the reforms necessary to the welfare of the whole people, while our country has in a large measure been sectional in its public enterprises, thereby overlooking those reforms that are most general in their application.

There are 26,000 miles of navigable rivers in the United States, on which the Federal Government has expended $475,211,250. Why has it done so? It has done so because these rivers are public highways on which commerce is carried to and from the people. Then, as an economic proposition, if the water routes over which the commerce is carried are of sufficient importance to warrant the expenditure of public funds for the purpose of minimizing the cost of carriage, will not the same principle apply to the land routes over which the same commerce must be carried before it reaches or after it leaves the wharf at the river's bank, and especially so when the greatest reduction of cost will result through the improvement of the overland routes, as is the case, which is proven by the following figures.

An average ton of freight can be carried over the great waterways of the country 1,000 miles for $1.25. It can be carried 250 miles for that price over the railways of the country and only 3 miles over the average land routes, while in France, England, Germany, and Wales, where the roads are good, the overland charges do not reach half that sum. Then, Mr. Chairman, does it not stand to reason that the best field of investment for the Federal Government in the improvement of routes of commerce is in the overland routes which bring the products of the farm and the forest from their points of production to the points of mobilization where they are loaded on car or boat? Mr. Chairman, I trust that the city dwellers and their entire quota of Representatives on this floor may soon realize that they, as well as the citizens of the rural community, will profit by better roads in the rural communities over which their food products and much of their raw material must first travel. Better roads in those communities will lessen the cost of transportation, which is a very noticeable element in the cost of these products to the consumer. As I have previously stated, the interests of the people of both the city and country are mutual, and I sincerely trust that the day is not far distant when the imaginary walls or prejudices between them shall be torn down, or at least forgotten, on the floors of the House and Senate of the United States Congress. It is true that when legislation is proposed here to construct public improvements in the cities there comes more or less opposition from some of the country districts; and, on the other hand, when we propose to appropriate money for the improvement of roads in the country we find opposition from the city districts, but not from all city Members, I am proud to say. But, Mr. Chairman, this is all wrong. There should be no such feeling existing among the Representatives of the American people. We are all one people, citizens of one country, and we are, or should be, interested in all sections of the country, and should strive in a spirit of harmony and unison to make it a greater and better country; and we can only do that by the improvement of both the cities and the country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my main object in addressing the House is to refer briefly to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] who addressed the House on yesterday afternoon and the vociferous gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] who spoke a few minutes ago and who grew so pompous and bombastic that it was difficult for us to tell which side of the question he was on. These gentlemen, who reside in coast-line States which have harbors fortified and maintained by the Federal Government, oppose the passage of this bill on the ground that its application, if enacted into law, will be local and not national in character. I want to ask these gentlemen what they think of the forts and harbors on the coasts of their States. Are they local or national propositions? Of course they will say that they are national and should be maintained by the Federal Government, and we all agree that they are; and now, if by lack of proper harbor defense, the cities and coasts that are under the protection of these harbors should be bombarded and destroyed by the guns of a hostile fleet, who would suffer the greater loss, the citizens of the destroyed cities or the citizens of the interior who are hundreds or thousands of miles away? Why, the citizens of the unfortunate cities would, of course, be the principal sufferers. Therefore the benefits derived from our harbor defenses accrue primarily and directly to the citizens who live in the cities and and on the coasts thus protected, and these harbors and forts, 27 in number and constructed along the coasts of the United States, on which the Federal Government has up to this time expended $126,000,000, are local institutions from a geographic point of view, for the people living under their immediate protection are primarily and directly benefited by them, but the country as a whole receives an indirect benefit from them as a national defense, which makes them national in character. And, Mr. Chairman, the same argument will apply to public roads over which the people travel from community to community, from city to country, and from State to State, and over which the mail and the commerce of the people are carried from locality to locality, from city to country, and from State to State.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentlemen who are opposing this bill are advocates of stronger national defense. But will they contend that the strength of our national defense lies solely in, and is measured solely by, the number of men and guns that we possess? Do they not know that the transportation and mobilization of our resources which go to make up the supplies of our Army and Navy are also important elements in our national defense? Therefore would not a better system of roads, which constitute a part of our great international transportation

system, over which are transported our soldiers and their food and other supplies necessary to their maintenance and operation, add to the efficiency of our Naval and Military Establishments? Why, Mr. Chairman, we are told by our military experts that the question of transportation is one of the very important questions in our national defense, and that the War Department and transportation companies of the country are now considering plans for a more adequate and more rapid system for times of need, and the importance of this system, Mr. Chairman, is not limited to its operations between the various Army posts of the country, but it extends over our waterways, railroads, and land routes to every nook and hamlet of this great country, from whence comes the volunteer soldiers and the supplies necessary to the maintenance of the Army. So, from a standpoint of national defense, our roads overland are interstate routes, and are not local in character, and they are most assuredly not as local in character or benefits as the fortified national harbors to which I have previously referred.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes, sir; I yield.

Mr. ROGERS. Has the gentleman read the committee report recommending the adoption of this measure?

Mr. FIELDS. I have.

Mr. ROGERS. Does the gentleman recall that in two places in that report it is specifically stated that roads are local concerns?

Mr. FIELDS. I am comparing our public-roads system, as a part of our national defense, with the fortified harbors on our coasts, which also constitute a part of our national defense, but which, geographically, are, as the gentleman classes our public roads, local concerns extending their direct protection, their immediate and direct benefits to the people who live within their shadows, insuring them protection against foreign enemies. And yet these concerns were constructed and are maintained by the Federal Treasury out of the people's money. Seven million dollars have been spent up to this time on Boston Harbor in the gentleman's own State and $13,000,000 have been spent up to this time on New York Harbor; and it is being urged by Members from that State that a great deal more should be expended on it to properly insure the safety of the city of New York, and yet the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] thinks that this bill, which proposes to distribute $25,000,000 of the public funds, or less than twice the amount that has been expended on New York Harbor, to the farming sections of the country, is both vicious and criminal. And the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] says that he "is amazed," terribly amazed, utterly and woefully amazed, that a committee of Congress should bring out a bill which proposes to appropriate the public funds in this way.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I claim to be a rigid economist, and I think that my record for economy in the expenditure of the public funds will compare favorably with the record of the gentleman from the Hudson [Mr. PLATT], and as an evidence of my sincerity I want to make him this proposition: If he will agree that the various vicinities along the sea coasts, wherein harbors have been fortified and are maintained by the Government, will return to the Government the $126,000,000 which it has thus far appropriated to the harbors, and agree to henceforth and forever maintain them at their own expense, I will take the liberty to say for the farmers that they will never again ask Congress to appropriate money for the construction or maintainance of public roads. But the gentleman will not accept my proposition, for he knows the farmers would get the better end of the deal. But he will continue to urge Congress to enlarge its sums for harbor defense, which is probably a wise and equitable doctrine, for our citizens along our coast lines are American citizens, and are entitled to adequate protection by their Government to insure their happiness and prosperity. But Mr. Chairman, while the enormous expenditures necessary to maintain our coast defenses are being drawn from the Public Treasury, I, for one, am unwilling to overlook or neglect the interests of those who reside in the interior of our country. I am unwilling to hush my voice in the cause of the farmer and his neighbor in the rural community, but to the contrary I shall contend so long as I am a Member of this body for his rights under the Government. And so long as the Congress shall appropriate public funds, just that long the farmers are entitled to their part of the amount appropriated; and, Mr. Chairman, every dollar appropriated to the public roads of the country will yield a due return to the Government, not only in revenue, but in the increased happiness and greater patriotism of the people, in better and more accessible schools in which to educate our children, more favorable environments under which to reverence and honor our flag, and more accessible churches in which to worship God. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I desire to register my approval of this bill primarily because it is a good-roads measure, and because, in my judgment, the Roads Committee has presented a plan as feasible, fair, and just as can be worked out on this proposition. Of all the criticisms that have been made, not a single Member up to this time has offered a suggestion that would improve the present bill. The plan worked out by the committee and embodied in this bill as nearly embraces every element of fairness and justice to all sections and to all the States as would appear practical from anything that has been said or from any suggestion that has been made. Therefore, I see no place for the sectionalism and provincialism that has entered into this discussion. For one, I am glad that Congress has seen fit to improve the great ports of the country like those at New York and Boston, because those ports are of interest to every American citizen and facilitate the handling of the products of the farm as well as the commerce of the cities.

This legislation is simply the reflection of national good-roads sentiment; is an act responsive to the general belief that the United States should assist in building and maintaining the highways over which the mails are carried, and the general demand that Congress enact legislation for that purpose.

In the enactment of this or like legislation the Congress should at least ask and have answered two questions—one as to the jurisdiction of the United States, and the other as to the number of American people to be benefited. The first is answered by the Constitution, which provides "that Congress shall have power to establish post offices and post roads." Reliable statistics will answer the second. There are in the United States 43,652 rural mail routes, with a combined length of 1,060,679 miles, over which travel 43,534 rural letter carriers, who for six days in each week deliver mail to more than 20,000,000 people at their homes, traveling annually 322,431,662 miles and carrying more than 3,000,000,000 pieces of mail.

There are 11,970 star routes, with a total length of 153,350 miles. These star routes reach the more remote sections in the rural districts with an estimated population of about 10,000,000 people. Hence this legislation would benefit directly more than 30,000,000 people, and indirectly our entire population.

We can not enact any law, we can not make any appropriation that would reach, help, and benefit a greater number of our people who deserve so well at the hands of this Congress than will this proposed road law and the appropriation it provides for.

Those living along these rural post roads, carrier and star routes make up practically our farming population, who I feel safe to say, have by all political parties been promised more and received less in performance than any other great class in this country, and for us now to enact this law would be a partial redemption of some of our pledges, and, at least, the liquidation of a portion of the accumulated interest on our unperformed promises.

The heaviest tax paid in this country is the bad-road tax. It has been estimated by the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Agriculture that we have 2,500,000 miles of public roads. Over these roads are carried annually 350,000,000 tons of freight, consisting of farm products, supplies, and other articles. The average haul per ton is 8 miles. Over the unimproved road the cost per ton-mile is 23 cents, or $1.84 per ton for the average haul of 8 miles. Over the improved or surfaced road the cost per ton-mile is 13 cents, or $1.04 per ton for the average haul of 8 miles—a saving of 80 cents per ton. Hence on 350,000,000 tons, with universal good roads, the annual saving would be $280,000,000. So from a business standpoint no investment for the public could excel that made in building and maintaining the public roads.

Now, I would like to call the attention of those gentlemen who have spoken against this bill charging it with being class legislation—a discrimination against the cities—to some facts: The mail is carried to and from these great cities in the North, East, West, and South over trunk lines of railroads and with all the promptness, speed, and security that the mind of man and money can conceive, plan, and execute, and that for the building of these railway systems Congress donated millions of acres of the richest portion of the national domain worth hundreds of millions of dollars. It does seem that in view of all this we should not meet this protest against a bill which proposes to spend the proportionately small sum of $25,000,000 for the benefit of the mail service in the rural districts.

In Louisiana we are now spending annually $2,500,000 on our roads. Under this bill we would receive $345,064, which would come to us not only as a relief but in greater value as an encouragement to scientific road building.

This measure will materially assist in bringing about the three conditions essentially necessary to make life on the farm attractive, viz, good schools, good society, and good roads—good schools in which the farmer may know that his sons and daughters can receive the foundations of culture, good society in which is developed mutual sympathy and united effort for the advancement of the common good, and good roads for easy transportation of his products and for quick communication with his neighbors, his institutions, and the outside world.

To hasten the fulfillment of these conditions would be the effect of this legislation, and it should, in my humble judgment, have the approval of this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] ask unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMPSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, the debate on this good-roads bill has demonstrated three things: First, that those States that have been the greatest beneficiaries of our tariff legislation are unalterably opposed to any bill that appropriates money out of the Federal Treasury that will be in any way beneficial to the great farming and producing masses of this country; second, that those who oppose the bill are not so much opposed to the amount of money that it appropriates as they are to the use to which it is to be put; and, third, the agitation for preparedness is to be used as a device to prevent all appropriations for internal improvements.

These three propositions, I think, are amply sustained by the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] in his discussion of the bill on last Wednesday and the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] and those made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] on yesterday. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], in the course of his remarks, said:

I say, sir, that this legislation is not wise, and I want to call the attention of the gentlemen on this side of the House especially to the fact that this is one of the measures which for several years has been in the platform of the Democratic Party.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is correct in that statement. The Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore in 1912 contained this plank:

We favor national aid to State and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post roads.

This platform declaration of the Democratic Party at Baltimore was but a reiteration of the Democratic platform on this subject adopted at Denver in 1908, practically in the same words, and the Democratic Party has endeavored in good faith to carry out this promise made to the great producing masses of the country. As soon as it was trusted with power by the people of the country and a Democratic House took over the control of legislation in March, 1911, the lower House of the Sixty-second Congress, which was the only branch of the Government that was Democratic, passed a good-roads bill. In the Sixty-third Congress we again passed a good-roads bill, and we are now about to redeem our pledge for the third time by passing this good-roads bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] said further:

While the Republican Party has not incorporated a plank for Federal aid but has simply asserted its belief in them and recommended the improvement of them to the several States of the Union.

I am perfectly willing for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] to define the position of the Republican Party on this great question, and it is in exact keeping with the provisions of the Republican platform of 1908 on which Mr. Taft was elected to the Presidency, though they did not go even to that extent in 1912, and the subject was not mentioned in their platform in 1904. The position of the Republican Party as gathered from the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and their platform declaration is that they are willing that the people should have good roads provided the people themselves go down into their own pockets and dig up the money with which to construct them.

I am surprised that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] should take this position, in view of the fact that for more than 100 years the people of the United States, by a system of tariff taxation, have been building up the great industries of Massachusetts and making it one of the richest and greatest States in this Union.

What has the Government done for other lines of development? We appropriated for river and harbor purposes between 1789 and 1910, $583,895,000; for fortifications between 1820 and 1910, $130,625,000. We are spending to support the Army and Navy annually the sum of nearly $250,000,000. We spent in the construction of the Panama Canal nearly $400,000,000. Unthinkable millions have been collected from the people to build up our manufacturing industries. The Government has contributed to the railroads of our country 158,294,870 acres of our public domain to assist and encourage their construction. This land at the market price would produce $5,000,000,000—a sum sufficient to build and equip every line of railroad in the United States. We have appropriated for furthering irrigation projects in the arid regions of the West, $36,933,643.78. We appropriated $35,000,000 to build a Government railroad in Alaska. Our intervention in the war between Spain and Cuba has cost us more than a thousand million dollars. It is now being urged upon Congress to erect residences for our ministers and ambassadors to foreign countries, at an estimated cost of about $10,000,000.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] in the course of his remarks on this bill yesterday, in reply to a statement from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], said:

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman is talking about preparedness. Does he know of any way by which $25,000,000 could be used for preparedness to better advantage under the present circumstances than by the building of good roads?

Mr. ROGERS. Oh, I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] made a complete answer to that inquiry in his questioning of the last speaker. The bill does not contemplate using this money exclusively, or at all, for military roads. That would be a different proposal. But here every lane and highway and byway of the Nation may be the recipient of Federal funds. The very first sentence in the bill says:

"That for the purpose of this act the term 'rural post roads' shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is or might be carried."

Any little cow path is just as much entitled to this aid as the Lincoln Highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

I gather from this statement that the opposition to this bill is not based so much on the idea it contains or the amount of money it appropriates as it is to the purpose for which the money is to be used. The gentleman said that the purpose that was contained in this bill was a proposition to aid in the construction of cow trails, meaning, I presume, that it was intended to aid in the construction of roads from the farm, where the products that go to feed the multiplied millions of this earth are produced, to the railroad station, from whence they are shipped to the great centers of population where they are to be used. He further said that this appropriation was not to be used in the construction of great interstate highways like the Lincoln Highway or the Old Trails Association, reaching from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT], in his speech on this bill, urged as an objection to its passage the fact that we would soon be called upon to raise large sums of money for the so-called purpose of preparedness, and he criticized the patriotism of those who would appropriate money for the purpose of constructing good roads that might interfere with this program of preparedness. He said:

But what shall be said of Democrats who pursue such a policy? Will they not be regarded as traitors? Will the bribe of a few paltry dollars for their districts procure them forgiveness?

If a Member of Congress is to be denounced as a traitor to his country because he refuses to go wild in favor of appropriating untold billions of dollars to build warships and organize large standing armies when there is no enemy in sight and because he votes the small and insignificant sum of $25,000,000 to aid in the construction of good roads from the farm, where the products are produced, to the railroad station, where they are shipped, thereby increasing the price to the producer and decreasing the cost to the consumer, I am content to have the term traitor applied to me.

I desire briefly to call attention to the condition of the farmers of this country, as shown by the census figures. During the 10 years from 1900 to 1910 the population of the cities increased 34.8 per cent. The rural population during the same period increased 11.2 per cent. The per cent of increase in the city population was a little more than three times that of the increase in the rural population, and in making this estimate the Census Bureau included as a part of the rural population all towns having a population of 2,500 or less. The real increase as between the two classes of population is, therefore, much more than the census figures show. The per cent of increase in the number of farms from 1900 to 1910 was

10.9. The increase in the number of farms and the increase in rural population was practically the same, demonstrating the necessity of increasing the farming population if the number of farms are to be increased. In 1910 there were 6,361,502 farms in the United States and there were 2 per cent less owners and 2¼ per cent more tenants living on farms than in 1900. In 1900, 31 per cent of the farms were under mortgage. In 1910, 33.6 per cent were under mortgage. In 1900 there were 67,719,410 cattle, 62,868,041 swine, and 61,503,713 sheep in the United States. In 1910 there were 61,803,866 cattle, 58,185,676 swine, and 52,441,861 sheep, a decrease during the 10 years from 1900 to 1910 of 5,915,544 cattle, 4,682,365 swine, and 9,055,852 sheep—8.7 per cent decrease in the number of cattle, 7.4 per cent decrease in the number of swine, and 14.7 per cent decrease in the number of sheep, and average decrease of 10.2 per cent in the source of our meat supply as against an increase in population in the entire country, including both the city and rural districts, of 21 per cent.

In 1900 we produced 1,619,415,263 pounds of butter; in 1910, 1,491,652,602 pounds. In 1900 we produced 298,344,642 pounds of cheese; in 1910, 320,532,181 pounds, an increase of only 0.07 per cent. In 1900 we exported 209,348,284 bushels of corn; in 1910 we exported 36,802,374 bushels, a decrease of 172,545,910 bushels within the 10-year period.

By comparison it will be found that the quantity of the present crops produced in the United States increased about 10 per cent between 1900 and 1910. This increase is substantially the same rate as the increase in the number of farms, which is 10.9 per cent, and the increase in the acreage, which was 9.9 per cent, the aggregate average production of these crops per farm and per acre remaining substantially unchanged during the decade, while the population of the country increased at a rate more than twice as great as the crop production, and the increase in the population of our cities being three and one-half times as great. These figures need no elaboration; no comment. They speak a condition which, if permitted to continue even for an inconsiderable length of time, as we reckon time, with the rapid increase in population, will bring want and hunger to the country. There were 6,361,502 farms in the United States according to the census of 1910. Of these 1,327,439, valued at $6,330,236,951, were mortgaged for $1,736,172,351, or 27.3 per cent of their value.

> Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates and men decay.
> Princes and lords may flourish or may fade.
> A breath can make them, as a breath has made;
> But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
> When once destroyed can never be supplied.

Mr. Chairman, these prophetic words of Oliver Goldsmith, the Irish bard, uttered back in 1770, are applicable to conditions in the United States to-day. If the Congress of the United States continues to neglect the laboring and producing masses of the country, while it lavishes appropriations running into the billions for the purposes of war; the improvement of creeks, over which not as much freight is carried in the course of a year as is transported over an ordinary country road leading from the farm to the railroad station, we will soon be face to face with the condition which the British Parliament had to solve in Ireland less than half a century ago and which has called for an appropriation of two and one-half billion dollars out of the British Treasury to encourage a movement back to the farm in order that the British Nation might produce enough within its own borders to supply the necessities of its people. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR.] [Applause.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about this bill for just a few moments for the purpose of getting my record straight. Four years ago and two years ago the committee reported and the House passed a very different kind of road bill. From my standpoint the committee has rather gotten the subject tangled up. Four years ago, when I first came to the House, we had no Roads Committee in the House, and a private committee was established under the chairmanship of the present distinguished and able Representative from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], the chairman of this committee, and that private committee prepared a road bill, which was put on as a rider to the Post Office appropriation bill and passed by the House that year. Substantially the same bill was passed by this House again last year. Now, that bill that has passed the House twice was a very different bill from the one that is before the House now. The bill that was passed at the last session of Congress and the session before that was a farmer's bill in a very large sense, and the bill that is before the House now is an automobilist's bill to a substantial extent. I wonder why some of our city friends are opposing it? It is quite as much in their interest as it is in the farmers' interest. I will explain to you what I mean. I have nothing in the world against automobilists. I am burdened with a piece of that kind of property myself, and I live in the city, too. But I believe that the primary object of this kind of legislation is to help the farmers of the country, and we ought to pass that kind of a bill that would help them in the most substantial way. The bill of last year will benefit the farmers most of all, and that was the main purpose of the legislation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I greatly regret to have to disagree with the conclusions of the committee in reporting this bill. I always like to agree with the committee. I want to say that I believe that the bill which passed this House last year is by far the better plan. It is a plan that is absolutely free from any constitutional objection. It is a plan that gives the greatest encouragement to the building of roads in every part of the country. It is a plan that is free from favoritism. It is a plan that will be of the greatest benefit to the rural letter carriers of the country—these Government agents that are required to go now along all kinds of roads and in all kinds of weather and who are of such great value to the farmer. It is a plan that gives to all the people the benefits of good roads.

Speaking for my own State, I want to say to the Members of this House that in a recent campaign I made this particular bill one of the issues of the campaign. It was an issue, too, that was heartily approved by the people. It was a plan that particularly appealed to the people because of its lack of favoritism, because it provided roads, not for the benefit of any class, not for the benefit of any particular locality, but in such a way that every class and every locality had an equal show to receive the benefits of the act. Speaking from actual experience, therefore, I believe that this House will make a great mistake if we change our bill now and adopt a different plan of aid to roads. The distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], than whom there is not a stronger advocate of roads in this House or elsewhere, and who has worked early and late for the cause, says that the reason for the change in the plan is because we have passed this bill twice in the House and have not been able to pass it in the Senate. I want to say to the gentleman and to other Members of this House that it is a mighty doubtful policy to swap horses in the middle of the stream. That plan certainly has had for two sessions the hearty approval of this House and, I believe, the approval of the people, and I do not believe that if we had passed the present plan in either of the former Congresses that the present plan would have been enacted into law. I believe those Senators who are opposed to the bill as constructed last session and the session before would have been opposed to the present plan, and when we undertake a change the chances are we will dissipate our strength.

Now, what is the difference between the two bills? I want to explain to you, if I may, just for a moment, the difference between the bill that you gentlemen passed last year and the bill that you are asked to pass this year. It is this: Last year all the roads of the country were divided into three classes, and all the roads of the country that conformed to those classes were to receive Federal aid to road building. This year we have adopted an entirely different policy. We are going to turn the appropriations over to the State highway commissions of the several States, and they are going to select, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, certain roads to be improved. The roads thus selected will, of course, form a very small percentage of all the roads in any State, and for that reason I do not think this bill is nearly so good as the bill that this House has passed upon twice and by which bill all the people would receive the benefits of the legislation.

Now, gentlemen, I am going to offer the bill that passed last year as a substitute for this bill when this bill comes on its passage. I believe that that bill is the better bill in every respect. I believe it is better because there is less favoritism about it. I believe it is better because more people get the benefits of Federal aid under it than will get them under this bill. I believe it is better for the reason that it will encourage State and county road building a hundredfold more than the present bill will do.

Now, mind you, I am going to vote for the present bill if I can not get the one that we passed last year. But why make this change? What is the reason for this change? This House has gone on record twice in saying that the bill of last year is a good bill and ought to become a law. Why is it that we make this change at this late day?

I have not seen a satisfactory answer given to that question. There may be one. I do not mean to say that there is not one. I certainly have great confidence in this committee, but I can not understand why "this horse was swapped in the middle of the stream."

I want to point out this, that I found by a recent experience that a bill of the kind we passed last year—a bill for Federal aid to road building—is a very popular bill.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. DENISON. What became of the other bill that passed the House twice?

Mr. McKELLAR. It failed in the Senate.

Mr. DENISON. Has it occurred to the gentleman that that fact perhaps had something to do with it?

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, as I said before, if the present bill had been passed by Congress last year or the year before it would have failed just as that one failed. It was not the peculiar form of that bill that caused its defeat. It was opposition to the whole policy.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is unwilling yet to speak for the Senate, I suppose?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am unwilling. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. We are all mighty glad that the gentleman is going to be in the Senate, but we all regret his departure from this House. [Applause.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] for the kind words that he has just said about me. I appreciate them very much.

Now, I want to say to the other gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON], who interrupted me just a little while ago, that I do not believe it makes a particle of difference what kind of a road bill we passed at the last session or the session before that. It was doomed to failure in the Senate. I will say to the gentleman that when we first began this propaganda four years ago we did not have a Committee on Roads in this House. And more than that, we who actively interested ourselves in the road movement here were published and advertised all over this country and designated as "dirt-roads statesmen" in derision, and yet in the short time of four years we find public sentiment has changed entirely and now there is a demand all over the country for Federal aid to roads, and instead of my distinguished friend here [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], the chairman of this great committee, being now termed a "dirt-roads statesman" he is one of the greatest statesmen in the country because he is at the head of this Federal road-building movement. [Applause.]

Having views that I have heretofore expressed, I am going to offer the bill of last year as a substitute for this bill, and I want to urge you gentlemen of this House before you vote to weigh carefully what you do. You have to go before all of the people of your several districts, and you are going to find that it will be hard to explain to the people why you abandoned a plan that is peculiarly in their interest, peculiarly in the farmers' interest, and adopted a plan that gives only certain routes and certain localities an opportunity to be improved. To give to these favorite localities indeed a great improvement, and I may say a much desired improvement, but at the same time leaving the vast body of your district, and perhaps many entire districts, without any Federal aid and without any Federal encouragement to State or county road building.

For those with these views I have reintroduced the bill which was passed by this House on February 10, 1914, and am going to offer it as a substitute for the committee's bill at the proper time. I do this because I believe it is a far better bill than the one the committee has reported out this session. If the substitute fails, I shall then support the present bill as being a step in the right direction. If the substitute is not adopted, I shall grealy regret to give up that plan, but I shall vote for the bill as reported out of the committee on the ground that it is the best that we can get. I am so heartily in favor of Federal aid to roads that I prefer to have a bill that does not meet my best judgment rather than to have no bill at all.

Gentlemen, I thank you very much. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back two minutes.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I feel very much like the old lady felt in the Methodist prayer meeting. I would like to add my "testimony" to what the "brother" has just said.

It so happens that I was the first Democrat, by the actual record and not by claim, to introduce a bill similar, but in my humble judgment more liberal than the one now before the House. I did that on the 21st day of April, 1911. I hold in my hand a copy of the speech I delivered in the House on the 29th of February, 1912, on the question of Federal aid to public highways. That happened to be the first speech made under the Democratic organization for Federal aid to public highways, and the burden of converting all these brothers that we hear now supporting this good-roads movement devolved upon me, and I am proud of the job that I so well did. [Laughter and applause.]

I heard a gentleman this afternoon speaking about Federal aid for public highways, and I remember shortly after the delivery of my speech in 1912 he came into the cloakroom and made a remark about the impossibility of the Government ever appropriating money for roads and the foolhardiness of a young, "tender-footed" Congressman butting his head against a brick wall; and yet he made one of the best speeches I have heard in support of this bill, so I felt at liberty, as the original Federal-aid-to-public-highways man in this House, by the record, to say a few words to my city brothers. [Laughter.]

This bill in its operation is not such a bill as I would like to have seen enacted into law, because the wealthier States of the Nation, which have made greater advancement on account of their large taxable values than the purely agricultural States and the sparsely settled sections of the country, will receive the greatest benefit from this legislation, while the exact antithesis of this condition should be true. The purely agricultural and less able States of the Union, from a standpoint of taxable values, should receive the greater portion of the appropriation.

The object of this legislation, Mr. Chairman, is dual. Avoiding the unconstitutionality of the Government's appropriating money for such purposes in the States, the money expended under this bill is to be applied to roads over which rural delivery routes are operated. Under the regulations of the Post Office Department these rural delivery routes are operated only over those roads which justify the establishment of the rural route and which can be traversed readily by horse-drawn vehicles the year round.

Recently the Post Office Department has made what I conceive to be, so far as my State is concerned, a most grievous error in attempting to establish motor car service over the rural delivery routes generally. The mistake consists only in the department attempting to put on a service that would be most acceptable and economical but for the fact that the major portion of the roads over which rural delivery routes now operate are still unimproved.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, one of the great pieces of legislation passed in the Sixty-second Congress can not and will not be fully developed or its beneficent influence fully realized until the rural carrier can conveniently and more rapidly transport parcel-post mail. The use of the parcel post is only in its infancy, and the service will not reach the maximum of its usefulness until this country has on all of its rural delivery routes a network of permanent highways traversible every day in the year without inconvenience.

Therefore, the complaint registered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] is a complaint that any Member representing a large city, filled with glaring electric lights, asphalt-paved streets, and smooth sidewalks could register. It is a purely selfish one. He could say the same thing to his neighbor whose house had been unroofed by a cyclone: "I care not for my neighbor, whose family in exposed to the cold and the rain; the roof of my house remains intact."

There was a great statesman, one of the greatest that this continent ever produced, broad minded and generous, who could look out of his library window and his vision encompassed the entire Nation. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will peruse the great speech of the immortal Webster in his reply to Hayne I am sure it will broaden his vision and he can see benefits accruing to the entire Nation instead of demanding that all internal improvements be made within sight of his own front door. Mr. Webster said, upon the occasion when Mr. Hayne asked the question, "What interest has South Carolina in a canal in Ohio?"—

> Sir, we narrow-minded people of New England do not reason thus. Our notion of things is entirely different. We look upon the States not as separated, but as united. We love to dwell on that Union and on the mutual happiness which it has so much promoted and on the renown which it has so greatly contributed to acquire. In our contemplation Carolina and Ohio are parts of the same country—States united under the same General Government, having interests common, associated, intermingled. We do not impose geographical limits to our patriotic feelings or regard. We do not follow rivers and mountains and lines of latitude to find boundaries beyond which public improvements do not benefit us.

Mr. Chairman, there are three modes of transportation—public roads, railroads, and water. The railroads and great trans-Atlantic steamboats, carrying our commerce to the uttermost parts of the earth, are absolutely dependent upon the public highways of the Nation for their traffic. If it were not for the

plodding farmer in the remote country districts of this Nation and the public highways leading to the great railway systems and to the navigable rivers of the Nation the people in the great civic centers would soon become the prey of hunger and be scattered over the face of the earth in search of food.

Mr. Chairman, it is estimated that good roads would add from $2 to $10 per acre to land values. The total area of farm lands in the United States is about 900,000,000 acres. It is estimated an increase of $5 an acre by the construction of good roads would add to our taxable values $4,500,000,000 per annum.

One of the greatest drawbacks to the farmer is the fact that under the present condition of the roads throughout the country he is practically isolated from market during the winter months. This is not only true in the South, where we do not have the continuous hard freezes incident to the climate of the States farther north, but it is true in practically nine-tenths of the States in the Union. No matter what prices corn, wheat, cotton, or other farm products are quoted at on a given day, if the roads are impassable the farmer is helpless to take advantage of the high prices; then when the roads are in passable condition and the great bulk of the staple crops is still in the hands of the farmer a general movement to market necessarily follows, depressing prices, and the farmer is the loser thereby.

Another great tax upon the farmers of the country attributable to bad roads is that at the very time the farmer should be hauling all of his fertilizers and going to market for all of his supplies he finds the roads impassable, and he is compelled to take good weather when he could be tilling the soil of his farm, to market his crops, and to do the necessary hauling incident to his farming activities.

Mr. Chairman, for the last few years we have been continually hearing the cry from every source of "Back to the farm." The brainy boys and girls of our rural districts are continually seeking to escape the social conditions prevalent in the country during the long, dreary, winter months of the year, attributable almost entirely to bad roads. The drift of our population from the rural districts to the cities is really becoming alarming. Much of the social isolation has been ameliorated by the extension of telephone lines in the country and rural free delivery, but these great conveniences do not yet satisfy those who live upon the farm. Instead of the winter months in the rural districts being the most pleasant and profitable of the year, they mean absolute social isolation. Bad roads prevent attendance at school and church; they make literary societies, social gatherings, club and lodge meetings practically impossible during the bad weather of the winter.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that I know the people who live upon the farms of this country as well as anyone. They are the most sociable people on the face of the earth. They love to go to church; they are ambitious to send their children to school. They love to visit one another and exchange ideas; they love to visit the sick; and when the week end comes they want to go to the nearest village store. The Representatives in this House who live in the large cities, either in an apartment house or in a private dwelling, can not appreciate these people. If a newcomer goes into the community, all the neighbors go and visit him and welcome him in their midst, but we can live in the large cities in an apartment house or next door to a family for 10 years and never know their names. So the cry of back to the farm will not be met, in my opinion, until something is done to make country life more attractive and the development of the farm more rapid.

In 1850, 12.5 per cent of the population of the United States were living in cities of 2,500 or over; in 1890, 35 per cent; in 1900, 40 per cent; in 1910, 46 per cent.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is my sincere hope that I may yet live to see the day dawn when this great lawmaking body will recognize that the future of this Nation depends largely upon the activities of this Government in making rural life more attractive by extending to the man on the farm many of the advantages that he does not now enjoy, and it affords me great pleasure to cast my vote for the bill under consideration, which I believe will ultimately do more for the upbuilding of the rural districts of this Nation than all the other legislation written upon the statute books in half a century.

Mr. Chairman, as I said in the outset this bill is not all that I had hoped for, but it is the best that could be done at this time under the unusual existing conditions. I hope that in the future these appropriations may be greatly increased and that the Government will, with the cooperation of the several States of the Union, rapidly construct a system of highways throughout the Nation second to none on the face of the globe, and in my judgment it will be the greatest asset and the richest legacy we can leave to posterity as a monument to the wisdom of the Democratic Party.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER]. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, in the limited time of five minutes it is impossible, of course, to say much about the merits of this bill, and therefore I must ask the privilege of extending my remarks.

Since I have been in Congress it has been my pleasure to support the bills that have come before the House which have directly affected the rural communities of our country. Out of more than a billion dollars that are appropriated each year for the expenses of the Government to carry on its business in all of its different departments, the amount that goes directly for the improvement of farming is less than 5 per cent.

We who represent Illinois upon this floor believe that it is a great State, and we realize, of course, that it is a rich State. I think Illinois does as many things for itself without calling on the Federal Government as any State in the Union. I believe we can put our record against that of any of the 47 other States. But when it comes to building roads throughout the States, that is an expensive proposition, and to levy taxes for that purpose upon the farms of Illinois will cost the farmers a good deal of money, which must be paid by taxation on the land. We have in our State a highway law and we appropriate each year for roads several hundred thousand dollars that goes to the different counties. We have also local taxation, which does build some roads; but, as we all realize, it is a slow process, and the farmers of this country need encouragement in this work.

I do not so closely question the constitutionality of this and other propositions as some gentlemen do, yet every man who serves upon this floor takes an oath to support the Constitution of the United States to the best of his ability as he understands it. But there are many questions that come here which are not free from doubt to a layman, who does not look at these questions from the standpoint of a lawyer, and he is apparently just as much in doubt as we are. I have listened to great lawyers who argued constitutional questions well upon both sides of this proposition; and in the end if this House passes a law which is unconstitutional, after we have used our best judgment, then it will go to another place, where the question of its constitutionality will be finally determined. As to myself, I believe that I am responsible to the constituents who have sent me here whom I try to represent upon this floor.

If there is a question of doubt in reference to the Constitution—which I do not believe there is in this case—I am willing to give the benefit of that doubt to the side which I believe to be right and which does the people the most good. There is one feature of this bill that is not satisfactory to me, and that is the section which, in my judgment, would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to send men out all over the country to inspect the roads. There might be an army of these employees scattered throughout the country. It is my judgment that we should trust the local and State highway commissioners or the governor, through his agents, to certify to the Secretary of Agriculture that the work has been properly done, and I hope to have such an amendment adopted that will meet this condition.

The only difficulty about expending $25,000,000 among all the States of the Union is that it is only a small beginning. Yet this small beginning is an encouragement to the people of all the local communities throughout the United States to help build their own roads. In Illinois we have the Dixie Trail; we have the Lincoln Trail, the Logan-Lee Highway; we have the National Road, the State Road, and all sorts of roads running over the State of Illinois, and the laying out of those roads encourages the people all through the neighboring part of the country to improve the condition of their local roads and make them better.

It occurs to me that of all the appropriations made by Congress directly to the people for improvements that none would be of more benefit than this bill in the aid of hard roads. It is said that those in the cities would get no benefit from the appropriations that improve the country roads. I would ask those who live in the city to consider that it is to their interest in building up a great city that there should be easy access to get in and out; that the roads should be improved; that they are interested in the proper system of roads that carry freight in the country and out of the country; and that they must remember that every farmer is located out a distance from the railroad and farm produce must be hauled to the station for shipment to the city. There has been for a number of years agitation to keep young men upon the farm. It is realized that too many of them leave the farm and seek employment of one kind or another in the city, and an effort has been made to try and

prevent this condition. The last census showed that in a number of counties of certain States throughout the United States the rural population has decreased very materially.

Illinois, in more than 1,000 townships, in the rural communities lost in population. The last census showed an increase of 37 per cent in tenant farmers in the United States, so that with this large increase something should be done to stop this condition which in the end, if kept up, must ruin our rural class. The Industrial Commission, which lately made its report, showed in one great State the horrible example of tenant farmers and the increase of tenants on the farm each year. We can not expect to have the prosperous rural community and have renters on the farm. The farm should be owned by the man living on it just so far as possible, and encouragement should be given in a substantial way to assist him to own a farm. In this country we do not want to build up a system of landlordism, and our people will not tolerate it, for, in the end, it must mean ruin. You can not expect young men to remain upon the farm when during a long period of the season, while he is not busy, he must be isolated from his local city or village, from the social centers, on account of the roads which are impassable. Telephone and rural free delivery have been of very material advantage to the farmer, bringing him in closer communication with his local city, but we need to go further and provide some better means of transportation over the roads in the community. Congress appropriates each year millions of dollars for rivers and harbors in the interest of transportation and cheaper freight, which we believe to be beneficial to the people in shipping the products of the farm, mine, and factory; but good roads are just as important to reduce the cost of marketing farm products. It may be said by some that the farmers should build their own roads by taxing their land and personal property. The farmer has always been willing and does bear his just proportion of taxation. His income usually is small, and what he accumulates must be earned by hard work by himself and family. Getting rich upon the farm is a slow process, and but few ever accumulate a large amount of property. Millionaires are not found upon the farm, and yet the produce of the farm supplies a species of speculation after it leaves the farmer's hands, and many times more money and profit is realized from handling the product than the farmer himself receives.

In this country, of course we need better roads to enable the farmer to market his product and to haul what he must buy for use upon the farm back to his home. A system of marketing which will enable him to put his produce upon the market to the best advantage is always a matter of great interest and should be developed so he may reap a just reward for his labor. It is useless for anyone to go out and propose going back to the farm unless he can show that farming conditions are better then when the boy left it. The young man knows under what disadvantages he labored and how he had to travel through the mud and what little profit there was in it to him. In Illinois the State highway commission cooperates with the different counties in the State in reference to road building. The money which is each year appropriated in cooperation with the counties for building roads is a slow process. In many counties material for hard roads must be shipped quite a distance into the State, freight rates are high, and in the end the building of hard roads is so expensive that but little progress has yet been made, so that to-day most of our highways are only dirt roads, which in the winter time with rain, freezing, and thawing, become impassable for hauling of any freight or even traveling in any way. Illinois is a fairly rich State in comparison with others and our lands will compare favorably with most States, and yet our farmers feel that taxation for hard roads would be so great that they hesitate to vote upon themselves and their children this debt, which would be hard to pay, and especially such would be the case if failure of crops come, so in the end they may be greatly in debt and possibly lose their land. It is true that an appropriation of $25,000,000 is not large when divided up among the States, as proposed by this bill, as it will give only a small amount and will not build very many roads, but it will do some good and will encourage the farmers and show them the Federal Government realizes the importance of these improvements and is willing to aid them in this work.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HULBERT].

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, this bill does not contain any provision from which either the district that I represent or the city of New York, in which it is located, the metropolis of America, derives any direct benefit, yet I am not prepared to say, until I have given this bill further consideration, that we can not benefit indirectly in the same sense that the people of the whole country may benefit by the expenditure of money for the improvement of the port of New York. [Applause.] I am not provincial in my ideas. Any man who has lived in the city of New York, who has grown up with its commercial progress and advancement, must look to the East, to the West, to the North, and to the South; and the people of my city are as liberal minded as those of any other section of the country. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] said to-day our State had appropriated the sum of $100,000,000 for good roads, and yet not one dollar of that amount has been nor will ever be expended in the city of New York. We in New York, however, will be called upon by the system of taxation which exists in our State to bear 74 per cent of that $100,000,000, all of which will be expended outside of the corporate limits of New York City, and in addition to that the people of the city of New York will be called upon in the future, as they have been called upon in the past, to improve, to extend, and to repair the streets and avenues and highways of New York City without any contribution whatever from the people who live outside of the city of New York. If the gentlemen on the other side of the House were equally consistent in their attitude upon good roads at Albany, we would be in more perfect accord.

Gentlemen, the consideration of this matter brings rather to my mind another question upon which I should like to digress for a few moments.

I have sought for a long time to ascertain the real definition and appreciate the application of the words "new project" as applied to legislation adopted by this House. I am constrained to the belief that the bill by which it is sought to appropriate the sum of $25,000,000 to be expended throughout the rural sections of this country is just as much a matter of a new project as the adoption of a provision for the improvement of the East River and New York Harbor.

I want to direct the attention of Members of this House to the fact that while $853,000,000 has been appropriated for river and harbor improvements, only $20,000,000, or less than 3 per cent of that amount, has been expended upon New York Harbor, and yet since 1881 there has been turned into the Federal Treasury from the port of New York $5,500,000,000, and the city of New York, to say nothing of private interests, has expended $8 to every $1 applied by the Federal Government for the development of the greatest harbor in the world and the most productive asset of the United States. In 1868 Congress adopted a project for the improvement of the East River by blasting out certain rocks, which menaced navigation, to a depth of 26 feet. But that was away back, 3 years after the Civil War, 48 years ago. The Government could afford to be liberal with the port of New York then. Up to 1912 about $6,000,000 was expended, and the project, with its modifications, carried 70 per cent to completion. Then the district Army engineer reported that the commercial necessities had outgrown river development, and recommended an amended project for a 35-foot channel and 30 feet to piers, at a cost of $33,000,000. The Board of Engineers scaled that down to $13,400,000, and it was adopted by the House at the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, but stricken out in Senator Burton's filibuster in the Senate. And there we stand to-day. Congress has ceased appropriations upon a project "the further improvement of which is reported as economically inadvisable," but refuses to provide a substitute in the greatest harbor in the world because it is opposed to taking on any "new project." This 35-foot channel from the Battery to Throgs Neck, a distance of only 16 miles, would give us an eastern deep-water entrance from the Atlantic Ocean into New York Bay and would provide New York, what does not exist in any port in the whole world, a double entrance and a double exit to New York Harbor, not only of enormous commercial value, but of strategic importance in the general plan of preparedness—a marine trench for naval purposes, as it were.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DUNN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. HULBERT. Now, Mr. Chairman, the effect of that improvement on the East River to the extent that it has been improved is that during the past year the boats which navigate that stream carried a total commerce of 45,000,000 short tons, having a value of $1,500,000,000. In addition to which there have been transported on these boats 22,500,000 passengers; and yet because the district engineer has found the expenditure of money under the project of 1868 is economically inadvisable, because we can not induce this Congress to appreciate the necessity of the adoption of the new project recommended by the Chief of Engineers, since 1912 there has not been a dollar expended in the improvement of this great waterway. You talk here of a merchant marine and the building of our pan-American commerce, but I tell you now there are steamship lines having vessels actually in commission and desirous of making New York

the home port, and we have not the docking facilities, because of lack of depth of water to accommodate them. I call attention to the fact that located on the East River is the Brooklyn Navy Yard, where you are building to-day vessels which have a draft of 30 to 31 feet, and yet the channel in the river is only 26 feet. The Secretary of the Navy within the past few days has addressed a letter to this House, which was referred to the Rivers and Harbors Committee, of which I am a member, and I desire to place that letter in the RECORD without reading it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a letter. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DECEMBER 21, 1915.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to invite your attention to the serious condition existing at the navy yard, Brooklyn, N. Y., in so far as pertains to the depth of water in ship channels leading thereto.

There is not sufficient water in these channels to insure the entering or leaving of a first-class battleship at all times.

At present only one battleship can be handled per day, and then only provided the weather conditions are normal. If the winds are such as to blow the water out of New York Bay then the depth of water in the approach channel is not sufficient to safely navigate a large ship. As an illustration, the following it noted:

On November 3, 1915, the U. S. S. *Texas*, one of our new first-class battleships, was ready to leave the yard, but the prevailing northwest winds had so reduced the depth of water in the Buttermilk Channel that even at high water there was not sufficient depth to insure her leaving the yard in safety. This ship therefore was forced to remain in the navy yard for over 24 hours.

This condition is a serious one and might cause grave complications. I understand there are two propositions before Congress—one providing a channel 35 feet deep and 1,000 feet wide in Buttermilk Channel, and the other north of Governors Island up the East River through Hell Gate. The second would provide for ships passing from the yard to lower New York Bay or to the Sound, a condition highly desirable from a strategic point of view. Either project will provide for free access to the navy yard.

The increase in size of ships has not yet reached its limit.

Through injuries received in battle, a ship could readily be drawing more water than normally at a time when it was most necessary to dock her.

It is therefore most urgent that an approach channel to the New York Navy Yard be maintained of not less than 35 feet depth at mean low water and 1,000 feet wide, and I can not too strongly urge the serious attention of Congress to this matter.

Sincerely, yours, JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

Mr. HULBERT. Now, I want to emphasize another fact. I do not say that there has been any discrimination against New York. I am not going to debate it. As a matter of fact, if any such charge were made, I would leave it to the determination of any unbiased mind.

But I want to call attention to a statement issued by the Post Office Department evidencing the fact that during the year 1914 the post-office receipts in the city of New York were upward of $29,500,000 and expenditures but $10,700,000, showing a net profit to the United States Government in the post office of the city of New York of upward of $18,800,000 to be applied to meet deficiencies in other sections of the country. In other words, the receipts from the city of New York post office were 10½ per cent of the total revenue of the Post Office Department of the whole United States for 1914. In spite of which fact I am called upon by many civic bodies in New York, composed of manufacturers and merchants from the Battery to the uppermost sections of the city, to enter my protest with those of my colleagues against the Postmaster General's proposed action in the great metropolis of America, the greatest in the world, whose postal receipts show a profit of $18,000,000 a year, by reducing the number of city deliveries in the business sections of that community. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to insert in the RECORD a letter I received on this subject from the Central Mercantile Association, and my reply, and the resolutions attached thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NEW YORK, *January 20, 1916.*

Hon. MURRAY HULBERT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Inclosed herewith please find resolution unanimously adopted by our board of directors on the 18th instant, protesting against any reduction in the mail deliveries in the business section of this city.

Would also be pleased to have you present this matter to Chairman MOON, of the Post Office Committee of the House.

Thanking you very kindly for your attention to this matter, beg to remain,

Yours, very truly,

CENTRAL MERCANTILE ASSOCIATION,
JOS. E. KEAN, *Secretary.*

Protest of board of directors and members of Central Mercantile Association against proposed reduction in mail deliveries in New York City.

Whereas it has been brought to our attention through the public press that the House of Representatives Committee on Post Offices, with First Assistant Postmaster General Roper, have under consideration a reduction of the number of mail deliveries in the business districts in this city: Therefore be it

Resolved, That immediate attention be called to the facts and conditions existing as to the total revenue of New York post office, which was upward of $29,500,000 in the year 1914; the total expenses of the New York post office for the year 1914 were about $10,700,000, showing a net profit to the United States Government of upward of $18,800,000 for this particular year. That the total revenues of the New York post office were over 10½ per cent of the total revenues of the Post Office Department for the whole United States for the year 1914.

Resolved further, That the board of directors of the Central Mercantile Association (comprising the great majority of the larger manufacturing, wholesale, and retail firms and real-property owners between Canal Street and Thirty-fourth Street, Fourth Avenue and North River) vigorously protest against any reduction in the number of mail deliveries daily in the business section of the city of New York, because it would result in much delay and great detriment to and seriously retard the daily mail-order business which is transacted by practically all manufacturing, wholesale, and jobbing houses in this city with business firms in all other towns and cities: Be it further

Resolved, That because of the vast volume of business done by mail order, that any reduction in mail delivery would necessarily result in a reduction of the postal revenue at the New York post office and likewise retard the general business of parcel-post delivery: And be it further

Resolved, That the President be urged to appoint a special committee to take the matter up and present such facts as may be necessary to the Post Office Department and to the Members of Congress in regard to the mail deliveries in New York City.

NEW YORK CITY, *January 18, 1916.*

NEW YORK BOARD OF TRADE AND TRANSPORTATION,
New York, January 12, 1916.

Protest against proposed reduction in mail deliveries in New York City unanimously adopted by the New York Board of Trade and Transportation.

Whereas it is reported that the House of Representatives Committee on Post Offices, with First Assistant Postmaster General Roper, have under consideration a curtailment of the number of mail deliveries in the business districts in this city: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we invite attention to the facts that the total revenue of the New York post office was $29,488,518.02 in the year 1914; that the total expenses of the New York post office for the year 1914 were $10,686,996.28; that the New York post office, therefore, produced a net profit to the United States Government of $18,801,521.74 for the year 1914; that the total revenues of the New York post office were over 10½ per cent of the total revenues of the Post Office Department for the whole United States for the year 1914;

Resolved, That we protest against any curtailment of the number of mail deliveries daily in the business sections of the city of New York, because it would result in delaying delivery of all mail from all parts of the country destined for New York business houses and injure the merchants and buyers in all other cities and places, and we further protest because experience in the New York post office shows that mail coming for delivery in this city is so vast in volume that any curtailment of the number of deliveries would cause an accumulation so great as to necessitate the employment of a larger number of carriers to enable them to make delivery on a reduced number of deliveries, and would thus cause an increase of expense instead of a reduction thereof;

Resolved, That the president be authorized to appoint a special committee to make proper representation of the facts to the Post Office Department and Members of Congress in regard to the mail deliveries in New York.

A true copy.

S. V. V. HUNTINGTON, *President.*

Attest:

FRANK S. GARDNER, *Secretary.*

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BRITT].

Mr. BRITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support, in a few words, the pending bill. I chance to be the farthest south Republican Member of this body in the eastern section of the United States, and yet I most heartily and gladly join with the Democratic chairman of the Committee on Roads in support of this bill, for the reason that I believe it to be founded on certain great essential and necessary principles. I think the bill meets many conditions which should be met, and should be met now. It has been said on this floor to-day that it was a discrimination in favor of the country and against the city. Such has been the substantial import of certain arguments. Can it be that gentlemen will come here and advocate the construction, at great expense, of splendid post-office buildings in our cities and towns, and yet hold that it is unconstitutional and impolitic to expend a dollar to make a post road along which the mail may be carried from that office to the man who chances to live in the country? I think the bill gives a splendid definition of the term post roads. It applies it to all of the country and to all of the towns, boroughs, and cities of less than 2,000 population, and it makes it apply to cities of more than 2,000 population if the houses chance to be upon an average of more than 200 feet apart. I think the distribution of the money is splendidly made and upon a most excellent and sound basis. In the first place, it recognizes the individual sovereignty of the States after the analogy of the apportionment of Senators in Congress, by giving the little States, such as Delaware and Rhode Island, $65,000

to start with, just as is given to the States of New York and Texas. In the next place, it recognizes the proportionate population of the States by the last decennial census, giving to each State one-half the remainder upon the ratio which the population of the State bears to the population of the whole country. It then apportions the remainder according to the relative mileage of rural routes and star routes in each State, an easily ascertainable fact.

When the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] referred to the Cumberland Road, he stopped short of telling this House that it was because of the construction of that road, and because of the Federal aid which constructed it, that the great section of the country in which he lives and which he represents had its development in the opening up of that wonderful country in the impetus given immigration by the construction of this road.

I live in a district which is rural and mountainous. I live in a State in which we as a State, as counties, as municipalities and townships, have done and are doing all that our resources will permit us to do in the way of construction of highways. We can not do all that should be done in a large district like mine, a district of a quarter of a million people, comprising 13 counties, a mountainous section, with rivers and valleys and deep gorges. We need the assistance which the Federal Government has given to hundreds and hundreds of less meritorious things. Can it be that since 1878 we have expended $650,000,000 to improve the rivers and harbors, not a penny of which has come directly to the benefit of the people of the district which I have the honor to represent, and yet that not a dollar, as some gentlemen say, be used to construct and maintain a road, perchance, to go out of the city into the rural sections? Can it be that we have given 197,000,000 acres of our western lands toward the construction of railroads as a great public subvention, and yet that we should not give to the rural sections a dollar in order that they may have better roads over which to carry the mails, over which to carry their produce, and better roads over which their children may go to school? Can it be that we may spend $500,000,000 upon the construction of the Panama Canal—for that is what it will amount to before it is completed, and I approve it most heartily, although it is thousands of miles from us—and yet it will be unconstitutional and impolitic to expend any money to construct highways upon which the rural citizens, the plain farmers, out in God's own free country, where men do their best work and think their purest thoughts and act their noblest parts, that it is unconstitutional and impolitic to spend a dollar for the construction of these roads? [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, this is not only a sound principle, it is a necessary measure. I urge it here to-day because the country people, who will be most largely benefited, have not received their just proportion of the distribution of public moneys by the Federal Government in its various governmental activities. Where are the large, costly buildings constructed for the Government? In the cities—and I am not against the cities. Where are the millions of dollars expended to dredge and clean the harbors in order that our ships may come in and go out with safety and facility? It is about the cities of the country. Where have the great expenditures been made for so many different public enterprises? They have been made most largely in and about the cities; and now the chairman of the Committee on Roads comes here with a bill which I think is a splendid bill in almost every particular and asks that rural routes and star routes and farmers' roads may be improved. Can we find a valid objection in all that has been stated? Not one. Some things said here to-day in opposition to this bill, to my mind, have been amusing rather than logical. Let me say once more it has been said that this is the entering wedge and that lavish expenditure will follow. It is said that we are building a road out to the farmer's house. Why, if that is the effect of it, what is it in the way of evil? If it should carry the road out into the country, out into the rural sections and past the farmer's house and result in a benefit to him and his family, is he not entitled to this as much as our sons and daughters are entitled to look upon splendid Government buildings in the cities? I live in a city myself. Are they not entitled to have some of the results of appropriative moneys of the Federal Government, even if it does not please the fancy of those gentlemen who chance to have no rural interests whatever in their districts?

The section in which I live has made great strides in road building. It can not do all that should be done. Over our mountains and up our hills and across our valleys we are laying out, constructing, and maintaining splendid roads, but we can not do it all. Gentlemen, those hills are as beautiful as God ever permitted man to look upon, and I could wish my colleagues no greater pleasure than to have them come at a time when the season is at its best and take an eyeful of the beauties of the mountains and valleys of my district. I am not asking for North Carolina anything to which she is not entitled as a part of the great policy which this Government has followed from the beginning in giving aid wherever wisdom and necessity have dictated that it should be given. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRITT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRITT. Mr. Chairman, one of the most vital questions which confronts the American people to-day is that of improving their public highways. This problem has been, up to the present, left by the National Government to be solved by the several States and their local political subdivisions in such manner as they may best be able. While this is a great burden for the States and smaller subdivisions to bear and while the interstate nature of many of these public roads and of present day traffic would seem to impose a part, at least, of this burden upon the National Government, yet these States and smaller subdivisions are assuming this burden in a manner becoming a great people, and great strides are being made in the direction of its solution. Evidence of this is afforded by the progress actually attained. The first authentic road census in this country was taken by the Office of Public Roads of the United States Department of Agriculture in the year 1904. This census disclosed the fact that we had a road mileage aggregating about 2,150,000, of which about 153,000 miles were improved. Our annual expenditure for road purposes that year amounted to about $80,000,000. In 1909 a second census was taken. This second census showed that during the five-year period the mileage of improved roads had increased to about 190,000, or nearly 25 per cent. The expenditures for that year were not obtained, but, according to figures recently compiled in the Office of Public Roads, the road expenditures for 1915 approximate the enormous sum of $200,000,000.

From these facts it is evident that the States and their minor subdivisions are putting forth a supreme effort to improve their highway conditions. It is apparent that they recognize the importance of this improvement and regard it of such pressing need that they are willing to spend their money and their energy in its accomplishment. This spirit of progressiveness should be commended. Not only should it be commended, but it should be rewarded by the National Government joining hands with the States and, through a spirit of wholesome cooperation and substantial money aid, assisting them in furthering the development of a better system of highways throughout this entire country.

Nearly every progressive undertaking looking to the advancement of our civilization is receiving some measure of aid or encouragement from our National Government. Laws have been enacted for the purpose of stimulating efforts in literature, the useful arts and inventions by a system of liberal copyrights, trade-marks, and patents. Annual contribution is made to the education of the youth of every State in the Union. Over $650,000,000 have been expended for the improvement of our rivers and harbors, and lighthouses and danger signals are maintained along all navigable waters to safeguard their commerce. Donations of public lands, aggregating 197,000,000 acres, have been made for the purpose of promoting railroad development throughout the country, and at present the Interstate Commerce Commission is maintained to prevent the railroads from charging excessive rates for transportation. The United States Department of Agriculture, with its corps of well-trained scientists, is engaged in trying to teach the farmers of the country to adopt better methods of farming so as to increase their annual production, which has already reached the $10,000,000,000 mark. But with all this, as broad as may seem the activities of our National Government, and as liberal as may be its appropriations, it has not yet joined hands with the people in aid of the improvement of our highwnys which are so vital to the welfare of our entire population, and particularly our rural population.

Consider for a moment the relative importance, as great national economic factors, of our farms and cities. Has it ever occurred to you that the American farm is the greatest known wealth producer, and that our cities are almost equally famous as wealth consumers? Such is, nevertheless, the case. Primarily, every city resident may be said to produce nothing. He is merely engaged in the consumption, distribution, or manipulation of that which is produced elsewhere, chiefly on the farm. On the other hand, every inhabitant of the farm may be said to be a producer, large or small, the value of their combined annual production exceeding the sum of $10,000,000,000.

Not only this, but a large per cent of the aggregate wealth of the United States is represented by farm property. Our total wealth at present is placed at about $150,000,000,000. Of this, more than $50,000,000,000, or about one-third, consists of farm property. The yearly return on this investment in farm property is represented by our ten billions of annual farm production, which is about 22.5 per cent of the money invested. There is scarcely another class of property in existence which yields such satisfactory returns or plays so important a part in our commercial and industrial development. This readily appears from the fact that in 1910 our exports of farm products, exclusive of forest products, amounted to $871,158,425, or 50.9 per cent of all domestic exports, while our imports of farm products amounted to $687,509,115, or only 44.2 per cent of the total imports, leaving in our favor a balance of $183,649,310.

But this vast wealth of farm products must be hauled over our public roads before reaching the channels of trade and commerce. It must be transported an average distance of about 9.4 miles before being served up as food for our city population or to provide raw material for running our manufactories or to swell the volume of our foreign commerce. It would seem, therefore, a duty of the National Government to help improve the highways over which these products must be hauled and thus facilitate their reaching the markets for further distribution. Exceeding care is taken and vast sums of money expended by the Federal Government to improve the channels of transportation through which they must pass after being removed from the farms. To promote this purpose donations of public lands aggregating 197,000,000 acres were made to the railroads; since 1875 more than $650,000,000 have been appropriated from our National Treasury for the improvement of our rivers and harbors; and the mammoth project of all ages is now being prosecuted in Panama, where approximately $500,000,000 is being expended in constructing the Panama Canal, to afford a shorter route between the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts and to facilitate the commerce of the world generally.

No objection is raised to these appropriations for the purposes named. Every one of them is a worthy project and deserves not only the aid which is being extended by the Government, but should command the hearty support and indorsement of every public-spirited American citizen. However, if there are other projects of similar merit or equally essential to our public welfare they should receive equally as favorable consideration at the hands of the Government. An instance in point is the improvement of our public roads. It seems inconsistent on the part of our Government for it to expend such vast sums in improving our rivers and harbors and digging the Panama Canal in order to facilitate the handling of our commerce, and then not to take an equal interest in the improvement of the highways over which more than 50 per cent of the products which enter into this commerce must first pass. The originator of this vast volume of commerce deserves some measure of consideration.

Another fact worthy of note in this connection is that the Government has expended nearly a quarter billion in the erection of public buildings in the towns and cities throughout the United States for the convenience of our city population. This was a large and necessary expenditure, yet its benefits only reach the approximate 47 per cent of our population living in the cities. Is it any more a duty of the Government to erect buildings in the cities to accommodate their population and add to their architectural beauty than it is to help build roads over which our farmers may haul their produce with ease and profit and thus enable them to improve their farms and build more attractive homes to beautify the roadsides? It has been well said:

> Tear down every edifice in our cities and labor will rebuild them, but abandon our farms and highways and our cities will disappear forever.

The necessity for this line of work was early recognized by the passage in 1806 of an act of Congress providing an appropriation for the construction of a great national highway from Cumberland, Md., westward. Appropriations of this character continued for a number of years, finally ceasing after reaching a total of $14,000,000. At the time these appropriations were made they represented a larger proportion of the then total wealth of the United States than would similar appropriations to-day aggregating $613,000,000, which is the total cost of the great French system of highways. The census of 1850, 12 years after the last appropriation for the old Cumberland Road, placed the total wealth of the United States at $7,135,780,228, which is less than the present annual value of our farm products. It would seem, therefore, if such appropriations could be made at a time when the national exchequer was at such a low ebb, with the same principle and even greater reasons therefor now existing, that our National Government should no longer delay extending substantial aid to the cause of better roads.

Not only does it seem that these appropriations might be made, but they have been made within recent years. Not, however, for expenditure within our own territory, nor for the benefit of our citizenship, but to build roads in foreign territory. Since the War with Spain, and prior to the year 1913, there had been expended from our National Treasury for road building in Alaska $1,925,000; in Porto Rico, $2,000,000; and in the Philippine Islands, $3,000,000; making a total of $6,925,000 thus appropriated for building roads outside of the continental United States. The total of all appropriations for the Old Cumberland Road was only $6,824,919.33, so that more has been expended in recent years in these foreign possessions than was formerly spent on our famous old national pike.

Many protest against the constitutionality of national aid. Even among some Members of Congress, a pronounced doubt seems to exist as to the constitutional authority for making such appropriations of public funds. But does it seem any more appropriate or a more rigid adherence to the spirit and letter of the Constitution for our Government to make such appropriations for the benefit of an alien population than for its own citizens? There is a very wise old saying that "Charity should begin at home," and it seems eminently applicable in this connection.

The Constitution is an instrument which we all revere. It has proven an anchor of safety in many a crisis, and if our ship of state shall always be steered in obedience to its mandates, our Republic will endure unto the end of time. We would not have a single clause or principle of that great instrument perverted, even if the doors of the Treasury would thereby be opened for the much-needed improvement of our highways. It is believed, however, that ample authority exists for Federal aid without the slightest warping of the Constitution. Paragraphs 1, 3, and 7, respectively, of section 8, Article I, provides as follows:

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.
>
> To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes.
>
> To establish post offices and post roads.

Either of the foregoing paragraphs is sufficiently broad to afford Congress ample authority to make appropriations for highway purposes. The "general welfare" clause, in paragraph 1, has often been invoked as authority for various kinds of internal improvements. But the question may be asked what constitutes an internal improvement? Well, in answer, it may be defined as an undertaking, promotive of the public welfare, but of such magnitude as to defy individual effort.

The power of Congress to make appropriations for this class of improvements received considerable attention at the hands of Congress at an early date. In a speech in the United States Senate in 1830, Daniel Webster referred to this power of the Government, in part, as follows:

> Under this view of things, I thought it necessary to settle, at least for myself, some definite notions with respect to the powers of the Government in regard to internal affairs, and I arrived at the conclusion that the Government had power to accomplish sundry objects or aid in their accomplishment.

The improvements of our rivers and harbors is an internal improvement on which the Government is now making lavish expenditures. In the early history of our country appropriations for roads and for rivers and harbors were classed together. The veto messages of Presidents Madison, Monroe, Jackson, and Pierce urged the same constitutional objections against appropriations for rivers and harbors as for highways. The principle involved in these two lines of work has not changed, nor have the clauses of the Constitution which authorize them been amended.

It may be claimed that river and harbor improvements, in addition to the "general-welfare" clause, find authority under the clause of the Constitution conferring upon Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States * * *," which seems inapplicable to roads. Assuming that the authority is derived from this clause, is it not also applicable to roads? In the first place, what is commerce? Webster's Dictionary defined it as "the exchange or buying and selling of commodities." If, therefore, I live on a farm 10 miles from the market, railroad station, or wharf and have $1,000 worth of produce which I wish to dispose of, at what time does that produce enter the realm of commerce? Is it when I load my wagon and drive away from the farm with it, or is it not until I shall have delivered it at the market, rail-

road station, or wharf? Logically my produce would be just as much articles of commerce while in transit from my farm to the point of delivery as after reaching there, and the public highway over which I might perform the haul would be just as much a route of commercial transportation as the railroads or rivers and harbors which might handle it afterwards.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, there originated along the lines of our railroads 968,464,009 tons of freight. Did the constituent commodities which entered into this freight not become articles of commerce before delivery at the railroad station? During 1910 our exports exceeded $1,700,000,000, of which 50.9 per cent was farm products, exclusive of forest products. Did the commodities represented by this vast sum not become articles of commerce until they reached the wharf for foreign shipment? Manifestly such is not the case. A commodity produced for commercial purposes becomes an article of commerce at the place of production, and it enters the channels of commerce the moment it is sold or exchanged or started in transit for sale or exchange. The vast tonnage of our railroad and water transportation routes consist largely of farm and other products originating away from the station or wharf, the initial haul being over our public roads. Therefore our public roads have just about as strong a claim on the Government, under the commerce clause of the Constitution, as do our rivers and harbors.

However, there is yet another clause of the Constitution which affords Congress this power more clearly than either of the foregoing. This is the clause conferring the power "to establish post offices and post roads." The authority granted by this clause is specific, and, inasmuch as the Government uses the public roads every day in the transportation of the mails, it would seem proper and timely for the exercise of this power. The rural delivery of mails is made each day over the public highways, the average number of miles traveled daily by rural carriers exceeding 1,000,000, or nearly one-half of all roads in the United States. Being a daily user of almost one-half of all our public roads, and the condition of these roads being so vital to efficiency and economy in the administration of the Rural Delivery Service, it would seem that the Government should take a hand in the improvement of these roads.

No country has good roads except where the general government has shared the responsibility of building and maintaining them. All of the European countries which have improved roads have acquired them under a system whereby their National Governments have borne a part of the cost and assisted in the supervision of their construction and maintenance. France is recognized as having the finest roads of any country in the world, but in the building of these roads the National Government of France contributed over $600,000,000, and supervises their maintenance to-day. Road conditions in some of the more progressive European countries are worthy of mention:

FRANCE.

France has an area of 207,054 square miles, a population (1901) of 38,962,000, and the total mileage of all public roads is 516,000 miles. This gives practically 2½ miles of road for every square mile of area and 75 people per mile of road. As compared with the United States, we have 2,200,000 miles of road, which gives an average of 0.74 mile of road per square mile of area, and a population of 41 per mile of road. On the other hand, Massachusetts has 2.15 miles of road per square mile of area and a population of 195 per mile, while Ohio has 2.18 miles of road per square mile of area and a population of 54 per mile of road.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The movement in England since 1878 has been toward the consolidation and enlargement of highway districts and the powers of the supervising officials. The first step in this movement really began in 1835, through an act of Parliament which gathered all existing statutes into one law and added certain clauses, among which was a permissive clause whereby several parishes could join together for road-administration purposes. In 1862 the highway district act was passed, which provided for the formation of highway districts consisting of several parishes and controlled by a highway board. The act was amended in minor detail in 1864.

The next act was the highway and locomotive (amendment) act of 1878. This provided for a more workable district and central authority, and provided for taking over the disturnpiked roads. One-half of the cost of main road maintenance was borne by the county and one-half by districts and parishes. Ten years later (1888) the local government act threw the care of all main roads on the county councils and abolished the old highway boards.

The last act of epoch-making importance is the development and road improvement funds act, 1909, which provides for a road board, the members to be appointed by the treasury. The board has power, with approval of the treasury, to make advances to the county councils and other highway authorities in respect to construction of new roads and the improvement of old ones. The advances may be either in form of grant or loan. The revenues are to be raised from licenses on motor vehicles and certain licenses and excises on the sale, manufacture, and import of petrol (gasoline).

SWITZERLAND.

In general, the public roads in Switzerland are divided into two main classes—cantonal roads, sometimes called State roads, and local, or communal roads. With the exception of a few intermountain and other roads of national importance, over which the National Government exercises a supervision, the cantonal roads are controlled entirely by the Cantons. The Federal supervision of these roads of national importance is largely limited to the voting of annual indemnities to the four Cantons of Grisson, Tessin, Uri, and Valais, which total about $103,000. If the special roads are not maintained in proper condition the Federal funds are withheld. The cantonal roads are generally placed under the direct charge of a highway department. Construction and maintenance are entirely supervised by this authority, while the funds are voted by cantonal government, usually under the budget system. In the new construction it is very customary for the Canton to pay a portion of the cost, while the remainder is assessed on the commune or parish. In the Canton of Vaud the proportion is 70 per cent by the State and 30 per cent by the commune. The Canton of Berne pays from 25 to 70 per cent, according to the financial condition of the commune, while the Canton of Tessin requires all new construction to be paid in full by the communes traversed. The maintenance of the cantonal roads, on the other hand, is in general, all borne by the Canton. A few Cantons require the respective communes to transport the necessary road materials from the pits or quarries to the road.

The maintenance of the cantonal or State roads is by roadmen employed throughout the year, as in France and Germany. The average length of section assigned to each man is about 3 miles. The annual salary of the cantonniers, or roadmen, varies from $150 to $200. In some Cantons the road men are also allowed the hay and pasturage along the roadside. Trees are only occasionally planted along the roadsides.

SWEDEN.

In Sweden every county is a separate community with regard to the construction and maintenance of public roads, bridges, and ferries. The county government board, appointed by the Crown, superintends the proper maintenance of the roads and bridges within the county. The orders of this board are executed by a superior sheriff (Kronofogde), deputy sheriffs (Länsmän), and assistant sheriffs (Fjerdingsmän).

The roads of the county are inspected once a year by a board consisting of the deputy sheriff and two jurors. A schedule for the inspection tour is published in advance and full records are kept of the inspection. A full report is made to the road board, and such road maintainers or road managers as are found to have defective road sections are notified, with detailed instructions of the necessary repairs. If these are not made within a specified time, fines are imposed, and the deputy sheriff may also have the work done and charge the expense to the road managers.

Until 1891 road maintenance was almost entirely "in natura," that is, by the owners or tillers of the soil. Now an additional revenue is raised from other taxable property than land, which constitutes a so-called "road fund."

The roads are divided into road districts, which are in turn divided into allotments to be maintained "in natura." These allotments are changed from time to time by the county government, but only on substantial evidence showing the need of such change. The road fund is distributed to the various allotments and for the district in general in a somewhat complicated manner by a board or committee in which both the county and district have a voice.

The Royal Board of Road Building and Water Works (Kongl. Vag-Och Vattenbygnadstyrelsen) has supervisory and advisory powers in matters concerning road construction, railorads, harbors, etc. This board is composed of officers who, besides being graduates in their departments at the Technical High School, have also passed a military course in the fortification corps in the army.

In maintenance the Federal Government contributes to the road fund a sum equal to 15 per cent of the total cost, while in new construction the Government pays two-thirds and the road district one-third. The method of handling the funds and carrying out the work of construction is very similar to that already described for maintenance.

Great progress is being made in this country in the work of road improvement through the efforts of the States and local governmental units, but the progress being attained is not as great as the importance of this question should justify. In order to accelerate this progress our National Government, following the example set by the national Governments of the progressive European countries, should lend its aid. Agitation looking to this end has been going on for a number of years, and a strong sentiment exists throughout the country in favor of such action. Not only this, but the number of bills which have been introduced in both Houses of Congress providing for some system of national aid indicates that a strong sentiment exists in Congress for participation in this work. Therefore it behooves this Congress to take some definite action looking to this end as soon as a definite and wise policy can be agreed upon.

For my own part, I think that the form of national aid which should be adopted should be of such character as will bring about a wholesome cooperation between the National, State, and local governments. In order to facilitate the administration of such a measure, the State should be the smallest unit with which the National Government would deal; but I think that through the State local government units should be included and required to share in the expense and responsibility incident to the carrying forward of the work. To this end, some scheme whereby there would be an equal division of cost between the National, the State, and the local governmental units should be adopted.

To my mind, the bill which most nearly embodies this idea among those which have been introduced in Congress is House bill 7617. This bill provides for an annual appropriation of $25,000,000, to be distributed among the different States on the basis of State units, population, and mileage of star and rural delivery routes. Under the provisions of this bill $65,000 would be distributed to each of the several States, one-half of the remainder to each State in the ratio which its population shall bear to the total population of the United States and the remain-

ing one-half among the States at the ratio which the mileage of star routes and rural delivery routes in each State shall bear to the total mileage of star routes and rural delivery routes in the United States.

This bill also makes the State the smallest unit with which the National Government would deal, dealings with the smaller units to be by the State authorities. The administration of the bill, so far as the National Government is concerned, is vested in the Department of Agriculture.

This department has done a great work in developing the widespread sentiment for better highways which now exists and has an efficient organization which can and should be utilized to further advantage by vesting in it the administration of such legislation as Congress may enact for the participation of the National Government in highway work. This is provided for in House bill 7617.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly hope the pending bill will receive the approval of this House.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. HERNANDEZ].

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in the few minutes that have been allotted to me I will not undertake to discuss this measure with the very eloquent men who have taken part in this discussion. I will content myself, however, in saying that I am heartily in favor of it, because I think, as has been said here, it is a beneficial piece of legislation for the people at large. We are legislating here for all the people. I heard the word "paternalism" used in connection with this measure. As I understand the word "paternalism," it means paternal aid to any community. Some of these gentlemen are laboring under the apprehension they are going to build roads for the farmers of the West or the Southwest or the Middle States. This apprehension, Mr. Chairman, is a very small one when you go and compare it with the amounts that the various States have already appropriated and are spending upon their public roads. Why, the small State of New Mexico is spending to-day at the rate of $1,000,000 a year on its public highways. We have constructed between 300 and 400 miles of roads in the last year. When they think they will not profit by means of these roads they are mistaken. Why, I have seen people traveling in automobiles from here down to the Pacific coast. I happened to be down there last winter and I saw people from Buffalo, N. Y., down on the coast who had gone across all of those States and across the States of New Mexico and Arizona. Everybody is benefited by good roads. Our last legislature in New Mexico made an appropriation, or, rather, approved the issue of half a million dollars in bonds for the purpose of good-roads construction. According to the terms of this bill we will get $155,000 out of the amount appropriated.

If this measure is enacted into law, it will be thankfully received, and the money will be properly used. I will also say here that in my State we are properly equipped. We have a State roads commission, composed of our governor, the commissioner of public lands, and of our State engineer, and they are an efficient board, who will see to it that these funds are not used on some cow trail or anything of that sort; and I am sure that the majority of the Members of this House have the same confidence that I have in the integrity and efficiency of their public officials. Let us be charitable and have confidence in a public official until he proves that he is unworthy of that confidence. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask permission to have my further remarks extended in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, in speaking of the roads and the improvements that are being made, I would like to show within the few minutes allotted to me the conditions of the highway department in New Mexico and what they have done toward the betterment of roads in my State.

The Thirty-sixth Legislative Assembly of New Mexico, recognizing the importance to the entire public of good roads and permanent road building, established a public highway known as El Camino Real, to traverse the most important counties from the border of Colorado at Raton, Colfax County, to the Texas border south of Las Cruces, in Dona Ana County, and while still a Territory attempted some improvement on the line of roads for the purpose of a main highway, but prior to 1912 no great progress had been made in improving the possibilities of traffic from county to county. Until New Mexico acquired the dignity of statehood the lack of funds and any central or State organization prevented effective work. Since 1912 the progress has been marked, and so great is the appreciation of the work being done that the State, county, and precinct authorities are now working in complete harmony to the great advantage of the entire State.

New Mexico has more to contend with than most States of the Union in constructing and maintaining roads.

It has an area larger than many of the States more densely populated. Its populated areas are far apart; its available funds smaller than any other State in proportion to the miles of road necessary to afford proper facilities for overland transportations; its rainfall torrential at times and destructive to the very best road construction; its geological conditions so varied as to present innumerable problems of construction and maintenance; good road materials are not always available within any reasonable distance, and cost prevents the consideration of imported materials; long stretches of deep sand, miles of heavy rock work, valleys, mountains, table lands, precipitation varying from 8 to 30 inches, and watercourses as uncertain as the floating clouds, all make the work of good road building both difficult and expensive; but the people of New Mexico have worked with the determination to succeed, and it is not too much to claim that for its population, taxable wealth, and mileage New Mexico is fully abreast with the most progressive State in the Union.

In my State there are now 4,000 miles of main State and intercounty highways, and there was expended on these roads in 1915, $550,000. In 1915 there were 350 miles of new roads constructed, and there will be expended upon the State and county roads in 1916 the sum of $1,250,000, and I estimate that about 700 miles more road will be built this year.

The Forest Service has also very substantially assisted in the building of roads in my State.

During the year 1915 from the 25 per cent of the gross receipts earned by the Forest Service the road fund, or rather the highway commission, received from the Forest Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, the sum of $16,871.75; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, there is available for the highway commission for the year 1916 the sum of $15,893.23.

For roads and trails and for the benefit of the public there is a further 10 per cent added, which, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and available in 1915, amounted to $13,497.40, and for the current year there will be available for the same purpose the sum of $12,714.58.

In giving you these figures I am trying to show you that the people of New Mexico have not been idle, but have done as much for the benefit of their roads and the public at large as any of the more populous States with very much more money to handle the great work than New Mexico has ever had.

The $65,000, being the specific amount to be turned over to the State, will not go very far in the great work that we are doing, but if we should be entitled to the total amount of aid, namely, $155,802, as proposed in the bill, our State will prove to you that the work that we can and will accomplish will be equal to that done by any other State in the Union.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, of course this is a very elaborate question. It is a very interesting question, and it is also a very important question. I have listened with much interest to the various Members as they have given their views upon the subject, and the first one that meets my view is the division of this $25,000,000. Some think a more equitable distribution could be made of this money. I will fully explain my position on that feature of the bill under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, this bill undertakes to aid the States in the construction of its public highways. It appropriates the sum of $25,000,000, from which amount $65,000 is to be paid in bulk to each State, large or small. The balance is then divided into two portions. One portion is to be distributed among all the States according to their population and the other portion is to be divided among all the States according to the number of miles of the highways used for mail delivery and star-route roads. In this estimate the population of Michigan is fixed at 2,810,173, and the number of miles of highway in Michigan for this allotment is fixed at 46,236 miles. The amount of Federal aid apportioned to Michigan under this bill is estimated at $850,492. Before this amount is available, however, a like sum must be used by the State in the construction of its public highways. The class of roads that may participate in this appropriation includes earth, sand-clay, sand-gravel, and

other common types of roads, as well as roads of higher classes, one of the purposes of the act being to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming community.

The roads are to be constructed under the supervision of the State highway department of the State wherein the road is constructed, and reports of the character of the highway and its completion are to be made to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States. This money may also be used for the maintenance of the highway as well as for its construction, and the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, from time to time make payments upon the construction or maintenance as the same progresses, but not, however, exceeding the prorata part to be paid by the United States for the value of labor and material put into such construction and maintenance. The work is to be carried on under the supervision of the State highway commissioner, who reports to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and all payments of money shall be made by the Treasurer of the United States upon the warrant of the Secretary of Agriculture.

EQUITABLE DIVISION OF THE FUND.

It is thought by some that making a payment of $65,000 flat equally to each State is not just. That the State of Rhode Island, with a population of a little over half a million and about 1,000 miles of highway, ought not to receive $65,000 of the appropriation, while New York, with a population of over 10,000,000 and over 48,000 miles of highway, is to receive only a like amount. While this amount was fixed arbitrarily by the committee, I think that the distribution of this equal amount can not be regarded as wholly unfair. A mile of highway in one State costs as much to construct and maintain as a mile of highway in any other State. It is as useful and beneficial and serviceable in one State as in another. This $65,000 apportioned to each State will construct possibly 5 miles of highway or less, and there is no State that can not use this amount in the construction of its highways to good advantage. Indeed, the amount of appropriation to each State under this act can be profitably utilized in the maintenance of the highways in all the States.

THIS MONEY WILL BE WELL EXPENDED.

We spent $400,000,000 for the construction of the Panama Canal, largely in the interest of commerce and transportation. When our country was new millions of acres of our choicest farming land, now of great value, were donated to the construction of railroads, canals, and highways in the interest of commerce and transportation and the general welfare of the Republic. Large appropriations are made annually for the construction of imposing Federal buildings throughout the land, and for the improvement of rivers and harbors in the interest of commerce and transportation, but the commerce of the entire country starts in the rural sections and from the farm, and no more beneficial appropriation, whether in the interest of commerce or the welfare and prosperity of the people, can be made than a reasonable appropriation for public highways.

MERCHANT MARINE.

Much is being said now about the desirability, the benefit, and the need of a merchant marine. We are all in favor of an American merchant marine to aid in our commerce, and surely it would be of great benefit to the industries of our country, whether that industry be of manufacturing or that of the farm. Our country's welfare depends upon agriculture, manufacturing, and commerce. The products of the soil are estimated at $9,000,000,000 annually. This is stated as their value at the farm, while the estimate is made that the cost to the consumer of these products is $27,000,000,000. Largely entering into the increased cost of farm products is the cost of transportation, and I was interested yesterday in the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE], when he states that the cost of transportation per ton-mile of these products from the farm to the market was practically 23 cents on poor roads, while a ton could be moved a mile on good roads for one-third of this amount, or about 7 cents per mile per ton. When we consider that the products of the farm run up into the billions of tons per annum it is easy to see the vast saving good roads are to the farmer, the loss being estimated at $228,000,000. May I say that but for agriculture our country would, indeed, be in a most deplorable, wretched, and impoverished condition. Let each farmer sit down and estimate the number of tons he markets each year, and the distance from his farm to the market, and what the saving would amount to each year if he could draw his products for 7 cents per mile per ton instead of it costing him 23 cents per ton a mile, and he will readily see the profit in good roads.

GOOD ROADS ARE FAVORED BY ALL THE PEOPLE.

The most important attribute of the State or Nation is its highways. The early highways of the States were its first concern. Without highways our rural communities would be practically shut off not only from the markets, but from civilization as well.

The highways were first constructed by the woodsmen, by those living in rural communities and with taxes levied on county, township, and farms. The hardy pioneer settlers cleared the country, beautified it by their handiwork, erected the country's schoolhouses, churches, and left an enduring monument of their handiwork in the construction of a network of highways which make accessible the remote parts of our country. They are gone, but these monuments remain for our use, our benefit, and our comfort. The welfare, prosperity, and happiness of all the people, not alone for those living in the country or the city or the villages, but for the people as a whole. Times have changed along with conditions. To-day the automobile has transplanted the horse on the highway and motor power is fast taking his place in doing the drawing and hauling. These advances are calling for better highways and are being met with a hearty response by the people in the country and cities. In fact, a person is hardly called an up-to-date farmer if he does not now have an automobile with which in a few minutes or hours at the furthest he can go to town, secure repairs for his machinery, do his trading or banking, and return. At first there was a strong prejudice against the auto by the farmer. They frightened his teams, he saw them used only by those having leisure on their hands and largely for pleasure. He could see that they cut up and destroyed his dirt highways. And it was not believed by him that they would ever become a necessary utility for carrying on his business. But with the coming of the Ford this has all changed. Every farmer now has his auto. This he uses for commercial business as well as for pleasure. The auto has passed from the stage of luxury to that of necessity. But with the small car has also come the great 60-horsepower passenger. Most will admit that the larger cars are owned in the city. Most will admit that the larger cars are the most severe on the highways.

There is no question but that is takes a good highway to stand up under the larger cars of to-day, and a dirt highway in wet weather is soon cut up and greatly injured by them. Most people living in the city use their cars for country travel, and I think they are willing, without complaint, to help construct and maintain country highways and will be in favor of Federal aid for the construction and maintenance of better roads. The estimated wealth of the United States is $150,000,000,000. No one would care to figure out the infinitesimal part this appropriation of $25,000,000 bears to that great sum. The wealth, the progress, and the prosperity of our country is so dependent upon our public highways that to deny the one is but to injure the other.

WASHINGTON CITY.

Who is there of you, my colleagues, who did not when he first came to this beautiful city of Washington, our National Capital, thrill with pride on seeing its beautiful public buildings, magnificent parks, and fine statues of our great men? But am I wrong in saying that you were equally or more impressed by its splendidly constructed streets and pavements? They are smooth as the typical barn floor and radiate in all directions and into every quarter of the city. They are permanently built of asphalt, and testify to the foresight and wisdom of their constructors. They were constructed at great cost, but there is no one to-day that would have them removed or destroyed for many times their cost.

FEDERAL AID.

Much has been said about Federal aid for the construction of highways. The claim is made that it has never been the policy of the National Government to lend its aid for this purpose, and the Cumberland Road is mentioned as the only road in which the Government participated in its construction. I might say, in passing, that the Sixty-second Congress appropriated $500,000 for this purpose. This sum was to be divided among the States according to population and miles of highway. None of it ever reached Michigan or many of the other States, for the reason that the States failed to qualify or conform to the provisions of the act. But this appropriation of $500,000 did not go unused. It was used in the State of Ohio, which seemed to fall within the provisions of the act.

MICHIGAN TERRITORIAL HIGHWAY.

In the year 1825 the President of the United States, John Quincy Adams, was authorized to appoint commissioners to survey and mark a road from Detroit to Chicago. Three thousand dollars was appropriated for laying out the road. In 1827 Congress appropriated the sum of $20,000 to aid in the construction of this road, and the act provided that the whole sum could be expended within the Territory of Michigan. The road

from Detroit to Chicago was designed to open up the West and make available the rich agricultural lands through that unbroken wilderness. And this road was also deemed important for the purpose of transporting munitions of war, provisions, and troops to points farther west. This is one of the reasons urged for making this appropriation 90 years after, and one of the benefits of the country should it ever be needed therefor. This highway had the efforts of Gen. Lewis Cass, and the road was located to be 100 feet wide between Detroit and Chicago; but the exhaustion of the appropriation made impossible the execution of the plan, and a highway following the Indian trail over which traveled those intrepid adventurers and explorers—Nicolet, first; then Marquette, La Salle, Joliet, Tonti, and other early missionaries, bearing the Christian cross. In 1832 the work on this great road was recommenced and completed thereafter. The bill for the Detroit and Chicago road passed the House February 2, 1825, and the Senate on March 2, 1825. It was signed by the President, and became a law on the last day of the session. It was fathered by Father Richard, who was a Delegate from the Territory of Michigan, entitled only to sit and have a voice, but had no vote thereon. Michigan Avenue in the city of Detroit and Michigan Avenue in Chicago are laid out along this route. It traversed a splendid country, and the modern cities and towns of Wayne, Ypsilanti, Ann Arbor, Chelsea, Jackson, Albion, Marshall, Battle Creek, Augusta, Galesburg, Kalamazoo, and Paw Paw, in Michigan, mark its trail.

The Legislature of Michigan of 1913 have designated this route a trunk line, and to-day the people of the State of Michigan and the counties and cities through which it passes are interested in constructing this Territorial highway laid out by the United States into a paved national highway, and before one century shall have rolled around from the laying out of this highway there is no question but what it will be transformed into a permanent and magnificent and useful paved highway, and practically along the same route. The people of Michigan are awake to the importance of good roads; they are also constructing a trunk line from Detroit to Lake Michigan through Lansing and Grand Rapids, and in a recent letter from the State highway commissioner of Michigan he says:

> I feel quite safe in saying that no highway laws in any other State has resulted in producing so many miles of improved roads at so small a cost within 10 years after its enactment as the Michigan highway law.

Michigan has already built and completed 3,765 miles of roads, which have been accepted by the State, which will be increased to 4,000 miles at the close of the fiscal year, June 30. The Michigan law has most of the salient features of the present act, and under the able management of our highway commissioner great progress is being made in the construction of its highways.

Much might be said about the evolution of our public highways and their construction. The construction of good highways dates back centuries before the Christian era. The evolution from the ox cart to the locomotive and from the prairie schooner to the limousine has been no more rapid than that from the windmill to the electric current. Good roads bring people, communities, and their affairs together. They are necessary and consequential to our advancement and our prosperity, and, as stated here on the floor of the House, by a careful study of the past in road building may we find the path of our prosperity for the future. We are getting used to better things, and let poor roads go with the log cabin. [Applause.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this bill. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY].

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a short editorial on "Peace and the people," from the San Francisco Chronicle of January 6, 1916.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting the matter indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask upon what subject?

Mr. CALLAWAY. On "Peace and the people—commercial organizations of America prefer law to war and warlike preparations."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I yield back the balance of my time.

The article referred to is as follows:

PEACE AND THE PEOPLE—COMMERCIAL ORGANIZATIONS OF AMERICA PREFER LAW TO WAR AND WARLIKE PREPARATION.

The people back home are against the entire preparedness plan, says Representative SHERWOOD, of Ohio, who of all men can not be classed by the militarists as a coward. He fought in 42 battles of the Civil War, left the Army a general, and now, at the ripe age of 80, is ready to reenlist if danger threatens his country. Unable to see any signs of such danger, he describes the preparedness agitation as the engineering of "armament makers and militarists."

Here is a man who can not be opposed to universal and compulsory military service because he is afraid of being called to the colors. His age, his record, and his willingness to go into the trenches, if necessary, are sufficient reply to those who stigmatize all advocates of peace as cowards.

It is a cowardly charge, and for the simple reason that excessive preparedness is more the policy of the craven than of the courageous. The apostles of peace may be mistaken, but they are surely less afraid than those who would sacrifice the freedom of this Nation on the altar of conscription. If the question of bravery is involved in the merits of the controversy, the decision must go hard against those who see in every European and Asiatic army a possible invader of America.

But it is not a matter of courage and is solely one of common sense, and this latter scorns the fear of attack by any one or more of the crippled armies of Europe.

And it is not only the people back home who are against preparedness. The commercial organizations throughout the country are overwhelmingly opposed to militarism and strongly in favor of the settlement of international disputes by judicial tribunals. The vote taken by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States shows a very small percentage of business men who prefer preparedness to conciliation and military to economic pressure on nations resorting to war. The great majority pin their faith to law as arbiter of disputes and to economic forces as the influence with which to restrain the militaristic nations.

It is an instructive return, because it evidences the comforting truth that the armament makers and all others financially interested in preparedness are but a small fraction of the business men of America.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS]. [Applause.]

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I will not enter into any general discussion of the merits of this bill for the want of time. It seems to be conceded that good roads will be of great benefit to the country and to the farming communities. It would seem idle to take any time in a discussion of that branch of the subject. Those who have spoken in opposition to the bill have not taken the position that it will not be beneficial to the country districts in general. The principal objection to this bill, judging from what those who have spoken against it have said, is a kind of feeling or opposition arising in the cities because no portion of the money which will be expended will be applied to the construction of streets or roads within corporate limits of cities in excess of 2,000 inhabitants, except under certain conditions. This is the point to which I wish to address my remarks in answer to the position taken by those gentlemen representing urban districts and who are opposed to the proposition because they say it will be a burden upon the city for the benefit of the country.

In my capacity of Congressman at Large from the State of Illinois I represent both urban and rural communities—both city and country—and believe that I am in as good a position as any Member here to judge accurately of the benefits that will accrue to the whole country in common if this bill shall become a law. In my State is the finest expanse of agricultural lands in America, and within her borders is the second city in population and in some respects the greatest city on the continent.

The thought I have in mind is this: Every city is dependent upon the country, and whether it be New York City, to which city the whole country contributes, or whether it be Chicago, to which the great Central West contributes, or whether it be the county seat, to which the county contributes, the growth, the development, and the wealth of every city in the land depend upon the prosperity and the development of the territory contributory to that city. [Applause.] I have heard criticism of the bill because of the fact that it was limited in its operation to towns of under 2,000 inhabitants. I happen to live in a town larger than that, a very prosperous county seat. I am sure that the people of the community in which I live find no fault with this proposition or because no money will be expended on the streets within our corporate limits. We have in my county a number of hard roads leading into the county seat. The business men of the city of Pittsfield, in which I live, have contributed by donation largely to the construction of all these roads. I myself have contributed, and we are willing out of our own pockets individually to raise

funds to build up the roads which lead into our city. We are perfectly willing that the Federal Government shall substitute itself and assist in the construction of these highways, because we know that on the development of the surrounding country, extending out to the limits of the county, and on the prosperity of the rural districts depend the prosperity, growth, and development of the county seat.

I want to say this about the roads of Illinois: Some one yesterday, I believe it was the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD], criticized the Illinois roads. I was surprised and a little pained that one of my colleagues had to come to his feet and admit that the roads in Illinois were among the poorest of all the States of the Union. There are two reasons for this, if it is true. We have more roads than many sections of the country where topographical conditions are different than they are in the State of Illinois. We have a road on almost every section line. But the chief trouble with good roads in the State of Illinois lies in the character of our soil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Can I have five minutes more?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I have not the time.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Three, then.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield to the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. The character of our soil consists of prairie black loam, and I may say that during certain seasons of the year we have the best dirt roads in the country, and then there are seasons in the year in which we have the very worst dirt roads in the country. But the reason why we have not developed roads in Illinois lies largely in the fact of the inaccessibility of road material. It may be 100 miles, and is in many places, to the nearest material that can be used for road building. The farmers and the local authorities can not go to a neighboring gravel bed and secure the material. They have to transport their cement and other materials over the railroads and then cart it into the country where it is to be used for this purpose. These are the reasons why we have not better roads in the State of Illinois. And it is only within the last two or three years that we have undertaken by means of State aid to build good roads there. We now have a law by which the State contributes one-half. We have a State highway commission; we have a State road engineer. Roads have to be built, under the direction of the highway commission, of the material which the State highway commission shall prescribe, and the State contributes one-half to the construction of those roads. When constructed the State takes them over and maintains them for all time.

We are entering upon an era of good roads in Illinois, and I will say to my friends in the East and those in the West who traverse the State of Illinois along the great national highways that they will in the near future, I apprehend, have less occasion to criticize our roads than at present. We realize that of all the great international highways from the East to the West, from coast to coast, four-fifths of them cross the State of Illinois. All of them projected north of the mouth of the Ohio River must of necessity cross the State of Illinois. We are contributing our share and will in the future do so, and I think it is not unfair, I think it is only proper, when this Government, in all its liberality, and I may say oftentimes its prodigality, in appropriating millions for various public purposes which go into the urban centers and upon our rivers and harbors, that a small proportion in the sum authorized in this bill should be appropriated to the construction of highways in the States. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEE].

Mr. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is not usually fruitful to discuss bills of this character in the Committee of the Whole in general debate; but, being friendly to the object of this legislation, I think it is my duty to point out what I think to be fallacies and imperfections in this bill as it now stands. We should be prepared when we come into the Committee of the Whole, under the 5-minute rule, to drastically amend it.

That this bill is intended all right is perhaps true. It seems that while this piece of legislation is covered with good intentions, like the road leading to ruin or that other road running to Chicago are "paved with good intentions," good intentions will not carry it through.

The bill we have before us has been extolled by many gentlemen as a bill for the purpose of building and maintaining rural roads, thereby lightening the loads from the farm to the market. If that is the purpose of the bill, it must be amended. Otherwise it will be subject to the provisions of the pure-food law and the penalties for misbranding, because this bill is not for the purpose of building or maintaining a road from the farm to the market. It does not say so, and it does not give you the right to say so.

There are three or four features of the bill I desire to discuss. The first is that it is not a farmers' bill. It is a bill fathered by the automobilists. But I do not find any fault with it on that ground. Maybe it is better on that account. But the bill is not to be controlled in the interests of the rural roads. The bill is drawn so that every dollar of every appropriation in every State can be expended under the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture within the limits of the metropolises of the several States. I have called attention to that fact before, and I call it to your attention again. It says:

That for the purposes of this act the term "rural post road" shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is, or might be, carried outside of incorporated cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000 and in said cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000 along streets and roads where the houses average more than 200 feet apart.

Now, we will cite Chicago. Within the city of Chicago, beginning at its outer limit, there may be consecutive miles selected where the average distance between the houses is more than 200 feet. I will not say that the Secretary of Agriculture would, in the beginning, favor placing all the expenditures within the metropolitan limits. I do say he is given the power to place them there. That would give the people who live in the metropolis a potent force in saying where, if not within their city limits, that money will be expended. The result will be—as I think this bill intends it to be—that the roads will be constructed under State control. They will be simply State roads running across the State, to become connecting links with great interstate systems. With that I am not at war. But that is not what we have heard explained here as the purpose of the bill, and frankness to the public demands that we say so or amend the bill to conform with the other view.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. SLOAN. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. POWERS. I am in sympathy with the purposes of this legislation, but there are a good many features connected with it that I do not approve of. Is it not true that under the provisions of this bill the State highway department of any State, if it is a Republican State and they desire to do it, could have an improvement of roads exclusively in the Republican part of the State, and in a Democratic State they could do exactly the same thing?

Mr. SLOAN. Certainly; and the Secretary of Agriculture, be he Republican or Democrat, can say to the Representatives of a State of the opposing party, "If you desire to have a million-dollar improvement of roads in your State, I will cause to be contributed only 30 per cent, or $300,000, while that State must contribute $700,000, while in a favored State for a million-dollar improvement this Government will require the State to put up only $500,000.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes; briefly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that whether the Secretary gives 30 per cent or 50 per cent on a particular road, it does not increase or decrease the amount that will be expended within that State for that year.

Mr. SLOAN. Within the discretion lodged with the Secretary of Agriculture, it authorizes him to say for every $3 the Government puts up the State must pay up $7, and if your annual quota is one-half million, as it is in Nebraska, under this bill to get all of it and prevent it lapsing back into the United States Treasury you must invest $1,166,666.66, while your

neighbor State to obtain similar result must invest only $500,000. I ask the chairman of this committee to read his own bill, because there is nothing in the bill that requires the expenditure of all the apportionment to the State. The Secretary can use his political power under this bill to say to the governor of a State, "If you want a million-dollar appropriation for improvement in your State, you must put up $700,000 and I will put up only $300,000." In another State, "If you want a million-dollar improvement, put up $500,000 and we will put up the other $500,000." That is the meaning of this bill.

Authority has been cited for the establishment of post roads. We find it in the Constitution. We find that it has been the subject of legislation. However, I do not know that we have any precedent in all the history of our country in the establishment of post roads where, when immediately upon the establishment through the funds of the Government, that that post road should be abandoned and jurisdiction over it absolutely surrendered.

That is one of the most serious vices of this proposed legislation. In this legislation we are not supposed to be representing our States in their sovereign capacities. Gentlemen at the other end of this Capitol will do that. We are supposed to represent the sovereignty of this Union and to look after the expenditures from the Treasury of this Union. Yet the effect of this bill is to demand of the Treasury from 30 per cent to 50 per cent contributions for the establishment and maintenance of roads, and immediately the Government's investment is complete in those roads the sovereignty is surrendered. When the money is invested, and within 30 seconds after the establishment of the road, the State can dislocate, relocate, or discontinue that road and destroy it. Under the terms of this bill there is not a condition which would require that State to respond either in forfeiture or in damages in any way or to any extent for lapse of that road.

The question was asked the other day what was the difference between this bill and the bill that was voted for in the last Congress. A large difference was this: Under the bill in the Sixty-third Congress there was to be an election of procedures. One where the Secretary of Agriculture should cooperate with the road-building authorities of the State. In that case there was no prohibition of the Government, after investing its money, proceeding to cooperate with the State in the maintenance and control of the highway so established.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The gentleman says the bill of last year provided that the Government should cooperate in maintaining the road?

Mr. SLOAN. Cooperate in its building; yes. In not saying that the complete control and jurisdiction should be given to the State it left the clear implication that who establishes shall enjoy and control.

The reason you left the election between that cooperation in building and control and the so-called leasing system which was the subject of choice was because you wanted the Government to contribute money to the construction of the road, but you did not want the Government to have any control.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Let us see if I understand the gentleman. Does he claim that under last year's bill the Government had control over the roads that it aided?

Mr. SLOAN. It would have if they elected under section 3 of last year's bill, but under section 4 of the same bill, which was the leasing section, it would not, and the reason is well understood by the gentleman from Virginia. It was in obedience to that doctrine which stands ready to receive money from the Government but refuses to give the Government any jurisdiction or control over the result of the expenditure of that money. To be perfectly plain, it is the ultra State-rights idea, that is ever willing and ready to put its hands into the Treasury of the United States and obtain money, but not willing to cooperate with the Government thereafter or permit the Government to have anything to say in the matter of the control. That is why the leasing proposition was submitted in the bill the last time. That system provided, not that the Government should cooperate in the building of the road, but that after the road was built, not as a matter of encouragement, but as a matter of reward, for a road of the highest class there should be paid $60 per mile, for a road of the second class $30 per mile, and for a road of the third class $15 per mile. Under the present bill after the Government invests $500,000 of its money in a million-dollar enterprise in any of the States, then this is how it will be disposed of. Page 4 of the bill provides—

> That all construction and maintenance of roads under the provisions of this act shall be under the supervision and control of the State highway departments of the several States.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. The gentleman has stated his contention that the Government surrenders control over this road.

Mr. SAUNDERS. It does not surrender it. It never exercises it.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. But the only part the Government has in it is to contribute to its construction.

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. What is the particular objection to the State retaining jurisdiction and control over Government-aided roads and being responsible thereafter for their maintenance?

Mr. SLOAN. There would not be any objection if what is implied in your question was a fact; but the government of the State is not responsible to the Government of the United States for the maintenance of the road under this bill. That is one of the imperfections I want to see amended. It should be if a road be established that road should continue forever under joint control of State and Nation, or if the Government should see fit to surrender a measure of control after the road was completed and the State failed, neglected, or refused to maintain that road properly, it should forfeit to the Government of the United States such sum or sums as should be fixed by this Congress, collected under the direction of the Secretary.

Another serious objection to this bill is the provision practically compelling the States of the Union to adopt a highway commission or forfeit large sums of money. The Constitution and laws of the United States guarantee to the States protection in their republican form of government, which is commonly construed to mean a representative form of government. Further, it will not abide a State departing from such government. Yet now it proposes to force upon a State a commission, usually non-elective, and refuses to permit the Federal authority to continue to deal with the governor, elected by and responsible to the people.

I trust that the real friends of this legislation will see that proper amendments are made to this proposed law, the virtue of whose purpose is staggering under the weight of its crudities, imperfections, injustices, and unwarrantable grant of power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DUNN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP].

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to read a resolution passed by the Legislature of Virginia on this subject of good-roads legislation.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Whereas the Congress of the United States has for many years, and is now, making enormous appropriations of money for the improvement of our waterways and harbors and in the erection of public buildings; and
>
> Whereas the great masses of the people of the State of Virginia and of the United States are deeply interested in the building and maintenance of our public highways; and
>
> Whereas there is now pending in the House of Representatives of the United States a bill, which has been duly reported and on the calendar of that body, appropriating the sum of $25,000,000, and of that amount giving to the State of Virginia the sum of $591,214 for the purpose of the building of roads in the State of Virginia; and
>
> Whereas this bill is of the most vital importance to the people of Virginia: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the House of Delegates of Virginia (the Senate concurring)*, That the Members of the Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States in both Houses be, and they are hereby, requested to support the aforesaid bill, or any similar measure, which will give the people of Virginia Federal aid in the construction of its public roads, and the clerk of this body is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of the Senators and to each of the Members of the House of Representatives from Virginia forthwith after its adoption.
>
> Agreed to by house of delegates January 19, 1916.
>
> J. W. WILLIAMS, *Clerk*.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, the resolution just read was introduced in the Virginia House of Delegates by Hon. M. K. Lowry, and was unanimously adopted by the Legislature of Virginia. It expresses the attitude of the people of the State of Virginia on the subject of Federal aid to roads. With the resolution and with the bill before the House I most heartily sympathize. It should have the support of every Member who desires to pass legislation in the interest of the rural communities. The opponents of the bill have not advanced a single argument to support their contentions that could not with equal propriety be advanced against any Federal appropriation for any internal improvement whatever. While there is a demand for appropriation of money out of the Federal Treasury from many sources, the present bill would probably benefit a larger number of people than an appropriation of a similar amount for any other purpose of internal improvement. The bill has been very carefully drawn, has the support of both Democrats and Republicans of the Roads Committee, and has the indorsement

of the good roads organizations throughout the Union. It is a crystallization of the best thought of the best minds given to road legislation, and is entitled to the best consideration of the membership of this House. I have at other times given my reasons for supporting similar bills before the House, and I will not now consume the time of the House by repeating them. The bill will have my best support.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to my friend from Missouri, chairman of the committee, that this is Saturday afternoon, and we have had a long and hard week's work.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois has been so exceedingly kind, considerate, and helpful that I am constrained to act upon his suggestion, and I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee determined to rise; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BORLAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7617, to encourage the building of good roads, and had directed him to report that they had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. KONOP, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for 10 days, on account of illness in his family.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE GOULDEN.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to remind Members that memorial services will be held in the House to-morrow on the life, character, and public services of the late Representative JOSEPH A. GOULDEN.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Sunday, January 23, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, submitting an amendment to last subparagraph of Navy Department's letter of December 16, 1915, to include U. S. S. *Virginia* (H. Doc. No. 612); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting list of documents and files of papers which are not needed or useful in the transaction of current business of the department and have no permanent value or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 613); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9117) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Woolaston; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9307) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor Stahler; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7867) granting an increase of pension to Martin Johnson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6442) to provide for the exchange of the present Federal building site in Newark, Del., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 65), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 322) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to sell the old post office and site thereof in the city of Dayton, Ohio, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 66), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPSTICK: A bill (H. R. 9800) to increase the efficiency of the defenses of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 9801) for the relief of certain Army officers and their next of kin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 9802) for the investigation and control of the white-pine blister rust; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9803) to emancipate from certain disabilities children who have judgments of conviction for crime of record against them in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HENRY: A bill (H. R. 9804) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture on behalf of the United States to cooperate with the authorities of the States accepting this act in the construction of certain highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 9805) to establish the Mount Baker National Park in the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 9806) to provide that the United States shall, in certain cases, in order to encourage and promote agriculture and better to secure the national defense, aid the States and the civil subdivisions thereof in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 9807) to prevent the desecration of the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 9808) giving preference right to entrymen upon the public domain in certain cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 9809) for survey of inlet and basin at Venice, Cal.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 9810) to amend an act entitled "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891, known as the desert-land law; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SUMNERS: A bill (H. R. 9811) for the erection of a public building at Dallas, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE: A bill (H. R. 9812) to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. WILSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 9813) to consolidate certain forest lands in the Florida National Forest Reserve; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9814) for the relief of applicants to purchase lands granted to the Oregon & California Railroad Co.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURKE: A bill (H. R. 9815) to amend subdivision A of section 4 and subdivision A of section 5 of the United States bankruptcy laws of July 1, 1898, and amendments thereto of February 5, 1903; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 9816) to provide for the erection of a public building at Mexia, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9817) to provide for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Teague, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 9818) providing that the Panama Canal rules shall govern in the measurement of vessels for imposing tolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9819) to amend the act of March 3, 1915, providing the time for the hold-

ing of United States court at Aiken, S. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 9820) for the purpose of limiting the activities of certain officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 9821) to prohibit the employment of any person who is not a citizen of the United States as radio operator or telegrapher on any vessel of the United States engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, and to establish the age of radio operators; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 9822) to provide for the retirement of employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9823) providing for equipment of apparatus and operators for radio communication at all life-saving stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 9824) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Pittsfield, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9825) to establish a military academy at some point in the State of Illinois, to be designated by the Secretary of War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 9826) to amend section 3362 of the Revised Statutes relating to tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 9827) providing for the retirement of officers of the Philippine Scouts, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 9828) granting a pension to Commodore P. Ellis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9829) granting a pension to Susan E. Nash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 9830) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Stubbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 9831) granting a pension to Frank A. Howell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 9832) granting an increase of pension to Katherina Betz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 9833) granting an increase of pension to Edwin C. Albertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 9834) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Heath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 9835) for the relief of Frank Hartman; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAMILL: A bill (H. R. 9836) for the relief of the Duncan Building & Loan Association, of Jersey City, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9837) for the relief of the Woodlawn Building & Loan Association, of Jersey City, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9838) for the relief of the Monticello Mutual Building & Loan Association, of Jersey City, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9839) for the relief of the Columbia Building & Loan Association, of Jersey City, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 9840) granting a pension to Nancy Proctor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 9841) granting a pension to Harris D. Williamson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 9842) granting a pension to Charles C. Watson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9843) granting a pension to Esther B. Woodard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 9844) granting an increase of pension to Robert Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9845) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Albert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9846) for the relief of Amanda McGhee; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9847) for the relief of Alfred Birch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 9848) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9849) granting an increase of pension to George W. McKelvey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9850) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan C. Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOD: A bill (H. R. 9851) for the relief of Sarah F. Trenwith, executrix of Clifford W. Simpson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOPWOOD: A bill (H. R. 9852) for the relief of Peter Michel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9853) for the relief of Hays Gaskill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULBERT: A bill (H. R. 9854) granting a pension to John Coombs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9855) granting a pension to Thomas P. McSherry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 9856) granting to the St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co., and to the Anheuser-Busch Brewing Association, and to the Manufacturers' Railway Co. permission to transfer certain rights of easement for railway purposes heretofore granted by the United States to the St. Louis & Iron Mountain Railroad Co. and to the Anheuser-Busch Brewing Association, respectively; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9857) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin L. Sayler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 9858) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Baltzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 9859) granting an increase of pension to Mandana C. Thorp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 9860) granting a pension to Michael Kilrow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 9861) granting a pension to Isidore Cohen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9862) for the relief of the estate of R. O. Haskins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOONEY: A bill (H. R. 9863) granting a pension to Alonzo Hutchison; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9864) granting a pension to Wilsie Lippincott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9865) granting a pension to Louis Settles; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9866) granting a pension to Catherine McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9867) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9868) granting an increase of pension to William W. Sparks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9869) granting an increase of pension to Frank Nesbaum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9870) granting an increase of pension to George W. Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9871) granting a pension to Adam Mikel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9872) granting an increase of pension to David Leeper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9873) granting an increase of pension to Thornton Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9874) granting an increase of pension to Leroy Knight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9875) granting a pension to Annie Hoover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9876) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Heston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9877) granting an increase of pension to Alvanes P. Henery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9878) granting a pension to Mary I. Gregg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9879) granting a pension to Marion Gregory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9880) granting an increase of pension to William Jackson Gilpin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9881) granting an increase of pension to George W. Flesher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9882) granting a pension to Barbara E. Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9883) granting an increase of pension to James M. Beggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9884) granting an increase of pension to John Beckett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9885) granting an increase of pension to Henry Lee Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9886) granting an increase of pension to James M. Albaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9887) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9888) granting an increase of pension to Emma C. Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9889) granting a pension to Amanda White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURRAY: A bill (H. R. 9890) granting an increase of pension to John C. Maddox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTH: A bill (H. R. 9891) granting a pension to Annie S. Lytle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 9892) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Stafford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9893) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Pendell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9894) granting an increase of pension to Justine Patzack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9895) granting a pension to Michael E. Urell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9896) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Dunahey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 9897) for the relief of T. L. Love, surviving partner of Robert Love & Son; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9898) for the relief of John E. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 9899) granting a pension to James Hayden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9900) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Charles W. Wooden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9901) to place upon the rolls and records the name of George R. Gary and granting him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 9902) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint John W. Hyatt a first lieutenant of Infantry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 9903) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 9904) to correct the military record of Benton V. Stone; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Workmen's Circle, Branch 429, favoring House joint resolution 38, for congress of neutral nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of joint board Furriers' Union, of Greater New York, favoring House joint resolution 38, relative to congress of neutral nations to offer mediation to the belligerents; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES: Petitions of citizens of Anson, bankers and other citizens of Colwich, and bankers and other citizens of Geuda Springs, all in the State of Kansas, protesting against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE: Petition of Hand Knit Hosiery Co., of Sheboygan, Wis., asking for passage of House bill 702, "to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petitions of citizens of Sedan and Girard, Kans., protesting against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring an embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: Memorial of boards of supervisors of Solano and other California counties, favoring legislation for preservation of California oil industry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Memorial of Pacific Fisheries Society, Seattle, Wash., relative to certain appropriations to the United States Bureau of Fisheries; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of St. Paul Commercial Club, protesting against tax on gasoline and automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mississippi River Levee Association, relative to plan to prevent floods in Mississippi River Basin; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of National Federation of Implement and Vehicle Dealers' Associations, favoring nonpartisan tariff board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul, Minn., favoring construction of a suitable building in which to care for the muniments of the American people; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of Aronsohn Bros. Silk Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of North Olmsted Congregational Church, favoring amending the pure food and drugs act relative to curative powers of a bottle of medicine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of North Olmsted Congregational Church, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of North Olmsted Congregational Church, favoring Federal censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of August Lehmann and 27 others of Prairie du Sac, and E. G. Jewel and 29 others of Hillsboro, all in the State of Wisconsin, favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of Henry Street Settlement, New York, favoring passage of child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of New York, favoring passage of House bill 2638, for claims of railway mail clerks for injuries received while on duty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of merchants of Morris, Ill., favoring a tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Morris (Ill.) Fiber Board Co. and Morris Cable Co., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Bay State Insulated Wire & Cable Co., favoring tariff on dye-stuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLYNN: Petition of Ansonia (Conn.) Electrical Co. and Waterbury Button Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petitions of Manheim Hosiery Co., of Manheim, and sundry citizens of Ephrata and Lancaster, Pa., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Papers to accompany House bill 8727, granting an increase of pension to Leroy Litchfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 8728, granting an increase of pension to Jonathan H. Slocum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: Paper to accompany House bill 9749, for the relief of the New Mexico Insane Asylum, of Las Vegas, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Papers to accompany House bill 9754, granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Harvey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULBERT: Petition of board of trade, New York, protesting against any further tax on real estate in New York; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Theatrical Protective Union, New York, protesting against tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IGOE: Memorial of Phineas Towne, of St. Louis, Mo., urging the adoption of the Keating bill to pension veterans of the Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of citizens of Wisconsin, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Camile J. Day and others, of Appleton, Wis., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of sundry tradespeople of New York, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKENZIE: Petitions of sundry citizens of Lee, Pawpaw, Amboy, Harmon, Albany, Tampico, Prophetstown, Erie, Morrison, and Thomson, all of Illinois, favoring bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petitions of Toohey Silk Mills, of Watertown, and Diana Paper Co., of Harrisville, all of the State of New

York, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of George E. Cox & Bro., of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NOLAN: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., favoring legislation in interest of oil industry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Lodi, Cal., favoring passage of Newlands-Broussard river-regulation bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., favoring legislation authorizing the appointment of a commission to investigate and recommend on the desirability of the waters of San Francisco Bay or the waters tributary thereto for a naval base; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, telegrams from the county clerks of San Benito, Contra Costa, Placer, Sutter, Merced, Sacramento, Eldorado, San Mateo, Alameda, Martin, Fresno, San Joaquin, Madera, Monterey, Tuolumne, Colusa, Sonoma, Butte, Calaveras, Santa Clara, Solano, Glenn, and San Francisco Counties, stating that resolutions have been passed by their respective boards of supervisors, favoring the passage of remedial legislation for the benefit of the oil operators in the State of California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NORTON: Resolution adopted by the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) District Medical Society, favoring adequate provision in the reorganization of the Army for a sufficient number of medical officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of H. M. Sherman, N. E. Cull, N. H. Dahle, J. Freesene, Ed Lemeley, Perry Brown, H. O. Keil, C. C. Marks, S. L. Arneson, G. C. Drogge, Alfred Arneson, George Kjos, Olaf Ostness, H. M. Anderson, A. J. Rolsum, Arthur E. Prior, and other citizens of Renville County, N. Dak., in opposition to program for military and naval preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution by the Burleigh County (N. Dak.) Farmers' Union, opposing the propaganda for preparedness and urging the enactment of a law providing for national standards for grain grading and inspection; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition from merchants of Reeder, N. Dak., urging the enactment of legislation which will compel concerns selling goods direct to consumers entirely by mail to contribute their portion of funds in the development of the local community, the county, and the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLATT: Petitions of the Firth Carpet Co., of Firthcliff, and Yazoo Mills, of Pleasant Valley, N. Y., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Benjamin W. Topping, of Elmira, N. Y., favoring a retired list for volunteer officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Karl F. Burgess, of Ithaca, N. Y., protesting against the preparedness program, both military and naval; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio: Petition of G. G. Updike and others, protesting against the proposed lengthening and motorizing of mail routes out of Troy, Miami County, Ohio; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of E. D. Shields and others, protesting against proposed lengthening and motorizing of rural free-delivery route No. 11 out of the post office at Greenville, Darke County, Ohio, and requesting that said route remain unchanged; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Nathan Thompson and others, protesting against the lengthening and motorizing of rural mail routes out of Ludlow Falls, Miami County, Ohio; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of sundry citizens of Albany, N. Y., favoring passage of bill for censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Additional papers in pension case of Henry P. Bliss, H. R. 8898; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 6722, in pension case of Cyrenous Dalley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the editor of Liberty Magazine, C. S. Longacre, favoring introduction through the House post office for distribution of Liberty Magazine among Representatives; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of John B. Andrews, secretary American Association for Labor Legislation, favoring passage of House bill 476 Federal employees compensation bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Memorial of General Leonard Wood Camp, No. 8, Department of Florida, favoring passage of bill for widows' pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of B. H. McCalla Camp, No. 5, United Spanish War Veterans, of Key West, Fla., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Providence (R. I.) Council, No. 95, Knight of Columbus, favoring a bill to make Columbus Day, October 12, a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of executive committee of Rhode Island Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Memorial of Devils Lake District Medical Association, favoring selection of Army surgeons from the medical profession; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, *January 23, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by Mr. FITZGERALD as Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our hearts turn to Thee, our Father in heaven, as we assemble here to-day in memory of a deceased Member of this House whose life and public services challenge the admiration of all who knew him. As a young man in his teens he answered the call of President Lincoln for volunteers to preserve the integrity of the Union, and proved himself a brave and gallant soldier on many a field of battle. When the war was over he returned to his home and took up the life of a civilian and made himself a worthy and valuable citizen. Wherever he was called, in city, State, or Nation, he served with distinction. His genial character, splendid personality, and generous impulses made him a favorite. Here on the floor of this House, where he served for many years, he was noted for his fidelity and efficiency, a consistent member of his chosen church. Long may his memory live and inspire others to emulate his virtues. Be Thou a comfort to those who knew him best, especially to the members of his immediate family, that they may look forward with hope in the blessed promise of the life immortal, through Him who taught us the continuity of that life and illustrated in the glorious resurrection. Amen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the Journal. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE GOULDEN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the special order.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr BENNET, by unanimous consent, *Ordered*, That Sunday, January 23, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon, be set apart for addresses upon the life, character, and public services of Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York offers a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 101.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity be given for tribute to the memory of Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, late a Member of this House from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That at the conclusion of to-day's proceedings the House, as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his distinguished public career, do stand adjourned.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Speaker, when the Sixty-fourth Congress convened, Col. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN failed to answer to his name because on May 3, 1915, he had responded to the final roll call of the Supreme Ruler of the Universe. When I recall his efficient and faithful service and glorious record of splendid legislative achievement and then take a retrospective

of his noble character as a man in private life, I consider that this House does great honor to itself by convening to-day, in compliance with its time-honored custom, to memorialize our lamented colleague. It is the most sacred privilege which can come to me as a heritage of his friendship that, as an evidence of my gratitude to him, and in sincere appreciation of his loyalty and devotion, I am permitted to participate in these exercises.

Friendship is the rarest and sweetest flower that grows in the garden of life; its soil is the human heart; it is planted by honest thought, nurtured by tears of sympathy, and kept alive by the breath of good wishes. Any one who possessed the friendship of Col. GOULDEN, and they were legion, might have applied the acid tests of a chattering tongue, a wind of adversity, a bit of good fortune, or a breath of slander, only to find that it was untarnished by any or all. It was pure gold. And so it is of the man as I knew him to be that I desire to speak this afternoon, with apologies for making my remarks more personal than might seem prudent.

When I had been elected a Member of this House, with that disinterested eagerness and courteous solicitude which characterized Col. GOULDEN as a kindly man of distinctive paternal tendencies, especially thoughtful and considerate of the young man entering upon a public career with little experience to his credit, he sought me out, as an intimate acquaintance of the younger members of family, and bestowed upon me his gracious and esteemed favor.

It was at his earnest insistence that I came to Washington as his guest at the opening of the final session of the last Congress, to serve what he termed "an apprenticeship," and until the Christmas recess I shared his company daily, attending each session of the House at his behest, where, although a man of a quiet and retiring yet most companionable disposition, he was always conspicuous by his military regularity in devotion to duty, and participated actively, forcefully, and influentially in the deliberations of this body, affording me many educational opportunities, for which I am now appreciably thankful for his thoughtful consideration.

He was an ardent and enthusiastic advocate of any measure from which he perceived a substantial benefit to the common weal would follow, but a fearless and tireless worker against that which did not meet with his approbation.

He manifested an especial interest in matters relating to educational and civic improvements, and, of the latter, notably the development of the waterways of New York Harbor and its tributaries, which he always sought to impress upon me was the foremost consideration deserving my attention in this Congress.

A veteran of the Civil War, he was intense in his patriotic devotion to his country, and particularly to the memory of those who had given of their services as his comrades, and it is not surprising to find that he was the foremost advocate and predominating factor in inaugurating a plan of military instruction in the public schools and inculcating the patriotic spirit in the youth of New York City. He devoted much of his time and talents arousing public sentiment in favor of this movement, and was one of the organizers of the military battalion of Public School 87 in the Borough of Manhattan, New York City, and which has since been adopted in all of the larger public schools in that city. The youthful inmates to the number of thousands participate every year in the Memorial Day parade, which will soon be bereft of the grizzled and enfeebled veterans of 1861–1865.

It was my privilege to attend with Col. GOULDEN a few days before he died a luncheon in New York City, on which occasion he delivered the last public address he ever made. He emphasized the long and arduous fight which he had carried on to secure by congressional enactment two great improvements of inestimable benefit to the upper section of the city, and one of which was adopted by the Sixty-third Congress, the other being situate in the district now represented by myself, and he said—it seems now almost prophetically—"My chief ambition to secure for the people of my district their most needed improvement is accomplished; my work is done; the other is in the district of my young and vigorous friend, who has the strength—and other adjectives which modesty impels me to omit—to take up the work which I have but begun." Col. GOULDEN had postponed a visit to Taneytown, Md., to join his daughter who had preceded him there, but left immediately after the meeting above referred to, and upon his return to Philadelphia the following Monday afternoon he was stricken in the Pennsylvania Railroad station and died peacefully.

In his pocket was found a poem of which he had intended to make use at a dinner of his Grand Army comrades the following Saturday evening and which I think makes a most fitting summary of his life and character:

A little more tired at close of day,
A little less anxious to have our way;
A little less ready to scold and blame,
A little more care of a brother's name:
And so we are nearing the journey's end,
Where time and eternity meet and blend.

A little more love for the friends of youth,
A little less zeal for established truth;
A little more charity in our views,
A little less thirst for the daily news;
And so we are folding our tents away,
And passing in silence at close of day.

A little less care for bonds and gold,
A little more zest in the days of old;
A broader view and a saner mind,
A little more love for all mankind;
And so we are faring adown the way
That leads to the gates of a better day.

A little more leisure to sit and dream,
A little more real the things unseen;
A little nearer to those ahead,
With visions of those long loved and dead;
And so we are going, where all must go,
To the place the living may never know.

A little more laughter, a few more tears,
And we shall have told our increasing years;
The book is closed and the prayers are said
And we are part of the countless dead.
Thrice happy if then, some soul can say,
"I live because the Grand Army passed my way."

Mr. Speaker, with him I wish to add that I live because Col. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN passed my way.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I felt a deep sense of personal loss when I learned of the death of our colleague, Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN. His genial optimism was ever a source of inspiration, and his happy smile radiated joy to every heart.

In his long service in the House the record shows he was an able Representative, true to every interest of those who trusted him. That this conscientious adherence to duty was appreciated by those he represented was demonstrated by the fact that after serving them for eight years he announced his intention to retire from Congress, and did retire for two years. His people, however, so strongly desired his return to public life that he was unanimously designated and confirmed at the primaries in 1912 and elected to the Sixty-third Congress. He again accepted their commission, and his later service was marked by that same fidelity to duty which was ever an outstanding quality in his public work. Knowing him as I did, I can thoroughly appreciate this devotion to him on the part of his constituents. He was truly their Representative, and their interests were to him paramount.

I could not forego this opportunity of adding my word of tribute to his noble service and this expression of my personal regard for him as a man, a friend, a patriot. The Nation shares his loss with his family, friends, and constituents.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, our departed friend, JOE GOULDEN, as we called him familiarly on this floor, was a soldier. Since his death I believe there are only two soldiers left in this whole representative body of 435 Members. As Comrade GOULDEN was a heroic unit of that great Army in our greatest war, it seems to me to be appropriate to mention some peculiarities of that war, as distinguished from all other wars in all history.

In the first place it was an open and manly war. It was not a subterranean war. Our trenches were never over waist deep. The army was in full view. Across the waters to-day the armies are all out of sight. They are in trenches from 6 to 8 feet deep, covered by an impervious substance.

There was another peculiarity of our war. During our whole four years' struggle there was not a woman or a child or a noncombatant killed by a soldier. Now there is in progress a war where they drop bombs down from the sky and murder innocent women and children.

There was another peculiarity of our war. Every soldier who stood behind a gun knew just what he was fighting for. In the present war the German peasant on one side of the River Rhine has no quarrel with the French peasant on the other side of the River Rhine. They are of the same class, they have the same general interests, and yet they are at each other's throats. Neither knows what he is fighting for.

There was another peculiarity of our war that never has attached to any other war in all history. It was the only war in all history where the soldiers on the march and around the

bivouac fires at night sang patriotic songs and recited poems of their own composition. In the War of the American Revolution the leaders of that struggle were the most highly educated men on either continent. In the North they were graduates of Yale, Harvard, and Princeton, and in the South of the College of William and Mary. Yet in that great struggle that lasted for seven years no epic poem was ever written, and not a soldier of the Continental Army sang a patriotic song. It was the same in the War of 1812 and the same in the Mexican War. But in our war over 100 patriotic songs were sung by the soldiers. The South sang Dixie, the Bonnie Blue Flag, Maryland, my Maryland, and Somebody's Darling. The North sang John Brown's Body, Tenting To-night on the Old Camp Ground, Who Will Care for Mother Now, the Battle Hymn of the Republic, and 50 other songs that I have not the time to recall. That was the peculiarity of our war. And the very first song that was ever sung in the camp of an army on either continent, written by a soldier, was sung by the famous Hutchinson family of New Hampshire in the camps of the Army of the Potomac; a song written by Col. Fletcher Webster, of the Twelfth Massachusetts Regiment, in Boston Harbor in 1861. He was the son of Daniel Webster, of ante bellum fame. He wrote the song, John Brown's Body Lies Mouldering in the Grave; a soldier by the name of John Brown, not the John Brown who went up at the halter's end at Harpers Ferry in December, 1859, but another John Brown, who belonged to the Twelfth Massachusetts Regiment.

Another remarkable thing of that war was that the poetic literature of the war was not written by the great ante bellum poets of that period. With the exception of Whittier not one of them wrote a patriotic song. That is remarkable. Take that pathetic song sung in all camps in the North and South alike because it is so universal in sentiment that it seems like the mother cry of all war-cursed nations, Tenting To-night on the Old Camp Ground.

The most pathetic poem of the war on the Southern side was written by Chaplain Ryan, of Mobile, in a single hour, after the surrender of Lee. I think I have a couplet here. I can remember most of it. This poem was first published anonymously, I think in the New Orleans Delta, but in a collection of southern poems published after the war it is credited to Annie Pyle Dennis, of Louisiana. I did not know the author of the poem until I purchased a copy of Father Ryan's poems in 1888 and found this among them. It seems as if Father Ryan's whole soul had gone out in the poem. Speaking of the Stars and Bars, the battle flag of the Confederacy—

Furl that banner, for it's weary;
Round its staff 'tis drooping, dreary;
Furl it, fold it—it is best,
For there's not a man to wave it
And there's not a sword to save it,
And there's no one left to lave it
In the blood which heroes gave it!
Furl it, hide it—let it rest!

One of the most pathetic poems of the war was written by a soldier, Col. Charles G. Halpine, who commanded the Irish Brigade of the Army of the Potomac, writing under the nom de plume of Miles O'Rielly. He wrote the poem read on the battlefield of Gettysburg at the time the President of the United States, Mr. Lincoln, delivered the oration, but that was not his best poem. His best poem is, "We have drunk from the same canteen." It has more of the soldierly feeling, fellowship, and sympathy than any poem written during the war:

It was sometimes water and sometimes milk,
And sometimes apple-jack fine as silk,
But whatever the tipple had been,
We shared it together in bane and bliss,
And I warm to you, friend, as I think of this,
We have drunk from the same canteen.

Mr. Speaker, I knew Comrade GOULDEN perhaps as well as any Member outside the New York delegation. I sat beside him when we had desks in this House for three Congresses. He was the soul of kindness and affability, with remarkable simplicity of character. His sketch in the Congressional Directory was brief and unpretentious. He did not even mention the fact that he was a soldier of the Civil War. It can be said of him that he had no enemy on either side of the House, always fair in debate, always considerate of the opinions of his colleagues; always attentive to his duties, he has left an enduring record of duty well performed. His life, his character, his career will always be a grateful memory to his family, his kindred, and his congressional colleagues. I was always glad to be his comrade and friend. In his companionship I felt as some gentle-minded lyrist has written: "I would rather have a plain coffin without a flower, a funeral without an eulogy, than a life without sweetness of love and sympathy." Post-mortem kindness does not cheer the troubled spirit. My departed friend and comrade shed the flavor of kindness and cheerfulness on all his friends. He always seemed to remember what all of us should remember, that we travel the road of life but once, and was trying to make the world better for having lived.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, my predecessor in this House, the Hon. Rufus E. Lester, was one of the most kindly men I ever knew. He was a great man in every sense of the word; he was one of the bravest Confederate soldiers who ever drew a sword. A fast friendship sprung up between Mr. Lester and the Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN. On the occasion of memorial addresses on February 10, 1907, on the life and character of the late Hon. Rufus E. Lester, Mr. GOULDEN opened his memorial address with these remarks:

He was loved and respected by the thousands who knew him. Ever genial, kindly hearted, he had a good cheerful word for everyone. To know him was to love him. I could not let this occasion pass without a few brief words of tribute to the memory of our departed friend.

And he adds further:

He loved his fellow men and in return was loved by them.

To-day, Mr. Speaker, I can not let this occasion pass without paying a tribute, in a few words, to the life, character, and usefulness of this departed friend. I come with a sad heart to speak briefly of the late Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN. On account of the friendship that had existed prior to my coming here between Mr. GOULDEN and my predecessor, Mr. GOULDEN was one of the first men I met when I began my services here in the Sixtieth Congress.

I saw in his face, when I met him, an evidence of the fact that he was a man with a golden heart. I felt in his warm handgrasp a welcome here, and I felt almost from the beginning that in him I had a friend. I learned to appreciate Mr. GOULDEN for his faithfulness here in his services to his country, and I also appreciated him as a friend.

He was a member of the Fifty-eighth, Fifty-ninth, Sixtieth, and Sixty-first Congresses. He wished to retire to private life and did retire. He was succeeded in this chamber in the Sixty-second Congress, but, appreciating his sterling worth, the people again asked that he return here and serve them, and, accordingly, in the Sixty-third Congress he was again a member of this body. This is a high evidence within itself of his standing in his community. It is a testimonial of the esteem in which his people held him. His record here among us is an open book. We all testify to his useful and able services in Congress and to the country.

In his memorial address on the occasion to which I have referred he used these words in referring to the late Col. Lester:

He was a typical gentleman of the old school, a splendid type of American citizenship. His voice is forever still, his kind, loving words will be heard no more, but his life's work will live in the history of his country and in the hearts of his friends.

How like Mr. GOULDEN himself, and how applicable to-day are these words to the man who spoke them! In concluding his remarks on that occasion in his eulogy to his friend he said:

As a Union veteran, proud of the heroism and bravery of the men engaged in the conflicts of the Civil War, a common heritage commemorating the deeds of our American citizen soldiery, I place this tribute to the memory of my late comrade, Rufus E. Lester, of Georgia.

These are the words of a Union soldier in his tribute to a departed Confederate officer. Free from bitterness and full of love, which was so characteristic of both these good men.

Mr. GOULDEN was a man with a generous heart. In all my service here with him I never heard him speak ill of anyone. In the long list of Members who sat with him in this House no one can state that he ever knew of the late Mr. GOULDEN saying or doing anything to intentionally wound the feelings of his fellows. Those are the things that make for greatness in men—a large, sympathetic heart, with a brotherly feeling, filled with human kindness. He was a Christian gentleman and had a steadfast belief in the great Maker of all the universe, and on the memorial occasion referred to he used this poem, which I to-day quote as fitting upon this sad occasion:

There is no death; what seems so is transition;
This life of mortal breath
Is but a suburb of the life elysian
Whose portal we call Death.

We all miss Mr. GOULDEN; we miss his smiling face, we miss his kind words, we miss the sunshine of his presence; and we shall continue to miss him. The House has lost one of its most useful Members; his State and Nation in his death have sustained an irreparable loss.

Mr. BENNET assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

[Mr. FITZGERALD addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, we have assembled in this legislative hall of the Nation to pay respect to the memory of our late colleague JOSEPH A. GOULDEN. To me the duty

which the hour imposes is a labor of love and I gladly welcome the opportunity to pay my tribute to his noble attributes of mind and heart.

I had the pleasure of serving with our late colleague on one of the important committees of the House. Meeting him frequently, I had the opportunity to observe and grew to admire the sterling qualities of his character. I shall leave to others the pleasure of reciting his long, successful business career and his long, honorable career as a Member of the House. I shall content myself with calling attention to what seemed to me to be the dominant element of his life—the genial, social kindness of his nature.

It is a noble tribute to a man when it can be said that his life is marked by uniform kindness, and that the more you know of him the better you grow to like him, and this all can be said of our worthy friend, whose memory we cherish and whose life of service and brotherly kindness we admire.

I have sometimes thought that the element of kindness was the noblest element of our nature; that the best and sweetest thing in all this world is simple, common, every-day kindness. Kindness is the most beautiful flower that grows and blooms in the soil of the soul. It is the one celestial flower that blossomed over the walls of Paradise and fell from the garden of the skies; its petals caught and carried the fragrance of heaven and it fills the earth with the incense of gladness. It sweeps the existence of time and reaches through boundless space even from the pit of hell to the gates of heaven and sits enthroned the best influence that sweetens life or molds a soul—kindness.

And so I can pay my friend no finer tribute than to say that in his daily life he exemplified the spirit of kindness in his contact with his fellow men. He believed with Washington Irving that—

A kind heart is a fountain of gladness, diffusing everything around it with pleasure and freshens everything into smiles.

and with Tennyson when he says:

How'er it be, it seems to me
'T is only noble to be good.
Kind hearts are more than coronets,
And simple faith than Norman blood.

I know he thought with Hans Christian Andersen that—

The best love man can offer
To a God of love, be sure,
Is mercy to God's little ones
And kindness to God's poor.

And so his life can teach us all that which we all should know: that kindness is beautiful—beautiful like the memory of your dear old mother's face; that kindness is the open door to happiness; that kindness is the golden key that unlocks and gives you the passport to all hearts, to friendship with the world's noblest and best; to happiness on earth, success in life, and entrance through the gates of heaven. I am told by those who have known our friend long and well that his kindness found outlet in noble deeds. With Holland he believed—

That a noble deed is a step toward God,
Lifting the soul from the common sod
To a purer air and a broader view.

Life is a mysterious reality.

It has been defined as a span of time between a cry and a sigh.

We begin it with a cry—we end it with a sigh.

Between these boundaries, brief as they are, is worked out the destiny of human life.

Into this short space of time are crowded the joys and sorrows, the hopes and struggles, the successes and failures of human life.

During this brief span are generated and nourished the forces and influences that govern life on earth and mould its destiny throughout the cycles of eternity.

And when sometimes in a serious mood our conscious self knocks at the portal of our very soul and asks, "What is life?" the serious thinking mind recoils, as it were, upon itself and asks, "Is birth the beginning of death, or is death the beginning of life?"

What is life?

It's a delicate shell
Thrown up by eternity's flow
On time's bank of quicksand to dwell
And a moment its loveliness show;
Then gone back to the element grand
Like the billow that cast it ashore.
See! another is washing the strand
And the beautiful shell is no more.
Life is a drop from the river
That rises in mist o'er the lea
A moment in space to quiver
Then falls on the breast of the sea.
It was—it is—now gone forever
Yet lives through eternity.

And so, thus living a life of service and kindness, his buoyant, courteous manner never deserted him; but when the end came—

Like a shadow thrown softly and sweetly
From a passing cloud, death fell upon him—

And when for him the golden bowl was broken and the silver cord was loosed he, too, could approach his grave—

Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

And when his path of life led to the door of the night of death it opened for him into the daybreak of a glorious immortality. And we who knew and loved him trust with that hope born of Christian faith that he found that—

Death is but an angel, who to man at last his freedom brings
And the grave is but a nest in which the soul shall find its wings.

Mr. BRUCKNER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives lost a valuable, painstaking Member in the untimely death of my colleague, JOSEPH A. GOULDEN. The pages of the RECORD will show that he was interested in the legislative program of the Nation, as well as that pertaining to his own congressional district, during his many years of service as a Member of Congress.

Life's race well run,
Life's work well done,
Now comes rest.

How could the life and work of our departed colleague be better expressed than in these few simple words? Col. GOULDEN was one of God's noblemen; the 71 years that he lived made the world better, because of the manner in which he lived.

He believed in the doctrine expressed by the poet who said:

How much joy and comfort we all can bestow
If we scatter sunshine wherever we go.

Those of us who knew him intimately only knew too well how he spread the sunshine wherever he would go. His presence always seemed a message of cheer and good will. He had a window in his heart always open for the expression of his candor and sincerity.

His integrity was superb, but his predominant quality was courage—courage to fight wrong and injustice—yea, courage to stand loyally by a friend.

Col. GOULDEN was a brave man; he was brave morally, and that is the highest type of bravery; that courage that reinforces conduct; that courage that supports character; that courage that makes the real man; that moral courage of belief and conviction.

Col. GOULDEN was a lovable man when you approached him, got near to him, when there was a fellowship between you. I never knew a man who was more lovable in his character or more tender in his sympathies. He was a man of great compassion, because he had in him a great heart. His sympathies were as broad as humanity, because his great heart was not prejudiced in ignorance, superstition, or in narrowness of conception. Wherever there was a human being Col. GOULDEN was prepared to say: "He is a part of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God."

I have good reason to speak in praise of this noble man. He and I were not only colleagues in Congress but we were intimate friends. When I came to Washington a green, raw Member, it was to him I looked for information and advice; and I found him always ever ready to help and assist me. I shall miss him in the future.

I learned to respect, admire, and to love this grand old man, who died as he lived—in the harness. His loss is a sad blow to the Borough of the Bronx, where he lived for the past 25 years, and for which he labored here unceasingly and accomplished much good. His loss will not only be felt in The Bronx but the country loses the services of one of its ablest legislators. Not only did he serve his country in the House of Representatives but answered his country's call in the dark days of the Civil War and served with distinction and honor. His death reduces the men who served in that war now Members of this House to a mere remnant of a guard.

The boys of '61 called him Comrade—that gem of human language which sometimes means but a little less than love and a little more than friendship—that gentle salutation of the human heart which lives in all the languages of man, that winds and turns and runs through all the joys and sorrows of the human race, through deed and thought and dream, yea through song and toil and battlefield.

I was aboard the funeral train as it bore his remains from New York City to its last resting place in the quaint village of Taneytown, Md., to sleep beside his father and his grandfather. I never witnessed such a demonstration of genuine affection for any man in public life as I saw evidenced by the people of that

little Maryland town. Hundreds flocked to the railroad station to catch a glimpse of the casket containing the body of their dear old friend as it was taken from the train and joined in the escort to the church. After the services, while his body was lying in state in that little church he so often attended, a vast multitude passed the bier in solemn procession looking for the last time on his peaceful face. There were tears and sobs and flowers upon his casket that sad day.

Mr. Speaker, as the years pass by, one by one we drop out, one by one we lay aside our task and cease our labor and toil. Time and again we are called upon to repeat the sad service we are performing to-day—to pay a just tribute of respect and homage to the memory and faithful service of a man who has gone before us. Col. GOULDEN was a man of splendid character, but at last he has laid off his armor, he has ceased to march, he failed to respond to the bugle call to duty in this life. Life's fitful fever is over, he sleeps well, he has passed from among us, and I ask myself the question: Where shall we find him, where is he? I may not be able to mark it on a chart, but I do know that wherever the Great Creator shall gather the great, the good, the pure, the noble, and the brave there we shall see and there we shall find Col. GOULDEN.

He was an affectionate father and good husband, a true friend, and over-generous political enemy. In politics a Democrat. In patriotism a thorough American. His great virtue charity. His constant desire was to serve God and his fellow man. Some men are made to be admired, some to be loved, a few to be loved and admired. To this small and goodly company Col. GOULDEN belonged.

Green be the turf above thee,
Friend of former days;
None knew thee but to love thee,
None named thee but in praise.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to pay tribute to the life, character, and memory of our late colleague, Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN.

My acquaintance with him began early in the Sixtieth Congress. In the office building we occupied adjoining rooms with a connecting door, and this door was never locked.

The acquaintance thus begun ripened into friendship that grew stronger as the years passed.

He was a modest, retiring, kindly man; neither self-asserting nor self-seeking. His was the manner of the well-to-do, well-read, and neighborly farmer. On one occasion, after a visit to his farms, he said to me that he derived more pleasure and enjoyment from a three days' visit to his farms than he did from his months of service in this House.

No man of nobler character or more blameless public or private life ever served a constituency in this Chamber. If a good name is rather to be chosen than great riches then he surely left to his family an inheritance most desirable, and one which will endure as long as time shall last.

No one who knew Mr. GOULDEN as I did could fail to love, admire, and respect him, and I shall cherish through all my future life the memory of his friendship as one of the blessings which a kind Providence has granted me.

As a good and faithful public servant the reward he most desired was the approval of his own conscience and the approbation of the people he loved and served.

The legacy of his life and its ennobling example is the common heritage of the living. His lifelong course of undeviating rectitude secures to his afflicted family an imperishable title to honorable distinction. Well may the widow and children who mourn him find consolation in the words—

God gave. He took. He will restore.
He doeth all things well.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, our lamented colleague, Col. GOULDEN, of New York, was associated with the Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Philadelphia, and frequently came to our city to confer with the officials of that well-known institution. He was therefore popular with us in a business way and his visits were always the occasion of a rallying of his friends both in business and in Grand Army circles. It was in Philadelphia, while waiting for the New York train, he died. The news of his death was flashed over the wires of the country, because the colonel had attained a celebrity amongst Grand Army men, and especially among the advocates of improved waterways along the Atlantic seaboard. The cable carried the sad news to the Hawaiian Islands, where a large party of Senators and Representatives had gone on a tour of inspection. It was from far-off Honolulu that a message of sympathy on behalf of former Speaker CANNON and other congressional associates that a cablegram of condolence was forwarded across the Pacific and over the continent to the bereaved family in the city of New York.

My acquaintance with Col. GOULDEN originated through the movement leading up to the organization of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association. That was back in 1907. The acquaintanceship quickly ripened into a friendship that was only broken by his departure from this earth. The colonel had been interested in the improvement of the harbor of New York. He had given particular attention to the obstructions in the East River, which he had sought to remove, and in the improvement of the Harlem Ship Canal, which connected the East River with the Hudson. This canal, upon which the traffic increased tremendously during Col. GOULDEN's service in Congress, bordered The Bronx district, which he represented, and which, he was proud to contend, had the largest population of any congressional district in the United States.

When the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association was projected the Colonel was quick to see the advantages that would be derived in the cooperation of the representatives of States bent upon a common purpose to open up systematically and economically a continuous line of waterways along the coast. At the first convention in Philadelphia in 1907 he took a leading part. In the subsequent conventions at Baltimore, Norfolk, Providence, Richmond, New London, and Jacksonville he participated, usually as a presiding officer at one of the business sessions. His popularity with the delegates from Maine to Florida was unquestioned. He had friends in every State along the line. In the organization of the New-York-Albany-and-Troy convention of 1914 the Colonel was chairman of the principal arrangements committee. It was New York's opportunity to show its interest and hospitality, and there was no one prouder of his part in bringing it about than our colleague, who, in welcoming the visitors to New York City, was heralded as a leader in the development of that great port. It was on this occasion, too, that he indicated to those who were to take up the work after him that what he had hoped to do within the limit of his powers had been done, and that it was for others now to take up the burden. A prophetic situation in view of what has since occurred!

Mr. Speaker, it was not only as a champion of improved waterways that I knew and admired our departed friend. He was my senior in service in the House of Representatives. The first bill introduced by me which had a chance of passing was a bill to provide a memorial in the city of Washington emblematic of the private soldier. It was supported by the veterans of my city and State and by that noble and fast-disappearing organization, the Grand Army of the Republic, of which Col. GOULDEN was a member. My bill reached the calendar with a favorable report and the Colonel, like other veterans of the Civil War, was interested in it. On the same calendar he had a bill providing for a monument to memorialize the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus. Both bills were in a tight place on the closing days of the Fifty-ninth Congress, and there was great doubt about their passing. I was new in parliamentary matters and was therefore alarmed lest the bill for the soldiers' monument might die with the other measures not reached before the close of the session. The Colonel was more experienced and I appealed to him. We worked together, and through the assistance of strong friends, who came to the rescue, were subsequently able to report to our constituents the passage of our respective bills. The soldiers' monument now stands at the corner of Seventh Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, an enduring tribute to the valor of "the man behind the gun;" the Columbus Monument, an evidence of the friendship and persistency of Col. GOULDEN, occupies a conspicuous place in front of the Union Terminal, where none who come to the Capital City and have eyes to see may fail to observe it.

There were other measures in which the colonel and I cooperated and in which he gave me encouragement, but my experience with him, which I am now pleased to acknowledge, was the experience of only one amongst the many. He was a kindly, genial friend to us all.

He will be remembered especially by newer and younger Members unaccustomed to interruptions in the course of debate for his helpful questions and his desire to relieve embarrassment. Whether for or against a proposition he took his stand with a smile and was always careful to avoid humiliating his antagonist. As I now remember him, seated somewhere in the front of the House, keeping up that splendid record for attendance and attention to duty for which he was conspicuous, I can not recall a single sharp word ever uttered by him during my observation of nearly 10 years. Nor can I think of any worthier tribute to lay upon his grave than to say that which all of us know to be true—he was generous as he was brave; he was

charitable as he was firm. In private life he was upright and pure. In public life he was faithful to his every trust.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, in the hurry and bustle of work on the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization I have not had time to prepare as elaborately as I would have desired such remarks as would adequately express my appreciation of the high value of the service that Col. GOULDEN rendered to our country.

When I speak of Col. GOULDEN I do not speak of one who was known to me merely by name. It seems to me but yesterday that in 1893, when I was a pupil in one of the public schools in New York City, that Col. GOULDEN, then one of the school commissioners of the city of New York, walked in one morning to pay a visit and address our class of boys.

He told us of his service in the Civil War and how he had been one of the listeners to our lamented President Lincoln's words at the dedication of the Gettysburg battlefield as a cemetery for those who had indeed given their lives for the country's salvation and that the Union might live. He told us how he had been impressed with the words that had been delivered by Lincoln, and that he, too, failed to realize that in years to come the address then being delivered before him and being heard by him would become as famous as the President who delivered it.

It is not an astonishing fact that as a result of Col. GOULDEN's talk the boys of that class commenced to and did make a study of the life of Lincoln and the Civil War to an extent that is surprising, looking back, as I do now, over 20 years of time.

Col. GOULDEN gallantly served the Republic in its hour of need, rendered to the city of New York services as a member of the board of education, and in other capacities in a manner that must always be a lasting monument to his fame and in this House made a record for attendance, for devotion to duty, for genuine service to our country, and for instilling true patriotism in the hearts of the growing generation that has not been equaled by many men in the United States.

Speaking as one who watched his career for over 20 years, I can truly say that he was always admired and respected in the little town where he first saw the light of day, revered and honored in the city of New York, where he spent a good part of his life, and I express the firm belief that his name will go down into the history of New York City, in this House, and in the State of Maryland, where we tenderly laid him to rest last May, as one who was a loyal patriot and devoted citizen, who loved his family dearly, who was not only an honor to his country, but a credit to it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I mourn with the family and friends of our deceased brother his untimely death, and I feel the grief that comes when a good friend dies. I knew Congressman GOULDEN well and favorably. I admired him greatly and he was my friend. As a Member of Congress he was the friend of every good cause. He was an industrious, able, and faithful Representative. New York Harbor never had a better friend in this House. He was a brave and gallant Federal soldier. He was a true disciple of Lincoln and was greatly devoted to our martyred President.

He was a polished gentleman—polite and courteous always.

He possessed a cheerful disposition, and sunshine and good cheer belonged to him as flowers and bird song belong to spring. He had a beautiful conception of life. He was a man of lofty principles and high ideals. He has served well his day and generation. Peace to his ashes. God rest his soul.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, one can hardly realize that JOSEPH A. GOULDEN has been called hence. He was here on the 4th day of March last, and separated from his fellows in apparent good health.

Mr. GOULDEN was of a genial disposition and always bore a smile on his face when greeting his friends. He was one of the few who carried sunshine wherever he went. His pleasant manner endeared him to his associates. He was one of those who apparently had a good conscience himself and expected nothing but kindness from others. Such men are few in number. The average busy man, such as he was, is studious and sometimes forgetful of others. But Mr. GOULDEN never seemed to be so engrossed in his work as to be neglectful of the ordinary civilities of life. The value of such conduct can not be correctly measured. The kind word, the smile of greeting, the hearty hand shake, the manifestation of personal concern, has driven the clouds of gloom from many an individual.

This life is full of trials, misfortunes overtake, sorrows are met, and men who are factors in smoothing the pathway of those who are thus afflicted, as Mr. GOULDEN did, are real benefactors.

Many men bear malice, seek revenge, and are spiteful to those who antagonize them, but Mr. GOULDEN was not so. He possessed that splendid coolness, that genuine poise, that superior manner that would tend to win men and overcome their want of generosity.

If I am not mistaken, Mr. GOULDEN was a superior man in personal character, in the recognition of the rights of others, and the exhibition of those lofty virtues which are possessed only by those of genuine integrity. Those finer sentiments in relation to country which would cause him to give life itself, if necessary, were constantly exhibited in the life of Mr. GOULDEN. He was a truly patriotic man. Himself an old soldier, he had the deepest sympathy for those who gave service on the field of battle. He was honored by position in recognition of this devotion to the "boys in blue"; but not alone was he interested in those who fought for the Union, but he had an abiding affection for those who wore the "gray" in the civil strife as well. In one of the last conversations I had with him, in speaking most sympathetically of the southern Confederate, he said:

> If I had my way, we would pension every one of them; they were just as honest and true as we were. We were all parties to the settlement of great questions which will never again be raised to disturb or annoy, and the Confederate is now as loyal to the flag as I am.

In his public service he manifested the same fidelity and genuine regard for the rights of others. His ambition was to do the right and to act justly toward all men. He was not an orator, but was frank and plain in speech. He was not a great statesman, but had that sense of justice and fairness which is convincing in its simplicity. He was in no sense conspicuous, for he was a modest and retiring man, but his merit was the more appreciated the longer one knew him. He was one of those genial, faithful, true gentlemen whose worth is never fully known, nor his real value properly estimated, but whose service is crowned with good intentions and faithful effort and whose merit is the more recognized as the real man is studied in the light of his achievements.

Life is a mystery at best. Whence we came and whither we may go is as much a puzzle as the Bible story of man's duty and destiny. Why should some die and others live is a marvel which men can not explain. Why Mr. GOULDEN, in the enjoyment of health and with a natural expectancy in life for a number of years, should so soon pass to the beyond, I can not explain. This we know—his race is run, his duties are over, and he lies cold in the embrace of death. Unless the seed dies, it can not live again in the vegetable world; unless this mortal body shall put off human environment, it can not enjoy immortality—is a story which nearly all accept.

Mr. GOULDEN has tested that vital truth. His life work is a splendid heritage to those he leaves behind, his example is helpful to those who consider it, and his memory is a sweet remembrance to those who knew him best. Time dealt gently with him after all; he lived beyond the three score years and ten, which is man's allotted time. I sometimes feel that one is fortunate to be called hence while yet active, before the sun of usefulness is fully set and the burden of dependence on others is reached.

The country has lost a faithful public servant. This House has lost an honored Member, and his colleagues a personal friend. So far as we can tell it may be said: He fought a good fight in life. He kept the faith in loyalty to the country and to his fellows, and he no doubt enjoys that reward which comes from devotion to duty and the sacrifices made in a well-spent life.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, it is an inestimable privilege, it seems to me, to have been associated with a few men who took part on either side of the great struggle from 1861 to 1865, and it is an irreparable loss to the membership of the House when one of the few remaining men who knew and went through that great experience has passed away.

I came into this House with the Sixty-third Congress; and the upheaval that preceded the election of that Congress took out of the House most of the Civil War veterans who were Members of the Sixty-second Congress. I believe Gen. SHERWOOD and Mr. GOULDEN and Mr. Kirkpatrick were the only Union veterans left in the House of Representatives, all three of them on the Democratic side. Certainly more kindly and friendly spirits never lived. There was nothing in the life of Mr. GOULDEN, who has passed away from us, or in the life of Gen. SHERWOOD, who we hope will remain with us for many years, that suggests that military training or participation in a great war leads to what is called militarism. Mr. Kirkpatrick was not a candidate for

reelection, but this Congress has brought back Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, of Ohio, to keep Gen. SHERWOOD company.

Mr. Speaker, there is little more that I can say about Mr. GOULDEN that has not been said by Members with a friendship of a longer standing. I may perhaps say that I, in a sense, inherited my friendship for Mr. GOULDEN. One of my predecessors in this House was Col. Thomas W. Bradley, a veteran of the Civil War. He was a warm friend of Col. GOULDEN, and when I first came into this House one of the first men that I got acquainted with on the Democratic side was Col. GOULDEN, who knew the district that I came from and took pains to look me up, and gave me advice which was always good advice. I have profited greatly by his friendship, and I have greatly missed him.

One thing in Col. GOULDEN's recent service in this House stands out in my memory as worthy of special mention at this time, and that is his eloquent tribute to Abraham Lincoln, delivered on February 12, 1914.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I am speaking the sentiment of my adopted State, of my colleagues of the Pennsylvania delegation, when I pay a respectful and affectionate tribute to the memory of one of the gifted men of the Keystone State. Mr. GOULDEN was a Pennsylvanian. While he was transplanted, or transplanted himself, to another Commonwealth many years before his death, he remained during all the years of absence from Pennsylvania still at heart and soul a son of that great State. Our acquaintance began with my entrance into Congress three years ago. He was one of the very first of the older Members to seek me out, to give me a welcome, to extend a cordial sympathy, and to be of real help in guiding my unaccustomed feet in this great assembly. Afterwards it became my privilege to be associated with him on one of the great committees in this House—a committee which is dealing with a very large and a very vital problem, affecting the very life of our free institutions—and I am very glad to say to-day, in memory of that man, that he was always true to the high ideals of this Republic, to the ideals which are embodied in the Declaration of Independence, which says that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I am very glad to bear testimony to the fact that our departed friend was not one who believed that it was well for this Republic to follow in the footsteps of empire. He believed that sooner or later, the sooner the better, we should be rid of dependencies, and he was working faithfully, with courage—I believe with vision—toward an end which I hope may soon be achieved.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, we are gathered here to-day to pay tribute to the memory of Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, better known to us as Col. GOULDEN, a colleague who was one of the most beloved men of Congress and one of the best known.

JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, representing the twenty-third congressional district of New York, was suddenly called to his last home on the 3d day of May, 1915, in the city of Philadelphia, in his seventy-first year of age, after a useful religious public and private life. Those who had seen him only a few days before, and others who saw him on the very day of his passing away, pronounced him in splendid physical and mental condition. His mind and activities were as fresh and vigorous as they had ever been in his lifetime. He still looked to the future expecting to perform even greater work than ever before and looked forward with every degree of hope and aspiration to another busy session of Congress and to more benefits to be derived for those constituents of his district whom he loved so dearly and for the great body of American citizens to whom he was so deeply attached.

There was perhaps no man in Congress more revered by the people of his home city, his colleagues in Congress, and his friends of every religious creed and political shade, than was Congressman GOULDEN. Not only was he an active business man, but he found abundant time to devote to the exacting duties as a representative of a large busy congressional district. He likewise was interested in farming and there was no time when he took more pleasure out of life than when he was engaged in the pursuits of agriculture on his farms in Carroll County, Md., my native State.

He was particularly beloved by the people of Maryland, especially those who knew him as "Farmer GOULDEN" in Carroll County. At the great annual picnic or farmers' meeting of which he was the forefront at Taneytown, Md., Representative GOULDEN was indeed in his element of pleasure and happiness. In that section he stored up in the minds of the farmers and villagers all he had to say and do, which has had its great influence upon the farming and business interests of that section.

Through this interest in his farms of our State he became a part of that section; he was an interested supporter of everything that was beneficial to the interests of Maryland and to the great metropolis of Baltimore. Often have I spoken of him and said: "Maryland has in Congress seven Representatives; six elected from the districts of Maryland and the seventh elected from the twenty-third district of New York." He had not only the time and the ability to represent the teeming population of his own district, but he took time and sufficient interest to look into those matters appertaining to the welfare of Maryland.

His genial countenance, splendid fellowship, and good will impressed all who came in contact with him. It was a bright spot in the convening of the House of Representatives each morning to meet Representative GOULDEN, for he was strict in attendance, and to receive his handclasp, kindly smile, and best wishes for a successful day.

I became one of his close personal friends, as also did my colleagues from Maryland. I was in constant touch with him in the work of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, and there was no man, to my knowledge, who exerted a greater influence in those matters in which he was interested than did this genial Representative from New York.

I could not, Mr. Speaker, allow to pass this opportunity to publicly express to the family, friends, and constituents of Representative GOULDEN how much the people of my State appreciated his friendship and assistance; how much my colleagues and I appreciated the splendid support of our late friend and associate and his good will and friendly intercourse at all times.

Maryland may have many residents who are not natives of her soil, she may have many friends to locate within her borders, but none can ever take the place of Representative GOULDEN in the hearts and minds of his Maryland friends.

Mr. PRATT. Mr. Speaker, I did not know the late Col. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, but I counted upon the prospective privilege of knowing him through a letter of introduction which I carried in my pocket until the morning in May when I read that his life had suddenly gone out. In one sense, Col. GOULDEN was identified with the congressional district I have the honor to represent, and that was through his long connection with the New York State Soldiers and Sailors' Home, at Bath, N. Y. In 1902 he was appointed by the governor of New York as a trustee of that home. He held that post until his death, and for the last year of his life was president of the board of trustees.

In response to an inquiry, Col. Joseph E. Ewell, commandant of the home, writes to me feelingly as follows:

> Col. GOULDEN was active, energetic, able, and efficient in the discharge of his duties, and was greatly interested in the home. He rarely missed a meeting of the board of trustees, often being obliged to come from Washington for that purpose; and in a marked degree he gained the confidence, respect, and good-will of all connected with the home as members or officers. He was kindly, genial, and friendly in his attitude toward every one with whom he had personal or business relations.

In the resolutions upon the death of Col. GOULDEN adopted by the board of trustees of the New York State Soldiers and Sailors' Home appropriate reference is made to the valuable service he rendered in many fields of activity. These resolutions declare that he was—

> the type of man the world loves. Just and generous, courageous and conservative, upright and fair, tender and sympathetic of heart, with a message of good will to all and encouragement to his fellow-men, he possessed a character worthy of all emulation, and left memories to be cherished throughout the years to come.

Such was our late colleague, one of the most popular and esteemed Members of this House, a man of strong convictions and yet tolerant in his opinions, charitable in his judgments, and kind and gentle in his acts; a man of incessant activity, who served his State and Nation with loyalty and integrity; who shirked no responsibility, who was equal to every opportunity, and who found his greatest joy and satisfaction in doing his simple duty as a man and citizen and public servant.

We of this House do well to honor his memory to-day, and we bid him farewell with affectionate regret.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, in the presence of death I always feel overwhelmed. Both life and death are mysteries. The mind of the primitive savage and the intellect of the philosopher of modern days are alike helpless when confronted with the problem of existence. We do not know, we do not understand. We can not grapple with the mystery of life, with the problems of life. There is only one thought in my mind when I see a life ebbing away, when I see an active man departing, and that is that every moment of our life should be devoted to some useful service. Let others wreck their minds in the vain effort to

solve the mystery of existence, to penetrate the inscrutable veil which separates life from death. For us there can be but only one broad highway in life, and that is the highway of useful, social service. Blessed is the man whose friends can say that he lived a useful, noble life.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as I was passing through the Capitol I chanced to notice the House was in session, and so happened in this Chamber. My especial attention had not been called to this service, and, like many other Members, was busy with my own affairs, and failed to take note that this day was set apart to pay tribute to the life and character of a departed Member. I am not prepared to speak as I would like, but can not permit this opportunity to pass without saying a word of tribute to my friend, Col. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN. He was one of the first Members I learned to know well when I came here in the Sixtieth Congress, and as the years rolled by our acquaintance ripened into a warm friendship. He was a most lovable man, as gentle and kind as a woman. He had a big, warm, sympathetic heart. Well do I recall his kindly face. I scarce remember of his ever passing by that he did not say "How are you to-day, Brother?"; and this affectionate greeting was accompanied by an outstretched hand for hearty handclasp. Little wonder that he was admired and loved here as but few men are. A few years ago I was one of a congressional party to make a trip to the Canal Zone. The party was in charge of Col. GOULDEN, who looked after the minutest detail and seemed to think only of our comfort and welfare. He seemed to be always striving to do some kind act for some one. His life was one of service and full of good deeds. I could mention many instances of his great kindness to me personally, and so when I read of the sudden summons which overtook this soldier, statesman, and friend, I felt a deep personal loss. I shall long love to recall many pleasant memories of this good man, and—

I can not say—I will not say—
That he is dead. He is only away.
With a cheery smile and a wave of the hand
He has wandered into an unknown land
And left us dreaming. How very fair
It needs must be, since he lingers there.
And you—oh, you who wildest yearn
For the old-time step and glad return—
Think of him faring on, as dear
In the love There as the love Here.

Mr. FARLEY. Mr. Speaker, the ceremonies here to-day indeed impress me with the realization that this House, the Nation, and the State of New York lost a valuable, well-known Member in the death of JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, and I would not be equal to representing my people if I did not, even with my limitations, say a few words at this time.

I have known Col. GOULDEN for many years, and learned to admire him for his careful, painstaking, honest interest in all things pertaining to the welfare of the city and State of New York, as well as the Nation. He seemed to me to be a man of wonderful capabilities in grasping needful situations, and was always willing and anxious to perform his share of the task in finally accomplishing the end. His untimely death on May 3d, at Philadelphia, was flashed to New York City, shocking all of us who knew him, and almost immediately orders came from you to attend his funeral.

The services at the parish church, even at the very early hour at which they were held, were attended by a throng of people. The special train bearing his remains to their last resting place at Taneytown, Md., left an escort of many friends at the station in New York City. The few stops en route for relatives to join the funeral were conspicuous for their gathering at the station of people who knew and loved him. The arrival at his native town, Taneytown, was a picture I shall never forget, as I witnessed the hushed, bareheaded multitude from the town and countryside waiting to pay a tribute of respect to their distinguished departed townsman. The services at the little church and the interment 'neath a tree—a spot he had selected in the churchyard—ended the sad duty that mortal can render the dead, were all attended by this sad concourse of people.

To-day we are gathered in special session to pay a final tribute in an official manner to him who was one of us and is no more.

Men are known by their words and their works. The record of JOSEPH A. GOULDEN stands for itself so clear that we might well emulate it.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, when I entered this Chamber for the first time as a Member of this body, April 7, 1913, one of the first of the older Members who took me by the hand and bade me welcome was the late Col. GOULDEN, to commemorate whose noble life and accomplishments we are gathered to-day, and I gladly avail myself of the privilege of paying a tribute to my departed friend.

It was my good fortune to serve with him early in the session, by your appointment, as a member of a committee to visit a distant southern city, during which time we were thrown constantly together, which resulted in the creation of a bond of friendship which was broken by his death. I had the deepest attachment for him, and the news of his death, which reached me on the other side of the continent, came as a distinct shock. His daily kindly greetings as the session advanced were most welcome and his advice and suggestions were of the greatest aid to me in acquainting myself with the business of the House.

I delighted in talking with him about his experiences during the war, probably because of the fact that my father and brother had also served in that great struggle, and I had always been taught to venerate and esteem those who had offered their lives on their country's altar.

He was, indeed, a most interesting personage, genial, courtly, and a man of the most tender sensibilities and noble impulses. He had a host of friends, regardless of politics, drawn to him by his modest, attractive, and kindly personality, who mourn his loss with deep personal grief.

I do not believe any man who has served as a Member of this House was more conscientious or had a higher sense of honor or was more anxious to deal honestly with his fellows than our departed friend. His constituents recognized his high character and ability, and their appreciation of his splendid service in their behalf was shown by repeatedly reelecting him as their Representative in Congress.

It is proper that we should pause from the exacting cares and responsibilities which our duties here impose upon us to pay this tribute of respect to our late colleague, whose life has been a noble and worthy success, devoted to his God, his country, and his friends.

The dread summons which came to him, and which we know not how soon must come to us, found him calmly and resolutely awaiting its approach, as is evidenced in the closing words of a eulogy which he delivered in this House on the life and character of one of his colleagues on an occasion similar to this, and which is also a splendid index to his character, when he said:

His passing was a deep personal loss to me, and my heart was saddened as I saw him laid away in beautiful Laurel Hill Cemetery, with the ever-placid Schuylkill flowing near by. I thought of many things; of the passing friendships that come with years, of my own few remaining days in this House, and of the living friends that may soon sever; then life itself, which has deserted my own good friend thus laid away with so many present to bid him farewell, occupied my thoughts, and looking to myself I whispered in the words of Mrs. Barbauld:

"Life; we have been long together
Through pleasant and through cloudy weather:
'Tis hard to part when friends are dear,
Perhaps will cost a sigh or tear;
Then steal away, give little warning,
Choose thine own time;
Say not 'good night,' but in some brighter clime
Bid me 'good morning.'"

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, this is a good world. The pessimistic poet of the past who said:

The evil that men do lives after them, but the good is oft interred with their bones—

spoke from an evident experience of the gloomier things of life. It is a good world, because good men and good women make it so. And among those of my acquaintance who have done their share there has been none who ever touched life for its betterment from more angles than Col. GOULDEN. I stand here to-day as his elected successor, through two accidents; latterly the accident of his death; before that, the accidental circumstance of a redistricting of the congressional districts of our State. For six years he and I sat here as colleagues, and the closest of colleagues, for the old seventeenth district and the old eighteenth district marched with each other, to use the old language of the common law, along their boundaries for miles. They were populous districts, and between us we had the responsibility of representing here over a million of the inhabitants of the State of New York. That circumstance and the contiguity of our districts threw us into almost daily contact, and the fact that the House at that time was of my party, and he ever earnestly striving to secure every possible bit of legislation for the benefit not only of those whom he represented but those with whom he was affiliated, made our intercourse of the closest character.

There was a great disparity in our ages. He was precisely the age of my own father, and yet of the two, if there was any difference in energy, the greater activity was his. Our colleague, Mr. FITZGERALD, says that he doubts whether the district

realizes the services that it had from Col. GOULDEN. He would not express or have that doubt if he lived in the district. Col. GOULDEN was a Democrat, always, when a candidate of that party, but from the time I first knew him until the time when he died there never was a time in my judgment when as the candidate of another party, or of no party, that great independent community would not have returned him to this House by an emphatic majority.

In the recent campaign, as I walked the streets of that district, young men came to me and said, "We are Republicans, but of course we voted for Col. GOULDEN, because when we were at school it was Col. GOULDEN who used to come around and take an interest in the school, and when the Spanish-American War was on it was Col. GOULDEN that came to our school and organized us into companies to go. Oh yes, we are Republicans, but we always voted for Mr. GOULDEN."

And the business men would say to me, "Well, we wish you luck. Oh yes, we are Republicans, of course we are, but we always voted for Mr. GOULDEN because he was such a good Representative." And the women would say, "Well, Mr. BENNET, so and so, and this and that, but you never would have stood a chance if Col. GOULDEN was living." I will never forget that one of my best supporters in the Bronx, as I sat talking with him, opened the drawer of his desk, took out a photograph of Mr. GOULDEN, held it up, and said "I always voted for him."

Mr. GOULDEN had grown up with The Bronx, he had seen it rise in population from 70,000 to 600,000, and during that entire rise and progress there had been not one single good movement with which he had not been connected, not one. Neither race nor religion constituted a boundary or an impediment for his efforts or his interest.

He was staunch in everything. No one ever had to inquire long to find out that he was a loyal member of the Roman Catholic Church, and yet the best among the Protestants and the Hebrews in The Bronx voted for Mr. GOULDEN. Not only was he loyal to The Bronx, but he was loyal to the city and to the State. We shared between us the temporary guardianship of a waterway which separated our two districts. He knew that waterway, and during his entire service in this House there never was a moment when anything that ought to be obtained for that waterway was not obtained. He knew where to go and when to go and how to do it and what was wanting.

And so in every activity he was helpful and energetic. Two of our colleagues have spoken of the office he held in connection with the Soldiers' Home at Bath. It was near to his heart, and so was every question relating to the old soldier. When I came to look over the bills in his file introduced in the Sixty-third Congress I found that the pension bills introduced in behalf of old soldiers and their widows and veterans of the Spanish-American War were not at all confined to the twenty-third congressional district, but that they covered the State, showing in some degree the acquaintance which he had.

Nearly a score have spoken to-day. I should have been willing that we all should have rested our mutual praise and common appreciation upon the prayer of the Chaplain.

Possibly I am the only one here who recalls that when some years ago the Chaplain reached the 25th anniversary of his marriage, it was JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, a Catholic, who went from man to man and got from each of us $1, and then in the parlor yonder, to the utter surprise of Dr. Couden, presented him with more than three hundred shining silver dollars that he had taken the trouble to procure from the Treasury. It was that sort of act that has brought upon this floor to-day Representatives from more States than I have ever heard in my six years of prior experience deliver addresses at a memorial service. It was that kind of life, touching every interest, that made him dear to this House.

Col. GOULDEN was an active legislator. When the *Maine* was blown up in Habana Harbor, it was he who introduced the first bill to have the bodies of the dead sailors brought back here. When the great order of which he was a member desired a commemoration of Christopher Columbus in this Capital, it was Col. GOULDEN who worked until the bill for the statue of Christopher Columbus went through. Out of his own mind he evolved the idea that it was a desecration to associate with the flag of our country the advertisement of any business, and it was he who secured the passage of the bill in our State making that particular act a crime. The only unfinished business that I know of in his legislative career is the fact that the bill introduced by him Congress after Congress to place a similar law on the statute books of the United States has not yet passed.

There is no relation of either his public or private life which could not be happily touched upon, no strain of fidelity under which his character gave. Gentlemen have risen to-day and read from memorial addresses delivered by Col. GOULDEN on occasions such as this. Those references could have been indefinitely multiplied. In my six years of service I do not now recall ever having read the proceedings of a memorial service, or having been present at one, with which Col. GOULDEN was not connected, and why? Because he knew good of all of us.

He was to our virtues over kind,
And to our faults a little blind.

He liked men, he was genial, companionable, friendly. It was no veneer; it was the real thing.

I can not speak intimately of his domestic life, for with that I was not closely connected. I know it was all that such a life should have been. I know the happiness of the home, and, in fact, as I glance back through memory along the career of Col. GOULDEN, there seems nothing essential in which he was deficient. Last night, in New York City, in a room, a reproduction of home life of a country in Europe, I saw a little picture that I shall always imagine is typical of the home of Col. GOULDEN. It was a representation of a painting over a fireplace epitomizing the home, simply two hearts intertwined with flowers, and I imagine that the foundation of his home was that.

Mr. Speaker, we change rapidly here. Of the 37 men from New York State who took the oath of office 10 years ago, at the beginning of the Fifty-ninth Congress, but 2, Mr. FITZGERALD and myself, took the oath of office at the commencement of the Sixty-fourth Congress. We go back into private life or into other public activities or into the realms beyond, and we shall be fortunate, each or all of us, if when we say our final farewell it can as certainly be said of us, as it can be said of Col. GOULDEN, that the world is better for our having been here.

I append as a portion of my remarks some of the resolutions introduced on Col. GOULDEN's death.

The resolutions are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Borough of the Bronx, May 21, 1915.

Mrs. JOS. A. GOULDEN,
2433 Creston Avenue.

DEAR MADAM: At a meeting of the local school board of district 25, held on the evening of May 18, 1915, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted and I was directed to transmit the same to you.

"Whereas the Nation, the State, and the city of New York have sustained an irreparable loss in the death of Col. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, former member of local school board 25, former member of the board of education, and Member of Congress; and

"Whereas the services of Col. GOULDEN in all the offices he has held have been painstaking, conscientious, and signally successful and valuable; and

"Whereas his charming and impressive personality was deeply impressed upon all who came in contact with him;

"Therefore, we hereby express our sense of personal loss and sorrow in view of the demise of this splendid man and exemplary citizen, and implore Almighty God to mitigate by His precious consolations the sorrows of the bereaved members of the surviving family.

"*Ordered*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to Col. GOULDEN's family and incorporated in the minutes of this board."

Very sincerely, yours,

HENRY L. SAMSON, *Secretary.*

GEN. LOUD'S TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN GOULDEN AT THE TESTIMONIAL RECEPTION AND DINNER TO GEN. GEORGE B. LOUD, MAY 8, 1915.

In the midst of our fraternal love feast there is an aching void in the hearts of many present; a note of sadness vibrating on many a heartstring, because of the absence of one loved by us all, and who, so prominent in the initial work for this gathering, would have added so much joy and cheer to it, had God spared him. I refer to our comrade, JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, our last Civil War veteran in Congress from the Empire State.

Without a word of reference to him here would be a woeful omission. He crossed over to the great right wing of our Army and Navy in the other encampment this very week, leaving so many of us sorrowing and yet bewildered, and for our only consolation the memory of his grand work for his State and city, for American citizenship, and the tender and precious memory of his generous and lofty character.

A faithful service in the United States Navy in the Civil War, commended for the faithful and meritorious discharge of duty, a long and active membership in the Grand Army, a citizenship which was an honor to his country and people; so it may be truthfully said of him that the world became richer and fraternity of sublimer significance because of his life, and the world was manifestly poorer on his going out. Few of this great metropolis will be more deeply deplored among the hosts gone before in many years than JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, and after the tears are dried there will come a memory of him to his loved ones and friends that will paint the past with colors which will keep his picture in their hearts and minds always perfect.

As I remember him, who was so close to my life, in his nature there was a wealth of sunshine. Humor flowed from his heart like a sparkling spring gushing out of the rock. His presence always seemed a message of cheer and good will. His inborn geniality amounted to genius which created sweet and wholesome character and radiated cheer. He had a window in his heart, always open for the expression of his candor and sincerity, true to the core. His integrity was superb, but his predominant quality was courage—courage to fight wrong and injustice; courage to stand loyally by a friend and comrade. Those who had business, social, or fraternal relations with JOSEPH A. GOULDEN always relied on the lasting, true devotion of his manhood and were refreshed by the charm of his individuality. In the calm, serene retreat of his home he was like the tree that grows in the sunny South—its leaves

ever green, its blossoms pure and sweet; and home to him was the grandest, sweetest spot on earth.

Who will fill his place in the Congress of the United States, representing as he has so faithfully his great constituency, and, too, as the tried and true representative of his comrades, with whom he kept ever in close touch of his heart, and as unshakable in his devotion as the rock of Gibraltar?

THE PIONEER REPUBLICAN CLUB,
Bronx, New York, May 17, 1915.

Mrs. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN,
2433 Creston Avenue,
Bronx, New York City, N. Y.

DEAR MADAM: It is with deep feeling that the officers and members of the Pioneer Republican Club of the thirty-fourth assembly district extend to you and yours their sincere expressions of sympathy and condolence on the death of your dear husband, the Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN.

You have suffered an irreparable loss, his friends a cherished companion, and the community which he represented a man in whom reposed their everlasting respect and absolute confidence.

It is our desire, dear madam, that this letter, conveying the heartfelt sympathy of each and every member of this organization, will, in its own way, tend to alleviate your sorrow in this sad hour of bereavement.

Very sincerely, yours,

HARRY ISAACS,
Secretary.

Just a week ago the writer of these lines congratulated Col. J. A. GOULDEN upon his vigorous appearance and the complete possession of all his physical and intellectual qualities that had, at age 71, set him apart from men in general as one exceptionally robust, of splendid health, and destined for continued usefulness for many years. A few hours ago the summons came without a moment's warning; quickly, painlessly, without fear, with sublime confidence in Him "who doeth all things well," an earthly career was ended that had made an impress for good in a wide circle of associates whom he honored with his friendship.

Mr. GOULDEN first came to the company in October, 1879, in the capacity of superintendent of eastern agencies, establishing many new ones and actively and efficiently cooperating with all within his field. In this selection he displayed excellent judgment, bringing to the company many who are still associated with it, and creating among them proper business ideals from which they do not depart. He was one of the organizers in 1883 of The Penn Mutual Agency Association, and was continuously connected with it as an officer, being its president at the time of his death. In April, 1889, he became a general agent in New York City, and in association with his son, Maurice E. Goulden, has represented the company with great reliability and distinguished credit. His energy was so boundless that he participated in the work of many helpful undertakings, being actively interested in school, religious, political, and military circles, in each of which he bore his part manfully, with excellent discretion and wise foresight. Prior to his connection with The Penn Mutual he had served in the Navy during the Civil War, and had been manager of the Pennsylvania State Reformatory. Upon his removal to New York he became a member of the board of education, where his work in behalf of teachers was recognized and applauded. He was a trustee for many years of the Soldiers and Sailors' Home, and recently was president, and had been officially and creditably connected with many organizations because of his keen interest in G. A. R. affairs. He was serving his twelfth year in Congress as a Representative from The Bronx, N. Y., when suddenly called hence. His work in Congress was particularly notable in connection with life insurance affairs; but he also earned the good will of his constituents by close attention to their local matters, as shown by repeated elections with large majorities. In 1913, when the income tax was proposed and debated, he strongly opposed that section which put a tax upon "dividends of surplus," and was markedly influential in securing its elimination. While many men exerted themselves to this end, no one was more powerful than he; and life insurance owes him a debt of gratitude for vigorous and unselfish service, which was politically at his personal risk, his course being the expression of a guiding principle that he would not ignore.

Personally he was most attractive. His was a broad, generous, sympathetic nature that looked upon the world with loving eyes that were animated by a desire to serve and amend. Intellectually he was strong and of determined purpose in advocating what he esteemed to be wholly right, and yet with that old-time grace and courtesy that wounded no sensibility and gathered friends rather than critics and opponents. As husband, father, friend, in all social and business relations, he measured to the full standard of a man. Kind, patient, gentle, and forgiving, courageous in adversity, simple and unpretentious in prosperity, a thoroughly faithful and honorable man in all his dealings, we of his chosen company deplore his loss as an irreparable personal affliction.

HENRY C. LIPPINCOTT.

MAY 4, 1915.

At a regular meeting of the Holy Name Society of the Church of Our Lady of Mercy, Fordham, N. Y., held on May 9, 1915, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That the Holy Name Society of the Church of Our Lady of Mercy, Fordham, N. Y., deplores the loss sustained in the death of our late brother, the Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN. We extend to his family our heartfelt sorrow at their grief, and assure them of our sympathy. In him the Holy Name Society has lost an energetic member, the church a model Catholic, the people of our borough an untiring servant, and the country a most patriotic and devoted citizen. But while our hearts are wrung with the sense of our loss, we glory in the confident hope that his life, spent for the glory of his God, his church, and his country, has earned for him, at the hands of his Maker, a richly earned reward; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the society offer up its monthly holy communion on the second Sunday of June, 1915, for the repose of his soul; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed, be presented to his family."

ALFRED J. AMEND,
JOHN J. DALTON,
WILLIAM J. DALY,
WILLIAM T. GILROY,
ALOYSIUS M. TIGHE,
Committee.

At a regular meeting of the Taxpayers' Alliance of the Borough of The Bronx, city of New York, held on the 12th day of May, 1915, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Whereas it has pleased an all-wise God to remove from our midst by death the Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN on May 3, 1915; and

"Whereas the Borough of The Bronx and the country at large have lost in him one of the most distinguished Representatives in Congress, an untiring and honorable business man, an intellectual and brilliant orator, an honored soldier, and a warm and loyal friend and comrade: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the Taxpayers' Alliance in meeting assembled herewith tender to his bereaved widow and children their sincere sorrow and regret at his sudden and unexpected demise; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That these resolutions be engrossed and delivered to them as a token of our deep-felt sympathy."

TAXPAYERS' ALLIANCE OF THE BOROUGH OF THE BRONX,
GEORGE M. SCHULTZ,
President.
HARRY ROBITZEK,
E. L. FRANZ,
ARTHUR ARBANDER,
Committee.

NEW YORK, *June 4, 1915.*

Resolutions adopted by Guiding Star Council, No. 212, Knights of Columbus, upon the death of Hon. Sir Knight JOSEPH A. GOULDEN on May 3, 1915.

Whereas it has pleased God to remove from this world Brother JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, a charter member of this council, who from its very beginning, notwithstanding his other many and varied activities, took an earnest and unceasing interest in its welfare and, by his loyalty and encouragement, materially advanced its usefulness and prosperity; and

Whereas Congressman GOULDEN has rendered his country and his community long and distinguished patriotic and public service, and has also wrought great and lasting benefit to our honored order in ably advocating its principles and objects, and particularly in his successful work for the erection of the great memorial in the National Capital to our patron, the discoverer of America; and

Whereas our departed friend has commanded our emulation and respect by his exemplary practical Catholicity at all times and places, and won our admiration and love by his kindly advice and genial disposition: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we do hereby express our heartfelt grief at the sudden passing of our renowned and well-beloved member and of the loss suffered thereby by our country, our order, and our council; and be it further

Resolved, That we honor and cherish the memory of JOSEPH A. GOULDEN in our hearts and our prayers as of one especially deserving of our gratitude; and be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the record of this council and that an engrossed copy thereof be presented to the bereaved widow and family of our lamented brother as an evidence of our sympathy for them and as a reminder of our attachment to him in life and our memory of him in death.

JOSEPH POLCHINSKI,
Grand Knight.
MICHAEL A. DOWNS,
Recorder.

Minutes adopted by the board of trustees of the Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co., Philadelphia, on the death of Col. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN.

It having pleased Almighty God to remove from this world our late member, Col. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, the board of trustees of the Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Philadelphia, desires to record on its minutes an expression of its high appreciation of the many lovable and admirable qualities of the deceased.

While a member of this board but for a brief period, his connection with the company as its supervisor of eastern agencies and later as general agent during a period of more than 40 years brought him into close relation with and endeared him to the entire management of the Penn Mutual.

The confidence and respect in which he was held by all who knew him was evidenced by the many positions of public honors he was called upon to fill, in all of which he performed his duties with great credit and dignity. To be of service to others, he regarded as a pleasure rather than an obligation, and he was untiring in doing, without thought or hope of reward, kindnesses without number.

This board mourns his untimely demise, recognizing not only the loss which the company sustains through his death, but that of the public as well.

The members of the board of trustees desire to extend their sincere and heartfelt sympathies to the family of its departed member.

GEORGE K. JOHNSON,
President.
JOHN HUMPHREYS,
Secretary and Treasurer.

Resolutions adopted by County Committee of the Thirty-fifth Assembly District.

Whereas the Almighty God in His wisdom has called to Himself our late beloved Congressman and fellow committeeman, Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN; and

Whereas Congressman GOULDEN, by a life devoted to the service of his country, his State, city, and borough, had gained for himself a noble reputation by his genial ways, his zeal, and his ability, endeared himself to all who knew him, and more especially to his friends, comrades, and acquaintances, and by his effort to build up and carry to success the great Democratic Party had won the admiration and esteem of the leaders of our party and the love and affection of the County Committee of the Thirty-fifth Assembly District: Now be it

Resolved, That while submitting to the will of the Almighty, we recognize in the death of Congressman JOSEPH A. GOULDEN the loss to the National Legislature of a wise and zealous Member; to the veterans of the late Civil War of a noble comrade and devoted friend; to the people of this city and borough of a public-spirited citizen; to the Democratic Party of an earnest advocate of the principles of Thomas Jefferson; to the members of the County Committee of the Thirty-fifth Assembly District of an active and sincere fellow worker; and to the

members of his bereaved family of a devoted husband and father; and be it further

Resolved, by the members of the County Committee of the Thirty-fifth Assembly District in meeting assembled at the North End Democratic Club, on the 28th day of May, 1915, That we sincerely deplore our great loss and tender to his widow and children our deep sympathy in this their hour of bereavement; and be it further

Resolved, That these preambles and resolutions be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and that a copy of them be engrossed, suitably framed, and presented to Mrs. Isabelle A. Goulden, as a tribute to the memory of her beloved husband, Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN.

JOHN MONAGHAN,
Chairman Democratic County Committee of the Thirty-fifth Assembly District.

JOSEPH I. BERRY,
Executive Member, Democratic County Committee of the Thirty-fifth Assembly District.

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION OF P. S. No. 46,
Borough of The Bronx, N. Y., May 12, 1915.

Mrs. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN,
2433 Creston Avenue, New York City.

DEAR MRS. GOULDEN: At a meeting of the association held on Friday evening, May 7, 1915, the following resolutions were adopted:

"Whereas the Parents' Association of P. S. 46, Bronx, has learned with deep regret of the death of Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, who was for many years an earnest friend of the public schools, beloved by pupils and teachers:

"*Resolved,* That this association offers this slight tribute to his memory, and extends to Col. GOULDEN'S widow in her bereavement the sincere sympathy of its members.

"*Resolved,* That a copy of these resolutions, signed by the president and secretary, be forwarded to Mrs. Goulden."

Offering you our deepest personal sympathy, we are,
Yours, most sincerely,

CHAS. C. MARRIN,
President.
HERBERT A. KNOX,
Secretary.

NEW YORK STATE SOLDIERS AND SAILORS' HOME,
BATH, STEUBEN COUNTY, N. Y.

IN MEMORIAM.

Col. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, president of the board of trustees of the New York State Soldiers and Sailors' Home, and the cherished friend of the members thereof, died in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., on the 3d day of May, 1915, at the age of 71 years.

In the full vigor of his strength, with mental powers unimpaired, with his work unfinished, without even the warning cry of pain or of weariness of mind, full of honors, beloved best by those who knew him best, his life went out and his earthly career was ended. He died as he lived, bravely facing life's duties, successfully bearing life's burdens, and "working out the things given him to do."

JOSEPH A. GOULDEN was in every essential the type of a man the world loves. Just and generous, courageous and conservative, upright and fair, tender and sympathetic of heart, with a message of good will to all, and of encouragement to his fellow men, he possessed a character worthy of all emulation and left memories to be cherished throughout all the many years to come.

Following the insistent impulses of his nature he ever sought graver duties and higher achievements. From early manhood he was almost continuously engaged in the services of his State and Nation.

In 1864 he enlisted in the United States Marine Corps and rose to be a noncommissioned officer in the service. In 1914 he was elected, for the sixth time, to membership of the American Congress, wherein he became a commanding figure and rendered service of great value to his country. He was appointed a member of this board in 1902, and at the time of his death was the oldest member in service. In 1914 he was elected its president.

In his official capacity he sought only the highest good of this institution and the permanent uplift of its members. He was beloved of his associates on this board, in his rare and genial presence all found pleasure and profit, and in his death each has sustained a personal and irreparable loss: Therefore

Resolved, That we, the members of this board, for ourselves and for the officers and members of this home, deeply deplore the untimely death of Col. GOULDEN, and record here our belief in his unqualified loyalty to this institution and to its officers and members, our faith in his integrity and uprightness as a man, and our admiration for his life and character.

Resolved, That this minute be made a part of the permanent records of this institution, and that a copy of the same be forwarded to the family of the deceased, to whom, for ourselves and for those whom we have the honor to represent, we extend our deepest sympathy and condolence.

Adopted July 15, 1915.

P. P. BUSH,
Acting President.
PETER SHERIDAN,
Secretary pro tempore.

In memoriam on the death of Brother JOSEPH A. GOULDEN. Resolutions unanimously adopted by Taneytown Grange No. 184 in regular session, May 11, 1915.

As we meet together this evening there is a profound sorrow because of the death of our brother, Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, a great statesman, a valiant soldier, a devout Christian, and a true neighbor. During the war he was an officer in the United States Navy. For several terms he was commander of the G. A. R. of New York.

The war for the Union over, in peace as in war, his time and talents were at the command of his country, and step by step again he rose from the humble voter in the ranks until an overwhelming majority of his fellow citizens called him to be a Member of the House of Representatives at Washington, D. C.

As a member of our grange, he always had its interest at heart and was one whose presence as master of ceremonies at the annual grange fair added largely to the success of the literary program.

In the Subordinate and Pomona Grange he was a molder of opinions and a director of thoughts. So long as this grange stands, so long will his influence exist and his loss be keenly felt.

Of the man there is no need to speak. His life was devoted to helping neighbors. The deep sense of personal loss with which his sudden demise struck all who knew him testifies more strongly to the hold he had upon the people he loved than could any mere empty words of grief; and from every heart, while torn with sorrow, comes the fitting epitaph: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

It is ordered that the charter of Taneytown Grange No. 184 be draped for 60 days, and that this memoriam be entered upon the minutes of the grange, published in the Carroll Record, and a copy be sent to the family.

It is further ordered that a page in the annual Grange Fair Catalogue be set aside to his memory, and as a mark of respect for the public spirit he always manifested in the grange fair, be it ordered that August 10, 1915, at 10 a. m., the opening services of the fair shall be a memorial service; that the flag be raised at half mast, and all exhibitors, concession people, and all business of any kind be suspended during said service and the public be invited to join in this service.

B. O. SLONAKER,
W. K. ECKER,
MILTON OHLER,
JOHN H. SHIRK,
CHAS. E. H. SHRINER,
Committee.

The Penn Mutual Agency Association has sustained a great loss in the death of Col. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, who for 36 years was closely identified with the company in many important capacities. The summons came to him on May 3, 1915, in the city of Philadelphia, where he had gone to attend meetings of the executive committee and the board of trustees. Col. GOULDEN first became associated with the Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company at Pittsburgh, Pa., on October 21, 1875, as superintendent of eastern agencies. Upon his removal in 1887 to New York City, he was appointed general agent. For many years he was vice president of the Penn Mutual Agency Association and was acting president at the time of his death. He was elected a member of the board of trustees in October, 1914, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Col. Markoe, of Baltimore. He filled these responsible positions with distinguished ability and marked success. He was elected to Congress in 1902 from the most populous district in the country, and he served for five full terms and a portion of the sixth term. He was interested in many State movements for the public good. Every question that touched the people was his concern, and in all his labors he commanded the confidence and esteem of his associates. His gospel was the gospel of good cheer, and his gracious smile and warm hand grasp will be sadly missed. Col. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN served in the Navy during the Civil War. He was trustee for many years of the Soldiers and Sailors' Home and recently was president and had been officially and creditably connected with many organizations because of his keen interest in Grand Army affairs. In Col. GOULDEN'S death we mourn the loss of an upright man, a loyal friend, a wise and faithful counselor.

Asleep amidst the familiar scenes of his summer home at Taneytown, Md., we bid him a long farewell. May he rest in sweet peace.

HUGH M. WILLET,
J. W. IREDELL, Jr.,
JAMES C. BIGGERT,
Committee.

OCTOBER 18, 1915.

NEW YORK, *May 17, 1915.*

Mrs. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN,
2433 Creston Avenue, New York City.

DEAR MRS. GOULDEN: In accordance with action taken by the board of education at its meeting held on May 12, I send you herewith a copy of the tribute to the late Mr. GOULDEN prepared by Mr. Frank D. Wilsey and unanimously adopted by the board by a rising vote.

In doing so I can not refrain from expressing my personal sympathy to you and your family. While I was not connected with the board of education when Mr. GOULDEN was a member, I met him on a number of occasions and was well aware of his deep interest in the public schools. It was always a pleasure to meet him, and I regret that my opportunities for doing so were not more frequent.

Again assuring you of my sympathy, I remain,
Very truly, yours,

A. EMERSON PALMER,
Secretary Board of Education.

It seems appropriate that action should be taken by the board of education with reference to the death of Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, which occurred very suddenly in Philadelphia on May 3, 1915, because at various times he was officially connected with the public-school system, and also because of his deep interest, extending over many years, in the well-being of the schools of this city. He was apparently in good health and as active as usual in his customary pursuits up to the moment when he was stricken.

Mr. GOULDEN was born in Pennsylvania, August 1, 1844. Before he attained his majority he enlisted in the Marine Corps of the United States Navy, serving therein in 1864 and 1865. In 1892 he was appointed by Mayor Hugh J. Grant a member of the board of education of the former city of New York, and was active in its work for his term of three years, 1893–1895, being a member of the committees on teachers, sites and new buildings, school furniture, nomination of trustees, supplies and school system, and also a member of the executive committee of the College of the City of New York.

In 1902 he was appointed a member of the local school board of district No. 25, and was chairman of that board until October, 1903, when he resigned, prior to taking his seat in the House of Representatives at Washington. Mr. GOULDEN served as a Member of Congress from March 4, 1903, until his death, with the exception of one term.

Having been a teacher in early life, Mr. GOULDEN'S interest in everything relating to the public schools was intense, regardless of whether or not he was officially connected with the educational department. One instance of this interest is found in the work which he undertook some 15 years ago in providing busts of George Washington for the schools in the Borough of The Bronx. In 1901 Mr. Frank Tilford pre-

sented copies of the Houdon bust of Washington to all the public schools in Manhattan. Shortly thereafter a movement was started in the interest of The Bronx schools, of which Mr. GOULDEN was the most active promoter.

Mr. GOULDEN served as a member of the board of managers of the State Reformatory at Morganza, Pa.; as a member of the board of trustees at the soldiers' home at Bath, N. Y.; and was secretary of the commission which erected the Soldiers and Sailors' Monument on Riverside Drive.

In the death of Mr. GOULDEN the public schools of this city, and especially those of The Bronx, have lost a most sincere well-wisher and supporter, and not a few of our principals, teachers, and pupils must feel that they have lost a personal friend.

Resolved, That the foregoing be adopted as an inadequate expression of the feeling entertained by the board of education by reason of the lamented death of Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, and that a copy of the same be transmitted to his family.

—

At a regular meeting of the Mosholu Catholic Club, held Tuesday evening, May 4, 1915, the following preambles and resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN having departed this life on May 3, 1915; and

"Whereas he always was a loyal friend and supporter of this club; and

"Whereas the members of this club desire to express their deep sorrow upon his sudden death; be it

"*Resolved*, That the members of the Mosholu Catholic Club keenly feel his loss and hereby tender to his family their heartfelt sympathy and condolence in this hour of their bereavement; and, be it further

"*Resolved*, That these resolutions be spread at length upon the minutes of this meeting and a copy forwarded to the family of the late Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN."

MOSHOLU CATHOLIC CLUB,
JAMES M. MORAN,
By FRANK J. GOSO,
DANIEL O'SULLIVAN,
Committee.

NEW YORK, *May 10, 1915.*

—

Resolutions adopted by the Harlem Luncheon Association.

Whereas on the 3d day of May, 1915, Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN departed this life, and, by resolution duly passed at the meeting of the Harlem Luncheon Association, held on the 12th day of May, 1915, it was

Resolved, That out of respect to the memory of the deceased gentleman suitable action should be taken to mark the high regard in which he was held during his lifetime.

Resolved, That we deeply deplore his death and extend to his widow and children our deep sympathy in the hour of their great grief.

Resolved, That a copy of these preambles and resolutions be forwarded to the widow of the deceased gentleman.

Attest:

C. H. FULLER, *Secretary.*

—

MEMORIAL CONCERNING THE DEATH OF HON. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, WHICH OCCURRED ON MONDAY, THE THIRD DAY OF MAY.

(Prepared and presented by Hon. JAMES L. WELLS.)

At a regular meeting of The Bronx Board of Trade, held this 26th day of May, 1915, the following memorial concerning the death of Col. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, which occurred on Monday, the 3d day of May, was unanimously adopted and copies thereof, signed by the president and attested by the secretary, were directed to be transmitted to the family of the deceased and to the public press:

MEMORIAL.

"The members of The Bronx Board of Trade, in the city of New York, hereby express and record their profound sorrow for the great loss which they, in common with people of our borough, city, State, and Nation, have experienced in the sudden death of Col. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, the distinguished Representative of the twenty-third district of New York in the Congress of the United States, a charter member and for many years an active vice president and a faithful and conscientious director of this organization.

"The life of Col. GOULDEN is a splendid illustration of a noble patriotic American citizen. As a volunteer in the war for the preservation of the Union, as a public instructor and a life-long champion of popular education, as a manager of the Pennsylvania State Reformatory, as the secretary of the commission that erected the beautiful Soldiers and Sailors' Monument on Riverside Drive, as a trustee of the New York Soldiers and Sailors' Home, as a commissioner of education of the city of New York, as a Representative in Congress for 12 years, and as a member of this board, deeply interested in the development of The Bronx, Col. GOULDEN rendered services of inestimable value to the people.

"He was assiduous and untiring in the performance of his public duties and conspicuous for his intelligence, his wide experience, his sincerity of purpose, his sound judgment, and his moral courage. His genial manner and his uniform courtesy, his innumerable acts of kindness, his broad and liberal views, his generous consideration of the opinion and the rights of others, his purity of life, and his unswerving belief in an overruling Providence guiding the destiny of men and nations—these are the qualities that endeared him to the people. These are the essential elements of his character that will long perpetuate his memory.

"'The night dew that falls,
Though in silence it weeps,
Shall brighten with verdure
The grave where he sleeps;
And the tear that we shed,
Though in silence it rolls,
Shall long keep his memory
Green in our souls.'

"The members of The Bronx Board of Trade, individually and as a body, tender their sincere and deepest sympathy to the bereaved widow and family of Col. GOULDEN. In recognition of his many important public services and as further testimony to the nobility of his manhood and the high esteem in which the memory of our departed associate is held, it is hereby directed that this memorial be inscribed in full upon the records of this board."

—

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 15, 1915.*

Mrs. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN,
2433 Creston Avenue, Bronx, New York City.

DEAR MRS. GOULDEN: At the regular meeting of Potomac Council, Knights of Columbus, of a recent date, the attention of the council was called to the demise of your highly esteemed husband.

In behalf of the council, I was directed to convey to you the sincere and heartfelt sympathy of the council, and to express to you the great loss our order has sustained in his sudden departure from this life.

We are not unmindful of the great work he accomplished in presenting and by his untiring energy having the Columbus Monument bill passed by the United States Congress. It is with a deep sense of gratitude we recall his successful efforts in this matter.

To some of us who knew him personally, and had an opportunity to appreciate his noble and lofty character, we can but say the world has lost a noble man.

Trusting the good Lord may comfort you in the time of your great loss, and again extending our sincere sympathy, we are,

Very truly and sincerely, yours,

POTOMAC COUNCIL, No. 433, K. OF C.,
P. L. O'BRIEN, *Recorder.*

—

U. S. GRANT POST, No. 327,
DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK, GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC.
Brooklyn, May 12, 1915.

Mrs. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, *New York.*

DEAR MADAM: This post instructed me to convey to you our deep and hearty sympathy in your recent bereavement.

Very sincerely, yours,

W. C. PECKHAM,
Adjutant.

—

BRONX CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
New York, May 29, 1915.

Mrs. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN,
2433 Creston Avenue, Bronx.

DEAR MADAM: In compliance with the will of the chamber I have the honor of presenting the following resolution recently adopted:

"Whereas Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, a resident of The Bronx for most of his life, a Member of Congress for a long number of years, and always identified with and working for not only the interests of the Bronx, but those of the entire American people, has suddenly passed away; and

"Whereas the members of the Bronx Chamber of Commerce, in meeting held this 22d day of May, 1915, do recognize the true worth of the deceased: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the members of the said chamber of commerce unanimously, and with heartfelt sympathy, extend to Mrs. Joseph A. Goulden and family their condolences."

Respectfully, yours,

J. M. TAYLOR, *Secretary.*

—

NEW YORK CITY, *May 17, 1915.*

Mrs. J. A. GOULDEN,
2433 Creston Avenue, Fordham.

DEAR MADAM: In behalf of the members of Ladies' Auxiliary No. 1, I beg to extend to you our heartfelt sympathy for the death of your dearly beloved husband. He was the true friend of all who needed him and will be mourned by many. In your great bereavement we trust it will be a comfort to you to feel that those whom God wishes most He calls suddenly to Him.

In sympathy and hoping God will lighten your grief, we beg to remain.

Sincerely, your friends,

LADIES' AUXILIARY No. 1,
KATE L. WHITE,
Recording Secretary.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues, for one reason or another, are not able to be here to-day, and I, as well as yourself, have had personal requests from a number that they may have the usual leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that during the next five legislative days those who were present and those who for one reason or another are detained from this Hall to-day may have leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD upon the life, character, and public services of the late Col. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULBERT). The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the Members of the House may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In accordance with the resolution heretofore adopted, the House will stand adjourned.

Accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m., the House adjourned until to-morrow, Monday, January 24, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *January 24, 1916.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thy peace lies deeper than the noise and confusion of the world's dread alarm. Thy peace is as a tide, too deep for sound and foam. We know that the world's peace waits upon the peace of God in the hearts of men. We come before Thee to open our hearts, that our minds and hearts may be kept in perfect peace by Thy grace, that we may know that which passeth knowledge of the peace of God in our hearts. Grant, we pray, that with calmness of thought and with a devotion to the highest interests of mankind we can quietly and consistently with Thy will perform the duties of this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

EDWIN C. BURLEIGH, a Senator from the State of Maine, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS (H. DOC. NO. 613).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of documents and files of papers in the Department of Commerce which are not needed or are useful in the transaction of current business and which have no permanent value or historical interest. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] the committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of the appointment thereof.

LIST OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 97).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to the order of the court, a list of cases referred to the court by resolution of the Senate under the act of March 3, 1887, known as the Tucker Act, which cases were dismissed by the court on the motion of the claimants' attorneys, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also transmitted to the Senate resolutions of the House on the death of Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, late a Representative from the State of New York.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 1773. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Warfield, Ky., and Kermit, W. Va.;

H. R. 4716. An act to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River; and

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHAFROTH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Two Buttes, Colo., praying for the formation of a United States of the world, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FLETCHER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Florida praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented memorials of sundry citizens of Texas, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. THOMPSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Lyon, Allen, Sedgwick, Reno, Coffee, Sumner, and Dewey Counties, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Fairview, Salina, Pretty Prairie, and Altoona, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring revenue stamps to be placed on individual bank checks, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the faculty and students of Fairmount College and Church, Wichita, Kans., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. OLIVER. I send to the desk a short communication from the Pennsylvania State Association of Dyers and Cleaners requesting action looking to an investigation of the causes of the advanced price of gasoline. I ask that the communication be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the communication was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA STATE ASSOCIATION OF DYERS AND CLEANERS,
Pittsburgh, Pa., January 18, 1916.

Hon. GEORGE T. OLIVER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a convention of the Pennsylvania State Association of Dyers and Cleaners held in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., a few days ago, a resolution was passed favoring an investigation by the Government of the rapid and continuous increase in the price of "gasoline" by the refiners.

Our industry uses millions of gallons of this article and we believe the present advance of practically 100 per cent is uncalled for. I, as secretary of the association, was instructed to bring this matter to your notice.

Thanking you in advance for any trouble we may cause you,

I remain,

THOMAS W. MURPHY,
Secretary Pennsylvania State Association of Dyers and Cleaners.

Mr. OLIVER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Apollo, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to place a prohibitive tax on intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Delaware County Children's Aid Society, of Swarthmore, Pa., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Alderson, Pa., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 179, International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, of Williamsport, Pa., remonstrating against a tax on admission charges to theaters, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Pitman Manufacturing Co., of Laconia, N. H., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented petitions of the Aspinook Co.; the Ashland Cotton Co., of Jewett City; the Diamond Spring Line Co., of Stafford Springs; the Glazier Manufacturing Co., of South Glastonbury; the Pond Lily Co., of New Haven; the Pratt, Read & Co. and the Pratt, Read Player Action Co., of Deep River, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON presented the memorial of Thomas Gannett Holyoke, of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against an appropriation being made for the construction of a building for the Department of Justice, Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a memorial of the Commercial Club, of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Washington Council, No. 1, Junior Order United American Mechancis, of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from Paris Gibson, of Great Falls, Mont., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to enlarge homesteads and for the leasing of public lands, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a petition of the Board of Commerce of Little Rock, Ark., and a petition of the Cotton Exchange, of Memphis, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate future deliveries of cotton, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PITTMAN presented a petition of the Railroad Commission of the State of Nevada, praying for a readjustment of the compensation paid railroads for transporting the mails, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of the Peninsular Paper Co., of Ypsilanti, Mich., and a petition of the Michigan Bag & Paper Co., of Jackson, Mich., praying for the imposition of a

duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Lega Cittadina di Mutuo Soccorso, No. 1, of Laurium, Mich., and a petition of the Italo-American Federation, of Upper Peninsula, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. KENYON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Woodbine, Iowa, praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Stars and Stripes Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Burlington, Iowa, praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of West Virginia, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented petitions of sundry citizens of Vermont, praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of the Retail Druggists' Association of Bridgeport, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to fix a standard price for patented and trade-marked articles, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Windsor Locks, Conn., praying for an appropriation for the improvement of the Connecticut River between Hartford and Holyoke, in that State, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New Haven, of the Consumers' League, and of the Motherhood Club, of Hartford, all in the State of Connnecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 1793) granting to the State of Kansas title to certain lands in said State for use as a game preserve, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 62) thereon.

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (S. 888) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to confer upon Marcus A. Jordan the life-saving medal of the first class, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 63) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) authorizing the Librarian of Congress to return to Williamsburg Lodge, No. 6, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Virginia, the original manuscript of the record of the proceedings of said lodge, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 64) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3761) granting to the State of Utah the Fort Duchesne Reservation for its use as a branch agricultural college; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3762) to amend section 2322 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to mineral locations; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3763) granting an increase of pension to Jane McD. Johnston (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 3764) to consolidate certain forest lands in the Florida National Forest; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 3765) granting an increase of pension to George Engleman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD (for Mr. CULBERSON):

A bill (S. 3766) to provide for the erection of a public building at Dallas, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3767) requiring all public-building bills to be submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury for investigation and report as to whether proposed buildings and sites are needed and the expenditure justified and as to the lowest cost at which buildings found necessary may be erected with economy and efficiency; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 3768) granting lands to Wade Pemberton and others, of Hot Springs Lodge, No. 62, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Hot Springs, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3769) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 3770) to amend the act to regulate commerce, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 3771) for the relief of Alfred Cluff, Orson Cluff, Henry E. Norton, William B. Ballard, Elijah Hancock, Susan R. Saline, Oscar Mann, Celia Thayne, William Cox, Theodore Farley, Adelaide Laxton, Clara L. Tenney, George M. Adams, Charlotte Jensen, and Sophia Huff; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3772) for the relief of the estate of Facundo Gonzales (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3773) to cancel the allotment of Davie Skootah on the Lummi Reservation, Wash., and reallot the lands included therein; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3774) to authorize the sale of lands allotted to Indians under the Moses Agreement of July 7, 1883; and

A bill (S. 3775) to establish the Mount Baker National Park, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3776) providing for the establishment of a radio station on Unga Island, Alaska; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 3777) for the relief of W. H. Presleigh (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3778) granting a pension to Preston S. Atchison (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3779) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Rutter;

A bill (S. 3780) granting an increase of pension to Canrisa R. H. Richey;

A bill (S. 3781) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Schreiber;

A bill (S. 3782) granting an increase of pension to Abbie Sloggy;

A bill (S. 3783) granting an increase of pension to Theodore D. Swain;

A bill (S. 3784) granting an increase of pension to George M. Titus;

A bill (S. 3785) granting an increase of pension to John M. Turner;

A bill (S. 3786) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Welliever;

A bill (S. 3787) granting an increase of pension to Hulda L. Winter;

A bill (S. 3788) granting a pension to Rudolph Kals;

A bill (S. 3789) granting a pension to Lucina C. Hatch;

A bill (S. 3790) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Harris;

A bill (S. 3791) granting a pension to James B. Gillick;

A bill (S. 3792) granting a pension to Charles H. Eyerman;

A bill (S. 3793) granting a pension to Willie J. Etheridge;

A bill (S. 3794) granting a pension to Fannie S. Douglass;

A bill (S. 3795) granting a pension to William S. Davidson;

A bill (S. 3796) granting a pension to Effie M. Crail;

A bill (S. 3797) granting a pension to Mabel F. Coen;

A bill (S. 3798) granting a pension to Catherine N. Burlingame;

A bill (S. 3799) granting a pension to Thomas Baxter;

A bill (S. 3800) granting a pension to William W. Batterton;

A bill (S. 3801) granting a pension to Charles A. Barthrop;

A bill (S. 3802) granting a pension to Edwin Ash;

A bill (S. 3803) granting a pension to Leander Alexander;

A bill (S. 3804) granting a pension to Lottie Short;

A bill (S. 3805) granting an increase of pension to Mahala Clemons;

A bill (S. 3806) granting an increase of pension to Susan J. Cantrell;

A bill (S. 3807) granting an increase of pension to George W. Boring;

A bill (S. 3808) granting an increase of pension to Caroline L. Ackley;

A bill (S. 3809) granting a pension to Matilda Weger;

A bill (S. 3810) granting an increase of pension to Pedro B. de G. Fernandez;

A bill (S. 3811) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Goodwin;
A bill (S. 3812) granting an increase of pension to Henry Harpham;
A bill (S. 3813) granting an increase of pension to Ida J. Morey;
A bill (S. 3814) granting an increase of pension to Eldridge Morse;
A bill (S. 3815) granting an increase of pension to William Mower;
A bill (S. 3816) granting an increase of pension to Anna L. Phillips;
A bill (S. 3817) granting an increase of pension to Emiles Pomeroy;
A bill (S. 3818) granting an increase of pension to Louis W. Pryor;
A bill (S. 3819) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Randall;
A bill (S. 3820) granting an increase of pension to Augustus A. Rice;
A bill (S. 3821) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Rice;
A bill (S. 3822) granting a pension to Ottiwell M. Roberts;
A bill (S. 3823) granting a pension to Albert F. Pray;
A bill (S. 3824) granting a pension to Elisha Painter;
A bill (S. 3825) granting a pension to Sarah E. Muzy;
A bill (S. 3826) granting a pension to Penelopie S. Miller;
A bill (S. 3827) granting a pension to Michael Maloney;
A bill (S. 3828) granting a pension to Fred T. Macomber;
A bill (S. 3829) granting a pension to Ella S. Kyes;
A bill (S. 3830) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McGooden;
A bill (S. 3831) granting an increase of pension to Mercy A. Martin;
A bill (S. 3832) granting an increase of pension to Lewis B. Hunt;
A bill (S. 3833) granting an increase of pension to Jens C. Jensen;
A bill (S. 3834) granting an increase of pension to Cassius M. Jones;
A bill (S. 3835) granting an increase of pension to John Little;
A bill (S. 3836) granting a pension to Delia E. Wall;
A bill (S. 3837) granting a pension to Isaac N. Troutman;
A bill (S. 3838) granting a pension to George A. Torchio;
A bill (S. 3839) granting a pension to Mary Standifer;
A bill (S. 3840) granting a pension to George W. Smith, alias George Smith;
A bill (S. 3841) granting a pension to Dollie E. A. Smith;
A bill (S. 3842) granting an increase of pension to Marion D. Egbert;
A bill (S. 3843) granting an increase of pension to William R. Donaldson;
A bill (S. 3844) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Dean; and
A bill (S. 3845) granting an increase of pension to Patrick J. Conway; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 3846) granting a pension to Mary E. Lindsay (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 3847) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Runkle (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 3848) granting an increase of pension to John Brown (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 3849) granting an increase of pension to William Painter (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 3850) granting an increase of pension to William P. McCartney;
A bill (S. 3851) granting an increase of pension to Archibald Haddan;
A bill (S. 3852) granting an increase of pension to John Stauffer;
A bill (S. 3853) granting a pension to Caroline Chambers;
A bill (S. 3854) granting an increase of pension to William Wright;
A bill (S. 3855) granting an increase of pension to David J. Braughler;
A bill (S. 3856) granting a pension to Mary M. Lose;
A bill (S. 3857) granting an increase of pension to Annie S. Aul; and
A bill (S. 3858) granting a pension to Amelia Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 3859) granting an increase of pension to Teodora Antonia Baca de Martinez; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROUSSARD:

A bill (S. 3860) for the relief of the Chettimanchi Band or Tribe of Indians of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.
A bill (S. 3861) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act for the withdrawal from bond tax free of domestic alcohol when rendered unfit for beverage or liquid medicinal uses when mixed with suitable denaturing materials,'" approved March 2, 1907; to the Committee on Finance.
A bill (S. 3862) for the relief of the Rapides Building & Loan Association, of Alexandria, La.;
A bill (S. 3863) for the relief of the Shreveport Mutual Building Association;
A bill (S. 3864) for the relief of the Sixth District Building & Loan Association, of New Orleans, La.;
A bill (S. 3865) for the relief of the Fidelity Homestead Association, of New Orleans, La.;
A bill (S. 3866) for the relief of the Union Homestead Association, of New Orleans, La.;
A bill (S. 3867) for the relief of the Iberia Building Association, of New Iberia, La.; and
A bill (S. 3868) for the relief of the Teutonia Loan & Building Co., of New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 3869) granting a pension to Marcelle M. Muller, Anthony N. Muller, jr., and Maud Muller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 3870) to validate the Indian allotment application of Anna Campbell Valentine; and
A bill (S. 3871) to validate the homestead application of Edith A. Purdy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 3872) for the relief of John Horgan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 3873) to authorize the counties of Minidoka and Cassia, State of Idaho, to construct a bridge across Snake River; to the Committee on Commerce.
A bill (S. 3874) granting an increase of pension to Peleg N. Carson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 3875) granting a pension to Ione I. Bell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 3876) for the relief of George H. Rarey; and
A bill (S. 3877) for the relief of William Fulton Hedges (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 3878) granting a pension to Michael Smyth (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 3879) granting an increase of pension to Milton M. Jones (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 3880) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Keffer (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 3881) granting an increase of pension to Mandana C. Thorp (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 3882) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Thompson (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 3883) granting a pension to Annie Bonville (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 3884) granting a pension to John Washburn (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 3885) granting an increase of pension to Fitch Lockwood;
A bill (S. 3886) granting an increase of pension to Lucy R. Hall;
A bill (S. 3887) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah W. Cross;
A bill (S. 3888) granting a pension to Elias Lyon;
A bill (S. 3889) granting an increase of pension to Lula S. Knight Bigelow; and
A bill (S. 3890) granting an increase of pension to Robert Whitehead; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of Tennessee:

A bill (S. 3891) granting a pension to G. W. Leathers;
A bill (S. 3892) granting an increase of pension to Harry Colpus; and
A bill (S. 3893) granting a pension to Robert M. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 3894) for the relief of Henry E. Williams (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

A bill (S. 3895) for the relief of the Portland Iron Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 3896) granting an increase of pension to Hettie Fletcher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 3897) to authorize the purchase of the manuscript of the Legislative History of the Army of the United States and to make appropriation therefor (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3898) granting an increase of pension to Elmer C. Stiles, alias Charles White; and

A bill (S. 3899) granting a pension to Josef Messany; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

A bill (S. 3900) to authorize the sale and disposal of an island in the Coosa River, in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3901) for the relief of Lieuts. E. E. Bennett, W. N. Porter, and W. W. Hicks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 3902) granting a pension to James T. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 3903) granting an increase of pension to Elie Jones Quinby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

A bill (S. 3904) conferring upon tribes or bands of Indians the right of nomination and election of their agents or superintendents, to encourage them to interest themselves in their own affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 3905) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Hanson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3906) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Harbinson; and

A bill (S. 3907) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Mayo; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 3908) granting a pension to Jennie Perry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 3909) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Dawson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (by request):

A bill (S. 3910) for the relief of Capt. Thomas R. Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 85) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the election of President and Vice President by direct vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment to S. 381, the so-called Philippine government bill, and ask that it may be printed and also printed in the RECORD. I will say, if permitted to do so, that I offer it as a substitute for all the amendments I have heretofore offered on this subject. I have revised it somewhat and amplified it slightly. I think it now presents the views of those who think something should be done in the matter at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator have any objection to having it read at this time?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Not the slightest. I shall be very glad to include in my request that it shall be read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The amendment was read and ordered to be printed, as follows:

SEC. —. The President is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippines, and he shall on behalf of the United States fully recognize the independence of the said Philippines as a separate and self-governing nation and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the government instituted by the people thereof. This transfer of possession, sovereignty, and governmental control shall be completed and become absolute not less than two years nor more than four years from the date of the approval of this act, under the terms and in the manner hereinafter prescribed: *Provided*, That if the President, at the expiration of the said period of four years, shall find that the condition of the internal or external affairs of said Philippines in respect to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government thereof is such as to warrant him in so doing, he is hereby further authorized, by proclamation duly made and published, to extend the said time to and including the date of the final adjournment of the session of Congress which shall convene next after the date of the expiration of the said period of four years, and thus afford the Congress an opportunity in its discretion to further consider the situation in the said Philippines; but any such extension of time by the President shall not otherwise suspend or nullify the operative force of this act, unless the Congress shall hereafter so direct. For the purpose of a complete and prompt compliance with this direction, the President is hereby invested with full power and authority to make such orders and regulations and to enter into such negotiations with the authorities of said Philippines or others as may be necessary to finally settle and adjust all property rights and other relations as between the United States and the said Philippines, and to cause to be acknowledged, respected, and safeguarded all of the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States resident or engaged in business in said Philippines or having property interests therein. In any such settlement or adjustment so made in respect to the rights and property of the United States as against the said Philippines the President shall reserve or acquire such lands and rights and privileges appurtenant thereto as may, in his judgment, be required by the United States for naval bases and coaling stations within the territory of said Philippines.

Immediately upon the passage of the act, the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located, in the form of a treaty or other character of binding agreement, whereby the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines, and also to mutually obligate themselves, equally and not one primarily nor to any greater extent than another, to maintain as against external force the sovereignty of said Philippines. If any of the nations so invited to join the United States in such undertaking shall decline to do so, then the President shall include as parties to such convention or agreement such nations as may be willing to join therein and to assume such obligations; and if none are willing to so unite therein, then the President is authorized to give such guaranty on behalf of the United States alone for the period of five years from and after the expiration of said period of four years, or any extension thereof, and pending the existence of such separate guaranty by the United States, the United States shall be entitled to retain and exercise such control and supervision in the said Philippines as may be necessary to enforce order therein and to avoid external complications.

STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS.

Mr. BORAH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1053) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

MUNITIONS OF WAR.

Mr. ROBINSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. ——) to provide a tax on munitions of war manufactured in the United States and to amend the act of Congress approved October 22, 1914, entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes," which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC PRINTING AND BINDING.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1107) to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to public printing and binding and distribution of Government publications, which was referred to the Committee on Printing and ordered to be printed.

THE JUDICIAL CODE.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1412) further to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1412) further to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $1,250 for rental of additional quarters in the District of Columbia for the Navy Department during the remainder of the fiscal year 1916, intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 9416), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $50,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the continuous spread of the white pine blister, rust, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 9416), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROBINSON submitted an amendment proposing to set aside from the several appropriations for protection, improvement, and management, etc., of the various national parks, including the Hot Springs Reservation, such sum or sums as

the Secretary of the Interior may deem necessary to be expended in the employment of competent persons in the District of Columbia and in the field, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 9416), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

THE FRIGATE "CONSTITUTION."

Mr. GALLINGER. I submit a resolution, for which I ask present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 76) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to communicate to the Senate all facts bearing on the present condition of the frigate *Constitution*, now lying in the Charles River, Boston, and also an estimate of the amount of money that will be required to put the frigate in a condition of good repair, with a view of retaining the vessel as a historic relic of the early days of the American Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire asks for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. STONE. Let it go over until to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERK.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 77), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an additional assistant clerk at $1,200 per annum, to be paid from "miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. O'GORMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 78), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interoceanic Canals be authorized to employ a stenographer temporarily and that the said stenographer be paid at the rate of $50 per month for each day of such employment, not exceeding four months, and that such services be paid for out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

SELF-GOVERNMENT IN THE TROPICS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a pamphlet entitled "Self-Government in the Tropics," by Samuel L. Parrish, and request that it be referred to the Committee on Printing, with a view to the printing of it as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so referred.

NATIONAL PROHIBITION (S. DOC. NO. 250).

Mr. CHILTON. I ask that there be printed as a document certain extracts from reports of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor in the Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, and Fifty-first Congresses, favorably recommending the passage of resolutions for the submission of the question of national constitutional prohibition to the several States of the Union, together with a letter from ex-Senator Henry W. Blair, of New Hampshire, to Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, United States Senator from Texas, relating thereto. I have had an estimate made and find that it will cost about $50.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CHILTON. I ask that 2,000 additional copies of the document be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 9416. An act making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LANDS IN NEVADA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

The bill (S. 2520) granting to the State of Nevada 7,000,000 acres of land in said State for the use and benefit of the public schools of Nevada and the State university of the State of Nevada was announced as first in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over, Mr. President.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I have asked that the bill go over this morning.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, the bill has been at the head of the calendar for a month. It is a simple measure. I submit that it is not fair for the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to constantly object to its consideration. The bill has been attacked through the newspapers of this town, and that attack is having its effect. Nearly every western Senator has been attacked on account of the bill, and bills similar to it. I do not think it fair to western Senators to permit this attack to go on as it has done, and not to be answered at this time. So I ask the Senator from Utah, for that reason, to allow the bill to be taken up at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have previously stated to the Senator from Nevada that the Senator from New Mexico desires to speak on the bill, and that Senator is now absent from the Chamber. I therefore ask that the bill go over until the Senator from New Mexico shall be present.

Mr. PITTMAN. Do I understand the Senator from New Mexico to whom the Senator from Utah refers to be Senator FALL?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. PITTMAN. And that that Senator is now sick?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know whether or not the Senator is sick, but he is not now in the Chamber.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, after the bill has been on the calendar for a month, and we have tried to get it considered and disposed of, after it has been a dozen times passed over at the request of the Senator from Utah, it seems to me that the Senator from New Mexico has had sufficient opportunity to be present and to discuss the bill if he desires to do so.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I told the Senator from Nevada that I should object to the consideration of the bill, and I have done so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Being objected to, the bill goes over.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 1053) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S.1062) relating to the duties of registers of United States land offices and the publication in newspapers of official land-office notices was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 706) to amend section 269 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 609) to aid in the erection of a monument to Pocahontas at Jamestown, Va., was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 611) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Matthew Fontaine Maury, of Virginia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States conferring upon women the right of suffrage was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Being objected to, the joint resolution goes over.

The bill (S. 707) for the relief of Beverly E. Whitehead was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 3331) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) to provide for holding the San Antonio Bicentennial Exposition in 1918 was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution goes over.

The bill (S. 2406) to amend section 162 of the act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The bill (S. 3518) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill just announced on the calendar, which is a pension bill, notwithstanding the objection of the Senator from Nevada.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire to proceed to the consideration of the bill notwithstanding the objection.

Mr. PITTMAN. I move as a substitute for that motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration——

Mr. GALLINGER. The motion is not in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question first comes on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. PITTMAN. I raise a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PITTMAN. My point of order is that a motion of this kind is not in order until the hour of 1 o'clock has arrived, and before the calendar has been thoroughly called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is overruled. It is a rule of the Senate that at the conclusion of morning business, or if morning business has not been concluded by the hour of 1 o'clock, a motion may be made to take up any bill on the calendar; and, once having been made, a motion to substitute some other bill is not in order. The motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill must first be passed on. The question now, therefore, is——

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in order that I may understand what the ruling of the Chair is, I desire to ask, does the Chair rule that before 1 o'clock, if morning business is closed, a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill on the calendar can be made?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does so rule.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is no doubt about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was forced to that conclusion by the Senator from Utah at the last session of Congress on a former ruling of the Chair.

Mr. GALLINGER. Question!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, whether the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3518. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask that the title of the bill be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 3518) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLAPP (when his named was called). In the absence of my general pair, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when the name of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota was called). I announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON] on account of illness.

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). In the absence of my general pair, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], I withhold my vote.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is absent, but is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I desire this announcement to stand for all votes to-day.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] and vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). In the absence of my general pair, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHILTON. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness, as is also the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. They are both paired.

Mr. COLT. In the absence of my general pair, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY], I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the affirmative). I have already voted, but I have ascertained that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], with whom I have a general pair, is absent. I therefore transfer my pair to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. OLIVER. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. PENROSE] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. If he were present and at liberty to vote, my colleague would vote "yea." I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. MCCUMBER] is necessarily absent and that he is paired with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. If my colleague were present and at liberty to vote, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CATRON (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY], who is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH].

I also desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is paired with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE].

Mr. BURLEIGH. I am paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I will therefore take the liberty of voting. I vote "yea."

Mr. REED. I am paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. STONE. I announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT].

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 12, as follows:

YEAS—56.

Ashurst	Gallinger	Lippitt	Shafroth
Borah	Gronna	Lodge	Shields
Brandegee	Harding	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Burleigh	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Smoot
Catron	Hollis	Nelson	Sterling
Chamberlain	Hughes	Norris	Stone
Chilton	James	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	Johnson, Me.	Oliver	Thompson
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Page	Townsend
Cummins	Kenyon	Phelan	Underwood
Curtis	Kern	Pittman	Wadsworth
Dillingham	La Follette	Poindexter	Walsh
du Pont	Lane	Pomerene	Weeks
Fall	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Works

NAYS—12.

Bankhead	Hardwick	Robinson	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Husting	Sheppard	Thomas
Fletcher	Myers	Smith, Ga.	Vardaman

NOT VOTING—28.

Beckham	Gore	Overman	Simmons
Brady	Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Smith, Md.
Broussard	Lee, Md.	Penrose	Smith, Mich.
Clapp	Lewis	Ransdell	Swanson
Colt	McCumber	Saulsbury	Tillman
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Sherman	Warren
Goff	Newlands	Shively	Williams

So Mr. GALLINGER's motion was agreed to; and the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3518) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent realtives of such soldiers and sailors. It proposes to place upon the pension roll, at the rate per month therein specified, the following-named persons:

George Jaggers, late of Company F, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Barnet Hauver, late of Company B, Seventy-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

David Phillips, alias Charles Gray, late of U. S. S. *Key West*, *Great Western*, and *Naumkeag*, United States Navy, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John R. Thompson, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Frederick Schnetzer, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James H. Goldsborough, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Emma F. Webster, widow of George A. Webster, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment, and Company E, Sixth Regiment, New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving..

John A. Morris, late captain and assistant quartermaster, United States Volunteers, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Spencer J. Dyer, late of Company B, Third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and second lieutenant Company K, Fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jane E. Bloss, widow of George E. Bloss, late of Company H, Fiftieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving and $2 per month additional on account of the minor child of George E. Bloss until she reaches the age of 16 years.

Cyrus Spooner, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Delias W. Compton, late of Company F, Thirty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Catherine Scheibel, widow of William Scheibel, late of Company M, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Charlotte J. Smith, widow of Frederick L. Smith, late of Company F, Twenty-third Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Lydia A. Smith, widow of Augustus E. Smith, late of Company E, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Daniel L. Tallcott, late of Company G, Twenty-fifth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Aurelia M. Todd, widow of Samuel D. Todd, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Emma M. Bowman, widow of Edward Bowman, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Susie S. Flanders, widow of George J. Flanders, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Josiah P. Hackett, late of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Andrew Jewell, late of Company A, Eighteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William J. Young, late of Company K, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rebecca Hutton, widow of Michael Hutton, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company D, Two hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Peter M. Miller, late of Company E, Forty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas A. Carpenter, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary Bresnahan, widow of John Bresnahan, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Josiah A. Dadmun, late musician, Third Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Irving W. Coombs, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel Hodgkins, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Theophile A. Dauphin, late of Company K, Eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John W. Wooley, alias John Wilson, late of Company F, Third Battalion, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William H. Steel, late of Company D, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Frederick Ickley, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Caroline E. Beck, widow of George A. Beck, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Nicholas A. Bovee, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Matilda J. Hampton, widow of John Hampton, late of Company H, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Harvey E. Derrin, late unassigned, Fourteenth Regiment, and Company L, Sixth Regiment, New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alberton H. Town, late of Company G, Ninety-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ruby L. Knapp, helpless and dependent child of William B. Knapp, late of Company D, Twenty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and hospital steward, United States Army, $12 per month.

Terance McGrath, late of U. S. S. *Ohio*, *Lockwood*, and *Hetzel*, United States Navy, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Bridget Prickett, widow of Milton Prickett, late of Company A, First Regiment Oregon Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month.

William Shaw, late of Company K, Thirtieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Horace H. Lockwood, late of Company D, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and First Independent Company, Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, $21 per month.

George W. Sargent, late of Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment, and Company F, Twelfth Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary B. Yerington, former widow of Almon Yerington, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month.

Matilda Davis, widow of William H. Davis, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Henry Wagoner, late of Company D, Seventy-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rufus S. Maxwell, late of Company F, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Herbert M. Starbird, late of Company M, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Cavalry, and Company D, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Abbie F. Dyer, widow of Ambrose S. Dyer, late first lieutenant Company H, Fifth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Henry J. McFadden, late second lieutenant Company D, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Harris B. Hubbell, late of Company D, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Orin W. Goodale, late of Company A, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Eliza M. Watkins, widow of Joseph H. Watkins, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Essie Watkins, helpless and dependent child of said Joseph H. Watkins, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Eliza M. Watkins the name of the said Essie Watkins shall be placed on the pension roll at $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Eliza M. Watkins.

William Howard, late of Company B, One hundred and second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Isaac H. Bodenhamer, late of Company A, Seventy-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Aliza A. Gordon, widow of Eli P. Gordon, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month.

Americus V. Larrance, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Harriet A. Turnbull, widow of John M. Turnbull, late first lieutenant Company C, Thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of Samuel R. Edwards, late of Company D, One hundred and thirty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month.

Emma D. Phelps, widow of George W. Phelps, late of Company H, Sixtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Franklin H. Gillett, late of Company A, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Halsey, late of Company D, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lavina Hunter, widow of William F. Hunter, late of Company A, Ninety-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Abraham Jones, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Kenyon, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ebenezer C. Lafollett, late of Company F, One hundred and fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Catharine Mayer, widow of Nikolas Mayer, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Clara Mayer, helpless and dependent child of said Nikolas Mayer, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Catharine Mayer the name of the said Clara Mayer shall be placed on the pension roll at $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Catharine Mayer.

George Ringle, late of Company K, Twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alfred P. Williams, late of Company G, Fifty-ninth Regiment, and Company F, Sixty-sixth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George E. Fleming, late of Company D, Sixty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Marion Clemans, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Susan M. Lysinger, widow of Joseph H. Lysinger, late of United States Navy, $12 per month.

George W. Aldrich, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

August Baker, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel Dunham, late of Company G, Thirty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William C. Fickas, late of Company L, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hacker Davis, late of Company I, Thirty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Amelia Hubbard, widow of Lucius F. Hubbard, late colonel Fifth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and brevet brigadier general United States Volunteers, $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

James Wilson, late of Company L, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William R. Morrell, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Richard H. McWhorter, late first lieutenant Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry; $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Hill, late of the U. S. ram *Queen of the West*, United States Navy, $21.50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George Bond, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Adams, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Maria E. Bowers, widow of Ira M. Bowers, late second lieutenant Company H, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Charles P. De Forest, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry H. Geer, late of Company B, Eighteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Margaret Semple, widow of James W. Semple, late of Company A, Eighteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Henry H. Klock, late first lieutenant and adjutant Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

May Bell Anderson, widow of Thomas J. Anderson, late first lieutenant and aide-de-camp Gen. Lane's staff, United States Volunteers, and major and assistant adjutant general, United States Volunteers, $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Eugene B. Fisher, late of Company D, Twenty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James S. Ames, late of Company G, Eighty-seventh Regiment, and Company G, Forty-second Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry J. Mullins, late of Company A, Twenty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hannah R. Linton, widow of James D. Linton, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of Benjamin Linton, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Sarah E. Hanes, widow of John Hanes, late of Company D, Twenty-fifth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Joseph H. Hanes, helpless and dependent child of said John Hanes, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sarah E. Hanes the name of the said Joseph H. Hanes shall be be placed on the pension roll at $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Sarah E. Hanes.

Nancy C. Fouts, widow of William P. Fouts, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of Norman J. Painter, late of Company B, First Regiment Michigan Engineers and Mechanics, $12 per month.

Mary Norton, helpless and dependent child of Patrick Norton, late of Company A, Forty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Napoleon Tulip, late of Company I, Seventeenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ann L. Elliott, former widow of Jesse Elliott, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Martha C. Igo, widow of Daniel Igo, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and first lieutenant Company I, Two hundred and eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Jesse Thompson, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Bella Curry, widow of Amos P. Curry, late captain Company B, Tenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Susan Robinson, widow of Squire Robinson, late of Company G, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and

former widow of Robert G. Bloomfield, late of Company K, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Caroline J. Cromwell, widow of Charles W. Cromwell, late first lieutenant Company H, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Mounted Rangers, $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Gideon Mason, late of Company C, Ninety-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and One hundred and twenty-sixth Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Gabriel Anderson, alias Gabriel Oleson, late of Company D, Thirty-eighth Regiment, and Company H, Thirty-fourth Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph Lappier, late of Company D, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel M. Terry, late of Troops D and K, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Louisa Gaither, widow of George Gaither, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John Wiebel, late of Company F, Third Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Elander R. Grant, late of Company D, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph Wentworth, late of U. S. S. *Ohio*, *Albatross*, and *Princeton*, United States Navy, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edward A. Savage, late of Company E, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William O. Freeman, late of U. S. S. *Sabine*, *Ohio*, and *Casco*, United States Navy, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Zadoc McFarland, alias Samuel G. West, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Robert R. Ferris, late of Company G, One hundred and seventy-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah E. Davis, widow of Benjamin F. Davis, late of Companies I and A, Fourteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

John Kemmer, late of Company K, Forty-eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary C. Estes, widow of Albert H. Estes, late captain Company E, Tenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

George Osten, late leader of band, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph L. Buckley, late of Company E, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Christopher C. Blake, late of Company G, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Sharpshooters, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Wilkins, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

True W. Lovering, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Eli W. Adams, late of Company A, Ninety-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lydia F. Goodaker, widow of Samuel C. Goodaker, late of Company M, Second Regiment California Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month.

Mary I. Fawcett, widow of Thomas Fawcett, late of the United States Navy, $12 per month.

Thomas B. Carey, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment, and Company F, Seventieth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jacob Conrad, late of Company E, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rose A. Mooney, now Reed, former widow of Julius C. Mooney, late of Company K, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Sallie A. Hawkes, widow of Erastus L. Hawkes, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and major, Tenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. Mr. President, on page 14 I move to strike out lines 11, 12, 13, and 14, the pensioner having died.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 14 it is proposed to strike out lines 11, 12, 13, and 14, in the following words:

The name of Marion Clemans, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the joint resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

FEDERAL JUDGES.

The resolution (S. Res. 66) directing the Judiciary Committee of the Senate to make inquiry and report the number of Federal judges now holding office who are unable to discharge substantially the duties of a judge, etc., was next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, has Senate joint resolution 60 been called?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; and it was passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been passed over.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Would it be in order for me to move to take up the joint resolution at this time?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, what action was taken on the resolution just read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was about to put the question when interrupted by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I was on the floor, but did not observe that the joint resolution had been passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. So soon as this resolution is disposed of it will be in order for any Senator to make a motion to take up any bill on the calendar. The question is on agreeing to Senate resolution 66.

The resolution was agreed to.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 33, being Senate joint resolution 60.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me? I wish to say that I hope he will not make that motion this morning. I desire to look at the resolution, and I have not the time, of course, to do so now.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I called up the joint resolution the other day, and was told that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] wished to offer an amendment; and I consented to have the matter go over until he could have an opportunity to do so. It is important that the resolution should be considered. I can not tell at what stage other business may intervene to prevent its consideration, and I beg the Senator not to insist upon a further postponement. I think I have shown sufficient consideration for those who wished to address themselves to the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada withdraw his motion.

Mr. NEWLANDS. No; I must press my motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question, then, is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada. [Putting the question.] By the sound the ayes seem to have it.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask for a division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All in favor of proceeding to the consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 60 will rise. [A

pause.] All opposed will rise. [A pause.] The ayes have it, and the Chair lays the joint resolution before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Gronna	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Harding	Martine, N. J.	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Hitchcock	Myers	Smoot
Brandegee	Hollis	Nelson	Sterling
Broussard	Hughes	Newlands	Stone
Bryan	Husting	Norris	Sutherland
Catron	James	O'Gorman	Swanson
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	Oliver	Thomas
Chilton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Thompson
Clapp	Jones	Phelan	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Pittman	Townsend
Colt	Kern	Poindexter	Underwood
Cummins	La Follette	Reed	Vardaman
Curtis	Lane	Robinson	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lea, Tenn.	Shafroth	Weeks
du Pont	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Williams
Fletcher	Lippitt	Sherman	Works
Gallinger	Lodge	Shields	

Mr. CHILTON. My colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. BORAH. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. BRADY] on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The joint resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas a number of bills are now pending in Congress, having for their object the further regulation of carriers engaged in interstate commerce; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission has, from time to time, made recommendations to Congress in relation to the general subject of regulation, some of which are now under consideration but have not yet been acted on; and

Whereas a system of governmental regulation of interstate commerce has now been in effect for 28 years, during which period the extent and powers of regulation have been, from time to time, varied and enlarged, and there has thus been accumulated valuable experience for the guidance of Congress in the premises; and

Whereas the growth of interstate commerce and the enlargement of the powers and duties of regulation have so increased the exactions on the Interstate Commerce Commission as to necessitate, in the public interest, the consideration of the best method of dealing with the situation and of expediting the public business; and

Whereas adequate and well-managed transportation facilities constitute a prime necessity of business prosperity and are a common interest of all the people, and in order to afford these facilities and to enlarge them as the needs of commerce increase the credit of the carriers and proper regulation of their operations are matters of fundamental public concern; and

Whereas as a basis for any further legislation that may be undertaken by Congress in this regard the whole subject of governmental regulation should be deliberately and thoroughly studied in the light of the experience and suggestions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, of the carriers, of the shippers, and of the general public, with a view to adequately safeguarding the interests of the public, securing the establishment and maintenance of transportation facilities adequate to the needs of a growing and expanding commerce, and assuring to private owners and the investing public just consideration and protection of their legitimate rights of property: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate and the Committee of the House of Representatives on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, through a joint subcommittee to consist of five Senators and five Representatives, who shall be selected by said committees, respectively, be, and they hereby are, appointed to investigate and report upon the subject of the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce, with authority to sit during the recess of Congress and with power to summon witnesses, to appoint necessary experts, clerks, and stenographers, and to do whatever is necessary for a full and comprehensive examination and study of the subject and report to Congress on or before the third Monday in December next; that a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this resolution and to pay the necessary expenses of the subcommittee and its members is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Said appropriation shall be immediately available and shall be paid out on the audit and order of the chairman or acting chairman of said subcommittee, which audit and order shall be conclusive and binding upon all departments as to the correctness of the accounts of such subcommittee.

The joint resolution had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with an amendment as follows:

On page 3, lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "and report upon the subject of the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce" and insert "the subject of the Government control and regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, the efficiency of the existing system in protecting the rights of shippers and carriers and in promoting the public interest, the incorporation or control of the incorporation of carriers, and all proposed changes in the organization of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the act to regulate commerce."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement regarding this joint resolution.

The purpose of the resolution is to make an exhaustive inquiry regarding interstate and foreign transportation, similar to the inquiry made by the National Monetary Commission regarding finance and banking. The resolution, however, does not provide for a commission, but for a subcommittee of the Interstate Commerce Committees of the House and the Senate—5 Members from each; 10 in all.

Numerous bills have been introduced in both Houses looking to the regulation of railway securities, the increase in the membership and the division into branches or departments of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the national incorporation of great interstate railway systems, the relations between rail and water carriers, both river and ocean. The proposals were so numerous and varied, and the difference of opinion regarding them so great, that it was thought the coordinating of the committees of the Senate and House having jurisdiction of interstate transportation would be instrumental in focusing the attention of Congress upon definite measures which would be framed after full hearing and discussion. Such measures would then go to the committees themselves for consideration and report to the respective bodies. The President had favored this view and had recommended action upon these lines. The proposed resolution provides for a subcommittee to be appointed from the committees of the Senate and House having jurisdiction of the subject.

The resolution as originally introduced had provided in general terms for the investigation of the general subject of the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce. The committee by its amendment had changed this phraseology so as to authorize the committee to—

investigate the subject of Government control and regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, the efficiency of the existing system in protecting the rights of shippers and carriers, and in promoting the public interest; the incorporation or control of the incorporation of carriers and all proposed changes in the organization of the Interstate Commerce Commission and act to regulate commerce.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] by his proposed amendment seeks to amend this by adding:

The subject of Government ownership of public utilities, such as telegraph, telephone, express companies, and railroads engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, and report as to the wisdom or feasibility of Government ownership of such utilities, and the comparative worth or efficiency of Government regulation and control as compared with Government ownership and regulation.

I contend, Mr. President, that it would be much better to confine the proposed investigation to the question of Government regulation. That regulation has been thus far, in my judgment, highly successful, and it can be made more efficient through proper legislation. Unless, of course, regulation involves not only reasonable rates to the shippers but fair returns to the carriers, it will fail of its purpose, for a fair return to the carriers is essential in order to secure the investment of money in needed extensions and improvements, and unless the regulation results in fair rates to the shippers, the whole public purpose of the regulation fails. Logically we should complete and perfect public regulation before the question of public ownership is taken up. To investigate both questions at this time, when there are no fair methods of judgment or comparison, would produce confusion instead of certainty.

Of late years, until the foreign war stimulated the business of the country, the transportation interests had suffered, as have the other business interests of the country. Prior to the European war there was a gradual let down in business, industry, and production, which was necessarily reflected in the reduction of transportation. There has been no period in the history of transportation for the last 20 years in which the problem, so far as the finances of the railroads were concerned, was so serious. The railroads, having lost the political control which they once exercised, and being forced into the forum of public opinion, thought it wise to present their case to the public through addresses, pamphlets, and newspaper and magazine publications. The situation was one of diminishing traffic and increasing wages and taxes. They perhaps overstated their case, and the result was that whilst perhaps their appeals in a measure affected the public judgment and moderated governmental action regarding their activities, the effect was to alarm their own

stockholders and investors generally in railway securities and make it difficult for them to obtain the money needed for extensions and improvements. There had been no period in this generation, outside of the panic year of 1907, when it was so difficult for them to secure money. The negotiation of long-time bonds was impossible. The negotiation of short-time notes at high rates of interest was necessary, and the maturing of those notes from time to time increased their embarrassment.

The recent revival of industry has, of course, affected them favorably, and they are now approaching a time when it will be easier to make their negotiations; but all such negotiations would be hampered by a consideration and discussion of important questions relating to their regulation and control at a time when a presidential campaign is approaching and when the general inclination of both parties is to take a political rather than an economic view of such questions.

Besides this there are so many questions now pending before Congress relating to the civil war in Mexico and the international war abroad—questions of preparedness and questions of revenue—that it would be difficult to get a full consideration of the questions relating to transportation either by committees or by Congress. It appears wise, therefore, whilst providing for an intermediate inquiry, to postpone definite action until the period of calm shall come after the presidential election.

The language of the resolution is sufficiently broad to cover every possible inquiry regarding transportation without accentuating such inquiry as that which relates to Government ownership, an inquiry which might have the effect of producing uncertainty in arrangements that are now pending for the immediate financing of many railroads. I feel sure that logically full consideration of Government ownership should only come after the question of public regulation has been exhausted and its incompetency and inefficiency demonstrated. So far as I am concerned I feel greater confidence in the success of public regulation than ever. We have under it secured the most perfect railway system in the country with more reasonable rates of freight and fare than prevail anywhere in the world, and whilst there are still imperfections to be remedied it is evident that governmental ownership elsewhere had not evolved a system at all comparable with ours.

I refer to these considerations for the purpose of stating that, in my judgment, it is of the highest importance, both to the public, the shippers, and to the carriers themselves, that we should arrive at some rational solution of all the pending proposals without public excitement upon the subject. I think it would be a mistake to take up all the questions now by the respective committees of the Senate and House when both Congress and the country are intent more upon political than economic action and when the questions relating to existing international and civil war are so engrossing. It seems to me that the regulation of carriers is now reaching its crucial state. The carriers have found it difficult during this period to meet the demands of the country for expansion and enlargement, and that is a condition which is unfavorable to the shippers and to the business of the country.

I believe that public regulation is a success. I believe that it can be improved so as to make it more successful not only in the interest of the shippers themselves but in the interest of the carriers and with reference to the expansion and development of the railroad system to meet the requirements of the country. If the public regulation of railroads does not succeed, if it breaks down in any way, Government ownership must follow; but it seems to me that Government ownership can not logically be considered until the failure of public regulation is established.

Therefore, whilst the language of this resolution as reported by the committee would be broad enough if the committee saw fit to consider any well-considered scheme of Government ownership and report upon it, I would regard it as ill-advised to accept the amendment of the Senator from Idaho regarding the Government ownership of all public utilities. I believe that it would accentuate that form of governmental control. I do not believe that the committee will have time to enter upon that subject as it ought and make its proper recommendations with reference to the improvement of the regulation of the railroads of the country. Such an inquiry will be a very extensive one when made, involving an inquiry at very great expense, not only into local conditions but into conditions throughout the world, a careful examination of all the prevailing systems of Government ownership, and a comparison with our own.

I am, therefore, opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho, not so much because I am disinclined at some time to enter upon such an inquiry, but simply because I think this is not the time logically for it, and I would not wish to emphasize in the public mind the idea that the Congress of the United States regards public regulation as a failure and is now prepared to enter upon the consideration of Government ownership.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Chair understand that in the absence of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] the Senator from Nevada is offering the amendment?

Mr. NEWLANDS. No; the Senator from Idaho has been here. I supposed he was here. He was here when I commenced my remarks.

Mr. BRYAN. May I inquire of the Senator from Nevada if the language printed in italics is what he refers to when speaking of the Borah amendment.

Mr. NEWLANDS. No; the Borah amendment is a separate printed amendment. The amendment in italics is the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho has offered no amendment. The Chair heard the Senator from Nevada read it, and was in doubt as to whether the Senator from Nevada intended to offer it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state that I understood the Senator from Idaho had given notice that he would offer it, and I thought it proper in my preliminary remarks to call attention to it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada why it was that the proposed law carrying out the platform pledge of his party, as I understood it was for that purpose, providing for the regulation of stocks and bonds of interstate railroads, was allowed to die after it had passed the House and then been reported by the Senate committee and placed on the calendar of the Senate? Why is it that now we should want to make an investigation as to whether we ought to pass anything of that kind when I supposed it had been determined at least by the Senator's own party that such a law was necessary?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state to the Senator that a bill was passed in the House of Representatives providing for the control by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the securities issued by interstate carriers. That bill came to the Senate and was reported to the Senate with amendments. The understanding of the committee when that report was made was that the bill provided for the absolute control by the Interstate Commerce Commission, a national authority, of the securities of railway carriers, and it was assumed, though it was not expressed in the bill in that connection, that under the decision of the Supreme Court such a control exercised under national authority would practically oust the jurisdiction of the State commissions regarding the securities of carriers engaged in interstate commerce but organized under the laws of the respective States. After that report was made Mr. Brandeis and Mr. Rublee appeared before the Interstate Commerce Commission and urged that it would be exceedingly unwise to provide for the absolute control of these securities; that in some way the Nation might be committed to existing issues which might have been unlawfully or wrongfully made and would be estopped from attacking them hereafter; and they insisted upon it that the supervision of the national commission should be confined simply to requiring statements from these carriers to the Interstate Commerce Commission and their full publicity, thus relying upon publicity as a control and a corrective rather than upon the absolute control of the commission. The views of Mr. Brandeis were sustained by some of the members of the committee, whose attention, I presume, had for the first time been called to the importance of the subject, and it was apparent that unless the matter were reconsidered by the committee there would be a long and protracted debate on the floor of the Senate over that question.

We were then toward the close of a long session, during which the most important questions relating to banking and trade had been considered. Congress was wearied and it was thought inadvisable to press the bill at that Congress. That Congress was followed by the last session, a short session, and then as the result of mutual consultation, particularly upon this side of the House, with reference to a legislative program which could be put through in so short a session, it was not deemed wise to bring up that measure.

We are now in a long session, but we are approaching a political campaign, and, as the Senator knows, politics have much more consideration in such a Congress, and always have had, than economics. It is therefore deemed wise to have both committees, through a subcommittee, act upon all these various measures that have been presented with a view to sifting them

thoroughly, holding public hearings and making a report as soon as practicable, thus presenting to their respective committees their concrete judgment as to the measures to be enacted.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator another question before he sits down. Does the Senator believe that the Senate and Congress and the President and the entire country ought to suspend operations after it was, I think, conceded, at least by the Senator's party and a great many others, including myself, that it ought to be passed, after it had passed the House and been reported favorably by his committee to the Senate, because two men, Mr. Brandeis and Mr. Rublee, appeared before the committee and requested suspension of action, that the entire country ought to halt and wait? If it be true that it was only a question of waiting, why is it that at the beginning of this Congress the Senator and his committee having had all the information before it did not propose the bill that had so nearly been passed before? Why is it necessary to investigate further?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. If the Senator from Nevada will allow me, I desire to say that while I am sure the chairman of the committee wishes to be absolutely accurate, as a member of the committee and one who has heard the statement that he has just made, I am bound to dissent from some of its details. I can not agree that the Committee on Interstate Commerce suspended or abandoned the bill which the Senator from Nebraska refers to because it did not meet the views of Mr. Brandeis and Mr. Rublee. Whatever effect their views may have had on members of the committee, I am sure the Senator from Nevada does not mean to say that the committee itself accepted the opinions of these gentlemen, eminent as they are, and through their advice or influence reached the conclusion that no further efforts would be made to pass the bill. There were some of us who were very anxious that the bill should be pressed at all times, not only during the latter part of the long session but during the short session as well.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I do not think the words which I used could convey the impression at all that we suspended operations simply because Mr. Brandeis and Mr. Rublee appeared before our committee. There were several members of the committee who had given most thorough and conscientious consideration to all the railway problems that have involved us for years who seemed inclined to sympathize with that view. It was perfectly apparent that a long debate and contention would take place over the bill and that it would be impossible to conclude it at the long session of Congress.

I will further state that the business of the committee is not suspended and will not be suspended by the adoption of this joint resolution. It is entirely within the province of the Interstate Commerce Committee to take up any of the measures that are now pending before it.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator from Nevada permit me to ask him another question there?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. If the passage of this joint resolution will not suspend the operations of the committee, I should like to ask the Senator if, notwithstanding the passage of the joint resolution, the committee of which the Senator has the honor to be the chairman expects soon to report to Congress the bill, or a similar bill, providing for the limitation of the issue of stocks and bonds by interstate carriers?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I can not state what the committee expects to do. I am, however, willing at any time to bring before that committee any measure that is presented in the Congress of the United States by any Senator, and to bring it up on the request of a Senator for the consideration of the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator is chairman of the committee; he has the same authority and influence with the committee that chairmen generally have; and he is perhaps often authorized to speak by those in control of his party on matters that are the subject of party consideration; and so I should like to ask him whether he intends to press such a measure. Is it the intention of the Senator, so far as he can control his committee, to bring out a bill here that will regulate the issuance of stocks and bonds by interstate carriers, regardless of the joint resolution which is now pending?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I can not accept any language which indicates that I have any control over the committee. That committee is composed of gentlemen of intelligence and independence, and the committee acts according to its own judgment, not according to mine. If, however, the Senator asks me as to my personal views, I shall be very candid with him and will give them.

I believe that as to all the measures which relate to securities, which relate to the reorganization of the commission, and to other important amendments of the interstate-commerce act, it would be wise to turn over their consideration to a subcommittee proposed to be appointed by this joint resolution, if it passes, and to defer action upon them until we get their report. I believe that in that way we shall get a more perfect scheme of legislation than we shall get by two committees of Congress acting in a detached way upon these very important questions at a time when the country is intent upon political rather than economic questions, and when most important questions relating to finance, revenue, and pending wars are absorbing our attention.

Mr. TOWNSEND and Mr. STONE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, with the nominal purpose of the pending resolution I am in accord. Any real information intended to make the Interstate Commerce Commission more useful, to rid it of unnecessary burdens, to strengthen it in its ability to carry out the purposes for which it was created should be obtained; and while I have little faith in investigations by men with fixed and preconceived ideas on the subjects to be investigated, still I can imagine that the commission or committee proposed, if constituted of men who will recognize and report facts, whether pleasant or otherwise, and who will devote the study and work contemplated by this resolution, can be of service to the Congress in its future considerations of the interstate-commerce law. I am going to support the resolution on that theory. It is proper, however, that the Senate should know the possibilities under the measure and the immediate cause of its appearance here.

I am informed by credible authority that this resolution has the indorsement of the President. He is reported as saying that the interstate-commerce law is breaking down and that the railroads should be untrammeled. He also desires, in the interest of nonpartisan legislation, that the proposed committee shall not report until after election. I think he is not likely to be disappointed in the last particular, for the work to be performed by the committee would more likely require two years to complete it than that it could be completed in eight months.

If the President also desired that no interstate-commerce legislation be enacted until after election, this resolution would furnish an excellent excuse to his followers in Congress to postpone such legislation. Of course, whether action on new matters is had or not will rest with Congress, but, judging the future by the past, I have no doubt of the potency of the President's wish in this regard.

I appreciate the President's desire for nonpartisan legislation. It is novel to this administration. Perhaps he has in mind his preparedness program, which has no hope except by the aid of Republicans. I have known that in Democratic as well as in Republican administrations not all of wisdom or patriotism rests with majorities.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to preface my question with the statement that I fully agree with the Senator from Michigan in his expression as to the desirability of having this work done in a nonpartisan way. I myself believe that all legislation ought to be nonpartisan, and that is what suggested the question. The regulation of stocks and bonds was a plank in the platform of the Democratic Party. I myself approve it and believe in it; but when that party undertook to carry out that part of the platform, all at once, for some unseen cause, the program seemed to have been changed and stopped. Now, I want to ask the Senator if this is not politics, and nothing but politics—if it is not merely to lay a foundation so as to give an excuse when going before the country in the coming campaign for not having complied with the agreement they made with the people in their platform adopted at Baltimore in regard to the issuance of stocks and bonds?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I had hoped to express myself on that subject when I reached the point, although I confess that I had not paid much attention to the Baltimore platform, as I did not suppose that it had any binding force upon Democrats at this time. If it contains any unbroken plank, I do not know which it is.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not believe in the coming national campaign as to whatever

part of the Baltimore platform has not been complied with—which will probably be a large share of it—the Democrats will have various excuses as to why it was not complied with, and is not this joint resolution the foundation of an excuse for not having done one of the things promised in the Baltimore platform?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I think that is entirely probable. But the expressed excuse for this resolution is the statement that the interstate-commerce law is breaking down and that there is need for more favorable treatment of the railroads. Now, I agree that the Interstate Commerce Commission is not as strong with the people as it was 18 months ago, but I probably can not agree with the President as to the cause of its lessened strength, and certainly if the railroads are unjustly shackled I want to know it and to assist in breaking those shackles, for an injury to the railroads is an injury to the people.

It is my belief that the Interstate Commerce Commission is not as popular with the people as it was prior to its last decision in the 5 per cent rate-increase case, and when the people lose confidence in the commission its usefulness becomes impaired. I have never complained at increases of rates allowed by the commission when its decisions were based upon the law governing rates, viz, "they shall be just and reasonable," and this has been construed by the courts to mean sufficient to yield a reasonable return to the carrier upon the property actually employed for the public use. The railroads should have a right to such returns, but the makers of that law never expected that it would be construed to guarantee profit under any management however faulty, nor to pay dividends on stock however attenuated with water. In other words, the commission was not created to establish a policy for the control of carriers' finances. The first decision of the commission denying the 5 per cent raise was right under the law and the submitted evidence. The railroads had not attempted to prove the justness and reasonableness of the rates in the proposed schedules. They simply said "we need the money." The second decision, six months later than the first, reversed the former on exactly the same state of facts and without any additional testimony except that the European war had broken out. What a blanket for covering mistakes that war has furnished this administration! Why the war created revenue for the carriers. It did not reduce their net incomes.

Now, I have great faith in the character and purposes of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It has always been composed of good and capable men. It is one of the most useful branches of the public service. The final decision in the 5 per cent rate increase case shows that a majority of that commission, however, are very human.

They yielded, I believe, to Executive suggestion. I do not know that the President talked with members of the commission after that first decision, but I do know—if newspaper reports are to be believed—that railroad officials in influential numbers called upon the President and that he was reported as being out of harmony with that decision and as favoring the proposed increase. I do know that the commission reversed itself and thereby lost some of the confidence of the people. The people should understand, however, that the commission has not, to my knowledge, followed that decision as a precedent, although railroad attorneys have invoked it.

The Interstate Commerce Commission was created as a people's tribunal. The railroads were under the law given the right to appeal to the court, but the shipper was allowed no such privilege. The commission was supposed to act for him. It could even proceed in his behalf on its own initiative. Why should he be permitted to ask for a review of his agents' acts? Of course, the commission should not be permitted to do wrong to a carrier, for, I repeat, a wrong to a railroad is a wrong to the patrons of that road and to the State, but it should be exceedingly zealous in safeguarding the rights of the people.

The pendulum seems to have swung to the opposite extreme. A few years ago railroad baiting and illy considered railroad legislation was the business of some men, and now the "public-be-damned" policy seems to be more popular. I am willing that a committee be appointed to investigated the interstate-commerce law, but I want it to report facts to the end that unwise laws may be repealed and new legislation enacted to carry out the purposes of the act of 1906.

I know that the Interstate Commerce Commission is overloaded with work. It has been the dumping ground for all kinds of legislative enactments, which have required much time and which should have been assigned to other agencies.

From the very nature of things it can not personally consider the thousand matters submitted to it. It can not even read the testimony taken by its agents in the hundreds of rate and regulation cases brought before it. I doubt if it is possible for its members, individually, to read the more than 2,000 legal briefs presented to them annually. A great part of this work is done by examiners. Some of these examiners have been forced upon the commission by high political influence. All, or nearly all, are paid insufficient salaries; that is, the salaries in many cases are not sufficient to secure permanently men big enough for the job and many of them are not capable of performing the great work to which they are assigned.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAMES in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator's statement, almost startling, that incompetent men are forced upon the commission through political influence suggests a question to me. I want to ask the Senator whether, in view of that statement, it would not be almost necessary to amend the pending joint resolution by providing that the committee shall investigate as to whether political influence, proceeding from any political party at any time, has been instrumental in pushing onto the commission appointees who in reality have to do work which the law really contemplated the commission should do?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I think the joint resolution is broad enough to cover that, if the committee has a disposition to do it. I think it is a serious matter. I am mentioning these things on the assumption that the commission is breaking down; and I want to find out, if I can, why this is so, if it is so. Some of these examiners are high-grade men, but they seize the first opportunity to accept better positions outside the commission. Their experience with the commission makes them valuable to private and corporate interests, and they very properly accept the more remunerative employment. If this proposed committee shall show the true situation in reference to these and similar matters, it will be worth while.

The commission has not broken down and it will not break down if Congress does not ask it to do things impossible of performance, if it is not loaded down with incompetent political subordinates, and if it is not coerced by Executive influence.

I shall vote for this resolution, because it is reasonably possible that the joint committee created by it may disclose facts which will enable and induce Congress to strengthen the great Interstate Commerce Commission in its efforts to perform its duties in an unprejudiced and fearless manner under the law.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator know what these law examiners are paid annually?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think one or two get around $5,000, and their salaries range from that figure down.

Mr. SHERMAN. Five thousand dollars is the maximum?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I understand that is the highest salary that is paid to an examiner, although I am not certain that there may not be exceptional cases.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator think that compensation or a lower one will secure a high type of legal ability?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; I have been saying that I did not think the salaries were sufficient, because the work of these examiners is of the very highest importance. It is of almost as much importance, possibly, as that of the commissioners themselves. So this question ought to be investigated, and a report made.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield further to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHERMAN. If I understand the duties of these examiners, some of whom I have the good fortune to know personally, let me inquire if their examination of the questions that are referred to them is not reduced to writing and reported back to the commission, and whether in the main the commission does not adopt the report of the examiner as the decision of the commission?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think the commission is compelled to do that. It can not read these cases. It is an absolute impossibility for it to do so. It must rely very largely upon the reports of the examiners.

Mr. SHERMAN. These examiners ought to be possessed of excellent ability, ought they not? Because they are the ones who make the original examination, and hear the witnesses, and arrive at conclusions, and report them back.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think so. So, Mr. President, I say that I am in favor of the resolution if some of these matters shall

have been investigated impartially and fearlessly, with an idea, not of bolstering up some particular theory, but of strengthening the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is the people's forum. It was created as a people's forum.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator if he favors the enactment by Congress of a law giving the Interstate Commerce Commission the right to regulate the issue of stocks and bonds by interstate railroads?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am not sure whether I do or not. I have been in favor of that proposition. I am not entirely clear about it now. Possibly if I could frame the law I might be in favor of it; but knowing, as I do know, that a result might occur that would be detrimental rather than beneficial, without doing any good to anybody, I should hesitate to say as a general proposition that I am in favor of a law to that effect.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, I should like to ask the Senator whether he is in favor of any legislation, such as has been repeatedly suggested by the Interstate Commerce Commission, that would regulate some of the admitted evils? I will put it broadly, and ask the Senator whether there is any legislation in regard to the regulation of railroads that he now favors?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That I now favor?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that the Senator would like to see enacted into law.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It is possible that some durable legislation facilitating railroad financing may be necessary. I would prefer that Congress enact it rather than to permit the commission to do it.

Mr. NORRIS. Does not the Senator believe that this very resolution that we are going to adopt will be used as a buffer to prevent the enactment of that legislation, and that the cry will always go up, "You must wait two or three years more until this joint committee reports"?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I said at the beginning of my remarks that that was possible under this resolution. If the President—and I say "President" because he has been very potent in matters of legislation—should desire that no legislation be considered, either before the election or afterwards during his term, I think his desire would have a good chance of being carried out; for while Congress has the power to consider and pass legislation regardless of this resolution, yet the probabilities are that if any effective legislation, at least, is offered, this resolotion will be presented as a buffer—to use the Senator's term—to prevent its consideration. I think it is possible.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan further yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the Senator favor us with his opinion as to the cause of over 40,000 miles of railways in the United States being operated by receivers at the present time?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; I do not believe I will go into that, Mr. President, because, really——

Mr. SHERMAN. Is it an absence of legislation or too much?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the Senator if he does not think it is due to the absence of any law that makes the robbery of the stockholders of a railroad company, such as happened in the case of the New Haven, the Rock Island, and the Frisco, a crime? Is it not because the law at present permits those who ought to represent the stockholders to take advantage of their position of trust to sell them out, as was done in every one of those instances?

In other words, does not the Senator believe that because the ordinary investor knows that the stock of any railroad may be manipulated in that way, and therefore made unsafe, he refuses to invest in it, and that makes of it, as a matter of fact, to a great extent a gambling institution? Ought not a law to be passed that would prevent the kind of a situation that has been illustrated by the roads I have mentioned, and would not that place the stock of all railroads upon a basis that would invite the honest investor?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Answering the last question first, I do not know whether it would or not. If such a law can be passed, and if such a condition is due to the lack of law in that respect, of course, I would be in favor of passing it; but I do not know always just exactly what causes that condition. I know that seemingly excellent laws are passed sometimes, but bad conditions still exist; and I am quite inclined to agree with the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] that as a general proposition we have too much law.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I just wanted to cite one more instance, in addition to the cases mentioned by the Senator from Nebraska, where it seemed to me that the unregulated capitalization of a railroad company may bring about a receivership, and that is the case of the Union Pacific Railroad. It has been described on this floor a number of times, and I will only mention it in outline again.

The result of the transaction was that the Union Pacific Railroad is incumbered with $100,000,000 of indebtedness with no corresponding property in return. The earning capacity of the railroad was not increased by incurring the $100,000,000 of indebtedness. It is perfectly obvious that in a situation of that kind it is more difficult for the railroad company to meet its obligations. If it goes in debt without any return it is very likely, even in normal times, the condition described by the Senator from Illinois may result.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I have said all I care to say on this subject, and conclude practically as I began with the statement that I am in favor of any commission that will honestly investigate and get at the facts upon which Congress can proceed to strengthen the great Interstate Commerce Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the first amendment of the committee to the joint resolution.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, is this on the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment offered by the committee.

Mr. BORAH. I do not care to be heard on that.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have no special objection to this particular amendment, but I desire to be heard at some length on the joint resolution itself. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS]. I shall not be able to conclude what I have to say at 2 o'clock, and I was not ready to go on to-day. That was the reason why I asked the Senator in the beginning not to make his motion to take up this joint resolution to-day. If it is necessary, however, I presume I can take up the time until 2 o'clock. I do not care to do that. I am perfectly willing to vote on this amendment if the Senator would be willing then that the matter should go over until I can look up a few things that I am not ready to take up at the present time.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I am afraid I will not have another opportunity of bringing up this matter.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator must realize that 2 o'clock will soon be here. He will have just as much time to-morrow as he had to-day.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I am inclined to think the Philippine bill will be temporarily laid aside to enable us to complete the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. That will take unanimous consent, will it not?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not think it will. I think it can be done on motion.

Mr. NORRIS. We will see, when we reach it, what it will take. Of course I can take up—as I will have to take up, if the Senator insists on it, and no one else wants to talk—about three times as much time as I would necessarily take if I had a few hours to arrange what I have to say. Since, however, the Senator does not feel inclined to grant me that reasonable request I will proceed.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NORRIS. I do.

Mr. BORAH. Might not we dispose of these amendments, if the Senator has no objection?

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection. If the Senator was willing, I was willing to concede that much to dispose of these amendments and let the resolution progress that far; but he is not willing, when they are disposed of, to lay the joint resolution over until to-morrow.

Mr. BORAH. It will take five minutes to dispose of the amendments, and we will be that far along to-morrow.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; but I do not feel disposed to yield now, unless the Senator would be willing that the joint resolution should go over until to-morrow.

Mr. CATRON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harding	Nelson	Sterling
Bankhead	Hardwick	Newlands	Stone
Beckham	Hitchcock	Norris	Sutherland
Borah	Hollis	Oliver	Swanson
Brandegee	Hughes	Overman	Thomas
Bryan	Husting	Page	Tillman
Catron	James	Phelan	Townsend
Chamberlain	Jones	Pittman	Underwood
Chilton	Kenyon	Poindexter	Vardaman
Clapp	Kern	Reed	Wadsworth
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Shafroth	Walsh
Clarke, Ark.	Lea, Tenn.	Sheppard	Weeks
Colt	Lippitt	Sherman	Williams
Dillingham	McLean	Shields	Works
du Pont	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	
Gallinger	Myers	Smoot	

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY]. He is paired with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. STONE. I wish to announce, and let it stand for the day, the absence of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] on account of illness.

Mr. CHILTON. I make the same announcement that I made on the former roll call as to my colleague [Mr. GOFF] being absent on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 381.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] whether he has any objection to the Philippine government bill being temporarily laid aside in order that we may complete the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada how long it would probably take to finish the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I have heard of but two Senators who desire to speak, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. NEWLANDS. With pleasure.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to suggest to the Senator that it will not, in my judgment, take near as much time if the resolution should go over for a day or two as it would take if proceeded with now. I have not looked at some records that I want to examine. I have no desire to delay the resolution, I want to say to the Senator, although I want to be heard somewhat at length. If I have to go on to-day I shall have to stumble through a great deal of stuff that I would probably eliminate if I had a little time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will also say to the Senator from Nevada that I desire to speak a short time on the resolution, and if he should undertake to force it through this afternoon I promise him it will not pass to-day.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I understand that it requires unanimous consent to lay the Philippine government bill aside. Can it be done on motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be done by motion, of course, but it displaces the Philippine government bill in case the motion is sustained by the Senate.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Of course I would not want to bring about that effect. So I assume the resolution will have to go over. I will ask the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] whether he will be prepared to go on at the close of the morning business to-morrow?

Mr. NORRIS. I think so, as far as I know, unless investigations I intend to make should go further than I expect. I have no disposition to put it over.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to say to the Senator from Nebraska that I have had no disposition to cut him off from a full opportunity to debate the resolution, but I have made seveveral attempts to bring it up. The other day I postponed its consideration upon the request of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and upon his assurance that he would help secure the early disposition of the resolution. I should like the Senator from Nebraska to unite with me in bringing the matter to an early conclusion.

Mr. NORRIS. I will not try to delay it for the purpose of delay. I have tried to delay it to-day because I was not ready to go on and would not do so unless I was forced to proceed. I want a little time to get some of the records together that I wish to use.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I give notice, then, that to-morrow morning at the close of the routine morning business I shall call up the resolution for action.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, inasmuch as we have just had a call for a quorum, I am going to ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that the bill and all pending amendments may be passed to a final vote not later than 3 o'clock on Thursday of this week.

Mr. SMOOT. I think under the rule that request could not be complied with now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of opinion that under the rule it will be necessary to have a call of the roll before the request for unanimous consent can be put. There has been intervening business between the former roll call of the Senate and the present time.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, for information, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Utah whether there would be any objection to such a request?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] is out of the Chamber just at this moment. I think he is at lunch. I do not believe the question ought to be asked in his absence, even in the way the Senator has put it. I could not say, as far as I am concerned, whether there is any objection to setting a day certain for a vote or not.

Mr. LIPPITT entered the Chamber.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from Rhode Island has entered the Chamber. I will state to him that I am making an informal inquiry whether there would be objection to fixing an hour on a day for a final vote on the bill and all pending amendments.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, until the pending amendment, what is known as the Clarke amendment, is disposed of I think it would not be easy to get a unanimous-consent agreement fixing a day for voting on the bill. It seems to me that no one knows to just how much discussion that amendment is going to lead. I know several Senators who are inclined to express an opinion in regard to it. So I think it would not be a favorable time to make the request. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska. I personally have no disposition at all to delay a vote on the bill.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate very briefly in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

The Filipino people are now engaged, with our help, in solving the problem of popular government, and if we grant them independence in the near future it is manifest that they will undertake to establish a system of popular government in some form; in other words, a government by the people and without the aid of a monarch or an aristocracy.

Now, it is clear from the experience of every nation which has tried to establish a stable popular government that we are not giving the Filipino people sufficient time in two or four years to work out this problem.

Can we expect the Filipino people to accomplish something which France was unable to accomplish, which Spain was unable to accomplish, which the Central and South American Republics were unable to accomplish, and which no nation in the world which has made the attempt has been able to accomplish?

It took France 80 years, from 1790 to 1870, to establish a stable popular government, and before she was successful her Government was three times overturned by the populace of Paris, three times by the army, three times by foreign invaders, while one constitution succeeded another in rapid succession. Can we expect more of the Filipino people than of the French people?

The efforts of Spain to establish popular government began in 1812, and after some 40 military insurrections it has ended in a restoration of monarchy; and the experience of France and Spain has been the experience of other European nations in their attempts to establish popular government during the past century, with the possible exception of Switzerland.

Turning to the Western Hemisphere, we are all familiar with the history of the Central and South American Republics and the length of time it took them to establish a stable popular government. It is safe to say that it was 50 years from

the times these colonies of Spain declared their independence before they succeeded in this undertaking.

Not to mention minor insurrections, there were more than 80 revolutions in these Republics during the first half century of their existence. Mr. Meyer, of the Library of Congress, has given me some data on this subject, which I ask to be made a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Data in relation to revolutions in South American and Central American States and in Mexico.

[Not including minor insurrections.]

Country.	Date of liberation.	Number of revolutions during first half century.
South America:		
Argentina	1812	7
Bolivia	1825	7
Brazil	1822	1
Chile	1818	13
Colombia	1819	5
Ecuador	1822	3
Paraguay	1811	(1)
Peru	1821	6
Uruguay	1830	8
Venezuela	1819	4
Mexico	1813	10
Central America:		
Costa Rica	1821	1
Guatemala	1821	8
Honduras	1821	7
Nicaragua	1821	4
Salvador	1821	1
Total		85

[1] Practical dictatorship.

Mr. COLT. From this compilation it appears that there were 13 revolutions in Chile during the first 50 years of her independence, 7 in Argentina, 7 in Bolivia, 6 in Peru, 5 in Colombia, and 10 in Mexico. The number of revolutions in the other Republics will be found in the annexed paper.

And it may be observed in this connection that it took us, with all our experience in self-government, some 13 years, or from 1776 to 1789, before we succeeded in establishing a stable, popular government.

When we consider the history of popular government and the present conditions in the Philippines, I am convinced that it is impossible for the Filipino people to establish a stable popular government in two or four years, and hence that it would be an act of injustice toward them and a breach of good faith on the part of the United States to grant them independence at the time proposed in this amendment.

As to the second proposition contained in this amendment, I am unable to see how the United States can, during the present war, obtain any pledge from other nations guaranteeing the sovereignty and independence of the Philippines; and, if the times were normal, I can find no sufficient ground upon which the great powers would enter into any such obligation. If this should turn out to be true, and the United States alone should guarantee the independence of the Philippines for five years after parting with our sovereignty, then we are left in the position of assuming a responsibility without the power of enforcing it. For these reasons, Mr. President, I shall vote against this amendment.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not share the views of able Senators who have spoken upon this question with reference to the attitude of Japan toward this Government or of the attitude of Japan with reference to our possession of the Philippines. I do not believe that the Japanese people are seeking difficulty with the United States, and I have never seen anything which indicated to me that our possession of the Philippines was at all irritating to those people or to the Japanese Government. In any event, any vote that I shall cast upon this amendment or the bill will in no wise be colored or controlled by what is supposed to be the attitude of Japan or any other nation toward the United States. I look upon it as a matter which concerns the United States alone and its policy. What is our interest and what is our duty toward the Philippine people? When I shall have determined to my satisfaction these questions I shall not be concerned about the supposed views or supposed irritableness of other nations.

Neither do I believe, I desire to say by way of digression, that there is any great power seeking difficulty or anticipating trouble with the United States. Our troubles at the present time with other nations arise not out of any specific desire on the part of those nations to have difficulty with the United States but simply because their great interests and our interests inevitably under the conditions which are now prevailing conflict. It is quite natural for those powers, struggling as they are for existence, to urge their rights and to pursue their policies to the limit, and it is quite proper that the United States should guard its own interests. But whatever the difficulties are or may have been, it has never occurred to me that we ought to interpret the situation as we find it now throughout the world, and the difficulties which now present themselves to us as a desire upon the part of any nation to have difficulty with the United States. I do not believe that any of the belligerent nations are pursuing a course with a view of bringing about unfriendly relations. It has been assumed that because of Japan's favor to the allies in this war that the allies would be bound to join in any ambitious program which Japan might have at the close of the war, and that therein is to be found a menace to the United States.

Nations do not act upon the moral obligations of yesterday but upon the primary interests of to-day. They do not consider in making up their policies the friendships and relations of the past, but the advantages and opportunities of the present or the future. It seems in these days that even treaty obligations are of slight or no consequence as against present exigencies or future expectations. The alliances of this supreme tragedy may last a little longer than usual by reason of the fearful welding, but even they will yield to the changing interest and lurking jealousies of the swift coming years. Only a short time ago Japan and Russia were at war, and we see them now in practical alliance. We see Germany and England within most recent years in the friendliest relationship. We see them now in deadly conflict. I do not get much enlightenment or imbibe any considerable fear from the present alliances. If you will tell me where the vital and material interest of this or that nation will lie a decade from now, I will tell you something of the dangers of attack from that source. But if you undertake to talk to me of the present alliances and friendships and from these to deduce future programs and actions I am unable to become very deeply interested or greatly alarmed. We do not know what the future interests will be, and therefore we do not know what the future alliances will be. All the more reason why we should be constantly prepared. The patriotism of a people is a noble but a singular virtue. It ignores the appeal of past friendships and soon forgets the insults of former enemies.

So, Mr. President, any condition which may be presented at this time as to the supposed attitude or state of mind of any great power would have nothing to do with any vote which I might cast upon this bill.

In saying that I do not believe that Japan is seeking trouble with this country or that either the central powers or the allies are formulating plans or nursing designs looking to an immediate attack upon the United States dependent only on the result of the war, I do not, of course, argue against a reasonable program of preparedness. I would assist, however, if I could, in raising the discussion of so vital a problem out of the region of temporary fear, based upon conditions which may pass with the hour, into the region of deliberate conviction based upon those sound and permanent principles which must accompany national power so long as it endures. Under the leadership of Col. Roosevelt, eight or nine years ago, I voted for four battleships to be at once constructed, and to be followed by a policy which would have given in this hour not a third-rate but in any event a second-rate Navy. I voted then as I did because I could not well understand how a great Nation with thousands of miles of seacoast and a stupendous wealth at the water's edge, with its commerce extending to and ramifying all parts of the earth and entering upon its career of world power, could safely be without a great Navy. It seemed to me to be as indispensable to our national honor and prestige as any other great principle upon which the Republic is founded; that in the vicissitudes of human affairs there may come a time, and no man knoweth in advance the time, when force, and nothing but force, would mean safety, mean civilization, mean national integrity, mean national honor.

Washington, in his inaugural address, said:

> There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be imperiled, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.

That is the principle, permanent and abiding, as essential before the war as now, upon which to build your program of preparedness. Not upon the theory of some supposed specific plan of attack, more likely false than true, but upon the prin-

ciple and the same principle that you police your cities—simply because so long as men are human disorders will sometimes arise, and so long as nationalism is the basis upon which human societies are organized conflicts will sometimes come. I have no faith in the permanency or effectiveness of any program of preparedness superinduced by or based upon present disturbances or conflicts. A policy begun in fear will end in failure. When the supposed causes seem to pass interest in the program will pass. Your arguments will no longer be backed up by concrete examples and your appropriations will cease. But a program, sir, based upon the broad and serene policy of Washington, as clear visioned and as long visioned as that of his doctrine of neutrality, and sustained by every truly great American from that hour to this, a program based upon education and intelligent conviction of the effect that it is indispensable to national safety and power at all times, will have some chance of being permanent and effective.

Take a lesson from recent history and see how futile are the plans and programs founded on passing incidents and how essential it is that we dig deeper and build, as Washington and Hamilton built, upon the verities of human nature and human experience as they are gathered not of a day but through the long sweep of the years. The spring of 1914 was the richest in promise of peace in the whole history of the world. The fringe of the millenium seemed to be lingering about the horizon everywhere. Another peace conference was soon to be held at The Hague. We were just getting ready to celebrate the centenary of the treaty of Ghent. Everybody was writing treaties. The Senate was ratifying them without discussion or consideration, provided they looked like peace treaties. Rulers were signing them with ostentatious ceremony.

The sleeping qualities of the human heart seemed really to be aroused and prepared to dominate all human conduct and all nations and all peoples, all races and all religions were soon to be united in a bond of universal peace, unending and unbreakable, and human misunderstandings, selfishness, and passion and war were to be known no more. One of the great peace advocates of the world declared in exultation that the world would never again witness a great war. But, sir, in August came the world conflict. The delegates to The Hague were interrupted in their journey by the submarines and the Zeppelins. Beneath the surface so calm and pacific were the old, ugly passions and prejudices and ambitions of men. Not only was the millenium postponed, but it is a serious question if civilization has not gone back many a decade. I would have no hopes, Mr. President, of any reasonable, permanent, and helpful program of preparedness if we are to continue to make this supposed enmity the moving power of the program. This great conflict has served to awaken and to startle, but it has not changed the principles upon which a nation should always build its program of preparedness.

I have digressed, Mr. President, from the discussion of the Philippine question to say this much upon this subject, because so much has been said and has been well said, so far as that is concerned, as to the supposition that our dealing with the Philippines and, indeed, our entire program of preparedness should be based rather upon conditions as they now present themselves than upon those great principles which, in my judgment, obtain just as much in peace as in war.

Mr. President, I want now to discuss for a time the Philippine question. It seems to me that there are two propositions, or two courses, or two policies, open to us in dealing with the Philippines. The first is to get out of the Philippines now, or as soon as we may, taking into consideration the necessity of certain delay necessary to the transfer of government. There is no doubt, I think, that this policy would be to the best interest of the United States if we were to view the matter wholly as a question of material interest or material welfare. I think that most of us, if we could roll back and reconstruct or redirect the events of the last quarter of a century, would leave the Philippine Islands just as we found them. I think most of us feel that it would have been better. But circumstances unusual prevailed which seemed to necessitate assuming the sovereignty over those islands. If we were now clear of the islands, our sovereignty withdrawn, so far as the people of the United States are concerned as to their material interests, it would be considered as altogether to our advantage. Any proposition to withdraw sovereignty within a reasonable time—that is, as soon as the transfer of the reins of government and the adjustment of American interests can be effected—has for its support the material interests of the people of the United States. I am bound to say, however, that if the Filipino people would be content to remain indefinitely and the people of the United States would eliminate all politics and settle down to the task of training them for a higher civilization, that immediate withdrawal would not be for the best interest of the Filipino people themselves. It is the "if," however, which seems insurmountable.

The second proposition, Mr. President, is that of remaining in the Philippines until we shall have done something substantial and permanent in the way of instructing the Filipinos in self-government—in self-government as we understand it, because we have no capacity for teaching self-government upon any other plan. When we talk of teaching self-government in the Philippines it must necessarily be to some extent in harmony with the views of self-government as we entertain those views; in other words, if we stay there any longer than the necessary time to get out, it must be that we are staying there for the benefit of the Filipino people themselves—that we are not staying there for the benefit of the United States or for any material interest which the United States could have.

If we remain in the Philippines for the purpose of performing this obligation—that is, of teaching the Filipino people free government and the capacity to maintain independence—a practical question arises, namely, how long will it take us to perform that task? How long will it take to reconstruct the conception of government which is entertained by those people, if indeed any idea of government is entertained by them at all? After we determine, if we can, how long it will take, then is there anyone willing to declare that we are to remain there until the task is completed? If we do not stay until such time as we shall have accomplished the task in its fullness, will we have benefited them at all? In other words, can we accomplish anything there in the next 10 years or 15 years or 20 years or 25 or 30 or 35 or 40 years in the way of permanent value of permanent good to the Filipino people? I believe that if we were to leave the Filipino people within the next 2 or 3 or 4 years, they would be benefited by our presence there just as much as if we should stay there for 15 or 20 years, and then leave them. I say this for the reason that no people in the history of the world have ever acquired anything like a capacity for self-government within less than centuries. It has never been possible under any conditions for a people to acquire that great power except through centuries of struggle and sacrifice, even when they have had the guiding hand and controlling influence of higher and more civilized nations to lead them.

I think, therefore, the question presents itself in this way: Are we going to remain there until we fulfill the obligation in its entirety upon the basis of teaching those people the capacity for self-government? If so, how long will it take? As has been said by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], it will not only take decades, but it will take decades upon decades to accomplish that. In other words, in so far as we can now foresee or formulate plans, it means the permanent holding of the Philippine Islands.

The Anglo-Saxon race was from 500 to 1,000 years in acquiring a capacity for self-government. France has been not only decades but centuries in working out the problem of self-government. For more than a hundred years the Mexican people have been struggling with the question of self-government, and, in my judgment, they are no nearer to it to-day than they were at the time that Hidalgo raised the insurrection of about 1810 and based his fight upon the principle of a true democracy.

The veneer of democracy is one thing and easily created. But real democracy, government by the people, is a wholly different thing and the most difficult of all governments to construct and maintain. The outward form of republicanism or democracy signifies nothing. It may conceal the most cruel, corrupt, and oppressive absolutism, as is instanced in the history of Mexico for the last 30 years. The most difficult lesson for a people to learn and the most elusive and difficult to retain after it has been learned is the lesson of self-government. The most tormenting problem ever given to a people for demonstration is the problem of democracy. It has its manifest blessings when wrought out to success, every one of which blessings, however, are purchased and enjoyed only through the most exacting devotion and the most inflexible public interest upon the part of an entire people. There can be no basic foundation for such a government other than the most widespread and thoroughly disseminated knowledge and character upon the part of the people. No people have ever acquired the capacity for self-government except through decades and centuries of the most grievous experience. Why talk to these people of independence now? They have not, as a people, the slightest conception of the duties, the sacrifices, and the obligations of free government. They have not as yet mastered the first lesson. To delude them into the belief that they are fit for self-government or that they soon will be is to work signal injustice to them.

If you point to the fact that there are brilliant and capable men in the Philippines, I concede it all. I in nowise seek to impeach their character or intellectual standing. But there is no country in the civilized or semicivilized world which may not produce a few men of great and brilliant attainments, men who may in their aspirations have some poetical conceptions of free government. Mexico had her Hidalgo, her Guerrero, her Juarez, her Madero. They built their castles in the upper air and gave the highest and noblest manifestations of their sincerity, for they died and were willing to die for their faith. But they had no foundation upon which to build. That without which free institutions are but a tormenting dream, to wit, a sturdy, self-reliant people, a people of intelligence, of fixed and wholesome habits and customs they did not have. The only thing in the world out of which you can build and the only thing which will for any length of time preserve a Republic is the character and wholesomeness and principles of the people, the masses. Sam Adams was successful in organizing his revolt and sustaining it because he appealed to men of unusual character, of exceptional training, of signal moral courage; men who had been educated in what was in some respects the most remarkable university the world has ever seen, the New England town meeting. Washington, in the convention of 1787, said in those famous lines that perhaps no government which they could form would be accepted by the people. But it was accepted. The people were equal to the task imposed upon them. What could those leaders have done without such a constituency?

If we stay there, therefore, to serve these people, what standard shall we set up? What must we do and what must they be willing for us to do?

When shall we expect the United States Government to announce that in its judgment these people should now be free and independent? Will it be when a few intelligent and capable men have developed sufficient capacity to maintain an aristocratic form of government or will it be when the masses have been educated and schooled into self-discipline and into that knowledge of public affairs and that sustained interest in the public welfare which makes possible a republic? Will we, in order to escape the burdens of our task like an impatient guardian anxious to be rid of the ward, be satisfied with a republic in form or in name but an aristocracy in fact—a government with a few cultured and ambitious men at the top and ignorance and dependence and peonage and slavery at the bottom—or will it be when there has been sown among the people that spirit of independence, that integrity of view, that vision which alone fits them for the onerous obligations of free government? The latter obligation is the one which this country must assume if it take up the task at all. To do less is to shirk responsibility, and we had better go now. To remain longer are expense and outlay for us and no permanent benefit to the Filipinos.

You can not take those people, with the training which they have had, or the lack of training, and rear the masses of the people themselves to the standard of self-government inside of half a century or a century. If we are to discuss the question of self-government within 17 years after we first went there, and promise those people independence, or hold that view up before them at a time when they have no conception of self-government, to my way of thinking it is infinitely better to turn them loose now, and let them work out their own destiny. We may spend our time and our means and our energy for the next 15 or 20 years, and, so far as permanent results are concerned, they will be no different than if we should leave the Philippines within the next 3 or 4 years.

So I say, Mr. President, we either ought to adopt the amendment which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] has submitted or we ought to eliminate, once and for all, all discussion of independence and let the Filipino people understand that the first lesson which they must learn is the lesson of self-government before they shall be permitted to assume the right of independence, and they must be permitted to know from us in plain but kindly language that they will not acquire that capacity for self-government within the next 50 or 100 years; that it is a long, tedious lesson, requiring patience and persistence beyond anything they seem to have contemplated.

Mr. President, there is one other feature of this matter we can not ignore in measuring the task before us. The power of a nationality struggling ever to become a nation is one of the most weird and persistent influences in all the affairs of the human family. The turmoil in Europe for the last 100 years has been largely by reason of the fact that some nationality has been dominated or controlled by a nation of a different nationality. A nationality and a nation are two different propositions. These people are entirely different in language, in customs, in habits, in tastes, in mental capacity. They are a nationality in and of themselves, so far as comparison with the United States is concerned, and it will take many years to reconstruct that nationality, if we can ever do it at all. I think I may say that it has never been accomplished satisfactorily and never tried for any considerable length of time without great sacrifice of human life.

In 1772 three of the great powers of Europe partitioned Poland; in 1793 they made that partition complete, and were supposed to have destroyed that great nationality; but, as some writer has said, the Polish agitator has been the nerve of revolution in Europe every hour since the partition took place. There has never been a great revolution struggling for better conditions in Europe since 1772 that has not in some respects been led or aided by great Polish patriots. The kings or the absolute powers which distributed their country distributed the patriotism and the desire for nationality throughout Europe and furnished the means by which to augment, and thereby further, every revolution in Europe since that time.

It seems impossible, Mr. President, to destroy that sentiment of nationality which at all times inheres in a people, and it seems to be as strong with races of inferior capacity, if I may use the term, as with races of a more developed standard.

I want to read a few lines, Mr. President, from the great Italian statesman, Mazzini, in regard to the proposition of one nation trying to dominate, control, or educate, or direct another nation or nationality. Speaking of the smaller nationalities of Europe which have been under the control of some larger nation, Mr. Mazzini said:

> They struggled, they still struggle, for country and liberty; for a word inscribed upon a banner, proclaiming to the world that they also live, think, love, and labor for the benefit of all. They speak the same language, they bear about them the impress of consanguinity, they kneel beside the same tombs, they glory in the same tradition, and they demand to associate freely, without obstacles, without foreign domination in order to elaborate and express their idea, to contribute their stone also to the great pyramid of history. It is something moral which they are seeking, and this moral something is in fact, even politically speaking, the most important question in the present state of things. It is the organization of the European task. In principle, nationality ought to be to humanity that which division of labor is in a workshop—the recognized symbol of association; the assertion of the individuality of a human group called by its geographical position, its traditions, and its language to fulfill a special function in the European work of civilization.

Whether that function be small or great, inferior or superior, it seems to assert its right to existence against all the power of man to change or to redirect it; in other words, a review of the history of the world shows that there is a logic of things and a logic of events which no human agency can change or redirect, and one of them is founded upon the great desire of every nationality at some time to become a nation.

Now, Mr. President, let us examine for a moment the conception of government which obtains in the Philippines after the years which we have been there—and perhaps we have done as good a work in the Philippines as ever was accomplished by any people toward a dependent people. I read from the testimony of ex-President Taft, on page 368, at the bottom of the page. He is there discussing the presentation of the views of leading Filipinos upon the question of independence:

> Well, they said, they wanted to file a brief with me; and they did so—and these were leading educated Filipinos. In that brief they went on to enumerate the number of offices that there were in the municipalities and the Provinces and the central government; and then they gave statistics of the Ilustrados, the educated people in the island; and they proved that the Ilustrados were more than twice as many as the offices to be filled; and they said that with two shifts that would give a competent government, and self-government. [Laughter.] Well, I explained to them that it was not the capacity to fill offices that gave a capacity for self-government to a people, it was public opinion, and that if they did not have broad popular public opinion to control people in office, they were not fit for self-government.

Then he further says:

> I took a committee of Senators and Representatives out to the Philippines when I was Secretary of War, in 1905, and Fisk Warren, an anti-imperialist from Boston, visited the islands at the same time, because he thought that with my prejudice and my bitterness of feeling I could not be relied on to show the party the real capacity of the Filipino people for government; and so he demanded, in the name of the Filipino people, that I give the Filipino people an opportunity to be heard.
>
> And after I had taken the party all around the islands and we came back to Manila I sent word to Mr. Warren that he might produce any committee that the Filipinos wished to send and present what they thought as to their own power of self-government.
>
> And so they presented a petition August 28, 1905. I can not read it all. It says.

This, to me, Mr. President, is one of the most interesting features of this entire investigation and altogether the most instructive piece of evidence that we have. This is from their brief:

> In spite of the unquestionable political capacity of the Filipino people, the result of their present degree of culture and civilization, that they are in a condition of self-government is denied in varying degrees

and forms, though precisely the contrary is demonstrated by facts, experience, and considerations, among which the following deserve mention:

First. It is an irrefutable fact that the Filipino people are governable; the period of Spanish dominion and of the present American sovereignty bear out this assertion. The political condition of a country principally depends upon the degree of governableness of its people; the more governable the popular classes are the better the political condition of the country.

This was the view of government as presented by the most intelligent of the Filipino people, which, of course, is the old view of the Holy Alliance, which was formed at the close of the Napoleonic wars, the principal tenet of whose creed was that all power came from above and that the people were not entitled to have anything to say with reference to the divine right of government; that a governable people were a people who submitted to the dictation and direction of those who chanced to be in a governing position. It is the old doctrine of the congress of Laybach, that the power to govern comes from above, and that all effort to assert any such right upon the part of the masses should be eliminated, regardless of the method of elimination.

When a people such as the Filipinos gave signal evidence of their capacity to obey during a period of over 300 years, free from disturbance or deep political commotions, it must be granted, considering that all things tend to progress, that they possess the art of government; all the more so because, among other powers, they possess that of assimilation in a marked degree, an assimilativeness which distinguishes them from other people of the Far East.

Second. If the masses of the people are governable, a part must necessarily be denominated the directing class, for as in the march of progress, moral or material, nations do not advance at the same rate, some going forward while others fall behind, so it is with the inhabitants of a country, as observation will prove.

Third. If the Philippine Archipelago has a popular governable mass called upon to obey and a directing class charged with the duty of governing, it is in a condition to govern itself.

These factors, not counting incidental ones, are the only two by which to determine the political capacity of a country.

To wit, a governing class and a class willing to be governed—class domination, class control, class direction—and no form of government ever conceived by the human mind is quite so cruel and oppressive as class government.

These factors, not counting incidental ones, are the only two by which to determine the political capacity of a country—an entity that knows how to govern, the directing class, and an entity that knows how to obey, the popular masses.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will the Senator inform me whose sentiments are those?

Mr. BORAH. Those were the sentiments of some 25 of the most highly educated Filipinos as they presented their theory of self-government to ex-President Taft.

Mr. LIPPITT. Will the Senator state the date of that document?

Mr. BORAH. Nineteen hundred and five.

Mr. LIPPITT. Some 10 or 11 years ago?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I presume the Senator makes that suggestion upon the theory that such an idea of government could be eliminated in a period of some 10 or 20 years.

Mr. LIPPITT. No, Mr. President; I only wanted to have the exact time, because it was only a few years after we had been in the islands, and I thought it was perhaps only just to the Filipino people that that might be stated and let everybody draw his own inference from it.

Mr. BORAH. What I am seeking to do in bringing the attention of the Senate to this conception of self-government is to emphasize the fact that it comes from a class of people who are more highly educated and better trained in the affairs of government than we would be able to educate and train the masses of the Filipinos in the next fifty or a hundred years. It is to show they have a different standard, a different understanding, and that we not only have to train them to read and write and give them poise and character as a people, but we must reform and change all standards and all conceptions of government.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. It is, in other words, Mr. President, a conflict between the old doctrine of the holy alliance and the United States Government in the Philippines, and we will have to stay there, if we do stay, until we uproot and eradicate a thing that is most difficult to uproot and eradicate, and that is the conception of government which has been drilled into the intellect and moral fiber of those people by 300 years of experience. Now I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I was about to ask the Senator if he did not think that the sentiments expressed by the people whom he has just quoted are sentiments of the class that would do the ruling and governing in the islands if the Filipino people had their independence?

Mr. BORAH. Exactly; I have no doubt of that.

Mr. President, I know that there are a great many very intelligent men in the Philippines, men of great capacity—exceptionally brilliant men some of them are—and in saying anything that I do say I do not, as I have already said, seek to impeach their intelligence or the integrity of character of those men, but we are not dealing with a situation which simply requires us to teach some one how to read or how to speak the English language; we are dealing with a question which requires the unteaching of centuries of schooling. We can not, if I may repeat, ignore the tutelage or the gloomy lessons in government which those people have had for the last 300 years.

The country, as I have said, which held sway over these islands, it will be remembered, was one of those powers which joined the conspiracy at the close of the Napoleonic wars, under the sacrilegious title of the Holy Alliance, the supreme purpose of which was to crush out free government and to root out the spirit of liberty wherever it was possible to exert to that end its sinister and baleful influence. The basic principle of this merciless creed was that the people were by ordinance divine wholly unfit to have a voice in the sacred affairs of government; that all powers of government came from above; and that any manifestation of independence, any expressed purpose to be free upon the part of the governed, were to be stamped out in any conceivable way which a tireless and satanic ingenuity could devise. No member of this conspiracy was more unyielding, more successful in carrying out in all its hideous logic this cruel and fiendish theory. Wherever her inflexible decrees have had sway ignorance and oppression and social degradation have been the immutable lot of the masses. With studied and iniquitous vigilance, with an industry worthy of a noble cause, she punished with rack and thumbscrew, with torture and death, everyone who gave evidence of a longing to enjoy the initiative of sentient beings. Always exacting the last penny which an oppressed peasantry could through unremitting toil grind out, withholding every comfort whose temporary enjoyment might be calculated to reanimate some soul with the desire to be free, she succeeded at last in destroying wholly and completely the initiative, the self-respect, the self-reliance, the hopes, and ambitions of all those from whom we believe the rights of government are derived. She left the hearts and souls of the people as bare and blighted as the miserable hovels in which they lived. It is no ordinary task to unteach these lessons, to reanimate with the aspirations and confidence of a self-helping people these dependents of three long, black, rayless centuries.

It will be a difficult task, a long and arduous task, to implant in the hearts and minds of the masses that initiative, that intelligence, that self-respect and self-reliance indispensable to a self-governing people.

So, Mr. President, we must gird ourselves for this kind of a task: Either to stay there indefinitely—and I say "indefinitely" because I regard 50 or 100 years beyond a point which we ought to discuss independence at all; I regard the task before us such as precludes the discussion of independence or anything like it. We must stay there indefinitely if we are going to help the masses of the Filipino people; and I do not permit myself to be influenced by the intelligent, capable upper class in the Philippines, because they will likely be able to take care of themselves. To state it more appropriately perhaps in the task before us we must first of all consider the interests of the masses.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator tell us, if he has the information, what proportion of the entire population of the Philippine Islands are of the more intelligent class?

Mr. BORAH. I can not tell the Senator exactly. I am told, however, by those who have been there that it is a very small percentage, but I do not know what it is exactly.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator from Idaho will permit me, there are about 68,000, as I recollect, qualified to vote under the literacy test.

Mr. SHAFROTH. How many?

Mr. LIPPITT. About 68,000.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no; there are 248,000 who were registered under the test, and 235,000 actually voted.

Mr. LIPPITT. Yes; and of that 235,000 there were about 68,000, if my recollection is correct, who qualified under the literacy qualification. There were other qualifications. I will

turn to the testimony in a minute or two, but I think I am correct.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, in an address delivered by ex-President Taft before the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, in 1915, he discussed the point the Senator has been making, as to the fact that there was a governing class and a class willing to be governed, and he said:

Thus they were capable of self-government because they had a ruling class of 10 per cent and an obedient class of 90 per cent.

And he went on further to say that a prominent Filipino suggested that they ought to have a third class of Chinamen, who would not be allowed to participate in government, but who would do the work.

Mr. BORAH. In the language of the ex-President, to serve in the capacity of work animals.

Mr. GALLINGER. Work animals; yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me just a word further, I quite agree with what the Senator has been saying, that in order that a people may be capable of self-government the masses of the people must understand self-government. It is not sufficient to have a governing class.

I desire to put this question to the Senator: According to the information which we now seem to have, probably not to exceed 10 per cent of the people of the Philippine Islands have sufficient training or sufficient intelligence even to undertake the effort of governing themselves. Suppose that instead of these intelligent Filipinos—who, we must all concede, even though they may be intelligent, have not the capacity of the Anglo-Saxon for self-government—10 per cent of the population were American citizens who were trained and who had inherited through centuries this ability for self-government. Even with a class of that character in these islands, does the Senator believe that it would be possible for those men, let alone the Filipinos, to govern the islands if the strength and power of the United States Government were entirely withdrawn?

Mr. BORAH. No, Mr. President. Even the Anglo-Saxon race has not shown very much greater capacity for proper self-government, where there were only about 10 per cent of them, than any other race. The Anglo-Saxon race has disclosed its great capacity for self-government because of the intelligence and the capacity and the character of the other 90 per cent.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Precisely.

Mr. BORAH. If you had only 10 per cent of Americans in the Philippine Islands, I would not be willing to intrust them with the power of government over the other 90 per cent. The Senator will recall that only this morning in the Judiciary Committee we had an illustration of the remarkable disposition of the Anglo-Saxon race to revert to the power of tyranny and oppression when there were only about 10 per cent of them in the place, and the other 90 per cent were of some other class or of an inferior people. They ignore the Constitution and constitutional provisions, in certain places where we are now governing a large class, almost as much as our cultured friends who have been trained in that kind of class government for the last 300 years.

There is just one safeguard for a free people, and there is no other found among men or upon earth; and that is the education, the character, the intelligence, the initiative, and the poise of the man in the street. There is no class of people who are to be trusted with the power of governing some one else. Abraham Lincoln said that no man is himself free who governs some one else against his will.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a minute, to correct a statement which I made a few minutes ago?

Mr. BORAH. Yes, sir.

Mr. LIPPITT. I find, on looking at the record, at page 187, that there were about 90,000 Filipinos who qualified under the educational test. There were others who qualified under the qualification for holding office and under a property qualification.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment, and then I will yield to the Senator. Does the Senator wish to reply to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes. I want to say to the Senator from Rhode Island that he does not take into consideration the fact that the qualification which is imposed on a voter there, outside of the property qualification, consists of his knowing enough to read and write the English language or the Spanish language, neither of which is his own language. Suppose, as a matter of fact, we were to impose here the requirement that no one in this country could vote unless he were able to speak the Spanish or the French language. How many voters would we have?

It seems to me that is not a fair illustration to test how many people can read and write in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I have made no statement with reference to these points. I merely made a statement as to the number of people who were qualified to vote under a property qualification. Any deductions that may be drawn from that are something entirely outside of my vision. I merely stated the fact.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. The statement made by the Senator just before he was interrupted seems to me so apt and so true that I feel impelled to inform him that some years ago I had the honor of an interview with the late President of Mexico, Porfirio Diaz, and in response to an inquiry which he made of me concerning my impressions of the Mexican Government, I replied that it seemed to me to have been better described by Mr. Lummis as "a republic in chancery" than any other description I had ever seen. I then said that the so-called Republic of Mexico was as radically different from our own, so far as my observation went, as though it were a monarchy. His reply was that no nation can be a self-governing one which does not possess a great, intelligent, patriotic, property-holding class, and that until Mexico had such a class its government would not be that of the United States.

I simply interject that into the RECORD because it seems to be so apposite with the reflection of the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, that is quite correct, and I am coming in a few moments to Mexico as an illustration. In taking up Mexico I will say now, in order that there may be no misgivings, that I am not going to discuss it as its history has been written for the last four or five years, but prior to that time, as an illustration of class rule.

I find here, upon page 370, that ex-President Taft says there are about 90 per cent of the people not fit for self-government, but that the 10 per cent of educated Filipinos do not understand self-government. I ought to say in passing here, in order that there may be no misunderstanding, that there is nothing surprising about the fact that the Filipino educated gentleman has an entirely different conception of government than we have. He has been trained in it. He has known nothing else. He has no other view before him. He never has had. It would be a great surprise if we should find that he had any such view as we entertain.

Let me call your attention to an illustration drawn by the ex-President:

One day, while I was governor in the Philippines, a man named Felipe Calderon, one of the leading lawyers in the Philippines, the man who introduced the constitution into the convention at Malolos, came to see me—

Now, here is a constitution maker—

While he was there a poor old Tagalog, who could not speak Spanish, presented a petition to me. My Spanish would make your heart bleed to hear it, even when I was out there, and now it has gone entirely. The petition was in Spanish, and so far as I could figure it out, it contained a recital that his son had been six years in Bilibid Prison; that he had never been tried; and the old man wanted to know what I could do. He had heard that the commission had come there to help out the Filipinos, and he wanted to know if we could not help him.

Well, I turned to Calderon and said to him, "The writ of habeas corpus is in force here. If you will just present a petition for the writ in any of the courts in Manila you can get this man out, if what he says is true."

"Well," said Calderon, "what is a petition for a writ of habeas corpus"?

He had copied the Mexican Constitution and the Federal Constitution and had helped to make up the constitution of Malalos, but he did not have any practical knowledge of those processes which are the Anglo-Saxon palladium of individual right and liberty. And so I drafted for him the form of a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, and he took it into court and he got his man out.

That is called to your attention to direct you again to the thought that the proposition of teaching them to read and write, and of giving them an education, and of spreading that kind of intelligence among the masses is only the first step, a very short step, and may be a very ineffective step, toward self-government.

The task before the American people in the Philippines is to reconstruct the entire conception of government on the part of the intelligent, as well as to train those who are without intelligence; and no more difficult task was ever assumed by anyone. Let me ask the learned Members of this Senate, men versed in history: Will you give me an illustration, from the beginning of time until now, where that task has been achieved with any degree of permanent success? Will you tell me of an instance

in which an intelligent and educated or a self-governing people has ever trained another nationality into their style and capacity of government?

It may be that there is such an example; but I do not know of it, and I have been unable to find it. I do know that there are countless illustrations to the contrary. Therefore, I say that the task before us is not the task of a quarter of a century, nor of half a century. Indeed, sir, if we are to be fair and candid with the Filipino, we must say to him that he is with us for all time, unless we turn him loose now. So far as those now living in the Philippines are concerned, they will never secure independence if they await the completion of the full task which we assume by remaining longer.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I do not want to interrupt the Senator; but I should like to suggest to him that in those governments where the people have evolved their own civilization and reached a point where no one would question their capacity for maintaining a government of their own, in order to change to our form of government they have almost universally been forced to resort to revolution, and the revolutions have almost universally come from the class of people who Senators maintain upon this floor are incapable of self-government.

Mr. BORAH. All revolutions in government that had any real foundation have started from the masses.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I entirely agree with what the Senator has said; and I want to cite an instance bearing out the Senator's argument that mere forms of self-government do not constitute self-government; and that, on the contrary, without any forms at all, if the people understand the principles of self-government, they will have it. I refer to the contrast between the man the Senator has described, who drew a free constitution for the Philippine Islands and did not know what the writ of habeas corpus was, and the great, free people of Great Britain, probably as free a people as there are in the world, who have no constitution at all, so far as any written form is concerned.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. President, one more illustration upon this matter and I will pass it over.

It has been said in this debate that there is very little resemblance between the Mexican situation in previous years and that in the Philippines. I find a very strong resemblance.

The Philippines were discovered and brought under control by the same class of explorers as those who overran and conquered Mexico—the same treatment of the natives, the same method of control, the same remorseless rule ensued. I venture to say the same effect and the same deadly virus were the inheritance of both countries from the common master. Allow me to digress here long enough to say I have read a good many pages of history, some bright and some exceptionally black, but I have never read any story of frightfulness anywhere equal to the dismal, monotonous, ruthless, unbroken, and unending story of oppression and injustice in Mexico. In duration and in demoniacal heartlessness, in unvarying fiendishness it has no parallel, so far as I know. Compared with it the cruelties inflicted upon Cuba which called into action the humanitarian spirit of a whole Nation were mild and fleeting. And so far as bringing any relief was concerned, the people of Mexico gained nothing by her independence. It left the same class of rulers—men with the same conception of the rights of the masses, the same venal appetites. It is a pathetic tale, the scene of which lies so close to our door, this effort, this long, futile struggle of the masses to be free, to realize that ever-haunting, half-waking dream of ownership of their lands and their homes; a dream always interrupted at a propitious moment under Empire or Republic alike by that debonair and delivilish clique of conspirators, the sole inheritors of Mexico from the mother country.

It is now over a hundred years since the statesman-priest, Miguel Hidalgo, called about him the oppressed, the peons and the slaves, and declared war on their oppressors. From that hour to this the fight has gone on, and in my humble judgment they are no nearer realizing anything like a free or tolerable government to-day than they were 100 years ago. The ruling class as elsewhere at all times talk glibly of free government and practice the most pronounced oppression; profess great concern for the poor yet with unabated vigilance restrain them to the dead level of hopeless serfdom. These rulers have succeeded in their nefarious schemes from year to year and from decade to decade because they have been successful in denying to the masses all opportunity or chance of advancement, in deluding them from time to time with the promise of free homes and free government, but always denying the one and for the other giving them a most cruel, exacting, venal, blood-sucking aristocracy.

In 1856 in Mexico under Juarez—about the one real sympathizing patriot, so far as the masses were concerned, that Mexico ever produced—they wrote a remarkable constitution. I have it upon my desk and had intended to read from it, but I have not the time. It is a remarkable instrument. It divides the government into three parts—the legislative, the executive, and the administrative—and then they wrote a remarkable charter of principles. It was written by Juarez and his supporters, by those who constituted the masses or the governed class. As soon as it was put into effect, and as soon as it began to prevail in Mexico, the governing class conspired to destroy it, and the war between them has been going on from that time until now. Leaders like Juarez could not rely upon the masses. Yet many were able to read. Many were able to write. They could make constitutions. They were of exceptional intelligence for people who had been raised as they were. But the capacity for self-government was utterly a thing apart from the masses of the Mexican people. The result has been that you have had class war in Mexico from that hour until now; and, in my judgment, you will have the same question in the Philippines until those people are not only—if I could use the term properly—reconstructed but rehabilitated in their entire conception of self-government. Will some man tell me within what number of years we could do that?

Mr. LANE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. LANE. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the Senator has said, and I have noticed that he bases his argument that the Filipinos will be unable to govern themselves upon the assumption that for the past 300 years they have been saturated with examples of government set them by the Spanish. As a matter of fact, as I have read the history of the Philippine Islands, the Filipino people for 300 years were in revolt against the Spanish rule, and have never accepted it at any time, and never at any time within the 300 years of occupancy of that country by the Spanish people did the Spanish Governor General or any of his suite or any of his functionaries dare go outside of a walled city without danger of losing their lives. The Spanish influence never went beyond the reach of their cannon. The people of the interior of the country were in revolt against them for 300 years continually and constantly, and no Spanish Governor General in 300 years had his scalp safe on his head unless he stayed within or hugged close to a walled city. From within walled cities they tried to rule them, but the rule did not extend far outside of the wall. They did not become accustomed to or receive any inspiration from the Spanish rule. They fought it all down the line for all that time. They are amply prepared, if resistance and repugnance to that kind of a government prepare them, for freedom. They were held in check by the military power of Spain, but never admired or consented to the methods of conducting a government as it was conducted by that country. The lone 10 per cent to whom the distinguished Senator now refers were the people who lived inside of the walled cities, and not those who were free and out in the open country.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon, because it entirely accentuates the view which I take of this situation. There is a way of saturating a man which is different from applying hot cloths. But this statement that was filed with the ex-President by the learned Filipinos said, as one of the arguments in favor of free government:

> When a people such as the Filipinos give signal evidence of their capacity to obey during a period of over 300 years, free from disturbance or deep political commotions, it must be granted, considering that all things tend to progress, that they possess the art of government; all the more so because, among other powers, they possess that of assimilation in a marked degree, an assimilativeness which distinguishes them from other people of the Far East.

I do not think there is any difference between the Senator and myself as to final results.

Now, let us view this preamble just a moment, for I am going to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] as a substitute for the preamble and a substitute for the bill, because that is the effect of it. It is a substitute. It is

offered as an amendment, but the effect of it is to constitute it a substitute.

The preamble says:

Whereas it is desirable to place in the hands of the people of the Philippines such an increasing control of their domestic affairs as can be given them without, in the meantime, impairing the sovereignty of the United States, in order that, by the use and exercise of popular franchise and governmental powers, they may be the better prepared to fully assume the responsibilities and enjoy all the privileges of complete independence, which it is the purpose of the United States to grant when, in the judgment of the United States, it will be to the permanent interest of the people of the Philippine Islands.

No impartial tribunal is erected to pass upon that question; but the United States, when in its judgment it shall deem it to the permanent interest of the Filipino people to have independence, is going to grant that independence. To hold a people in subjection when you say to them, "You are practically prepared for independence," when as a matter of fact they are not practically prepared for independence and will not be for long years to come, is, in my judgment, to create disturbance, to breed revolution, to create discontent and dissatisfaction. It is to invite trouble. It is to make real progress in their interest most difficult, if not impossible.

If this bill passes with the preamble in it, within 90 days or six months those people will begin to feel that the time is ripening for their independence; that you could not have been talking about an independence in the far-off years; that it must be something that is practically now within their reach, and that they are practically fitted for it. The effect of the preamble would be to breed discontent among the people of the Philippines if you do not give them their independence within a very reasonable time.

If I am correct in my position that if we stay there for 5 years or 10 years or 15 years or 20 years and then give them their independence they will as a permanent proposition be no better fitted for self-government than they are now, we are going to have all kinds of trouble and difficulty within a very short time by reason of this preamble. They will construe it from their standpoint, and they will insist that they are entitled to have it construed from their standpoint and from what they believe to be their capacity for self-government.

I think it was Mr. Burke, the great English orator and philosopher, who said, in his speech on reconciliation with America, that—

Refined policy ever has been the parent of confusion and ever will be so long as the world endures. Plain, good intentions—

The orator continues—

as easily discovered at first as fraud is sure to be detected at last, is, let me say, no mean force in the government of mankind. A genuine simplicity of heart is a healing and cementing principle.

This is the substance, if not his exact words.

I think of all things in legislation the most important is language which is not susceptible of misconstruction or misunderstanding. It ought to be plain, simple, direct, and positive. We ought not, in my judgment, even to discuss the question of independence with these people at this time if we are going to retain them until indeed they are fit for self-government.

Now, Mr. President, there is one other reason why I am inclined to support this amendment.

Mr. SHAFROTH. In line with the statement the Senator has just made that they would not be fitted for self-government for decades and decades, does he not think that that would lead to insurrection and to revolts among the Filipino people?

Mr. BORAH. Well, if it did, then we are up against this proposition of postponing that insurrection for a day only, because I can not conceive of the United States remaining in the Philippines for any purpose any longer except to educate the Filipino people in self-government. I do not see any other business we have there; I can not see any other reason for our remaining; and it is utterly untenable to my mind to assume that we can do that task or perform that duty inside of decades.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not understand that it is the purpose of the Senator from Idaho to make any declaration on the subject at all.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator has stated his own view but it is no part of his purpose to insert in this measure such a declaration.

Mr. BORAH. Not at all.

Mr. President, there is one other feature of this question which is in one sense a peculiar one, and still it can not be ignored in this debate. For 17 years one of the great political parties of this country has assumed the position that the Filipino people ought to have their independence. That party is now in power in all the departments of Government. So far as the pledge of an opposite party is concerned it might not greatly concern me as a citizen of the United States and a member of another party, but we must deal with such questions from a little different viewpoint and at a different range, as it were intellectually, when we come to interpret those pledges in the light of what a dependent people expect and what they have a right to expect now. This campaign has been going on in this country, as I said, for nearly 20 years. In 1900, in 1904, and so on the great party now in power pledged itself to the giving of these people independence when they should come into power. There was no misunderstanding as to the meaning of that pledge in the campaigns. We may refine upon it here in the Senate Chamber, but the people of the United States understood it, and if the people of the United States understood it you may be assured that the Filipino people interpreted it even more strongly in favor of independence.

I will take a moment to recall those pledges, because they do not admit, in my judgment, of misconstruction, and are not to be ignored in the full and fair discharge of our duty:

We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder, which has involved us in enormous expenses, brought us weakness instead of strength, and laid our Nation open to the charge of abandoning a fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration—

This was in 1908—

of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us as we guarantee the independence of Cuba, until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers. In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our Government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases.

It has been said here that that did not necessarily mean that the Filipino people were capable of self-government; that it might take some time. I refer to a speech by Mr. Bryan, made many years ago—and certainly the Filipinos are no less fit for self-government now than they were then—in which he said:

We are told that the Filipinos are not capable of self-government. That has a familiar ring. Only two years ago I heard the same argument made against a very respectable minority of the people of this country. * * * Self-government is a constant education; the capacity for self-government increases with participation in government. The Filipinos are not far enough advanced to share in the government of the people of the United States, but they are competent to govern themselves.

* * * * * * *

Give the Filipinos time and opportunity, and while they never will catch up with us, unless we cease to improve, yet they may some day stand where we stand now—

And so forth.

I could quote to any extent from similar sentiments made by not only the distinguished leader of the party at that time, and possessing some influence in his party still, I suspect, but other distinguished leaders of the party, to the effect that the declaration in the platform meant precisely what it said—that the Filipino people were fit for self-government and were entitled to complete independence. Now, that pledge has been in existence upon the part of this party for the last 17 or 20 years.

As I said, that party is now in power. For one, I am not going to stand in the way of a fulfillment of that pledge because it does not relate to me, as some of the platform pledges might as a citizen of the United States, but it is a pledge by this Government, as it is now controlled, to a dependent people.

Mr. Moorfield Storey, in interpreting this platform, said a few days ago:

Upon these statements of policy and these promises the Democratic Party has sought the support of the voters, and it has now received that support and is in full control of the Government. If words mean anything, it has promised to give the Filipinos their independence, and no man can trust it if this promise is broken. Why should any Democrat suggest that the policy which his party has so uniformly and so repeatedly pledged itself to adopt be now abandoned and the Republican policy which it has "condemned and denounced," which it has characterized as "an indefinite, irresponsible, discretionary, and vague absolutism," which it has called "an inexcusable blunder," be now adopted or by delay continued in operation?

That is a construction placed on the platform by one of the most intelligent and one of the ablest Democrats in the country. Now, what interpretation naturally have the Filipino people placed upon it, and if it is not carried out—if that pledge is not fulfilled—in what condition of mind does it leave the Filipino people in the Philippines?

In my judgment, Mr. President, we can not ignore those pledges as we might as Republicans if they were dealing with matters which related solely and wholly to our own country.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, does the Senator from Idaho think that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas is a redemption of this pledge, which, as I understand him, is that the Filipinos shall be given immediate independence?

I call the attention of the Senator from Idaho to the fact that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas pro-

poses to give the Filipinos independence, perhaps, because it has a proviso which reads:

That if the President, at the expiration of the said period of four years, shall find that the condition of the internal or external affairs of said Philippines in respect to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government thereof is such as to warrant him in so doing, he is hereby further authorized, by proclamation duly made and published, to extend the said time to and including the date of the final adjournment of the session of Congress which shall convene next after the date of the expiration of the said period of four years, and thus afford the Congress an opportunity in its discretion to further consider the situation in the said Philippines.

So this extends independence with a string to it, which may be pulled back.

Mr. BORAH. It also provides that it shall go into effect unless Congress affirmatively rescinds or repeals this act.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Which Congress may very well do.

Mr. BORAH. Congress may very well do it, Mr. President. I am aware that it is an easy thing to pass resolutions in a political convention. I am also aware that to withdraw sovereignty where it has once obtained or to take the flag out of the sky with which it has become familiar is about the most difficult and tantalizing task that a people can undertake to perform. It is a very difficult thing to withdraw sovereignty.

I have no doubt that the Senator from Arkansas in offering this amendment had to accommodate himself to a situation and that there were those who were not willing to let the Filipinos go to-morrow or the next day, and, indeed, I presume, too, that it would be unwise, until the transfer of government could be made complete and efficient and effective, to do so; but it is a decided step, and in brief will be a conclusive step.

There is one thing that will be certain, and I think the Senator from Utah will agree with me. If that is passed, in at least five years from now those people will be free.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think that would follow at all.

Mr. BORAH. I think it does, for this reason: I have no fear in the world of Congress ever repealing this law if we start upon the proposition of independence.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The proviso that I have already read provides that the President may extend the time if, in his judgment, it appears that the conditions as to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government are such as to justify him in doing it. Of course if the conditions in that respect are such as to justify the President in extending the time, the language of the proviso, it seems to me, very clearly indicates that they will be sufficient to justify Congress in making some other disposition; and Congress may indefinitely extend the time or repeal the law altogether. It is not a hard and fast piece of legislation.

Mr. BORAH. No.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As I said, it is independence with a string to it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senator that if the date fixed in an act were absolute, four or five years from now, there would be a right in Congress to repeal the act. You can not make a legislative act which can not be repealed. Considering the exigencies that might arise, considering that we might be in a state of war at the time, it seems to me it would be very appropriate for the President to have the power to extend the time for a year, or even to extend it longer.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then, if the Senator from Idaho will permit me, let me ask the Senator from Colorado, if the effect of the legislation is the same whether it contains this proviso or not, why put in the proviso?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no; it is not the same.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I thought not.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; it is not the same; but I believe, and I think the Senator believes, if this is passed, as the Senator from Idaho has said, it will end our jurisdiction over there within five years, not that Congress could not vote under that proviso to extend the time—it could extend the time under any statement that might be made—but a pledge made by Congress is not likely ever to be violated by either a subsequent Congress or by the people of the United States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What the Senator from Colorado says is true—that if the proviso was not here at all Congress would still have the power to repeal the legislation. There is not any doubt about that. But the difference would be that in the one case there would be a positive, absolute piece of legislation the terms of which Congress would have to violate if it repealed the law, whereas with the proviso in there is not any violation of the terms, because Congress will have reserved the right. It is precisely the thing we do very often in legislation which affects the rights of private individuals. We grant a right to construct a bridge, or something of that sort, and we give the grantee warning by putting in the legislation a provision that this law may be repealed or altered or amended by Congress at any time. We warn him in advance what we may do. It is not because it adds to the power of Congress, but we put it in as an express admonition that we are reserving our right to do that, instead of giving the understanding that the law is unalterable and irrepealable.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator from Idaho permit me a suggestion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If Congress should pass a law at this session giving the Filipinos their independence in four years, a subsequent Congress could repeal that. There is another point to which I wish to call the Senator's attention. If this amendment is ever written upon the statute books it goes to the people of America for their approval or disapproval, and no political party in power, in my judgment, will come back here four years hence instructed to undo the work.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator from Idaho will allow me, Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], who seems to think the bill provides some method of extending the four-year term, if he has read the language in the bill which provides that in not more than four years independence shall be granted to the Philippine Islands. If that four years began on the 1st day of February, at 12 o'clock, it would compel the President of the United States four years from the 1st day of next February, at 12 o'clock, or at some time prior to that date to grant independence.

The bill then goes on to say that at the expiration of the period of four years—that is, at 12 o'clock four years from the 1st day of next February—after their independence has been granted under the terms of the bill, the President may consult Congress as to whether or not he shall continue the administration in the islands.

I will confess that under the conditions described in the language of the bill I am unable to see how it could be fulfilled. The bill provides that independence shall be granted before the time at which the President is allowed to consider whether or not it ought to be granted. The Senator from Idaho may want to vote for that provision.

Mr. BORAH. I do no think the view of the Senator is a correct view.

Mr. LIPPITT. I would be glad to have the Senator from Utah explain that provision if he is able.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I appreciate the great anxiety of the Senator from Rhode Island to have the views of the Senator from Utah, but really I would like to conclude and then let them enlighten one another later.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. COLT. I should like to ask the Senator how he reconciles his position of granting independence to the Filipinos with the other position which he has elucidated so ably that the people are not capable at the present time of establishing a stable form of government. If the people are not able at the present time to establish a stable form of government, does not the Government of the United States owe to them a duty which it does not fulfill by granting them independence now and thus setting them adrift before they are capable of maintaining any form of stable government?

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator a question in order to enable me to answer him more intelligently. How long does the Senator think, in view of the speech which he made this afternoon, it will take us to educate those people for self-government?

Mr. COLT. I have no idea how long it will take; and if the Senator presses me further upon that question I would say that I think we are bound to continue the same policy with the Filipino people which we have continued for 15 years, and that I would so treat the Filipino people in the future that at the time they might demand their independence they would then feel under such obligation to us that they would not desire their independence any more than Canada desires its independence from Great Britain to-day.

I can not forecast the future, but I do feel that we have a sacred duty to fulfill to these people who have been under our charge for more than 15 years, and to my mind it would be unbecoming this great Government now to set them adrift. Let us be consistent and not hesitate to fulfill the high duty and responsibility which has fallen upon us as a great power.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it is very difficult to secure from even so eminent a jurist and so profound a student of his-

tory as the Senator from Rhode Island any suggestion at all as to how long it would take us to perform the task which he says it is our duty to perform.

I would agree with the Senator that there has arisen a certain moral obligation upon the part of this Government toward the Filipino people, but I am just as thoroughly convinced of the proposition as I would be of any other that could be possibly presented to my mind, that we are not going to remain in the Philippines long enough to teach them the capacity or the art of self-government, and that when you vote down the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas you vote to retain permanently the Philippine Islands.

So there are two questions here—first, whether you are going to retain the Philippine Islands permanently or, second, whether you are going to release them within a reasonable time, within such time as they can take into their hands the reins of government and assume jurisdiction over the islands.

Mr. COLT. May I ask the Senator whether we should take any action at this particular time? Why make any such declaration as is set forth in the Clarke amendment? Why not pass the bill which the committee has reported and let the matter rest there for the present?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have been seeking to explain during the afternoon why I think it is unwise to pass the bill as it is, because it promises independence, when at the same time we know that not within this generation or the succeeding generation will they be fit for self-government. I think that is eminently unwise legislation, but I think it foreshadows beyond a question what ultimately we are going to do, and that is to turn the Filipino people over to themselves or to their form of government within a time in which they will not be any better fitted for self-government than they are now.

Originally, Mr. President, I viewed this situation just as the former Senator from Massachusetts, Senator Hoar, and others did, that we ought not to have gone into the Philippine Islands at all. After we had gone into the islands and assumed certain obligations I became convinced that a moral obligation had arisen and we owed the Filipino people some duty, and we ought to perform that duty.

I have since become convinced, however, just as certainly, that under the political situation as it prevails from time to time in the United States this is going to be a political question until it is settled, and so long as it is a political question we will never teach the people of the Philippines that capacity for self-government which will enable them to deal with the question as we deal with self-government. It will be a political question in the United States, and party prejudices will be constantly changing policies in the Philippines.

I will call your attention to one who has studied this question as profoundly as any man in the United States, and who was originally as much in earnest with reference to holding the Philippines as any other man in the United States, who has defended the United States in its action upon the Philippines as effectively as any other man, and that is ex-Senator Root, where he says:

> If things are to be done in that way—

That is, if the Philippine question is always to be a political question—and it always will be a political question—

> we had better give the Islands their independence promptly; not promise it in the future, but give notice of an election and turn it over as we did with Cuba.

Undoubtedly the former Senator from New York has come to the conclusion that we are going to get out of the Philippine Islands before we shall have fully done that which he thought ought to have been achieved before we left the islands. He feels that under the conditions which are to prevail by reason of playing politics we ought to leave now.

That position, Mr. President, is the position which I assume in regard to the Clarke amendment. I am quite aware that it does not turn it over, as Senator Root says in his letter, but it takes the step which, in my judgment, will likely never be retraced.

In conclusion, it is my purpose to vote for the Clarke amendment, which, as I have stated, is in effect a substitute for the bill. I do so because, in the first place, I entertain no doubt that it is a wiser course than that outlined in the bill proper, carrying, as it does, this preamble.

I do so for the further reason that this Philippine question has been for 20 years a political question, more so now in a practical way than ever before. It seems clear that it is always to be a football of party politics, that a dependent people are to be tossed about by the vicissitudes of party interest. That being true, it is utterly impossible to perform adequately the great task before us in the Philippines. We are doing what we are doing at a tremendous risk, and as failure under these conditions seems certain I prefer to withdraw our sovereignty now.

There are other and controlling reasons which I have indicated in my remarks, but which I will not recapitulate. If we could have gone on as we started, keeping strictly to the task of teaching these people the art of free government and the principles of a higher civilization, withholding all promise of independence until we should approach something near the time of its fruition I would have been willing to remain longer. Indeed, if I thought we would stay until in a true sense this experiment had been fully tested I would have been willing to stay. But this bill and the sentiment behind it leads me inevitably to the policy outlined by the Clarke amendment. Of the two policies I think it preferable.

Mr. THOMAS obtained the floor.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator, not controversial at all but to get his opinion. Why should the pending question dealing with the disposition of the Philippine Islands be a political or a party question? What is there about it that it should take on that attitude?

Mr. BORAH. Of course, theoretically, the Senator's inferences are quite correctly taken. It should not be a political question. But the Senator, of course, knows quite as well as I know that it is a political question, both here and in the Philippines.

Mr. STONE. Then does the Senator mean that one of the great political parties will favor the granting of independence to the Philippines in some form and that another one of the great political parties will oppose it?

Mr. BORAH. That has been the exact situation, I believe, for the last 17 years—the Republicans believing that the time was not yet at hand to promise independence.

Mr. STONE. Really I did not know that it had been a political or party question. To my thinking it ought to be so far removed from the field of party politics that I have not discovered that it was really a party question. I feel that Senators on a question of this kind ought to vote their opinion as to what is best for the country without any reference to party questions. If I am mistaken about it, and one party favors independence and the other is opposed to it, then am I to understand that the Democratic Party favors granting independence; and if it does that, the Republican Party is opposed to granting independence to the Filipino people?

I wanted to get near to an exact issue if possible, if there be such an issue, which I hoped there was not, and I have been inclined to believe that there was not.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Missouri looks entirely serious. There is an outward calm that is interesting.

Mr. STONE. And I am serious.

Mr. BORAH. But one of the most vital political questions that we have had in this country during one campaign, and incidentally important in all other campaigns, is the attitude of the two parties with reference to the Philippines. The Democratic Party pledged itself to independence.

Mr. STONE. That was 15 years ago.

Mr. BORAH. And ever since. You repeated it in the last platform. You say in the Democratic platform that you reassert and reavow all the things which you have said for the last 15 years with reference to the Philippines, and that you are in favor of carrying out the program, as you term it, and that, if put in power, you will do so. Here is the platform——

Mr. STONE. I am familiar with the platform. I know the attitude of the Democratic Party on the subject; but what is the attitude of the Republican Party?

Mr. BORAH. The attitude of the Republican Party was that we ought to stay in the Philippines until we enabled the Filipinos to exercise the art of self-government.

Mr. STONE. And the Senator from Idaho thinks that that may be 300 or 400 years.

Mr. BORAH. I am not at all averse to saying, Mr. President, I am not ashamed to say in the presence of this distinguished body, and I am not afraid to say in the face of history, that the Filipino people will not be fitted for self-government, upon any standard which has ever prevailed in a free government, inside of 200 years.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. Wait just a moment. The Senator from Missouri is a historian; he challenged me upon that point the other day; and I now ask him to point me to a single instance where a people have ever acquired the art or capacity for self-government inside of 500 years?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. I understand I was recognized a few moments ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado was recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. I have no desire to take the floor if the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has not yielded.

Mr. BORAH. I am going to yield now.

Mr. STONE. I undertook to interrupt the Senator from Idaho for a moment.

Mr. BORAH. I had intended to sit down, but the Senator from Missouri wanted to be enlightened as to the Democratic platform.

Mr. THOMAS. I wanted to ascertain my status on the floor.

Mr. STONE. I particularly wish to be enlightened as to the Republican attitude. You can never tell anything about a Republican platform; that goes as a matter of course. The Senator from Idaho asked me——

Mr. BORAH. Now, let us not discuss party platforms this afternoon, because that is an engaging subject.

Mr. STONE. Yes; and I will not do so, although the Senator from Idaho has provoked it.

There is a modern instance—a very recent instance—where I think the people concerned were no better qualified than are the Filipinos for self-government. I refer to Cuba.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, permit me merely to say that if you withdraw the protectorate of the United States from Cuba and take the lid off in Cuba you will see what kind of a self-government they have got there at this hour.

Mr. STONE. We have not any pretense of self-government in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, of course, an infant may walk so long as somebody holds him up, but—I do not say this disrespectfully—it is wholly misleading to assume for a moment that the Cuban people are trained now in the art of self-government.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I wish merely to say that there is, of course, no pretense of an independent self-government, or anything approximating it, in the Philippine Islands at this time. We are governing the Philippines; we make the laws for them; we supply them with American officials, and all that. So far as the Cuban people are concerned, it may be that the Senator's conjectures as to what might happen in certain contingencies might prove true.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. STONE. Very well. Mr. President, I did not know that the Senator from Colorado had the floor. I rose to make an inquiry of the Senator from Idaho before he took his seat, and he yielded to me before he did take his seat, but since the Senator from Colorado resents it——

Mr. THOMAS. I am perfectly good-natured about it. I simply was tired of "watchfully waiting." [Laughter.]

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I will not interrupt the Senator further.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Chair has anything to do with it, he will now recognize the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] asked the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] what the Republican platform says on this question. I happened to have the platform in my hand, and thought it would be appropriate to call attention to the platform of the Republican Party as in issue with the platform of the Democratic Party on that question in 1900. The Senator says he did not understand this was a party question, and yet in 1900 it was really the paramount issue of the campaign. I asked the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] to corroborate my recollection of that the other day, and I think he agreed with me that Mr. Bryan, as the candidate of the Democratic Party, made that what he called "the paramount issue."

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state that I said that Mr. Bryan tried to make that question the paramount issue, but that the newspapers of New York would not let it be done, because they wanted the financial interests to become the paramount issue. I have no doubt they carried the eastern part of the country on the financial plank in the platform.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Well, Mr. Bryan, as the nominee of his party, did the best he could to make it the paramount issue, and consequently it was the issue. The Republican platform of 1900 said:

> In accepting by the treaty of Paris the just responsibility of our victories in the Spanish War, the President and the Senate won the undoubted approval of the American people. No other course was possible than to destroy Spain's sovereignty throughout the West Indies and in the Philippine Islands. That course created our responsibility before the world and with the unorganized population whom our intervention had freed from Spain to provide for the maintenance of law and order and for the establishment of good government and for the performance of international obligations.
>
> Our authority could not be less than our responsibility, and wherever sovereign rights were extended it became the high duty of the Government to maintain its authority to put down armed insurrection and to confer the blessings of liberty and civilization upon all the rescued peoples.
>
> The largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties shall be secured to them by law.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, before the Senator from Washington takes his seat, I wish to ask him a question. It seems that for the enlightenment of the American people the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is to be filled up with platform promises on this question. I want to ask the Senator if the Bull Moose Party has not very recently spoken on the question?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not think so, Mr. President.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I understand that he has, and that he has declared in favor of getting out of the Philippines.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The platform of the Progressive Party contained no such declaration.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho if he will not publish——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must insist that some little decent respect shall be shown to the Chair. The Chair recognized the Senator from Colorado. Does he yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. LIPPITT. I simply want to ask the Senator from Idaho a question, if the Senator from Colorado will permit me to do so.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield, of course, but I hope the Senator's question will not open up another long debate.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Colorado, I simply desire to ask the Senator from Idaho, in connection with his quotation from Mr. Root, if he will not have published the entire letter of which the quotation was a part, so that it can be made plain just what Mr. Root's position is on that question?

Mr. BORAH. I have no objection to have published in my speech anything that Mr. Root may say upon any subject.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have listened with close attention to the remarks of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] upon the pending bill, whose every utterance meets my hearty approval. I do not think it is possible for one people to educate another people to its standard of efficiency either in self-government or in any other sort of government. They may, of course, transmit many of their experiences and they may make a profound impression upon the governmental theories of the subject people; but the spirit of nationality, to which the Senator from Idaho so eloquently referred, is one which embraces, and which I think is inseparable from, those ideas of government which are peculiar to it and which have been evolved either through stages of barbarism or civilization, or both, into the standard which appeals to it, and which is also best and most adaptable to its needs.

I do not believe that if the United States retained the Philippine Islands forever for the sole purpose of educating the Filipinos into the capacity for self-government—and we do not pretend to retain them for any other—that such purpose would be accomplished; that is, from the standpoint of Anglo-Saxon ideals of self-government; nor do I believe that it could do so in any given time or indefinitely, nor that any duty has devolved upon us to do it, or that we should do it at all.

If I understand the attitude of some of the opponents of this measure, of which the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] is a distinguished exponent, it is that out of our occupation and possession of the Philippine Islands has been evolved a duty—a solemn, unavoidable duty—resting upon the shoulders of the American people requiring them to transmit, before their protectorate shall be ended, no matter how long it may take, to the people of the Philippine Islands its own institutions, its own ideas of government, its own bases of society, its own methods of civilization; then it should turn them adrift, because they will then be perfectly able to take care of themselves.

Mr. President, I know of no recorded instance in history where anything of that kind ever took place, and I am confident that nothing of the kind ever did or ever will take place. The Senator, perfectly candid, as he always is, when face to face with the results of his doctrine, not only virtually concedes that that period of time will never come, but asserts that we should continue the policy in the hope that it would so far educate them as to destroy their sense or desire of self-government and make them so content with their lot that, like Canada, they will prefer their subjection to their independ-

ence; from which I infer that the Senator, recognizing the impossibility of the performance of the duty whose existence he asserts would continue the attempt to perform it until its purpose was visibly impossible of accomplishment, not only to the teacher but to the taught. By that time the old process of benevolent assimilation would have become effective, and the Filipinos, solely dependent upon us, would have lost their desire for liberty in their enjoyment of our mild and elevating overlordship.

Mr. President, I think that there is a duty which we owed to the Philippines when the Spanish War was ended; I think we still owe it to them; and I regret very much that we did not recognize and perform it away back in 1899 and 1900, as we should have done. It was pictured on this floor by the great Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Hoar, in one of the greatest orations that ever fell from human lips, filled with warnings not only as to the effect of our proposed policy on the Filipinos but upon our own institutions. The same note of warning was sounded at the other end of this building by the great Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. Reed. A former Senator from Vermont, still living I believe, used his pen in vigorous protest against what seemed to be to him a threatened violation of American principles, and a former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. John G. Carlisle, in one of the most statesmanlike articles ever written, published, I think, in Harper's Monthly of September, 1899, pointed to the inevitable fact that we were about to embark upon a policy which would surely transform our traditional policy, violate the underlying principle of our institutions, and enter upon a career of colonization with the avowed object of what was then popularly known as "benevolent assimilation," whose results no man could foresee beyond the certainty of national misfortune. But the Nation was deaf to these appeals. We did not regard our duty then, Mr. President; we waved it aside and bought the Filipinos for $2 apiece, paying $20,000,000 for them and for their islands; we took forcible possession of them at once and have held them ever since, under the protest of a great portion of the American people and under a sort of common consent that at some time in the remote future we would withdraw from them and let them work out their own destiny.

I do not believe there is much difference between any of those who have considered the subject, whatever their political affiliations may be, about the general proposition that we should not remain indefinitely in the islands.

The difference is between those who would fix a definite time for leaving them and those who contend that it is impossible to fix a time because of the difficulty of performing the task which our duty has placed upon us within any specific period. That is ostensibly the difference; the real difference is, Mr. President, that some of us think we should get out of the islands as soon as we can, while others do not propose to get out of there at all, since they can very easily assign an indefinite time for final action, to be measured by our opinion of the capacity of the people for self-government, and then, as we are the judges as to when that time arrives, we can and will postpone it forever. We will thus remain in the Orient, albeit we protest that we have neither the desire nor the intention of doing so.

Mr. President, the real duty imposed upon the American people by our occupation of the islands is to me an obvious one. It has not been accomplished. It was evolved from the act of our occupation, and has continued and will continue until we perform it. That duty is to leave the islands as soon as we can do so decently, as soon as we can do so safely, as soon as we can do so with due regard to an avoidance of those disturbances which are inseparable from putting the change into effectual operation.

Mr. President, if there is a doctrine which may be said to contain a national policy for America it is what is popularly known as the Monroe doctrine, announced nearly a century ago, since which time it has received the unanimous and sometimes the overenthusiastic support of all the American people. It is familiar to all, and therefore not necessary that I should repeat it; I recall, however, that when the proposition was submitted to Mr. Jefferson he wrote Mr. Madison giving it his unqualified adherence, yet emphasized the corollary of the proposition; that America should avoid all entangling alliances abroad, keep her hands off the affairs of the Eastern Hemisphere, refrain from participation in European affairs, and confine her political activities to the western world; in other words, the doctrine involved mutuality of conduct and consistency of action whereby, as a consideration of our insistence upon its observance, we should restrict ourselves to our own and the affairs of our own hemisphere. But when the Philippines were taken over, Mr. President, we established an outpost 10,000 miles from our mainland, away off in the Orient, and by that act struck our own great Monroe doctrine a blow in the face. We repudiated our own policy, placed ourselves in direct antagonism with its principle, and gave the nations of Europe warrant for believing that our hunger for land had overcome our previous declaration of a doctrine whose adoption was essential to our freedom and with what seemed to be our manifest destiny.

It must never be forgotten that we owe duties, Mr. President, to ourselves quite as strong, and to my mind far stronger and more insistent, than any which have been imposed upon us with regard to the Philippines by reason of the relations which we voluntarily assumed and have occupied toward that country during the past 15 or 16 years. One of them, and perhaps the most important, is to so conduct our relations with other countries and other lands as to make our national policy of "hands off the American Continent" effective at all times.

What is one of the results, or one of the apparent results, of this policy of annexation? The so-called Clarke amendment provides—and, indeed, I think, it may be essential—that when the Philippine Islands are turned over to their own people, we shall seek to effectuate by treaty arrangement with other governments such provisions for their safety, their autonomy, and their neutralization as may be essential to their welfare; in other words, the duty which we have assumed, the obligation which we have imposed upon ourselves is not so much the attempt to educate the people of the Philippines to the impossible, as it is to make arrangements, possibly entangling alliances with other nations, for the betterment and welfare of a people with whom we should never have had any relations whatever. Where these treaties may lead us no man knoweth. But we do know that they are the outgrowth of our disregard of a national policy, whose overshadowing importance to ourselves has been the theme of every statesman and diplomatist since 1823. Yes; we must make alliances forsooth with other nations for the protection of an Asiatic people with whom we have nothing in common, whom we secured at the behest of commercialism rather than from any concern for their so-called civilization.

Mr. President, we hear a good deal in these exciting times about the need of preparation for national defense. The imagination of many good men and women easily pictures the menace of foreign invasion; the air and the sea and the land seem to them to be peopled with specters of danger ever approaching from every side, the more apprehensive because they are unreal and indefinite, yet many of those who really entertain the view that our alleged defenseless condition makes us a tempting victim to any of the great powers of the world are among those who would keep the Philippines indefinitely, either as a subject Province or as an outlying colony, which may become fitted through the exigencies of industry and of politics for admission to statehood. They insist upon keeping a land thousands of miles away from our coast, which is unprotected and undefended, and which therefore offers to any nation which may design to enter into a conflict with the American people the most tempting opportunity to begin hostilities, where it would be practically impossible for us to promptly meet and overcome it. Of course, an attack of that sort, Mr. President, arousing the national indignation and appealing to the national pride, would inevitably plunge us into a war, which perhaps never would have arisen but for the opportunity given to bring it on through the existence of these conditions which this bill, I think, would put an end to. In other words, Mr. President, the Philippines are a source of national danger. I think that the suggestion made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] to the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] a few moments ago of the attitude of ex-President Roosevelt concerning the problem is correct, if I have been properly informed as to what he has recently said about it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am not fully informed as to the attitude of ex-President Roosevelt on the question. That, however, was not the question that was asked me by the Senator from Mississippi. He asked me as to the declaration of the Progressive Party platform on the question.

Mr. THOMAS. I understood the Senator from Mississippi to ask the Senator from Washington if the great leader of the late so-called Bull Moose Party had not recently announced himself in favor of an abandonment of the Philippine Islands. I may have been mistaken.

Mr. VARDAMAN. No; the question——

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think I heard the Senator from Mississippi distinctly. On the contrary, he asked me if the platform of that party had not so declared, and I informed him that it had not.

Mr. VARDAMAN. No; I asked the Senator, in a facetious spirit, if the Bull Moose Party had not recently declared in favor of releasing the Philippine Islands.

Mr. POINDEXTER. They have not. That was the question, as I understood it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Then I said to the Senator that I understood that "he" had. [Laughter.]

Mr. POINDEXTER. I did not catch the latter remark. I merely want to say that the attitude of Mr. Roosevelt was discussed here the other day, and a quotation from some of his utterances was made to show that he had been in favor of declaring to the Filipinos that we would give them their independence as soon as they were capable of self-government, but that construction of his utterance was disputed here, and I do not think that it was susceptible of that construction myself.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not care, of course, to raise the question whether or not my information was correct. I think, however, that the opinion of the late leader of the Bull Moose Party is much more important than the expression of the opinion of that party, which is now but a passing memory.

My understanding, however, is that the very point which I was just seeking to emphasize had impressed itself upon Col. Roosevelt, within the last four or five months at least, so strongly and so powerfully that, recognizing the danger involved in our exposed position away out across the seas, he suggested that it would be well to get rid of them, and get rid of them as soon as possible, especially, Mr. President, in view of the fact, as was well said by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], that the party now in power, having constantly promised to do this thing, could accomplish the purpose. Of course I do not pretend to quote the utterances of the ex-President.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to give the exact quotation.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It was in Everybody's Magazine of January, 1915, in which Col. Roosevelt said:

> If we act so that the natives understand us to have made a definite promise, then we should live up to that promise. The Philippines from a military standpoint are a source of weakness to us. The present administration has promised explicitly to let them go, and by its actions has rendered it difficult to hold them against any serious foreign foe. These being the circumstances, the islands should at an early moment be given their independence without any guaranty whatever by us and without our retaining any foothold in them.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, for once I am in perfect accord with the ex-President of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, I want for a moment to refer to the argument which is based upon the proposition that we should hold the Philippines until they are capable of self-government, which means, of course, that we must hold them until we think they have been educated up to our standard of political efficiency.

I contend that no nation has any right, that no nation can lawfully and justly acquire any right, to pass judgment upon the capacity of any other nation for self-government. It is none of our business whether the people of the Philippines are capacitated for self-government or not; and if we assume to judge, that judgment when tested by experience may prove to be worthless and erroneous.

Moreover, I deny that one people has the power to confer freedom and independence upon another, except by removing them from every constraint of overlordism. That is not the way in which freedom has been acquired by any people at any time in the history of mankind. Freedom, liberty, self-governing institutions have been won by the peoples who have enjoyed them by their struggles, their sufferings, and their sacrifices. One of the greatest Senators—Mr. Toombs, of Georgia—who ever occupied a seat in this body said, more than half a century ago:

> Liberty and freedom are the virtues of those who have acquired and fought for them without ceasing, and no nation can long retain them which is not at all times ready to die for them.

That is the test. If we are to keep these people in leading strings, the very fact will deprive them of that resourcefulness, that self-reliance, that experience which comes from hard knocks in government as well as in life, which is not only the test of character, but which develops it both individually and as a nation. The longer we hold these people, the longer one people hold any other in leading strings—provided, of course, their control is effective—the more remote is the possibility of self-government being developed among them.

And I want to say, Mr. President, that I am not much concerned whether the Filipinos, when they are given their freedom, as we call it, can or will govern themselves or not. I think we should be much more concerned in the reflex action and influence of our attitude concerning the Philippines upon our own institutions and upon the national character than we are in trying to educate them up to our own standards of self-government and then setting them adrift when we conclude that our task has been accomplished. They will ultimately have that government which comes from the evolution of tests and experience among themselves, and that will be the one to which they are entitled and for which they are adapted.

For my part, I do not care whether that ultimate government is a republic, a monarchy, or some other sort of a government. I am satisfied that it will be that which their experience ultimately develops, through a process of evolution and possibly revolution; and it is bound to be, in the last analysis, the one best fitted for them. They have a right to govern themselves in that way, if they see fit to do so, without any superposition upon them of our ideas, of our notions, or of our instructions, always, of course, giving them the benefit of the educational system which has been so effective up to this time, and has been the one redeeming feature of our occupation of the islands.

Government? Why, Mr. President, I think it was Plato who said of all governments that in their last analysis they were always the government of the strongest men. Even in our own form of government it is the strong men who dominate, and who, by impressing their personality and influence and leadership upon the machinery of government, make it effective or direct it for better or for worse.

So, as far as the future is concerned, while, of course, we may be largely interested in the results of our tutelage of those people, nevertheless the duty before us is one which we owe to ourselves, and it imperatively requires that we get rid of a subject people as soon as possible.

I was much taken some time ago with a reflection of the English historian, Mr. Froude. It is appropriate to the discussion. He said:

> If there be one lesson which history clearly teaches, it is that free nations can not govern subject provinces. If they are unable or unwilling to admit their dependencies to their own constitution, the constitution itself will fall in pieces from mere incompetence for its duties.

No more obvious truth was ever uttered.

These people, Mr. President, if we retain them, must become citizens, they must be admitted to our Constitution or the latter must fall because incompetent to discharge its functions. There can be no subjects in a republic. When he appears the republic becomes but a name. There can be, in a free republic, no subjects without doing violence to our institutions. They must be citizens if they stay; and those who oppose their independence must admit this or recognize a purpose of colonization. The present Speaker of the House of Representatives some time ago declared that the longer we continue to occupy these islands the greater the danger that politics may develop a situation which will ultimately lead to their admission as States of the Union. It is not, of course, improbable—indeed, it may be very likely—that if our constant occupation of these islands should lead to such a result the votes cast by an alien people 10,000 miles away might determine an election of a President of the United States at a most critical period in our political affairs.

Mr. President, I have not attempted any systematic discussion of this measure. But for the introduction of the amendment by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] I should have said nothing whatever upon it. But the amendment is, to my mind, the redeeming feature of the bill, and the criticism which I would make of it is that it does not go far enough. I should prefer to declare for their immediate independence. I think the analysis by Moorfield Storey of the Democratic platform upon the subject, as read here by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], is absolutely unanswerable. We have promised, ever since there was a Philippine question—and when I say "we," I mean the party to which I belong—we have pledged and declared over and over again that if and when we were restored to power we would give these people their independence. Now, we either meant it or we did not. I do not think there is any question about our candor and earnestness in this repeated declaration of good faith. But there will be if we ignore or disregard it.

I am glad we made it. It is true Democratic doctrine. It is an essential to the welfare of the people from the Democratic standpoint. It has become crystalized as a fixed principle of Democratic policy that upon our accession to power we would get rid of these islands. The only way to carry out that pledge, Mr. President, is to keep it by fixing some definite, arbitrary time when, regardless of consequences, the present relations between this Government and the Philippine Islands will terminate, when we will get out of there and come home, and when from that time onward the people of the islands will be left to themselves, to govern themselves as in their judgment they should and to look after their affairs in their own way.

My objection to this amendment is that the time suggested is too long, and that no contingency should be attached to the date when the bill becomes operative. But I am not one of those who rejects half a loaf because he can not get all that he wants. I think this, perhaps, is the best thing that can be done at present, the most efficacious thing, the most practical thing. Therefore I shall support this amendment, Mr. President, believing that in so doing I am not only following the dictates of my own judgment with regard to the question, but I am also carrying out and making effective the oft-repeated declarations of the Democratic Party upon this subject. I trust that when we are rid of the Philippines, when we have that episode of our history behind us, we will have learned a lesson from that experience so strong and so vivid and so constant as to make its repetition impossible.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 25, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24, 1916.

SECRETARIES OF EMBASSIES OR LEGATIONS.

CLASS 4.

Francis White, of Maryland, now a secretary of embassy or legation of class 5, to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 4 of the United States of America.

CLASS 5.

John Heath, of Palo Alto, Cal., to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 5 of the United States of America.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Joseph T. Lyons, of Boston, Mass., to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass., in place of Winthrop T. Hodges, resigned.

ASSISTANT APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Frederick J. Sullivan, of Lawrence, Mass., to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass., in place of Joseph T. Lyons, nominated for appraiser of merchandise.

SPECIAL EXAMINER OF DRUGS, ETC.

Dennis Flynn, of Lowell, Mass., to be special examiner of drugs, medicines, and chemicals and assistant appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass., in place of William H. Parker, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Charles W. Early to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 29th day of September, 1915.

Lieut. Wilson Brown, jr., to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 8th day of December, 1915.

Ensign Elmer De L. Langworthy to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1915.

Ensign Jefferson D. Smith to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1915.

Ensign Lawrence P. Bischoff to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1915.

Ensign Earl R. Morrissey to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1915.

Ensign Charles K. Osborne to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1915.

Asst. Paymaster Charles C. Copp to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 23d day of September, 1915.

Carpenter William E. Fitzgerald to be a chief carpenter in the Navy from the 15th day of November, 1915.

POSTMASTER.

NEW JERSEY.

John F. Sinnott to be postmaster at Newark, N. J., in place of Frank J. Bock. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1916.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 24, 1916.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Joseph T. Johnson to be United States district judge, western district of South Carolina.

POSTMASTERS.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Joseph F. McManus, Norwood.
Martin Ratigan, Whitman.

MONTANA.

Henry S. Paddock, Three Forks.

NEW JERSEY.

James Degnan, High Bridge.

OKLAHOMA.

J. L. Burke, Hobart.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Howard Kemrer, Paradise.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *January 24, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, our Father in heaven, for the dignity Thou hast conferred upon man, for it is writ, "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor; Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands; Thou hast put all things under his feet."

Give us therefore the courage of our convictions that whatsoever we put our hands to this day we may glorify Thee and thus glorify ourselves in the work whereunto Thou hast called us, that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done in all our hearts; in the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journals of the proceedings of Saturday, January 22, 1916, and Sunday, January 23, 1916, were read and approved.

PARCEL POST.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the parcel post.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the parcel post. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of preparedness and national defense.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal and the clearing of the business on the Speaker's table, he be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of national preparedness. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNET rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] I may address the House for 30 minutes upon the same general subject.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman to withhold that for another day. We are right in the middle of the consideration of the good-roads bill. If we do not finish the bill to-morrow it will run us into Calendar Wednesday, with other important matters coming up. Why can not the gentleman wait for a day or two?

Mr. BENNET. I ask for only 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] asks unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] he be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on the same general subject of preparedness. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RURAL CREDITS.

Mr. HOWARD rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. HOWARD. To submit a request for unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing a letter from Hon. Charles Hall Davis, of Petersburg, Va., which is a criticism of H. R. 6838, known as the Moss rural-credit bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter written by Charles Hall Davis, of Petersburg, Va., on the Moss rural-credit bill. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Georgia the length of the communication and what the nature of it is?

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Indiana, I will state that Mr. Davis is considered, in my judgment and by all of the people who have devoted any study to the question of rural credits, to be one of the greatest experts on that subject in the United States. He was the secretary to a former joint committee of the House and Senate, and practically drafted all of the organization features of every bill that is now before Congress for everyone who introduced them. He knows more about the question and is more vitally interested in it, from the standpoint of the farmers of the country, than any man I know of. This is a reply to a communication addressed to him by me, asking him to take the Moss bill and criticize it from the standpoint of an expert, and he has done so, and I will say to the gentleman that he has criticized it down to the bone.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ACTING CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 24, 1916.

To the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE:

Desiring to be absent from my office for a short period of time, I hereby designate the Chief Clerk of the House, J. C. South, Esq., to sign all papers that may require my official signature, and to do all other acts under the rules and practice of the House required to be done by the Clerk of the House.

Respectfully submitted.

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House.

PRINTING BILL.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent, and ask to have it read from the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BARNHART asks unanimous consent that House bill No. 8664, known as the printing bill, be given a privileged status, with one hour's general debate, subject to preference being given to consideration of appropriation, revenue, and regularly privileged bills, and with the definite agreement that while this bill is being considered it may be displaced at any time for the consideration of the aforesaid bills.

Mr. BARNHART. And other bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to say that there are other bills that are to be proposed that are not privileged, but that are of very great importance, a part of the program of this session of Congress, and for the present I shall object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Until at least the good-roads bill gets out of the way, and when that is out of the way, if there is nothing else, I may not object.

RURAL POST ROADS.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7617.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, rural post roads, with Mr. RUCKER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, it is well known by my fellow Members upon this floor that I heartily favor Government aid to good roads. I have heretofore, on more than one occasion, discussed this great question, in which the people are so vitally interested, on the floor of this House.

When the bill appropriating $25,000,000 for the improvement of good roads passed the House of Representatives in 1912, which I am sorry did not pass the Senate, I had the honor and pleasure of making the closing speech in favor of that bill, and was very much gratified to receive from Hon. DORSEY W. SHACKLEFORD, the present chairman of the Roads Committee, and the distinguished gentleman who is now in charge of this bill on the floor of the House, a letter thanking me for my assistance on that occasion. I hope it will not be deemed indelicate on my part to read you that letter, which is as follows:

WASHINGTON, *April 30, 1912.*

MY DEAR MR. CANDLER: I must go away to-night and be gone for some days. I will not be able to see you before I go, so I write this note to thank you for persistent and intelligent assistance rendered in the preparation and passage of the so-called Shackleford good-roads bill. You did splendid service in getting the bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture. I believe it was upon your motion that the bill was reported. But the best of it all was your masterful speech in closing the debate on the bill in the House to-day. It was a complete and convincing answer to those who argued that our measure was undemocratic. The people owe you much thanks for your efforts in their behalf.

With best wishes, I am,

Your friend, DORSEY W. SHACKLEFORD.

[Applause.]

I heartily supported the bill on that occasion and I with equal enthusiasm support the pending bill. On the first day of this session of Congress I introduced a bill on this subject myself. Quite a number of bills were introduced by other Members of Congress, and this bill is presented as a composite bill, intended to utilize the best features of various bills on this subject. This bill has the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture and has received the unanimous approval of every member of the Committee on Roads, and hence it is evident that this measure has a more unanimous and larger support than any other bill could possibly secure, and therefore it is evident that the best course to pursue is for every Member who honestly and sincerely favors Government aid to good roads to get behind this bill and by vote and influence put forth every effort to secure its passage. If it does not measure up fully to all the varied conditions existing throughout the country, when it is put into operation, that will be made evident, and it can then be so amended as to meet future emergencies and contingencies. The bill is as follows:

A bill (7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads; that for the purposes of this act the term "rural post road" shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is, or might be, carried outside of incorporated cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000 and in said cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000 along streets and roads where the houses average more than 200 feet apart; that not more than $25,000,000 shall be appropriated under the provisions of this act for any fiscal year.

SEC. 2. That out of an appropriation made under the provisions of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall deduct the sum which he shall deem necessary to defray the expenses of his department in the administration of this act, and apportion the balance of said appropriation for expenditure under the provisions of this act in the several States in the following manner: Sixty-five thousand dollars to each State and one half of the remainder in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the population of all of the States as shown by the latest available Federal census, and the other half of such remainder in the ratio which the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes in such State bears to the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes of all the States as shown by the latest available report of the Postmaster General.

SEC. 3. That as soon as may be after the passage of any act making appropriations under the provisions of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare and file in his office a statement showing the amount of such appropriation he has set apart to defray the expense of his department in the administration of this act and the amount of the balance which will be available for expenditure in each State, and transmit a copy of such statement to the State highway department of each State which has such a department, and to the governor of each State which has not such a department; that the State highway department of any State, after receiving such statement, may apply to the Secretary of Agriculture for aid under the provisions of this act in the construction or maintenance of any rural post road in such State; and if, in his judgment, such road is one to the proposed construction or maintenance of which aid should be given under the provisions of this act, then he shall request such State highway department to furnish him with surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost of said proposed construction or maintenance, and any other information which he may consider proper; that he shall examine said surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost and determine what would be the reasonable cost of such construction or maintenance and what amount of aid will be given under the provisions of this act to such proposed construction or maintenance, which shall in no case be less than 30 nor more than 50 per cent of what he has so determined would be the reasonable cost of such proposed construction or maintenance, and shall forthwith transmit to said State highway department a written statement of his said determinations; that upon receipt of such written statement the said State highway deparment may transmit to the Secretary of Agriculture a statement in writing notifying him that such proposed construction or maintenance will be undertaken upon the terms proposed; that thereupon the proper authorities of the State may, in accordance with the laws of such State, commence and prosecute said construction or maintenance in substantial compliance with said surveys, plans, and specifications; that when the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that said construction or maintenance of said road has been finished in substantial compliance with said surveys, plans, and specifications he shall cause to be paid to the proper authority of said State whatever remains unpaid of the amount which he has stated, as hereinbefore provided, would be given to aid said State in said proposed construction or maintenance of said road; that the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, from time to time make

payments upon such construction or maintenance as the same progresses, but these payments, including previous payments, if any, shall in no case be more than the pro rata part of the United States of the value of labor and materials which have been put into such construction or maintenance.

SEC. 4. That all construction and maintenance of roads under the provisions of this act shall be under the supervision and control of the State highway departments of the several States: *Provided*, That until January 1, 1920, the amount which has been apportioned to be expended in any State which has no State highway department shall be available for expenditure in such State in such manner as shall be agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the governor of such State; that the Secretary of Agriculture may make, or cause to be made, such inspection and examinations of any road constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act as he shall deem necessary, and he may prescribe what reports shall be made to him by the State highway department of any State in relation to any road in such State to the construction or maintenance of which aid under the provisions of this act has been given or sought, when such reports shall be made, and the form and subject matter of the same; that the Secretary of Agriculture shall have power to employ such assistants, clerks, and other persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere, to purchase such materials and supplies, and to prescribe such rules and regulations for the administration of this act as he may consider expedient.

SEC. 5. That the necessary culverts and bridges shall be considered as parts of the roads constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act; that the roads which may be constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act shall include earth, sand-clay, sand-gravel, and other common types of roads, as well as roads of higher classes, one of the purposes of this act being to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming communities.

In section 5 it will be noticed it is stated that—

one of the purposes of this act is to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming communities.

The purpose, therefore, is to benefit our agricultural interests. It will be seen by reading this bill that it provides that each and every State shall receive an arbitrary amount of $65,000, and in addition to this a proportionate amount in accordance with the number and length of the rural-delivery routes and the star routes and the population within the State. It is estimated that Mississippi would receive $497,130 each year under this bill. This is probably the fairest apportionment which could be made. If this measure is passed it will be a beginning of this great development in the United States, and as time may show it to be necessary the good work can be increased and enlarged as good policy and necessity may indicate and require.

This is no new question. The first American road law was passed by the General Assembly of Virginia in 1632. The Egyptians, Persians, and Romans built roads in their day. The present system of roads in France was founded by Napoleon. England had road legislation as early as 1285. The nations beyond the seas now have splendid roads, and it is time for this great Republic—the greatest in the history of the world—to begin and press to success the improvement of the highways in the interest of all the people. The Democratic Party in its last national platform declared in favor of National aid to State and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post roads. We must redeem that pledge if we keep faith with the people. Our forefathers, as time has demonstrated, builded well in their day, and in the first 50 or 60 years in the history of this Republic something like $14,000,000 was appropriated for the building and maintenance of public highways, and during the time the construction of the Cumberland Road was accomplished. Let us now gather inspiration from their splendid example and carry to consummation this great enterprise. [Applause.] There is nothing that would benefit the people more than good roads. They will increase the value of land, put neighbors closer together, bring the schoolhouses and churches nearer, and with their convenience exercise a beneficent influence which will bless all mankind. We have given to our rural population rural delivery of the mails and the parcel post, and now let us add to this a system of good roads and a rural-credit system, backed by Government aid, and this country will blossom like the rose, and prosperity, like the blessed sunshine, will shed its inspiring influence in every neighborhood in this magnificent Republic. Congress has waited too long now to give the people good roads and a rural-credit system. They need money at low rates of interest with which to improve their farms and produce their products, and good roads over which to transport their products to market. Both these great measures have been promised by the Democratic Party, and we are in control of this Government, and if we are to deserve and receive the further confidence of the people we must keep faith with them and redeem these two among our most important pledges and promises made to them. I voted for a rural-credit bill last Congress and shall gladly do so again, and do all I can to secure legislation. I heartily favor the passage of this road bill and will vote for it with pleasure, and I earnestly urge every friend of the people in this House to support it and thus make certain its passage. [Loud applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, it is with deepest regret that I follow the arguments which have been advanced by certain gentlemen on the floor of this House against this worthy measure. I am surprised that gentlemen who have spoken so ably and so well on other important questions should take the stand that has been taken against this bill.

To my mind it would appear that every sane and thinking American citizen can not but admit that any improvement in the roads throughout the country will result in benefit to the cities.

Transportation has brought people closer together and made commercial intercourse easier. Our great railroads have made it possible for thousands of American citizens to reach and develop land which otherwise would still be dormant.

In 1832 the railroads of the United States were operating 229 miles of trackage. Three years later, through the help of Congress, they were operating 1,098 miles of track. At the opening of the Civil War railroad mileage had been increased to 31,286 miles, and to-day they are operating over 260,000 miles of track.

Our interurban electric railways have brought cities and towns closer together, and these lines are now penetrating sections of the country which could not be reached by steam roads. Electric railways have made it possible for thousands of our city population to move into the suburbs and secure better and cheaper homes.

If Congress can be induced to give the same assistance to public roads as was given to railroads when steam transportation was so sorely in need of assistance, I feel sure that the country at large will benefit to an even greater extent than it did through the loan by Congress, which was the means of the beginning of this great development in railroad construction.

But the highways of the country, I regret to say, have been criminally neglected by our Nation. If they had received the same attention as the railroads and electric railways, our country would have a perfect system of highways, which, bringing the producer closer to the consumer, would do much to reduce the cost of living in this country.

In the last 20 years we have expended over $2,000,000,000 for our Army and Navy. If one-twentieth of that sum had been expended on our roads, I feel sure that the country would have been benefited to a much greater extent than it has through the expenditure of this immense sum for the maintenance of Army posts which protect us against savage Indians long since dead and the maintenance of a large Navy to protect us against foreign enemies who would be obliged to transport their armies over 3,000 miles of water before they could land on our shores. With every foreign power bankrupt, the gentlemen would appropriate still larger sums to build up a Navy to protect us against enemies from whose sting the venom has been removed for 20 years to come. The gentlemen will readily appropriate millions of dollars for the maintenance of troops in the Philippine Islands and the Panama Canal, but ask them to spend a like amount for the improvement of our home territory and they are deaf.

If the gentlemen are looking for war, if they are expecting it, let them take into consideration the fact that armies must be moved from one section of the country to another and that immense quantities of supplies must also be transported. It is not always that railroads can be depended on for this transportation, and in that event we must look to our highways to solve the problem of shifting troops and supplies.

In these times of peace every progresesive district and every enterprising town is devoting a great deal of thought and energy to the improvement of its roads, and it is high time that the National Government should do likewise.

I believe in economy, but not in false economy. I believe that the money that this bill calls for will be a splendid investment, and feel confident that the people of the United States will receive from it greater benefits than they would from any other project to which it might be applied.

I do not share the fear of some of my colleagues that the improvement of the roads will benefit the rural districts alone. Anything that is of benefit to the producing area must of necessity be of benefit to the cities.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill, and I shall cast my vote for it. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON].

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I observe with regret and pain that some of my esteemed colleagues from the large cities and thickly populated communities object strenuously to the expenditure of money to help construct roads in rural communities sparsely settled. I beg to remind the gentlemen that while God made the country and man made the cities, the best men

who have made the best cities, with very few brilliant and distinguished exceptions, came from the country that God made and will continue to do so. [Applause.]

I wish to call their attention to the injustice of requiring that these partially settled communities, in the very territory whence the resources as well as the men come, to build up and perpetuate the cities, should build their own roads, all of which tend to the benefit of the cities.

And I wish to say to the committee that I am corroborated by very strong authority in that line. Macaulay, writing of the situation in England in the seventeenth century, said:

> One chief cause of the badness of the roads seems to have been the defective state of the law. Every parish was bound to repair the highways which passed through it. The peasantry were forced to give their gratuitous labor six days in the year. If this was not sufficient, hired labor was employed, and the expense was met by a parochial rate. That a route connecting two great towns, which have a large and thriving trade with each other, should be maintained at the cost of the rural population scattered between them is obviously unjust; and this injustice was peculiarly glaring in the case of the great North Road, which traversed very poor and thinly inhabited districts and joined very rich and populous districts. Indeed, it was not in the power of the parishes of Huntingdonshire to mend a highway worn by the constant traffic between the West Riding of Yorkshire and London. Soon after the Restoration this grievance attracted the notice of Parliament, and an act, the first of our many turnpike acts, was passed, imposing a small toll on travelers and goods for the purpose of keeping some parts of this important line of communication in good repair.

In a city or a thickly settled community the number of people interested, traveling the road and paying tax, make it easy per capita to defray the expense of a good road, but in a sparsely settled country it would be too onerous on the people, none of whom are wealthy, to keep in order long stretches of road, mainly to be used by people from the cities traveling over them.

The people in my part of the country are accepting and acting upon those views. The cities and large towns are actively cooperating with the intervening rural communities and are helping to build good roads connecting the cities, large towns, and county seats, but they ought to have assistance from the Government. In the large cities and populous and wealthy communities that have already been blessed with the bounteous benefits of the rapid growth and unparalleled prosperity of this country the past hundred years are the last ones who ought to object to a fair and equitable plan for aiding in the construction of roads through the parts of the country less fortunate, up to this time, in population and prosperity. Their resources and prospects are so fine as to insure ample returns to the Government and the rest of the people for all the assistance that can be rendered now. The objection is shortsighted and ungracious.

I have been introducing bills for many years and have conferred and cooperated with the authors of other bills which promised any benefits to the people of the rural communities, and I shall vote for this bill, not because I believe it is the best bill, but because I believe it is the only one we can agree upon, and it does possess great merit.

I presume all are more or less acquainted with the wretched condition of the roads in many of the rural communities, especially where in bad wintry weather the people are compelled to use their vehicles in going to and from market. I can not better describe the situation in some of the communities than to read you the following extracts from Macaulay's History of England describing very similar conditions:

> The chief cause which made the fusion of the different elements of society so imperfect was the extreme difficulty which our ancestors found in passing from place to place. Of all inventions, the alphabet and the printing press alone excepted, those inventions which abridge distance have done most for the civilization of our species. Every improvement of the means of locomotion benefits mankind morally and intellectually as well as materially, and not only facilitates the interchange of the various productions of nature and art, but tends to remove the national and provincial antipathies and to bind together all the branches of the great human family. In the seventeenth century the inhabitants of London were, for almost every practical purpose, farther from Reading than they now are from Edinburgh, and farther from Edinburgh than they now are from Vienna.
>
> The subjects of Charles the Second were not, it is true, quite unacquainted with that principle which has, in our own times, produced an unprecedented revolution in human affairs, which has enabled navies to advance in face of wind and tide, and brigades of troops, attended by all their baggage and artillery, to traverse kingdoms at a pace equal to that of the fleetest race horse. The Marquis of Worcester had recently observed the expansive power of moisture rarefied by heat. After many experiments he had succeeded in constructing a rude steam engine, which he called a fire waterwork, and which he pronounced to be an admirable and most forcible instrument of propulsion. But the marquis was suspected to be a madman, and known to be a Papist. His inventions, therefore, found no favorable reception. His fire waterwork might, perhaps, furnish matter for conversation at a meeting of the Royal Society, but was not applied to any practical purposes.
>
> It was by the highways that both travelers and goods generally passed from place to place, and those highways appear to have been far worse than might be expected from the degree of wealth and civilization which the nation had even then attained. On the best lines of communication the ruts were deep, the descents precipitous, and the way often such as it was hardly possible to distinguish in the dusk from the unincloseed heath and fen which lay on both sides. Ralph Thoresby, the antiquary, was in danger of losing his way on the great North Road, between Barnby Moor and Tuxford, and actually lost his way between Doncaster and York. Pepys and his wife, traveling in their own coach, lost their way between Newbury and Reading. In the course of the same tour they lost their way near Salisbury and were in danger of having to pass the night on the plain. It was only in fine weather that the whole breadth of the road was available for wheeled vehicles. Often the mud lay deep on the right and left and only a narrow track of firm ground rose above the quagmire. At such times obstructions and quarrels were frequent, and the path was sometimes blocked up during a long time by carriers, neither of whom would break the way. It happened almost every day that coaches stuck fast until a team of cattle could be procured from some neighboring farm to tug them out of the slough. But in bad seasons the traveler had to encounter inconveniences still more serious. Thoresby, who was in the habit of traveling between Leeds and the capital, has recorded in his Diary such a series of perils and disasters as might suffice for a journey to the frozen ocean or to the Desert of Sahara.
>
> He was afterwards detained at Stamford four days on account of the state of the roads, and then ventured to proceed only because 14 members of the House of Commons, who were going up in a body, took him into their company. On the roads of Derbyshire travelers were in constant fear for their necks and were frequently compelled to alight and lead their beasts. The great route through Wales to Holyhead was in such a state that, in 1685, a viceroy going to Ireland was five hours in traveling 14 miles, from St. Asaph to Conway. Between Conway and Beaumaris he was forced to walk a great part of the way, and his lady was carried in a litter. His coach was with much difficulty and by the help of many hands brought after him entire. In general, carriages were taken to pieces at Conway and borne on the shoulders of stout Welsh peasants to the Menai Straits. In some parts of Kent and Sussex none but the strongest horses could in winter get through the bog, in which at every step they sank deep. The markets were often inaccessible during several months. It is said that the fruits of the earth were sometimes suffered to rot in one place, while in another place, distant only a few miles, the supply fell far short in the demand. The wheeled carriages were in the district generally pulled by oxen. When Prince George of Denmark visited the stately mansion of Petworth in wet weather he was six hours in going 9 miles; and it was necessary that a body of sturdy hinds should be on each side of his coach in order to prop it. Of the carriages which conveyed his retinue, several were upset and injured. A letter from one of the party has been preserved, in which the unfortunate courtier complains that during 14 hours he never once alighted except when his coach overturned or stuck fast in the mud.

[Loud applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT].

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, it is needless for me to say that I am heartily in favor of the passage of this bill. I have in former Congresses worked for and supported similar measures for Government aid to the construction of post roads in the United States. This bill was reported from the Committee on Roads, of which I am a member. The committee had before it many bills to consider; while they differed in their provisions and language used, yet the object sought was the same, all providing for aid by the Federal Government in the construction of highways in the interior country of the United States. What I may say on this subject will, to a large measure, be what I have heretofore said upon this floor in advocating the passage of legislation along the line of the provisions of this bill. In fact, it seems to me it would be almost impossible to advance a new iden upon this subject, as so many gentlemen in previous Congresses and at the present session have discussed this subject, and all that could possibly be said has been said.

Some objection has been raised to the provisions of this bill, and it has been said that its provisions were not as good as the bill that passed the House during the Sixty-third Congress. I confess that I can not say that I like the provisions of the pending bill better than I did the bill passed by the House in the Sixty-third Congress, yet after hearing the ideas advanced by different advocates of the measure in committee, and after the question was thoroughly considered by our committee, it was thought best to report the bill that is now being considered. If the desire of Members to speak in favor of this bill indicates the way they are to vote, I take it that there will be a very small vote against its passage; in fact, it looks as if the vote would be all one way.

This bill carries an appropriation of $25,000,000, and under its provisions the Secretary of Agriculture would first apportion to each of the States $65,000 and the remainder of the twenty-five million would be then divided among the several States as follows: One-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census, and the other half of such remainder in the ratio which the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes in such States bears to the mileage of the rural free delivery and star mail routes of all the States, as shown by the latest available report of the Postmaster General. The administration and expenditure of the money hereby appro-

priated is under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, acting in conjunction with the State highway departments of the several States or the person charged with the duty of looking after the highways in States having no highway department. I agree with the provision which places the control and expenditure of this money in the Secretary of Agriculture. This power must be delegated to some one, and we must proceed upon the assumption and theory that any officer qualified will exercise it with discretion and good faith and to the best interest of those who are to receive the benefits of same. Again, I can see an advantage to be gained.

It is true that men in the rural districts charged with the administration of road funds and road laws, however conscientious and earnest they may be, can not be skilled in road engineering, and for this reason most all of the highway departments of the States extend the aid of the highway departments to the local road authorities. Under the provisions of this bill the highway commission, upon the application of the road district, will send an engineer to provide scientific road construction and give advice as to the best material for road improvement in the immediate locality where the road is to be constructed. Without such engineering and without such advice of some one skilled in road construction the officials in the rural communities would often be helpless and would not be in a position to properly construct the roads.

What is now being done in many States by local legislation is proposed to be done under this bill by the Federal road departments and will result in great road improvement, thus giving to the local communities all of the scientific knowledge by the Office of Good Roads after years of study and expense. The Secretary of Agriculture will be able to be at the service of the local road officials of the States by giving them the assistance of expert engineers and road builders, who are familiar with the construction of roads in different parts of the United States; familiar with the quality of material available in the different sections; familiar with the process of drainage, which is an important feature in road construction; familiar with all the details which reduce the cost of road construction and improvement and which result in a more economic up-keep of the same.

In my State we have 937 rural routes, with an aggregate length of 25,504 miles; we also have 288 star routes, with an aggregate length of 4,125 miles; hence the amount that would be apportioned to Oklahoma under the provisions of the pending bill would be $532,138. While this amount is small, it will materially aid in the much-needed and long-delayed work of road building in the rural communities of the State. If this bill becomes a law, it will benefit more people than any measure that has been passed by Congress in many years.

The passage of this bill is not political in its nature, and in discussing its provisions no one can be charged with supporting the measure because it is political. I am indeed anxious to see legislation giving to the States aid in construction of post roads throughout the United States. I very much regret to hear any gentleman speak in opposition to this measure; however, I find no fault and do not feel like criticizing anyone who honestly opposes any measure that is being considered by this House. Any gentleman has a right to his views, and he is responsible to his constituents for his vote, and if he, after study, is convinced that it is not proper and beneficial legislation, I honor him for saying so; but I do appeal to his better judgment and ask him not to vote against this measure from a selfish motive or because he feels his section of the country will not profit thereby. All of the people of the United States will be benefited if this measure becomes a law. I regret very much to see my friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] oppose the pending legislation. Last Congress he voted with those who desired to see the measure become a law, yet if he has by study and research convinced himself that he should not support this measure because his constituents do not need it, and in his opinion it will not benefit the communities; that it is not just legislation and not such an enterprise as the Government of the United States should enter upon, I take it that it is his duty to oppose it. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] in the course of his remarks calls some of these roads that are sought to be improved "cow paths." May I not suggest to the gentlemen that these roads as arteries of commerce are contributing largely to the upbuilding of large cities in the New England States, and to the great city of Boston, from which the gentleman comes. The wealth of the cities was not produced in the cities. No city in any part of the United States produced its wealth and no city would long remain a city if it had to depend upon the products manufactured and produced within that city. But the great wealth of the metropolis of New York and every large city was produced from the rural sections of the United States and centralized, because of the great advantages of commerce and the methods of transportation of the products to the different parts of the world.

The city and the country must each rely upon the other, and it is by an exchange of their commodities that keeps our commerce going and maintains our producing powers, consequently it is not a question of city or town against the country, but it is as much the interest of the individual in the city and town to see that the producer of wealth from the farm in the rural districts is provided with good facilities for transporting his products from the farm to market as it is to see that they have good streets and sidewalks in the city.

The question of Government aid in the construction of public roads or the question of road building in the United States has for many years been discussed, but within the last few years a greater interest is being manifested and a greater realization for the necessity of road construction has been brought forward than ever before in the history of our Government. It is easy to understand why, because of the fact that our cities and towns are being so densely populated that it has become necessary that a greater acreage of lands in the country must be cultivated to maintain and support them, and in order that the farms may be properly cultivated, and society built up in the rural communities, that the people have awakened to the necessity of road building and believe that the Government should assist them in the construction of the same.

It is true that at present great agitation exists regarding the question of our Government being prepared to meet a foreign foe, and that the War and Navy Departments are advocating large expenditures for the purpose of strengthening our Army and Navy, our coast defenses, and that the same has been presented to Congress by our President; yet with all of the anxiety and desire for preparedness that is presented not one sentence, not one effort, not one move is made to prepare our cross-country roads for the proper defense should it become necessary to move our armies from one place in the United States to another. At present we would necessarily have to rely upon the steam railroad for transportation. A large portion of the success of the German Army in the unfortunate war that is now raging in the East has been brought about by reason of the fact that they heretofore constructed good roads, and such roads that they could transport thereon their heavy artillery and their necessary munitions of war, and do not have to rely upon railway transportation.

It will be but a few days until many of the gentlemen who are opposing this measure will be called upon to cast their vote for preparedness, and before that time comes I hope they will have a change of heart and be willing to assist those favoring an appropriation for good roads, and by their vote show to the people that they are willing to give them an opportunity to better the conditions in the rural communities of the United States.

Every man on the floor of this House must depend upon the products of the farm, and the cheaper you can bring these products to the door of the consumer the better off we will all be. Therefore it seems to me that the pending bill now under consideration is the wisest piece of legislation we have had before us for some time, and I wonder why the Government of the United States has neglected this proposition for such a great number of years, as it has been assisting every other enterprise, as I will show before I conclude my remarks, but so far has overlooked the construction of dirt roads in rural communities. This Government has constructed roads in our Territorial and insular possessions and has expended millions in constructing roads and trails in Alaska. It has expended great sums in the Canal Zone, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, and we have now reached the point where we should assist the people at home by extending aid in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads, which are now established and used by the Government under the supervision of the Post Office Department for the carrying of mail. This aid will have a direct effect of benefiting all those who reside in the rural communities in the way of providing a means for the farmer to get his products to market, and those residing in the cities and towns will have the benefit of getting the products delivered to their doors daily.

The United States is the only progressive Nation in the world that has not given great consideration to the construction of its highways and the improvement of its internal traffic. All of the progressive nations of Europe are giving national aid to their highways, while this Government has neglected to extend aid, and has thereby imposed a burden of millions of dollars annually on our producers. Quite a different condition exists in the countries of Europe. There a splendid system of roads

has been inaugurated. During the days of Napoleon, following the example set by the Roman Empire, an extensive system of road building was established throughout France, and many millions of dollars are expended yearly by that Government in the construction and maintenance of their roads.

The improvement of our inland highways by our Government not only cheapens the necessities of life but furnishes employment for many thousand of laborers who need the work. The farming population of this country constitutes about 35 per cent of the total population of the United States, and it is unfair to expect this large per cent to construct, unaided, the highways of this country. They should not be required to construct the roads over which they must haul their product to the consumer; at least the consumer should be required to contribute his share of the expense, as he receives as great a benefit as the farmer. All must admit that the farmer is the real producer of the Nation, and all must admit that he creates the wealth of the Nation, which largely finds its way into the pockets of other people, yet the producer has been required, unaided, to maintain and construct his roads over which he travels to the commercial centers of the United States.

Anyone who desires to be fair, even though he may reside in a city, will concede that there is no unfairness or unjustness in an appropriation by the Government to construct and maintain highways, and I rejoice to see the Members of this House who reside in city districts giving their aid to this bill. It shows conclusively that the city Members are patriotic and fair-minded business men and view this question in an economical way, and they realize all must be benefited by this appropriation. At no time in the history of our Government has there been as close relation between the people on the farms and the people in the cities. The rural mail routes and the rural telephone has done much to bring the country and city together, and the effect of this bill, should it become a law, will result largely in causing the young men and young women of the country to remain at home, as they will have all the advantages of the city life and at the same time enjoy the free out of doors and pure open air. At this time the high cost of living renders it important that we should seriously consider the question of transportation, and we should do all in our power to bring the cost of transportation to the lowest minimum. Transportation is now a paramount question. All civilized countries of the world have progressed rapidly along this line, and the great change made in the last decade is wonderful.

We have but three methods of transportation, viz, water navigation, railroads, and wagon roads. Each of the three depend largely upon the other. The railroad can not exist without the aid of the wagon road, and neither the wagon road or the railroad can properly perform their functions of upbuilding a nation without water transportation. Each of these methods has an important duty to perform, not only in the local community, but in an interstate and foreign commerce. Two of these methods of transportation are owned and controlled largely by private corporations and are operated for gain. The third method, or the wagon-road transportation, is controlled by the State and is free to all of its citizens.

Our Government imposes a duty on many articles of life, an internal revenue and corporation tax, which, in all respects, places an additional cost upon the articles and fixes a charge on the article by the corporation paying the tax. All of our citizens are taxed in one way or the other and proportionately to the amount they purchase and consume.

The railroads of the United States have grown in magnitude and efficiency until we have perfected the greatest railroad system in the world. Our navigable streams and Great Lakes are crowded with vessels large and small, all engaged in interstate traffic. Rivers and harbors are provided for annually by our Government, and large appropriations are made yearly for their improvement; and we also make large appropriations annually for the construction of public buildings throughout the United States. In the past our Government has donated millions of acres of land as a subsidy to railroad companies to induce them to construct railroads, yet practically nothing has been done for the improvement of dirt roads or national highways. We have to-day in the United States daily Rural Delivery Service, which traverses about 42,000 miles of different highways of the Nation, coming in daily contact with more than 20,000,000 people living in the rural districts. I do not anticipate that anyone will seriously oppose the passage of this bill in the House, but if they should do so, I desire to invite their attention to the fact heretofore mentioned that in the early construction of railroads throughout the United States land was donated to the railroads as an inducement to the corporations to construct their lines, at an estimated value now of more than $1,000,000,000. There has been appropriated for rivers and harbors since 1875, $592,395,000; for the building of levees alone to June, 1902, $16,582,000; for the construction of public buildings up to June, 1911, $213,376,000. Again, we have expended nearly $400,000,000 on the Panama Canal; for the construction of roads in Porto Rico, the Philippine Islands and the Territory of Alaska, $8,300,000.

The United States now has an estimated mileage of rural roads and highways amounting to 2,199,645, of which only 190,769 miles are improved. When you mention the number of miles of highways in the United States those who are disposed to oppose an appropriation for the improvement of rural roads may suggest that it would bankrupt the Government if we undertook to lend aid to the States in the improvement of roads; but it is estimated by the Office of Public Roads that 90 per cent of the traffic is confined to less than 30 per cent of the roads, and that the improvement of 440,000 miles of public roads would practically satisfy the demands of the country. If this estimate of the Office of Public Roads is correct, the improvement of our rural roads is not an undertaking so gigantic as one would suppose; at least, it is not as great an appropriation as Federal pensions and the maintaining of our Army and Navy, nor would the appropriation reach a sum as great as was added to the Federal pension rolls a few days ago, which passed the House without any serious objection; and in that connection I might say that I was heartily in favor of the recent pension bill and supported it, because I believe it to be right and believe the Government should look to the protection and convenience of those who fought for it in time of war, keeping in mind all the time the merit and efficiency necessary to maintain the Government.

I now think the time has come when we should consider the interest of those who live in the rural communities and provide for the improvement of our internal highways, so that those living in the rural district may reap as great benefit from the Government as those living in cities, on railroads, and navigable streams.

The report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1910 discloses that the tariff revenue aggregated $331,683,445; and the Government census of 1910 shows that we have 18,400,000 families in the United States. If you will apportion this tariff revenue among the families of the United States, each family is entitled to $18.13. The report of the Interstate Commerce Commission of the gross earnings of the railroads for the same period shows an aggregate of $2,787,266,136. Divide this amount by the number of families in the United States and you will find that each family paid a tax to the railroads for transportation of $151.48. The total amount of freight handled by the railroads for the fiscal years 1906 and 1907 was 1,100,000,000 tons. It is estimated that at least one-half of this tonnage was hauled to and from the railroad by wagons, and it would be fair to estimate that as much as one-third more was hauled to the consumer by wagons, on what may be termed a "second hauling," making a total of 800,000,000 tons hauled by wagons. In addition to this, a large bulk of the cotton crop, which amounts to practically 3,000,000 tons annually, is hauled from the farm to the gin, thence back to the farm, and finally to the railroad or to water navigation. It should also be stated that large quantities of agricultural, forest, and miscellaneous products are first hauled in their crude state over the rural roads before they reach the railroads and waterways, thus necessitating a rehauling of these products. So it is perfectly fair to estimate that the per capita transportation tax on the people of this country amounts to $53.37, as against a tariff tax of $18.13.

It is estimated by Mr. Page, the director of the Office of Public Roads, who is an expert on road building and wagon transportation, after a careful study of the question, that the cost of wagon transportation over the improved roads of England, Germany, and France by wagon is only 10 cents per ton per mile, but eliminating any doubt as to the cost in these countries of transportaing a ton a mile by wagon we will say that it amounts to 12½ cents per ton. If by the construction of good roads in this country we can reduce the cost of wagon transportation from 25 cents per ton per mile, which it now costs, to 12½ cents per ton per mile, we will save the people of our country on this item alone, at the very least calculation, $500,000,000 yearly.

Investigation shows that the cost to the American farmer is about 1.6 cents more to haul a bushel of wheat a distance of 9.4 miles from his farm to the neighboring railroads than it does to ship from New York to Liverpool, a distance of 3,100 miles. If we had a system of good roads throughout the country, the farmers would save in the cost of wagon transportation of the cotton crop yearly $5,076,183; of the wheat crop, $10,256,058; of the corn crop, $12,709,278; whereas it now costs for wagon transportation to get these three great crops to market twice this sum.

The question of reduction in the cost of getting the crops to market is not the only benefit to be derived from good roads throughout the rural districts, because statistics show that good roads in a community adds from $2 to $10 per acre to the land value, and the total area of farm lands in the United States in 1900 was shown to be about 850,000,000 acres, an estimated increase of $5 per acre. If such an amount should be added to the value of the land by the construction of good roads, it would enhance the taxable value of the farm lands $4,250,000.

The great disadvantage that now confronts the American farmer is that he must market his crops when the roads are good, and he is not permitted to hold them until the demand is the greatest and the price is the highest. The present condition of rural roads throughout the United States renders it practically impossible to market his crops during the winter months. It matters not what price he is paid, he must market his crops when the roads are passable.

Another great item to be considered in this matter is that the farmer is required to do his hauling when the roads are good, and when the roads are good it is usually pretty weather, and he should be devoting his time in the fields. If good roads are established, the farmer will be permitted to do his hauling when his fields are too wet to work, and thus save him a large amount of time which he would otherwise lose.

For the last few years we have been continuously hearing the cry from every source, "Back to the farm." The intelligent boys and girls of our rural districts are seeking to escape the social conditions prevalent in the country during the long, dreary winter months of the year, attributable almost entirely to the bad roads. The drift of our population from the rural districts to the cities is really becoming alarming, yet if we improve the roads we will remedy this condition and largely eliminate this desire to get to the cities. The telephone and rural free delivery has done much to satisfy those who live on the farm, and if we would lend aid in the construction of public roads, instead of the dreary winter months in the rural communities farm life would be more enjoyable and profitable. Bad roads prevent attendance at school and church; they make literary societies, social gatherings, club and lodge meetings practically impossible during the bad weather.

I have had an opportunity to learn personally of the conditions that exist in the rural districts, and have had actual experience and know of the inconveniences that go with country life a distance from the railroads. I was born and reared quite a distance from the railroad, and I know how difficult it is to get to and from the market places over unimproved roads.

Another great benefit to all of the people, regardless of citizenship in any State, which will be derived is the good effect it will have upon the rising generation in the rural communities, and, in my judgment, the improvements of country roads will make country life more pleasant, more enjoyable, and more profitable, and will be the strongest inducement to cause the young boys and girls to remain on the farm, and the question of supply and demand and high price of food products will almost be solved. I feel that within a few generations we will have improved roads throughout the United States, and few, I take it, will prefer the crowded city life to the freedom of outdoors in the country.

Another great benefit to be derived is that it provides better facilities and better opportunities for school and church attendance, and this means, of course, a stronger and better government. If we make a provision for the improvements of roads, it will increase the attendance at schools and churches and will in every way tend to upbuild the intellectual and moral standards of every community in the United States. There is no good reason that can be urged against the passage of this bill. No one who knows anything at all about country life can doubt that internal improvements is one of the best assets a country can have, and this improvement will advance and establish better government, better morals, better citizens, and promote social intercourse. The passage of this bill will materially cause the people in the country and the people in the cities to come closer together.

I want to see the day when every farmer can haul his product to market over good roads, without being forced to drive in mud up to the hub of his wagon. I want to see the day when every farmer can travel with pleasure, the same as the man in the city, who has the advantages of paved streets. It is nothing more than right that we should assist in the improvement of the post roads as provided in this bill.

There is one other advantage to be gained by the passage of this bill which I desire to touch upon, and that is the relief it will extend to the rural mail carriers and the star-route carriers. These men are compelled to expose themselves daily to all kinds of weather. The passage of this bill will lessen their burdens and lessen the wear and tear on their teams and equipment. I want to see the improvement of the post roads for that reason; and, another thing, I want to see the day when these rural mail carriers are given sufficient wages to compensate them for the great amount of labor they are performing. Take into consideration the fact that these carriers are required to expose themselves and perform their duties in season and out of season, and compare that fact with the compensation they are now receiving and I think you will agree with me that they should be paid better wages.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I am anxious to see this bill pass and become a law, and I hope that in the future the appropriations may be greatly increased and that the Government will, with the cooperation of the several States in the Union, rapidly construct a system of highways throughout the Nation which will be the best of any Government in the world and, in my judgment, when constructed, will be the greatest asset and the richest legacy which we will leave to posterity as a monument of the wisdom of the legislators of Congress.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

[Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentlemen on the other side to use some of their time.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the roads bill in the last House reported from the Committee on Roads. I am under the impression that I voted for a roads bill in the Sixty-second Congress, although some one intimated the other day that I did not. I do not know, and it is not material. I never vote for a bill trying to deceive myself as to what it means or what its effect will be. I have no doubt that the General Government will soon be engaged in aiding in the construction of roads throughout the country. And while the bills which have been reported heretofore carried authorization of $25,000,000, no one knows how much will be appropriated in a few years for that purpose. If we commence with an initial appropriation of $25,000,000, and that is successful, it is very likely that the sum will be very largely increased. This bill will undoubtedly pass this House, on the theory that it is in aid of the farmers. Now, I am not going to deceive myself about that proposition. The bill that was passed in the Sixty-second Congress was for the aid of country roads, roads which lead by the farmer's house, roads which are ordinarily not improved very much, and not usually in very good order; roads upon which the farmer really hauls his product a few miles to market; and perhaps my view of the subject may not be as broad or as informing as the views of others, because I live in a State and was raised in a portion of a State where no farmer hauls his produce many miles to market. We have a railroad every few miles in the State of Illinois. The farmers do not now, as they did when Illinois was first settled, have to haul their wheat 50 to 150 miles over a country road to market. He now hauls his grain a short distance to a car, or a warehouse, or a railroad.

That may not be the case entirely throughout the country, and is not, and there might be some reason—and there is—for the improvement of roads in order to aid the farmer to haul his crops or his produce to market; and yet in the main the products of all farms are carried to the real market by water or by rail—principally by rail.

But the theory of the first bill was to aid these country roads. There was quite a dramatic fight in the House between those who believed in aiding the country roads on the one side and those who were more or less susceptible to the influences of the automobile associations on the other side.

In the last Congress the bill was on a 50-50 plan. It gave authority to aid in the construction of the small or less improved country roads or the roads that the automobile people want. This bill is purely for the purpose of building automobile roads. Farmers will receive incidental benefit, but the highway commissioners of the various States in the main have been created through influences emanating from the manufacturers of automobiles.

Now, I do not say that it is not a good thing to build good roads in order that people may travel by automobiles, or that

that may not be in the interest of the farmers, because in some of the States—and I hope it may be true as to most of them—the farmers are not behindhand at all in the owning or using of automobiles.

But I am not going to vote for this bill at this time for this reason: I believe the Government can well afford, when it has the money, to appropriate it in aid of the construction of roads, whether they be through routes mainly used by automobiles or local routes mainly used by farmers for local work. But I do not believe that the General Government ought to levy special taxes upon a few for the purpose of constructing roads or beginning the construction of roads. We propose here an expenditure of $25,000,000 a year. That is just a little less than the special stamp taxes amount to. For the last fiscal year, when the emergency tax law was enforced for a little less than three-quarters of a year, the collection for stamp taxes under Schedules A and B of the law amounted to about $23,500,000. For the first quarter of this fiscal year those stamp taxes amounted to about $8,500,000, a little more than the amount that it is proposed shall be appropriated for the construction of roads.

I am not willing that the General Government shall levy special taxes in order to go into the business of providing roads. If we can raise the money, as we frequently have been able to, and probably will be able to in the future, in the general course of our revenue laws, and have a surplus which we can devote to the construction of roads, well and good. I do not vote against the bill because my own locality will not receive direct benefit from it, but for the reason that I doubt whether the country, where the money is expended, outside of the cities, is really any more benefited than the cities, where the money is not expended, even if it were for the construction of purely farmers' roads. The cities are prosperous only when the farmers are prosperous; the cities will do well and the men who live in the cities make money only when the country is prosperous and when those who raise the produce on the farms are prosperous. But I am not willing to levy special taxes against the cities in an odious form, such as the stamp taxes are, for the purpose of spending money which is not required for immediate expenditure, either in the cities or in the country.

I am not sure that the statement which I make will not bring adherents to the bill. I notice that the taxes collected under Schedules A and B of the emergency-revenue act, which is for documentary stamps, stamps on perfumery, cosmetics, and so forth, for the last fiscal year in the State of Alabama were $183,000; in the State of Arkansas, $117,000; in the first district of Illinois, which is Chicago, $2,480,000; in the State of Florida, $140,000; in the third Massachusetts, which is Boston, $1,004,000; in the second New York district, which is New York City, $4,354,000; in the first Pennsylvania, which is Philadelphia, $809,000; in South Carolina, $100,000; in Washington, $174,000; in North and South Dakota combined, $223,000. And I might go on with the list. These special taxes which we have levied are paid by a few cities as stamp taxes—an odious form of taxation at best. I am not undertaking to criticize the necessity of levying this tax at this time, but it is an odious form of taxation at the best, which weighs very heavily upon those who pay it, and which in most instances can not be passed on or divided up among the people generally.

Now, the Members of Congress from those parts of the country where these taxes are very small are in a vast majority in this House. They have the power, and they are about to exercise it, to take this money which they have levied upon the cities in an odious form and expend it in their own States and in their own communities. In the long run that method of raising revenue and expending money will not be a success. You levy the general taxes throughout the country on any proposition; the cities, in the first instance, pay the most of it. They do not complain. They understand the situation. Where the wealth is mostly gathered, there taxation necessarily will be, and must be, the heaviest. They do not complain when you take the money raised in the form of general taxation and expend it in particular localities where it may be of benefit, especially to the locality, and indirectly to the mass of citizenship throughout the Union. But they will have the right to complain when you tax special industries by stamp taxes for the purpose of raising money to be expended in particular localities, and so long as we have the stamp tax in effect, bearing heavily, a burden upon a few people, I am unwilling to take that money and vote it for the benefit of perhaps a majority in particular localities.

I know that probably that statement will only add to the votes for the bill, because it is very natural, though somewhat regrettable, that Members of Congress, human as they are, are more prone to vote for money to be expended in their district which they know their districts do not raise in the form of revenue. And yet the Government must always in the long run be fair to all. I do not think there is that necessity for this legislation at this time to justify the Government inaugurating a system of spending money for local improvements, and raising that money by an odious form of stamp taxation. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I have always been for good roads. Away back in 1904 it was my pleasure to vote in the Legislature of Maryland for the construction of one of the earliest and best roads in this section, that leading from Washington to Baltimore.

In 1906 we established a system of good roads, and since that time we have constructed in Maryland roads costing more than $15,000,000. Every section of our State is connected with every other section by trunk-line roads, and they are of great benefit not only to the cities but to the various sections of the State.

I come from a district entirely within the city of Baltimore, but I have never yet heard one of our people complain about the expenditure of money upon good roads in the State of Maryland. It has brought to us prosperity, it has brought close to the city of Baltimore every section of the State from the Potomac River to the Pennsylvania line, from the shores of the great Atlantic Ocean to the Alleghany Mountains, so that every section is connected by easy roads, and the farmers are using them to a great extent in bringing their goods to the markets of Baltimore.

I believe that whatever makes the counties of the State prosperous is bound to make the cities with which they trade likewise both prosperous and progressive, and upon that theory we have gone ahead in the construction of good roads throughout the State of Maryland.

We have a secondary system, which reaches the small road, or the road leading to the farmer's home. Under that system the counties are able to contribute one-half and the State the other half. By those two methods the State of Maryland has acquired a road system second to none in the United States, and we believe every dollar expended has been well expended; that it has brought great revenue to the State; that the properties along those roads have increased wonderfully in value; that the people from the towns and cities are going into the country, living on these highways, where they can easily reach the city of Baltimore or the other sections of the State to which they desire to go.

So I say I have always been in favor of good roads, though I represent an entirely city district. I believe no money the Government can expend can be better expended than upon the public highways of this great country. We ought not to consider whether we live in a particular city or a particular State, but whatever is beneficial to the great mass of the people of this country is bound to be beneficial to each and every section of the country. [Applause.]

When you realize that there are about 6,500,000 farmers in the United States and, including women and children, about 45,000,000 depending upon them, we can readily see the importance of such a bill as this to that vast population of the United States.

It costs 25 cents per ton-mile to transport farm products to the market in the United States where the roads are bad, while in continental Europe, where they have good roads, it costs but 8 cents per ton-mile, a loss to the farmer and his family of 17 cents per ton-mile.

The railroads of our country carry each year some 900,000,000 tons of freight, about 200,000,000 tons of which is transported over the country roads to the markets, wharves, or stations by the farmers, from which it can readily be seen the enormous loss to the farming population of the country by reason of the bad roads which we now have.

I can not better express my position upon the importance of good roads than to recite the facts I gave to this House two years ago upon a similar bill:

I have seen farmers haul their products to market on both pikes and dirt roads. On the average pike one team will haul from one and a half to two tons, make an average trip of 20 miles, and return in one day. On the dirt roads one team will haul, on an average, from one-half to three-fourths of a ton, make an average trip of 10 miles, and return in one day. Therefore, on this calculation, which is a fair one, it costs the

man on the dirt road four times what it costs the man on the pike to market his products, which is conclusive proof that the mud tax is the greatest, most excessive, and most burdensome tax that the farmer pays, and as it is a well-known fact that the ultimate consumer bears all the burden this mud tax must eventually be paid by him. So in view of the fact that the life of the Nation is dependent upon the success of the farm, will any man contend that it is not economical and profitable for the Government to expend money in the construction and maintenance of roads into and through the farming sections? The man who would make such contention is ignorant of the interest the city has, or should have, in the success of the farm.

We have been told that our great cities are merely the product of our agricultural resources. The factories change the products of field and forest to articles for the comfort of man. The progress and prosperity of our land stand upon the innumerable acres of the Union, and the great farm products produced upon this vast acreage is the great backbone of all common wealth and enterprise. Good roads reduce the cost of transportation from at least 28 cents per ton-mile to 8 cents. The experience has been that where good roads are constructed property is increased in value. The taxable basis of the State is increased, the result being a great benefit to the producer, the miner, and the taxpayer. We can not separate the interests of those of the city who earn their living by labor and manufacture from those of the country who produce the wherewithal upon which they live. We can not improve our roads without lessening the expense of transportation of the farm, and this lessened expense will eventually lessen the cost to the ultimate consumer. So with each and all of us, whether residents of teeming cities or of the country districts, good roads are of inestimable value.

Better roads mean cheaper transportation; cheaper transportation means cheaper foodstuffs and living. The farmer feeds the people. What benefits the farmer benefits those who work in the factory, the shops, the thousands and tens of thousands who live in towns and cities. Why improve the rivers and harbors and not improve the great highways of the land over which must be transported the wheat, the corn, the cotton, the cattle and hogs, and every article we eat and wear? The Government collects its revenue from all of the people and all of the people should receive the same fair consideration in return.

There is also another phase of the subject which I think is of vast importance to the people of our State. That is the "educational benefits" derived from good roads. I have always believed, from the time when I was a public-school teacher in my native State, that better advantages can be obtained by having large graded schools; and by the assistance of good roads we may be able to organize the several public schools into groups and merge these groups into central schools. The good roads will enable us to have well-equipped wagons, or perhaps motor vehicles, by which to convey the children from their several sections to the central school. In this way the country people will get the same advantages as those the city now enjoy. This system would insure the regular attendance of the children and their continued interest in the school and would, no doubt, prove a marvelous success in their education. I believe that the education of the children of the country districts is just as important to the people of Baltimore and other large cities as any other one thing, because it is a well-known fact that many of the country children become inhabitants of the large cities and take an active part in the general welfare and the industrial pursuits and professions of their adopted home.

Mr. Chairman, for the reasons which I have assigned, and many more which could be given in support of this bill had I more time at my disposal, I shall vote for the pending bill for the improvement of the roads of the country, and sincerely hope it may pass the House and the Senate and become one of the great constructive laws of our land.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PRICE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that no question before the country to-day meets with such universal approval and support as the question of good roads. Especially true in the country districts of the Nation, because it means, perhaps, more to our rural population than others, being isolated in many instances and long distances from the large cities and centers of population. The interest in good roads, however, is not confined to rural communities by any means, for in this day of automobiles and rapid transit the city resident is as vitally interested as any other. I think, then, that the desirability and the need of good roads need hardly be discussed, for it is universally recognized and conceded, the only question being as to who shall build them and the method to be employed in their construction and maintenance. So insistent has the demand become for improved roads that all the States of the Union, with the exception of five, have instituted special highway departments in their State governments, and many of our States have in recent years appropriated vast sums of money for improved roads, and I know that our people are willing to be taxed for these improvements, because they receive, perhaps, more real benefit from them than any other public utility. The time was when it was thought by many to be unconstitutional for the Federal Government to appropriate money for roads in the States, but in this day it is very generally conceded that it may do so without violence to the Constitution.

Congress appropriates money every year to projects more questionable, constitutionally considered. Not being a member of the legal fraternity, I would not presume to discuss this feature of the pending bill; but common sense would dictate that if the Federal Government can establish a post office in a State and a rural mail route from that post office, or contract for the carrying of the mails by star route from given points in a State, it may with equal propriety contribute to the building and maintenance of roads over which the mails are carried. I agree fully with the report of the committee that—

Roads are local concerns, and primarily it is the duty of the States to provide them for the people.

I also believe jurisdiction over the roads should belong to the State and should never be undertaken by the General Government.

The delivery of mail is a function of the Federal Government, and a road over which the mail is carried is just as much a postal facility as is the post office where the mail is distributed or the carrier on the route. An adequate office outfit, a competent carrier, and a good road contribute alike to the proper and quick dispatch of the mail; hence a contribution by the General Government to the States for the betterment of the road over which it exercises the postal functions should not be considered radical but an aid in the service it is attempting to render the public. The General Government renders aid to State institutions of learning where military training is given for the purpose of increasing the efficiency of our military service. It likewise extends aid to agricultural colleges in the States where military training is given in order to increase the efficiency of our educated farmers. It spends vast sums on rivers and harbors in the interest of commerce and navigation and in order that our Navy may better protect us. We appropriate millions of dollars annually for public buildings in order that the people's busineses may be expedited. If, then, we can appropriate such vast sums for these purposes, some of which only a part of the people are interested in, why should we not appropriate money for roads in which all the people are interested? If deepening a waterway is a saving to the public in freight rates and an aid in transportation, why is not the building of a road, which likewise is an aid to transportation and a cheapening of rates, also a public benefit worthy of Government aid? Our Government has expended millions of dollars in building post-office buildings in our large towns and cities. Why should we not spend millions more in building post roads? The reason for both expenditures would be the same, namely, the efficiency of the Postal Service.

But some gentlemen have obejcted to governmental aid because it is proposed to appropriate money without assuming jurisdiction, as is exercised in some of the appropriations I have mentioned. But that need not disturb us, for we are in part only reimbursing the State for some of the money it has expended in building roads which we are using in common with them for increasing the efficiency of the Postal Service. We do not need jurisdiction, as we demand in many other things, because we contribute only a part, and our contribution is made to an organized department of a State government having as much or more invested than we have and made under such restrictions as precludes the possibility of governmental waste.

The maximum amount that may be appropriated under this bill is twenty-five millions annually, certainly not a large amount for an object so worthy, when compared with appropriations for purposes less meritorious and with propositions which do not begin to compare in public benefit. As to the equity in allotment to the several States there is great diversity of opinion. I do not suppose it is perfect in its application. It would be beyond the possibilities of human wisdom to draft a measure that would be considered entirely equitable, but I believe the committee has come as near as it is possible at this time. This

is a great country of ours, made up of a Union of great States, some of them large in area but comparatively small in population, some small in area and large in population, but all great, whether large or small. Our interests are diversified. Our conditions are different. Some States have large cities, some are almost rural. Some present difficulties of one kind in road building, some another, so that a bill which would be absolutely equitable and free of arbitrary features would be impossible of preparation. But I believe the committee has done well. There are three methods of allotment to the States, first, an arbitrary amount of $65,000 is given to each State, large or small, and one-half the remainder to be apportioned in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the population of all the States, and the other half in the ratio which the mileage of rural free delivery and star routes bears to the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes of all the States. I do not know whether a more equitable plan could be evolved or not, anyway none has been proposed, and I will say this, that I am in favor of this bill, but if some gentleman who is opposing this measure will propose a better plan I will be glad to help adopt it. I am not wedded to the letter of this bill, but I am in hearty accord with the spirit of it. Until a better plan is suggested I shall stand by this. This bill is of so much importance to all the American people that we should not haggle about and split hairs over entire equity. The belief that some States will get a few thousand more and some a few thousand less than they are entitled to should not jeopardize the passage of a bill so far-reaching and beneficial. It is seldom that we have the opportunity to pass legislation so universally helpful as this bill will prove to be. There should be no sectionalism because all sections are helped. There should be no city against country, because you can not benefit the farmer without benefiting the city man as well.

In the State of Maryland, which I have the honor in part to represent, we have been operating under a law similar to this for many years. The State gives aid to the counties under certain conditions, and it has stimulated road building as nothing had done before, resulting finally in the bonding of our State and constructing a complete system of State highways. Although a small State we have spent over $16,000,000 in the last seven years and have some of the best roads in the Union. All of this was the result of the impetus given road improvement by the passage of the State aid law, whereby the State contributed 50 per cent to the counties. The law is still in effect, and at the last legislature the appropriation was increased from two to three hundred thousand dollars annually. While the State has constructed outright the intercounty system of 1,300 miles, the counties are constructing with State aid the lateral roads leading from the State highway into the surrounding country. It has been argued here that this bill, if enacted into law, would stagnate road building and place a premium upon inactivity. My experience teaches me otherwise, and it is my earnest conviction that if you pass this bill and make it a law you will have placed a stimulus before the American States for road construction they have never before possessed. During the passage of our road legislation through the various legislative sessions in Maryland we were confronted with the same issues that confront us here. The great city of Baltimore, our only large city, felt they were being called upon to pay more than her share of the cost of our State roads, but I venture to say that to-day there is not a handful of her citizens that regret contributing to the construction of a great State system of roads; the city has reaped her share of the benefits. In the last analysis all roads lead to the great cities and centers of population, and the interests and destinies of all our people are so interwoven, whether city or country, that all are equally benefitted.

Another argument made against this bill is that on account of special appropriations for national defense which this Congress is called upon to provide we can not afford to embark on road improvement. Why, it is a part of national defense! What better investment can we make than in spending a few millions to improve our roads for military movements? Of what use would a vast army be, no matter how well trained and disciplined, unless they could be quickly moved to the field of battle? It would be far more sensible, as a matter of defense and preparedness, to have a few less regiments of soldiers and better roads over which to move the remainder.

Another objection urged against this bill is the broad powers given the Secretary of Agriculture in administration, but I believe a close study of its provisions, taking into consideration the ends to be attained, will convince most of us that they are not dangerous powers, but wise provisions. For instance, he may in his discretion contribute on the part of the Government not less than 30 nor more than 50 per cent of the reasonable cost of such construction or maintenance. I admit these are broad powers for Congress to invest in an administrative office, but the peculiarity of the project, I believe, makes it a necessity. Conditions in one State might make it desirable to construct more miles of road with Government aid than in some other State, in which case 30 per cent could be furnished, while the State in which conditions warranted the building of less miles could be allotted 40 or 50 per cent. I believe if you take into consideration the advanced position of some States over others in road construction as well as the geographical conditions and the geological conditions of the various States we must conclude this is a wise if not a necessary provision. It is possible, of course, to abuse this power; but what power of administration is not susceptible of abuse? As for myself, I have no fear on that score either from the present incumbent or his successors. Another thing that must be borne in mind is that while the percentage may vary, the allotment to the several States may not be changed, so that a State will be sure of its allotment being expended either with a greater or less amount of its own funds. The third purpose for which it is conceded the Federal Government may aid the construction of roads is where the roads are used in the transportation of interstate commerce. The question of transportation in a vast country like ours is second to none, and the ease with which it is consummated and the lowest cost of service are vital questions. The great difference in the cost of transportation between the farm and the railroad with improved roads is apparent to all, when we consider the figures in connection with it. It has been estimated that it costs the farmer 25 to 30 cents per ton per mile to haul his products to the railroad, while the railroad company takes it to the city market, 150 miles distant, for one-half cent per ton per mile. Much criticism has been leveled at the railroads of the country in recent years, some of it deserved, but with such figures as these before us it is difficult to charge much of the high cost of living to the railroads. In the question of transportation alone the investment this country would make by this bill would be more than justified, and the millions thus spent would flow back into the pockets of the people manyfold. By this saving in transportation that I have indicated every man, woman, and child in the Union is affected.

France has the greatest road system of any nation in the world, having nearly a half million miles of macadam roads, constructed in part by national aid, and the products of factory and farm are carried to the markets for less than 10 cents per ton per mile, as against about 30 in the United States. Do you comprehend what a vast saving that would be to our people? Is it not easy to see what a factor that would be in reducing the cost of living in this country? It would benefit all classes—the laborer, the mechanic, the banker, the merchant, and the farmer. The farmers of the Nation are more vitally interested, perhaps, than any other, because it means more in the way of conveniences. It makes life on the farm attractive; it increases the use of automobiles by the farmers; it keeps the boys and girls on the farms, which are the great feeders of the Nation. The farm is the source of our national wealth, the foundation of civilized society, the best home of the family; it is the recruiting ground for our cities, and it is from the farmers that the great men in commerce and finance are recruited and from whence reinforcements come to replenish the forces in public life in both State and Nation. This is neither a sectional nor partisan measure, but should be met in a patriotic spirit.

The American people are as a rule patriots first, partisans second, and I believe all that is necessary to the passage of this legislation is that a clear understanding be gained as to the untold and undreamed of possibilities. I will give you an illustration from my own State: Our State road project was begun under a Democratic governor, a Democratic legislature, and a Democratic roads commission. In the midst of it, and after we were fairly started and had spent six millions, we were so unfortunate as to elect a Republican governor, who, in turn, appointed a Republican roads commission, but the legislature remained strongly Democratic. Many feared that party conflict and a divided responsibility would prove disastrous to our State road system, but there seemed a determination that party politics and jealousies should have no place in this matter. Accordingly, we find a Democratic legislature appropriating in two sessions over $10,000,000 to complete the roads, and we find the Republican road commission vieing with the Democrats by spending it judiciously and expeditiously. I commend that spirit to the Members of this House. Let us rise to the occasion, brushing aside all speciousness, and give this great people whom we represent their hearts' desire. If we think we can not afford it, let us cut off something else and make ourselves afford it. If you think some particular State is to get

ten thousand more than it should, forget it, and try to remember that we can not benefit any State or section without benefiting every other State and section of our common country. We are Americans, and we are here to legislate for all the American people. Let us aid in the construction of a great system of roads that shall reach from ocean to ocean and from the Lakes to the Gulf. Establish a public utility that is desired and used by all the people all the time. The automobilest on pleasure and recreation bent wants improved roads, and as he traverses this country and sees its greatness his love for it is bound to increase. The commerce will be carried over them with immense profit and benefit. The artisan and the laborer, with their dinner pails hung to the handle bars of a bicycle, will rejoice and bless the country in which they live. The farmer and his family will be more prosperous and happy, and the Government, which has made a comparatively small contribution, will move its troops quickly, deliver the mails with greater expedition, and see the products of the farm placed at the door of the consumer at a reduced cost. Are not all these desirable ends worth striving for; and that such results will be attained is, I believe, the opinion of the great mass of the American people.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois is unduly alarmed, I am sure, if he is under the impression, as he seems to be, that the rural sections of the country, or the farmers, as he puts it, are going to have an advantage in this bill over the cities. There is a general demand for good roads, and my observation has been that the greatest demand for road development comes largely from the city centers, in order that the cities might be brought more closely in touch with the rural sections.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], one of the ablest Members of this House, together with other distinguished gentlemen, have seen fit to criticize this bill. Admitting that it is not all that some of us would like, for I would like to see a bill carrying a larger appropriation for the purpose of road construction, yet it is the plan the committee has agreed upon, and it is the only plan now before Congress and I am heartily in favor of it.

On December 7, 1915, in the opening days of the present Congress, I introduced a bill having as its purpose governmental aid to road construction, which bill is No. 3060, and was referred to the Committee on Roads. That in a large measure expressed my idea of how the Government should contribute toward this important development. The present bill in some respects has provisions similar to those contained in my bill, but in other respects it is dissimilar. I shall not stop now to read my bill, as it is not under consideration, but I shall discuss the Shackleford bill, which is now under consideration.

CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION.

Some gentlemen have opposed and are opposing the idea of Government aid to road building upon the ground that it is not constitutional. There can be but little doubt in the mind of any one well versed upon the questions of constitutional law as to this issue. It is now pretty well and generally conceded that the General Government has the constitutional right to construct and maintain post roads, military roads, and roads used for interstate commerce. As has been so aptly said by the committee:

> On the general principle that the greater contains the lesser, it follows that the General Government may aid the States in the construction and maintenance of such roads.

And that is exactly what the Shackleford bill seeks to do.

OTHER QUESTIONS.

With the constitutional question out of the way, what other opposition have we? It has been urged from certain quarters that this would build roads in the country counties largely at the expense of the great cities, and that the cities pay the larger part of the revenues into the Treasury of the United States. Cities are built, as will be admitted by all, at the expense of the rural sections; and, furthermore, good roads would benefit everybody alike, and would help in bringing the people of the rural sections into closer touch and fellowship with their city brethren, and would prove of inestimable value to farmers and city people alike. It is a narrow policy to argue that money appropriated under this bill would benefit the farming population to the disadvantage of the city population. As I have already said, in my section the people in the cities are eager for better roads that they may be brought more closely in fellowship, commercially, socially, and otherwise, with the people on the farms and with many good towns scattered through the rural sections. The people of the cities are more able and I may add, in my opinion, are willing to bear the greater burden of the expense in order that this great work might be advanced, and in order that the whole country might be bound together in closer bonds of union by means of a network of improved roads

In many sections of the country there are small counties, with limited population and limited means, which are not able to improve and maintain their roads, and yet there can be no system of good roads until they are linked and connected from one county to another; nor can the farmers or people generally get the best use of the roads until the highways of the country are generally improved. If roads are constructed for use of the farmers and if they are good roads, they may be used for any and every other purpose; while on the other hand, if they are constructed for automobiles and are good roads, it naturally follows that the farmers will get the use of them for their various purposes. What the people want are good roads for all purposes, and they want them, as this bill fixes it, under State control.

FEDERAL AID.

I am no new convert to the idea of Federal aid to road construction and road maintenance. I have advocated it for years, in fact, before I began my service in Congress, and voted for and advocated Federal aid to road building when the question was before Congress in the last term. The House, as it will be recalled, passed a bill giving Federal aid to road construction and it was killed in the Senate, and did not, for that reason, become a law. Roads are local in their nature yet national in their importance, if they are improved roads; and national in their detriment to the general good if they are not improved. Primarily it should be the duty of the States to build and maintain the roads, but whose function is it to operate and maintain the mail facilities of the country? All admit that the latter is the function of the National Government; that being true, it is proper that the General Government should provide itself with adequate facilities with which to perform this important duty. The General Government provides other necessaries along this line for adequate mail facilities, such as postmasters, post offices, and so forth, so why not post roads? It also pays heavily for rental or carrying when the mails are conveyed over railroads; why not pay for carrying mails over State roads or help build and maintain those roads? A post road is as much a postal facility as is a mail car or a post office. In many sections post-office buildings are rented instead of owned by the General Government, as it is economy to rent rather than build them in thinly settled sections. The theory is identical—why not the Government pay a reasonable rental for the use of its mail roads, which will go to the construction and upkeep of these and other roads so used by the Government, which would be less expensive than if the Government constructed the roads in the first instance.

In times gone by, I hope never to return, the volume and weight of postal matter were of slight consequence in rural sections. To-day it is considerable in all parts of the country and particularly in the more progressive sections. Formerly the interest of the General Government in the condition of the roads was not very great for the reasons stated, but with the establishment of the Rural Free Delivery Service came also the necessity for better roads over which to transport and deliver the mails. With the Post Office Department's progressive idea of motorizing the rural service came a further demand for still better roads.

In the first place a community can not have the very best possible mail service even with a horse-drawn vehicle equipment unless the roads are fairly improved. The Government will not establish, nor attempt to establish, a rural route unless the roads are passable and unless it is evident that the mails can be delivered over them. Now, under the new or progressive idea originated by the present administration of affairs in the department, a motor route will not be established unless the roads are sufficiently improved for the use of automobiles. With the rapidly expanding Parcel Post System came a further demand for better service, and to get better service there is a general interest in and a demand for better roads. As a result of the demand of the people for efficient mail service on the rural routes and with the Government's faith pledged to better mail service, its interest in good roads has grown accordingly and to-day is a matter of large concern to the Government.

STATE CONTROL.

In the bill providing for Government aid, introduced by me, it is provided that the States shall exercise control over the roads, even though built or maintained by the General Government. This is upon the theory that roads are primarily local concerns over which the respective States exercise control, and that control should not be disturbed by the General Government.

WHAT THE STATES WILL RECEIVE.

This bill in many particulars is the same as the bill we had up and passed in the House in the Sixty-third Congress; and the maximum amount which may be appropriated for any fiscal year under this act is $25,000,000, which would be prorated to each of the several States, as follows:

State.	Population.			Rural free delivery.		Star routes.		Per cent of total miles of R. F. D. and star routes.	Amount.	Specific amount.	Total amount of aid to each State.
	Population.	Per cent of total population.	Amount.	Number of routes.	Aggregate length of routes.	Number of routes.	Aggregate length of routes.				
					Miles.		*Miles.*				
Alabama	2,138,093	2.34	$255,996	1,065	25,845	251	2,589.09	2.36	$258,184	$65,000	$579,180
Arizona	240,354	.22	24,068	28	677	88	2,391.73	.26	28,444	65,000	117,512
Arkansas	1,574,449	1.72	188,168	558	13,366	520	6,069.38	1.62	177,228	65,000	430,396
California	2,377,549	2.60	284,440	408	9,553	396	7,564.85	1.42	155,348	65,000	504,788
Colorado	799,024	.87	95,178	207	5,472	271	4,724.00	.85	92,990	65,000	253,168
Connecticut	1,114,756	1.22	133,468	281	6,219	65	359.06	.55	60,170	65,000	258,638
Delaware	202,322	.22	24,068	58	1,509	12	58.71	.13	14,222	65,000	103,290
Florida	752,619	.82	89,708	233	5,546	176	1,716.59	.60	65,640	65,000	220,348
Georgia	2,609,121	2.85	311,790	1,498	36,610	145	1,381.43	3.16	345,704	65,000	722,494
Idaho	325,594	.36	39,384	162	4,061	155	3,161.62	.60	65,640	65,000	170,024
Illinois	5,638,591	6.16	673,904	2,844	68,979	80	717.77	5.79	633,426	65,000	1,372,330
Indiana	2,700,876	2.94	321,636	2,072	50,774	90	733.88	4.28	468,232	65,000	854,868
Iowa	2,224,721	2.42	264,748	2,116	55,929	36	275.73	4.68	511,992	65,000	841,740
Kansas	1,690,949	1.84	201,296	1,859	50,838	123	2,058.30	4.40	481,360	65,000	747,656
Kentucky	2,289,905	2.50	273,500	800	18,765	786	7,843.45	2.21	241,774	65,000	580,274
Louisiana	1,656,388	1.81	198,014	275	6,504	283	2,492.44	.75	82,050	65,000	345,064
Maine	742,371	.81	88,614	478	10,970	288	2,561.62	1.12	122,528	65,000	276,142
Maryland	1,295,346	1.41	154,254	422	9,698	156	1,210.58	.91	99,554	65,000	318,808
Massachusetts	3,366,416	3.67	401,408	278	6,684	140	862.60	.63	68,922	65,000	535,429
Michigan	2,810,173	3.06	334,764	1,759	48,046	150	1,551.58	4.12	450,728	65,000	850,492
Minnesota	2,075,708	2.27	248,338	1,581	43,676	190	2,560.63	3.84	420,096	65,000	733,434
Mississippi	1,797,114	1.96	214,424	894	21,512	236	2,462.41	1.99	217,706	65,000	497,130
Missouri	3,293,335	3.59	392,746	2,166	51,455	452	5,310.99	4.72	516,368	65,000	974,114
Montana	376,053	.41	44,854	94	2,506	262	6,541.00	.76	83,144	65,000	192,998
Nebraska	1,192,214	1.30	142,220	1,066	29,233	211	4,554.27	2.81	307,414	65,000	514,634
Nevada	81,875	.09	9,846	4	85	81	2,807.60	.24	26,256	65,000	101,102
New Hampshire	403,572	.47	51,418	246	5,564	122	909.47	.54	59,076	65,000	175,494
New Jersey	2,537,167	2.77	303,038	311	7,149	110	553.09	.64	70,016	65,000	438,054
New Mexico	327,301	.36	39,384	28	801	218	4,860.61	.47	51,418	65,000	155,802
New York	9,113,614	9.94	1,087,436	1,949	44,970	486	3,648.97	4.04	441,976	65,000	1,594,412
North Carolina	2,206,287	2.41	263,654	1,378	31,961	396	4,042.54	2.99	327,106	65,000	655,760
North Dakota	577,056	.63	68,922	630	18,401	103	2,608.55	1.75	191,450	65,000	325,372
Ohio	4,767,121	5.21	569,974	2,545	60,917	149	1,041.16	5.15	563,410	65,000	1,198,384
Oklahoma	1,657,155	1.81	198,014	957	25,504	288	4,125.09	2.46	269,124	65,000	532,138
Oregon	672,765	.73	79,862	253	6,187	248	5,234.43	.95	103,930	65,000	248,792
Pennsylvania	7,655,111	8.36	914,584	1,906	49,963	562	3,962.92	7.48	490,112	65,000	1,469,696
Rhode Island	542,610	.59	64,546	49	996	18	87.61	.09	9,846	65,000	139,392
South Carolina	1,515,400	1.65	180,510	860	20,420	114	1,177.96	1.80	196,920	65,000	442,430
South Dakota	583,888	.64	70,016	621	18,271	190	4,021.74	1.85	202,390	65,000	337,406
Tennessee	2,184,789	2.38	260,372	1,611	38,313	207	2,276.41	3.37	368,678	65,000	694,050
Texas	3,896,542	4.25	464,950	2,019	49,251	628	10,179.40	4.94	540,436	65,000	1,070,386
Utah	373,351	.41	44,854	55	1,235	113	2,541.11	.31	33,914	65,000	143,768
Vermont	355,956	.39	42,666	343	7,610	137	1,166.77	.73	79,862	65,000	187,528
Virginia	2,061,612	2.25	246,150	1,101	24,557	626	6,295.00	2.56	280,064	65,000	591,214
Washington	1,141,990	1.25	136,750	349	8,539	173	2,450.77	.91	99,554	65,000	301,304
West Virginia	1,221,119	1.33	145,502	420	9,403	475	4,946.22	1.19	130,186	65,000	340,688
Wisconsin	2,333,860	2.55	278,970	1,691	41,717	145	1,510.27	3.59	392,746	65,000	736,716
Wyoming	145,965	.16	17,504	21	592	157	4,137.03	.39	42,666	65,000	125,170
Total	91,641,197	100	10,940,000	42,567	1,056,897	11,430	147,365.50	100	10,940,000	3,120,000	25,000,000

PREPAREDNESS.

We have heard and read a great deal lately on the question of preparedness, and we are told that it is vital to the Nation's safety. I agree that a reasonable and conservative amount of preparedness for an adequate and safe defense should be provided for; but for the life of me I can not see a better plan of preparedness than to improve our highways, both the roads and the waterways. They are both essential to prosperity and to the more substantial development of our great common country. If we would have the sinews of war for defensive purposes, we must keep our country prosperous. To make it prosperous we must aid in its development agriculturally and otherwise, so that the markets of this country and of the world will be open to our products and commerce. Beyond question, prices are most largely controlled by the laws of supply and demand. Unless there are markets there can be no demand, and unless we open up the ways leading to those markets, whether by highways or waterways, the demand may exist, but we can not supply it. This is a great, rich, powerful country. To develop its highways and waterways will not cost a great deal; no one man will ever feel the cost of constructing good roads, and the benefits to the people generally will be simply beyond measure.

I made an address in the last Congress in support of the policy of committing the National Government to aid in road construction and road maintenance, and my position on the subject is well known to every Member of this House and to the country, so I shall not take up much more of your time.

WHAT GEORGIA WOULD GET.

It will be seen from the table I referred to a while ago that the amount coming to Georgia under this bill would be considerable, amounting to $722,494, upon the basis fixed in the table upon which it has been computed. It will be observed that few States of the Union would profit much more largely than would my State. It would mean much to our State if this amount could be added annually to what Georgia is spending and would be of vast assistance in the construction and maintenance of our roads. It would lighten the burdens on Georgia taxpayers to a very great extent and would rapidly help in the completion of a splendid system of highways in our State for the general use of the public. It means a great deal to Georgia and to Georgians.

I hope to see the time when all of Georgia's roads will be improved, so that our farm products and commerce can be hauled and handled at less cost and so that our people from one end of the State to the other will be brought closely together by a network of good roads constructed with Federal aid. No greater work can be undertaken by the General Government; and what it means to Georgia it means to every other Southern State and to practically every other State of the Nation.

The complaint that the expense falls too heavily on the great cities like Philadelphia, New York, and Chicago is not well founded. These are great cities and the country is proud of them; we are all proud of their achievements; but let me assure you that each of the great cities of the country will be correspondingly benefited as the farmers of the country are given better roads. The farmers of the country have contributed all these years to the building of these great American cities, now why not the great cities bear their part of the burden in giving to the farmers of the country a network of improved roads? We must not think of our country as one of sections nor as one of cities and rural sections; we must think of it as one great whole. The interests of the country is so closely interwoven with the interests of the city that they are practically one and the same. It has been said:

Destroy your cities and they will be rebuilt and prosper again, but destroy the farms and grass will grow in the streets of every city in the land.

When you help the agricultural sections of this country, you help every interest in the country. There should not be a dissenting vote against this bill, and I hope it will soon become a law, and that the hope of the people for good roads upon a large and useful scale will soon be realized. It is a question that is close to the heart of the great American people, and they are looking to their friends in Congress to-day to support this bill, which is one of the most beneficial pieces of legislation that has been considered in this House in many a day or will likely be in many a day.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a short article from the Ocala Banner, published in my district on January 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the article referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, the value and importance of good roads as measured by the benefits they confer on all classes of our people, irrespective of their callings or residence, are now so academic and well understood as to render further discussion unnecessary, either to inform or to arouse interest in this great forward and progressive movement.

This Congress more than two years ago recognized the widespread demand for national aid in road building and appointed a committee to thoroughly study the question and to frame a bill for such purpose. The courteous and helpful answers of members of this committee in response to the numerous questions propounded during this discussion show convincingly that they have thoroughly studied the question from every viewpoint and have prepared a bill with an eye single to the common good and one free from all suspicion of partisanship, sectionalism, or selfish greed.

I believe that the passage of this bill will directly benefit more people in every State and in every section of our country than any other one single measure that this or any previous Congress has passed. [Applause.]

The suggestion has been made by one gentleman that this bill is perhaps not as good as the one drafted by this same committee at a previous session, but in such suggestion but few on this floor concur, and the Senate has already repudiated the former bill. It has even been asserted by some of the opponents of this measure that it should be labeled "A bill to provide funds for auto highways." No arguments or facts are advanced in support of such assertion, and I am free to say that if the Members of this House who are supporting this bill believed for a moment that such was its purpose or would be its effect, it would be defeated by an overwhelming vote.

The views on this subject of the distinguished chairman of the committee who drafted and reported the bill, as well as the views of many of his associates on the committee, especially the learned gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], are so well known to the Members of the House and to the public at large as to thoroughly and satisfactorily answer such a suggestion and insinuation. [Applause.]

The very language of the bill controverts it, for, as stated before, the declared primary purpose of this bill is not to construct or maintain good roads from one city to another, nor from one railroad center to another, nor from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, nor from ocean to ocean, but it is to build and maintain a system of roads over which the mail and parcel-post business of this Government can be carried from the local distributing centers in the several States out into the country districts. It is true, however, that when the system of roads contemplated and provided for in this bill is finally completed, that we will have through the connection and meeting of the independent segments that will be constructed at first out from cities and towns a united system of roads interlacing and connecting all the different sections of our country. This, though, must be considered as a secondary or postponed result of the system that we are now inaugurating.

The very fact that the bill provides that the funds to be appropriated shall be disbursed by and under the direction of the head of the Agricultural Department of the Nation is a further assurance that the money will be expended in a way that will best conserve and promote the interest of our great rural districts. This department is appreciative of the fact that good roads are absolutely essential to the furtherance and carrying out of every plan looking to the development, welfare, and growth of the all-important farming interests of our country. This department fully realizes that the men and women who toil with their hands close to old Mother Earth are the chief, yea, the real, wealth makers of this Nation, and that the entire Nation is vitally interested in the perfecting and carrying out of plans that will make farm life attractive, remunerative, and socially satisfying. When our rural life is not as wholesome and not as satisfying as it might be, the whole Nation at large is the loser. [Applause.]

If this Congress can lend its aid in building good roads to the homes of our farmers and will provide at this session a practical rural-credit system, such as has been outlined in what is known as the Bulkley bill, we will have done much for the internal upbuilding of our entire country, and future generations, as well as the present, will be the beneficiaries of this wise and much-needed legislation. Surely we will not distrust the head of our Agricultural Department in the matter of wisely expending, solely in the interest of the farmers, the funds that this bill serves to place at his disposal. As to how well he uses the talents now placed with him will depend all future grants.

In desperation some few who dwell in large cities and are opposed to bills looking to the aid of farmers have suggested that Congress is without power, under the Constitution, to make an appropriation for this purpose, but no one has, and I venture to assert no one can, seriously argue or maintain such position. The bill primarily proposes to aid in the construction and maintenance of a general system of roads leading out from towns, cities, and railroad centers, over which the rapidly increasing business of the Post Office Department can be carried and handled with economy and dispatch. All must admit that when such primary purpose is taken into account these highways lose their local character and become great public and national utilities [applause], over which every day there is and will be transported vast volumes of not only intrastate but also interstate business.

If it be right to appropriate large sums of money to purchase sites and erect thereon magnificent buildings in cities and towns for the prompt and efficient handling of city mail, then it must of necessity follow that it is lawful to use national funds to aid in the building and maintaining of good permanent roads over which the Government can carry on with economy and dispatch its equally important business with the men out on the farms. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB].

[Mr. WEBB addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I will now ask the gentleman from New York to use some of his time.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, in the Sixty-third Congress I regret to state that I voted for the Shackleford roads bill. I was one of those to whom the molasses in the form of an allotment to the State of Massachusetts was of sufficient attraction to catch the fly in the shape of my vote. I am glad to say to-day that I have gotten loose from the molasses and shall act upon this bill upon its merits. Such being the case, I shall record my vote against it.

The report submitted by the committee condemns the bill. Under the heading of "Federal participation" we find it states, "roads are local concerns, and primarily it is the duty of States to provide them for their people." At the beginning of the very next paragraph, in order to be sure that we do not forget the previous paragraph, it states:

> Primarily roads are local concerns, and jurisdiction over them belong to the States and local authorities, which jurisdiction should not be disturbed by the General Government.

I accept the statement of the majority of the committee as the best evidence against the bill. The roads are primarily local concerns, and should be provided by the States and jurisdiction over them should be controlled by the States or the local community. It seems to me we can make no stronger argument against the bill than the committee itself does in its own report. It distinctly states that roads are local in their nature, and it further puts a duty and obligation upon the State to construct them.

Then, again, it admits that no supervision or control of the highway should pass out of the State or local authorities. In other words, this report says that simply because you and I do not do our duty as men and citizens, it is incumbent upon our brother to perform that duty for us. Where is the logic and sense of any such statement as that? It is, however, exactly what the Shackleford report says upon the question of Federal aid to roads.

It says distinctly that it is incumbent upon the State or local community to pay for its own roads for the benefit of the community served, but by inference it says that there are some States in this country which so far have been negligent in their duty in this respect. Rather than arouse them to perform that duty, we will allow them to be as negligent as they desire, and reach into Uncle Sam's pocket to build the roads in order that mail may be delivered.

Then, too, the report says that as rural delivery is a factor in postal management it is right that the Government should pay its part of the expense of the use and maintenance of the highway. Mr. Chairman, what would this proportionate part be, based on a rural carrier going over his route of 25 miles once per day? If a road is used at all, the proportionate share of this light vehicle, whether it be manufactured by the angel of peace or the old-fashioned one-hoss shay or a motor cycle, would be so small that even the gentleman from Missouri could not find enough of an apportionment to base any kind of a payment.

It is admitted that the jurisdiction over highways should not be disturbed by the General Government, but, on the other hand, the supporters of this bill are perfectly willing to permit of all possible kinds of payments by the General Government without the least control of what the money is paid for. All the control the Government is to have is the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, that the specifications are made up in accordance with his views.

That is about as slipshod a business arrangement as I ever knew of even Uncle Sam being willing to participate in. It places in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture as nice a fund for political manipulation as can be possibly established, and opens up a new avenue of political appointment of the highest grade. First we had political places filled by this administration under the collection of the income tax; then another set of officials were established under the Federal reserve; next an additional lot under the war-revenue tax; and now we have a provision that before any of this money is expended the "Secretary of Agriculture shall deduct the sum which he shall deem necessary to defray the expenses of his department in the administration of this act." Still, in the debate on Friday last, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SCOTT] praises the Democratic Party for having included this splendid piece of legislation in their platform, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] invited all parties to join together in this "nonpartisan" legislation. It probably would be nonpartisan after the Democratic officials deduct all the necessary amounts for defraying the expenses of administration, and then designate what particular friends must be employed in the various States in order to have the specification properly approved.

I appeal to my Republican friends not to be deceived into believing that this is not a nice big slice of Democratic patronage. While I have heard many criticisms on this floor, and a favorite kind of attack in the press, on the river and harbor appropriations, Mr. Chairman, let me remind you that there are six processes of protection to the Treasury before a dollar is ever taken out for rivers and harbors. Here it goes out solely on the say so of the President's political appointee, the Secretary of Agriculture. If river and harbor legislation has in it any slice of "pork," the Shackleford road bill is the whole hog.

I need not refer to the very able argument and splendid speech of my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who is on the committee. I congratulate him on his clear explanation of the fallacies of this legislation, and, further, I desire to inform the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SCOTT] that he was mistaken in thinking the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] does not know what he is talking about in reference to Massachusetts roads.

We are expending in Massachusetts large sums of money for the construction and maintenance of a highway system, to the use of which we invite the people of the United States. You never have heard of Massachusetts asking the Federal Government for any assistance, nor can you use the molasses of this bill, in the form of an allotment of $535,000, to catch the fly of the support of the Members from that State to pay into the Federal Treasury several times that amount for the benefit of Democratic officeholders or even for the construction of roads in States which have not done their duty in accordance with the phraseology of the Shackleford report in having provided for roads for the people in their own community.

Let me call the attention of the House to section 5, under which you can build any kind of an old road you wish, whether it is of—

Earth, sand-clay, sand-gravel, and other common types of roads, as well as roads of a higher class, one of the purposes of this act being to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into adjacent farming communities.

The committee having stated that it is the duty of the local unit, designated as the State in this bill, to build its own highways, let me remind the friends of this bill that if such roads have not already been constructed leading from the center of population to the farming communities they have neglected their very first duty of construction, because that is exactly the class of road which the local unit should have been anxious to build first. It is true that charity begins at home, and the charity of the State or local community should begin at the depot or post office.

Then, too, the Government will be extremely liberal by the States when it assumes, as it will under section 5, the construction of culverts and bridges. There is no limitation of the size or span that a bridge shall be in order to be constructed by the Federal Government. It is extremely kind of you to allow Massachusetts, New York, and other States we can readily name to have the privilege of paying for the construction of bridges across the wide and tortuous streams of your Southern States. This, however, is a charity never intended for the Federal Government to assume, and it should not be made a part of the law of the land.

The bill is wrong in principle, vicious in its details, and filled with unfair and improper provisions. The condition of our Treasury is such that a special kind of bookkeeping, never before heard of, and which has been thoroughly explained on this floor, is needed in order to show any balance in the Treasury at all. The Shackleford bill appropriates $25,000,000 annually, performing thereby an arithmetical stunt of taking something from where there is nothing.

The Democratic wise men are scratching their heads and using their gray matter in order to discover some new form of taxation that will rest heavily on New England and lightly on the States where we are to build Federal roads, and if they can find these new methods of taxation, doubtless they will be willing to add this $25,000,000 in order that one plank of the Baltimore platform may be put into effect rather than broken to shreds, as nearly all of them have been by the present administration. This bill should, therefore, be beaten by the votes of the Members of this House.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary really for me to speak after the very strong statement and argument made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. No doubt the Government of the United States has the right to spend money upon post roads—I notice that this money is to be spent on any public road over which rural mail is or might be carried, and is rather indefinite—but even when the United States so spends money it is always recognized that the money ought to be returned by the locality. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] wisely pointed out the other day that the great Cumberland Post Road, a road responsible probably for the destruction of more than one administration, was paid for, not by the United States, but by the proceeds of public lands in the Northwest Territory. The great Pacific railroads were paid for by bonds issued by the United States. I think it was intended that the interest should be repaid by the roads, but the principal was repaid by the roads, and all other expenses were paid for by the proceeds of land grants to those railroads, with alternate sections benefited and reserved to the United States. If there is one thing in which a community ought to feel a pride and exercise its power, it is in the roads which it affords to its own people. If there is one thing that can not be safely trusted to a Secretary of Agriculture, maybe 3,000 miles away, it is the way that roads shall be built in your State and built in mine. It is impossible to deal fairly at such a distance. There are no less than three modes of distribution of the money of the Nation indicated in this bill. One part is equally given to each State, whether it contains so many thousands or so many millions of inhabitants. Half of the rest goes in proportion to population, and the other half in proportion to the mileage of rural free delivery roads appearing in the last report of the Postmaster General. Under his discretion to establish these roads this money, as far as half is concerned, can be distributed to what States he chooses, and under the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture it can be given to what localities he pleases within those States. Such an appropriation of public money, not by Congress but at the discretion of two Secretaries, is unknown in any bill, be it for public buildings or for rivers and harbors. I have no hesitation in speaking for my own State, because we are proud of what my State has done for good roads. We have been almost first in the United States to construct the best roads to be found any-

where to be used by everyone who travels from New York to Philadelphia, or from Pennsylvania to the seaboard, and we paid for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DUNN. I yield two minutes additional to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. We paid for them. I dare, therefore, to call attention to the fact that New Jersey, under this bill, is given $438,000 out of $25,000,000, according to the calculation at the end of the bill. It is 1.75 per cent, almost exactly. New Jersey's population is 2.75 per cent of the total population of the United States, and hers is not a population of idlers, for, according to the statistics, that State has 2.8 of the total number of people engaged in actual industrial occupations with their hands. She paid in 1914 of the internal-revenue taxes—which are the taxes we are raising now—3.6 per cent of the total amount. If this bill goes into operation, New Jersey will have contributed $900,000 of the $25,000,000, and she will get back $438,000 to be expended—not as she pleases, but as the Secretary of Agriculture shall adjudge. I do not think that this is fair to the people of my State. I do not believe that any other State wishes to take our money, and we do not wish to take theirs in order to do what is for our own local improvement. The greatest thing a State can have is good roads, but they are the possession of the State. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under leave to extend his remarks, Mr. PARKER of New Jersey submitted the following:

New Jersey is glad to take care of her own roads, although in these days those roads are a free contribution to the automobile traffic of the whole Union which often crosses the State without stopping, so that New Jersey people receive no benefit.

If there is anything which ought to be taken care of by the locality, it is the roads, and the locality gets the benefit of those roads.

A strong objection to this bill is that it results in using the taxes collected in one State to pay for roads in other States. New Jersey is an example. The report, on page 6, shows that she would receive $438,054 out of an appropriation of $25,000,000, which is as nearly as possible 1¾ per cent. The same table shows that her population is 2,537,167 out of a total population of 91,641,197, or over 2¾ per cent.

By reference to the Statistical Abstract of 1914, page 235, it appears that she had 1,074,360 persons engaged in gainful occupations out of a total of 38,167,336, or over 2.8 per cent, and from the same table, on page 596, it appears that in 1914, New Jersey paid in internal revenue $13,829,051.13 out of a total of $380,800,893.96, or over 3.6 per cent; that is to say, New Jersey contributes a proportion of internal revenue which is over twice as much as she is allowed in this bill. These figures are simply submitted in illustration of one of the considerations so well set forth in the minority views.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, there probably is not in this House a person who is a more enthusiastic exponent of good roads than am I. But inasmuch as I can not see my way clear to favor this measure at this time, I think it is reasonable for me to ask the privilege of stating my reasons.

Mr. Chairman, it is a fact that the State of New York has not, at the present time, spent all of the hundred millions of dollars appropriated for her good roads, but it is a fact that the balance remaining has been allotted for these highways. We have, probably, as thoroughly an organized highway department, as comprehensive a system of highways, as exists in any other State in the Union. And with all this departmental efficiency, we still have difficulty in distributing this fund to the satisfaction of every person interested in the work.

Considering this fact, with the added burdens which have been put upon us by the Federal Government in the way of taxation, I believe, with the small returns to the Commonwealth which this bill indicates we will receive, and what we must share with the other States, we of New York, at least, must be pardoned if we object to the injustice and impracticability of such legislation.

More than that, we are just entering upon a struggle for a condition in this country which, if successful, as I hope it will be, will require all the ingenuity of the present directors of affairs to raise funds sufficient for its inception and progress. It is a matter, it seems to me, of greater importance than the question of whether or not a wealthy State, or a coterie of wealthy States, should put their hands in their pockets for the benefit of the highways of their poorer sisters. Not that we love them less, but we love the good name of our country more. Indeed, I believe the time has arrived, until at least we settle on some definite policy of what is to be done to insure by strength the peace of this country, that we should vote for no appropriation for other than the usual necessitous work. Until that question is settled, settled not only as to policy, but as to the amount of the expenditure and from whence the funds are coming, highways can wait, if need be. The welfare of the country at large is far more dear to the heart of the patriotic American, be he a resident of a small State or a great one.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS] has nine minutes which he reserved on Saturday, and I now yield to him.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I am so intensely interested in the good-roads propaganda, so vitally concerned in seeing a beneficent road system spread like a great web all over our country, reaching into the remotest nooks and corners of every part of our fair land, that I expect to give this bill my support, realizing at the time I do it that it has many defects and falls far short of what I would like to see incorporated in a bill of this character. And since those in charge of the bill have invited criticism of its provisions, I shall venture to point out what I deem to be a few of its defects. There are several defects to which I would like to call attention, but I take it that before I get through with the one to which I desire to direct my remarks my time will have expired. The title of this bill, so far as the State of Kentucky is concerned, is a misnomer. Ostensibly this bill is being passed for the purpose of rendering national aid to the various States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

That is ostensibly the object and the purpose of this bill. It is so expressed in the title of it. So far as the State of Kentucky is concerned, I desire to say that no such thing will happen in that Commonwealth. I desire to point out, if I can do it, that but a very small proportion of this Federal aid, if this bill passes and the money is afterwards appropriated, will go to the rural post roads in the State of Kentucky. Section 3 of the Shackleford bill provides that the money appropriated under this bill shall be expended in the various States in accordance with the laws of those States. In order to know, then, how this bill is going to work in the various States of this Union, we will have to know what the various State laws are on that subject. I am not familiar with them, except that I am more or less familiar with the road law on the statute books in the State of Kentucky. That road law is, in substance, this: That the entire road system of the State is under the control of the commissioner of roads. A 5-cent tax on each $100 worth of taxable property is set apart as a road fund. Before any county in the State can get any State aid the county has to be taxed twice—first on the road fund generally and then it has to put up dollar for dollar. For every dollar that the county puts up the State puts up a dollar. Then, when this money is put up, on what roads will it go?

Under the provisions of the Kentucky road law the only roads upon which the State can render any aid at all are those roads that lead from one county seat town to the county seat towns of the adjoining counties. These are the roads, and these are the only roads, upon which any State aid can go until all these various roads have been constructed. That being true, on what rural post roads will this Federal money be put in the State of Kentucky? Only on those post roads or State highways leading from one county seat town to the next county seat town, and it can not be put on them unless they are used as post roads. And that is the way this law will operate in my State. Not only that, but under our law this State road fund that every county is taxed to help put up will only go to the counties that take advantage of the provisions of the State law. The great majority of the counties in the State of Kentucky are not meeting the requirements of the State road law in that State. That being true, under the provisions of the Kentucky road law this State road fund, which would have gone to a certain county if it had met the requirements at the end of each year, goes back into the general road fund to go into the counties of the State that do meet the requirements.

And, further than that, the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore has this as one of its planks:

> We favor national aid to State and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post roads.

To State and local authorities! This bill does not propose to give any part of this money to the local authorities, but to turn over the entire control of the entire sum to the various States of this Union.

Now, then, if any money should go to the State of Kentucky, if this bill passes and it should become a law—I reckon nobody seriously thinks it will become a law as long as the present occupant of the White House remains in power; of course, it will not become a law, and I reckon nobody is deceived about that—

but if it should become a law and should be put upon the statute books of this country, the Kentucky money will go to the State of Kentucky as a State, and no part of it will go to the various counties in the Commonwealth. That being true, since it goes to the State and is a part of the State fund, then the various counties in the State, in order to take advantage of its provisions, will have to put up just as much money as they would have had to put up if this bill had never become a law at all. That is the way this bill is going to work and operate, so far as the State of Kentucky is concerned.

I am not familiar with the road laws of the various States of this Union, but I desire to call attention to the fact that under the provisions of this bill the Federal money will have to be applied in accordance with the laws of the State in which the Federal money is to go.

There are a good mony other features of this bill of which I do not at all approve. The idea of putting this money in the exclusive control of the various States and letting the Government have no sort of control over the money it appropriates after it puts it up, no sort of jurisdiction over the post roads on which it puts it money, is not advisable. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MONTAGUE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. JONES and Mr. LANE members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Commerce.

RURAL POST ROADS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, how does the exact time stand now in respect to this debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN] controls 31 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] 64 minutes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield some time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REILLY].

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the Chair state is remaining to me?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 31 minutes.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this bill because I believe the Government has a right to appropriate money for this purpose, and because it is wise to do it. I represent a congested industrial district, with very few farmers in it. I would wish that we had many more farmers, on account of their great usefulness and the good citizenship they represent. But I feel that this appropriation will benefit the people in the industrial sections as well as those in the agricultural districts. Indeed, good roads are of such inestimable value to all classes that it is folly to attempt to particularize as to whom they will benefit.

Though Pennsylvania is a rich State, it has 90,000 miles of public highways. It has spent a lot of money in recent years to build roads and has extensive plans for the future, but much the larger part of that 90,000 miles is in a rough condition, and the $1,400,000 that will come from this appropriation to Pennsylvania will be exceedingly helpful in the colossal task that confronts that State in taking care of any reasonable part of this 90,000 miles.

With the 2,300,000 miles of public highways in the Nation and only a comparatively small portion of these arteries in proper condition, the vast means necessary in the large in area but less populous States for the construction of the needed modern road are beyond their reach. The rapid development of our country, its vast needs, together with the inconceivable requirements in food, raiment, and so forth, of its greatly increasing population make the means of transportation and distribution an ever-pressing question.

Cooperation between the Federal Government and the States will not only result in needed financial assistance to the States in their colossal road-building burdens but also in the benefits from the advancement made in the science of road making through the interchange of thought and experiences between the Nation and the States.

Notwithstanding our more than 300,000 miles of splendid railroads—nearly as much as all the rest of the world possesses—James J. Hill, the railway magnate and expert, has repeatedly stated that an expenditure of $500,000,000 a year for 10 years in railroad equipment would be necessary to meet the demands of our great growth, also adding that the time was not far distant when the artificial highways would not be equal to these requirements and that the natural highways of the watercourses must be utilized in this service. I doubt if the public highway, with its great possibilities in transportation by the use of the automobile, was in Mr. Hill's mind, but there are the 2,300,000 miles of public roads and millions of automobiles awaiting utilization in our giant strides of progress for the benefit of humanity.

The Government may well, properly and most usefully, lend a helping hand to the States in this great development for the common good. [Applause.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MILLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I have gone over the provisions of this bill very carefully and I have also listened assiduously to the debates on the bill in the last few days. I heard my friend from Texas [Mr. BLACK] say that surely the Delaware Member in this House should vote for this bill because of the proportionate amount of money it gave to the State of Delaware and the amount of roads there. Unfortunately I can not agree with him, and it is my intention to vote against the bill.

Representing as I do on the floor of this House the State at large, I feel that I should state a few of my reasons why I shall vote against it, although it looks like a good bill to people in a farming community. I beg to state that in Delaware there are far more country communities than there are urban; in other words, the State is almost wholly agricultural in its area. It would be a very easy matter for me to vote for this bill, because, apparently, it is in the interest of the country community. But, in my opinion, we should consider this measure not from the standpoint of the particular good it might do our own particular district or our own State, but we should consider it from the national standpoint as national legislators.

This bill provides $25,000,000, to be distributed all over the country. Why, gentlemen, to use a mining expression, the surface of the earth would hardly be scratched by this $25,000,000. I know it to be a fact that in the case of the few good roads that we have in my State, where we spend hundreds of thousands of dollars every year, if we should take advantage of this bill and receive the $103,000, or twenty-six one-hundredths of 1 per cent of the total amount, it would really do them no good when it came to actual constructive road building.

It is not my duty to call the attention of the Members on my side of the House to this bill, nor that of the people on the majority side, but I do not see how anybody, after listening to the address of the President of the United States at the opening of this Congress can conscientiously vote for this measure. Two very salient points were brought forth in that address by the President, namely, the question of national defense and the raising of additional revenue; and surely those Members on the Democratic side and those on our side who intend to support the President in national-defense matters can not vote for this measure that is brought in here before we have considered how that question is to be dealt with, pro or con, in this body.

And, furthermore, the majority, as all know in this House, is laboring to-day with one of the greatest dilemmas that has ever been put up to a party in power in deciding the question of how to raise the revenue necessary to run the Government for the remainder of this administration. At the end of the first fiscal year under this administration no one will deny that a deficit was shown in 1914, one month before the European war began, which made it necessary for the administration to resort to stamp taxes, about which our able leader of the minority [Mr. MANN] has spoken to-day.

I do not base my opposition to this bill on the conflict of interest between the country people and the city people, because, as I said before, I represent a State which is agricultural in area, all with the exception of one city. But, with the important questions that we have pending before us to-day, which were brought out in the President's address at the opening of this session, I do not see how any man can conscientiously vote for this bill.

With all due respect to the honorable committee that brought in this majority report, I wish to say that that report, as com-

pared with the minority report prepared by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], is eloquent in what it did not say in favor of this bill rather than in what it did say in favor of it. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] is recognized.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I can not agree with the gentleman [Mr. MILLER of Delaware] who has just spoken. While this Government will no doubt make proper preparation for its national defense, it is not necessary that we should become hysterical upon that proposition. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is not necessary that we should abandon all propositions looking to the improving of our domestic conditions. This Government will move along smoothly, whatever troubles may forebode.

This is a proposition in which the overwhelming masses of the American people are profoundly interested. It carries authorization for an appropriation of $25,000,000 for the improvement of rural roads. In the limited time I have, of course, I can not enter into the discussion of the various objections made to this measure, but I desire to give it my hearty approval and indorsement and ask permission of the House to incorporate in the RECORD some extracts from a former issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, being part of a speech that I made upon this subject in the House about eight years ago. [Applause.]

I have been especially interested in the waterways improvement, but not more than in the improvement of public roads. Both are essential to the convenience, prosperity, and happiness of our people. Frequently I have discussed the question of Federal aid in the construction of public roads. I favor this bill, as I have favored others to lift the rural American population out of the mud and grant to them the benefits that necessarily follow improved highways. Perhaps I could not better express myself to-day on this question than I did on March 3, 1908, when I spoke in the House of Representatives on the amendment that I then proposed to the post-office and post-roads bill. The RECORD referred to of that date, pages 2824 and following, show in part what I then said on the subject of good roads, as follows:

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. After that section, Mr. Chairman, I shall offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask permission to have read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

"*Provided further*, That a sum not to exceed $500,000 of this appropriation may be expended by the Postmaster General, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, in improving the conditions of rural delivery routes to be selected by them, for the purpose of ascertaining the possible increase in the territory which could be served by one carrier, and the possible increase of the number of delivery days each year, the amount required for proper maintenance in excess of local expenditure for rural delivery routes, and the relative saving to the Government in the maintenance of rural delivery routes by reason of such improvements: *Provided further*, That the State or county or counties which may be selected for improvement of rural delivery routes therein under this provision shall furnish an equal amount of money for the improvement of the rural routes so selected."

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. This amendment is possibly subject to the point of order that it is new law, and on the objection of a single Member of the House may be precluded from consideration under the rule. No such rule obtains in the Senate. That body may therefore act on this question in the public interest and force the House to its final consideration when the disagreeing votes of the two Houses are to be adjusted in conference. But the opportunity will be given to the House to act, if it will, as the amendment will be presented. That this amendment should become the law is essential in the public interest. It need not be concealed that the amendment, if not considered here, will be introduced and acted on in the Senate. Nor is it necessary to conceal the fact that it is intended as an experiment to ascertain the facts on which shall rest the beginning of a system of good roads throughout the United States. That it is to the supreme benefit of the people to have a complete system of good roads by Federal aid, if the same can be constitutionally obtained, is so clear that it is idle to discuss it. That such a system is needed for the expeditious transportation of overland rural mail must be clear when the almost intolerable condition of rural-route roads in the greater part of the country is known of all men, for expedition can not be had without such improvement. That the United States and the States or counties getting the benefit of the roads should jointly contribute to their improvement seems only to be just. That the United States and the States or counties are capable of gradually making the necessary road improvement I think will not be denied. That the increased wealth of the people in general, by reason of this needed internal improvement, will more than compensate for the expenditure is at least an incidental inducement to the expenditure, although, logically, it may seem not a justification for it when separated from postal necessities. Then, what is in the way of a modest beginning of this essential public work, which will be worth more to the masses of our people in direct and immediate benefits than the rivers and harbors and the Panama Canal combined? [Applause on the Democratic side.] So magnificent will be the result to our people living in the rural sections that it seems criminal to delay the beginning when the States and counties join, as they will join, in the improvement and share with the United States the benefits. Can it be said that Congress is without power? Shall it be said that it is an unwarranted interference in the affairs of the States? If either proposition could be maintained, then we should desist. If they can not be, why not begin the great work? The second proposition falls if the first can be overcome, because it is involved in it.

The United States is a Government of limited and delegated powers. Just such power as is conferred on Congress by the Constitution it may exercise, and such other power as may be fairly implied from the express power granted and necessary to carry it out. It is sovereign within the sphere of its constitutional jurisdiction; it is powerless outside of it. The State rights consist of the rights and powers that belong to a complete sovereign, save only those conferred on the United States in the Constitution. No State of this Union is therefore a complete sovereign, because it has yielded a part of its sovereign power to another political entity—the United States; and the United States is not a complete sovereignty, because there are sovereign rights that belong to the States—rights reserved and not yielded to the United States. The State is only a partial sovereign. The United States is only a partial sovereign. Their sovereign powers are distinct and separate. It takes both to make a complete sovereignty. In this is the strength of the dual system of government. In which government—State or Federal—rests the power to establish post roads? The United States Constitution, which is the supreme law of the land, in section 8, subsection 7, Article I, gives to Congress the right to establish post offices and post roads. This delegation of power makes Congress supreme on this question. The grant of the power carried with it the right to exercise such other powers as are necessary to enforce the same. It follows that the United States could, by purchase or condemnation proceedings, obtain the right of easement or use in any land in any State for post-road purposes (which is a governmental purpose) not already in use by the State for State governmental purposes, just as the State can condemn United States lands for State governmental purposes not in actual use for United States governmental purposes. These questions have long since been settled by State and Federal judicial decisions. The power exists, therefore, in Congress to establish these roads for postal service by express terms of the Constitution. Who shall object to cooperation by the State or the county with the United States in a work in which is joint and mutual benefit? The machinery for the perfection of this work may be Federal or State, as may seem best. These are not new propositions. This is the time for action. There has been enough discussion. If gentlemen complain of the form of the amendment, offer a better suggestion, and let it pass. Let us know now who is for and who is against this system of internal improvement.

It may be that the parcel-post proposition will present itself for consideration under the bill. A parcel-post system confined to rural-delivery routes at a rate compensatory to the Government might prove beneficial; but, in my judgment, this is questionable until the rural routes are so improved as to make the delivery of parcels speedy and satisfactory. The people are demanding improved conditions in all branches of the public service, and where these are practicable, or can be made so, it is the duty of the Representatives to respond to the public demand.

Unfortunately, a great portion of our public men regard the development of Federal power as destructive of the rights of States. This is true if such development be questionable under the Constitution; but if the Constitution confers a power on Congress, the development and exercise of that power to its full limit by the Federal Government neither destroys nor impairs any right of the States, for such right is not reserved, and, being delegated to the United States, does not belong to the State. The more speedy the full and complete development of all Federal power and authority under the Constitution comes, the more accurate will be the lines of demarcation on all questions of jurisdiction between State and Federal Government, and the more readily will the governments, State and Federal, adjust themselves to their constitutional orbits, from which neither may come to encroach upon the other. These governments are not intended to be inimical, but wholly interdependent and cooperative, each maintaining and exercising separately their powers as determined by the Constitution. [Applause.]

When we improve our great waterways, concerning which there is but little difference of opinion, it is for the benefit of the people of the entire Union, but the people of the States where the harbors are, or through which the rivers flow, get the most direct benefits. What right has the United States Government to claim jurisdiction over all the navigable waters in the States and remove the obstructions to the transportation of commerce placed therein by nature? The Constitution confers the power. It is a Federal and not a State right exercised in the interest of commerce. The right to establish post roads in the State is also a Federal constitutional right. Why should it not be exercised in the interest of the expeditious delivery of mail to the people, and incidentally to the benefit of overland commerce? This power is now dormant. No legislative action has imparted vitality to it. It is one of those Federal powers not yet fully exercised. In my judgment, its exercise will be beneficial to the States and to the United States; and surely the exercise by the United States of one of its powers can not be held to impair State rights.

The United States has exclusive jurisdiction, as I said, over the navigable waters in the States—waters navigable in fact and not merely declared so by statute. It does not own the river bed over which the stream flows; this is the property of the State. It does not own the river banks; these belong to the landowners adjacent. It has no riparian rights. It does not even own the water in the stream, for it may be used by private individuals, unless its use should reduce the quantity of the water or the flow of the stream so as to impair navigation. The United States simply has the right to the use of the stream to maintain navigation. Its jurisdiction for securing and maintaining navigation is complete. It is an express power exercised in pursuance to the Constitution to secure the consummation of a particular purpose, and that purpose is navigation free to all the people of all the States. The power to carry the mails to all the people over any portion of any State in the Union belongs to the United States Government, and it may open up post roads for this purpose, but in so doing no part of the soil of the State would belong to the United States, but merely an easement or right of way on a chosen road to carry the mails. It would have no special jurisdiction over the roads; the State would reserve its civil and criminal jurisdiction. The United States would have no more right on the road than a citizen would have except for the improvement thereof in cooperation with State or county authorities and for carrying mail. The right to protect its mails it now has everywhere. The apprehensions of many on this question are ill-founded. Let us give to our country this initial step to the ultimate consummation of a perfected system of internal improvements which, in connection with our rivers and harbors and ship canal, will so develop and enhance our resources that this Republic shall become more wealthy and more powerful than all the nations of Europe combined. [Applause.]

This was only an experimental proposition, but the suggestion of the development of good roads by Federal aid was not strong enough then in the House to demand a majority. Its advocates have since been insistent, and in 1912 the House passed an amendment to the post office and post roads bill authorizing the appropriation of $25,000,000 for good roads. The Senate refused to agree to this item, and passed an amendment directing the chairman of the Senate and House Committees on the Post Office and Post Roads to appoint several special committees, including one on good roads, to which the House agreed. In the conference that followed on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, the conference committee, of which I was a member on the part of the House, agreed on an experimental road fund of $500,000 under a suggestion similar to the one proposed by me on March 3, 1908. This was passed by both Houses and became a law—Public law No. 336. This was the same conference in which, by the direction of the other conferees, Senator Bourne, of Oregon, and myself drafted the parcel-post law, combining the provisions of my bill and amendments in the House and his in the Senate, and other provisions, which was adopted by Congress. On August 24, 1912, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 11850, the following appears:

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the committeees appointed by Mr. Moon of Tennessee, chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. The committees appointed by Mr. Moon of Tennessee, chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives, under the act of August 24, 1912, making appropriation for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, were:

Committee on Pneumatic Tubes: Mr. BLACKMON of Alabama, Mr. Murdock of Kansas.

Committee on Second Class Mail Matter and Compensation for Railway Mail Service: Mr. LLOYD of Missouri, Mr. Tuttle of New Jersey, Mr. WEEKS of Massachusetts.

Committee on the Post Roads: Mr. SHACKLEFORD of Missouri, Mr. MCGILLICUDDY of Maine, Mr. LEE of Georgia, Mr. MADDEN of Illinois, Mr. AUSTIN of Tennessee. (RECORD, p. 11850, 62d Cong., 2d sess.)

The result of the work of the committee appointed on good roads was the establishment by Congress of a permanent Good Roads Committee in the House. That committee has presented to you the pending bill. It is not, perhaps, just what some of you may want, but it is a good measure and deserves the support of the House. It is the beginning in a more substantial way of a work that should have been commenced long ago, and should continue until it is accomplished. The experimental stage is passed. Good roads are recognized as a public necessity. The agricultural, commercial, manufacturing, and educational interests of the country must necessarily be expanded by a completed system of good rural roads. The constitutionality of the undertaking, the benefits to be derived from it, the advancement of the people in all that makes for their welfare so clearly appear that there ought not to be any opposition to the measure. But some insist that it is unconstitutional to do this work for the people. These need only to be referred to that section of the Constitution heretofore mentioned. It is not merely an implied power, it is an express grant and delegated power which Congress has the right to exercise. Some say that it is class legislation. Class legislation, while obnoxious, is not prohibited by the Federal Constitution. But can it be that legislation that benefits directly two-thirds of our population and indirectly the whole population be called class legislation? It was said that it would benefit the farmers and laborers only and is therefore class legislation. Were this true, it would not condemn but commend the bill to all thoughtful and just men.

The farmers and laboring people of our country constitute an overwhelming majority of our population, and yet they have had but little done for them in the way of Federal legislation. Who are they anyway? They live not upon their wits but as God commands "by the sweat of their brows." By their labor they furnish that upon which all mankind exists. Largely freed by constant work as they are from the machinations of idle minds, unsound and immoral thoughts and practices, they are our best citizens in times of peace and our best soldiers in time of war. [Applause.] It was their blood that purchased the Nation's liberty; it is their labor that maintains the Nation's power and greatness. Shall we deny the benefits of just legislation to them?

If I understand the sentiment of this House, it is not only our purpose to pass this measure to improve rural roads but to perfect the parcel-post system that it may be of still greater benefit to the farmer and to the general public and to establish a system of rural credits by which the farmer can secure at a low rate of interest, on long-term loans, money to purchase lands and make homes or to improve those he now owns. The time has happily passed when Congress dares longer to ignore the rights of the producing or laboring classes of this Republic. These measures are but the legitimate outgrowth of a true Democracy responding to the demands of the people for the improvement of national conditions among many measures proposed by the Democratic Party since its ascendancy to power in the United States. We must look to the advancement and the progress of our country along all lines, and we must not hesitate longer to protect the rural population of our country and to grant to them these demands to which they are entitled. What is $25,000,000 to this people, with the contribution of $25,000,000 more by the States annually for these purposes until accomplished? It sounds like a great deal, but it amounts to but little after all. Why, sirs, there is one bill that comes into this House that carries $320,000,000. It is for the interest of the American people everywhere, and the demand has always been made for progress in that great department of the Government which it provides for—the Postal Department. No greater demand and no greater necessity exists than this law for the establishment and the maintenance of post roads to carry the means of information from one end of this Republic to the other to the people, and I commend it to your favor. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I believe in internal improvements within the United States. I would much prefer to see our money spent here than to have it spent in foreign countries or in making toward the improvement of foreign countries or colonial possessions.

I believe in the improvement and the development of the waterways of the United States. We have 50,000 miles of waterways, navigable and nonnavigable, and only half of them improved. If they were all improved there would be less congestion in the great cities and more activity in the country. One of the reasons for the improvement of waterways is that railroads have taken the farmer away from the soil that God seems to have provided for him, to the lines of the railroads; there the people throng together, so that business is concentrated, while vast areas of the country go unpopulated and unused.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SLOAN. Are we to understand that the gentleman is in favor of any plan to reduce the population of the City of Brotherly Love and drive them to the country?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not on normal grounds; but when it comes to undue congestion, I would say that it would be a good thing for the people of Philadelphia and a good thing for the people in the country, where farms are now begging for labor, if many of those who are not able to obtain as good a livelihood in the city as they could obtain on the farm, could be induced to leave the city and go to the farm. [Applause.]

The gentleman's question brings up the very interesting economic and sociological fact that the farmer, on the average, is progressing more successfully to-day than the delver in the city. It is a fact sometimes overlooked in our debates. In the district I have the honor to represent, there is probably not an acre of unimproved ground. Everything except the streets and the public squares is built over. Yet there, in the hurly-burly of the people, rushing to work in the morning and rushing back at night, there are thousands whose positions are not so good as they would be on the farm, whose earning power is not so great, and whose lives would be happier and healthier if they were in the country. They do not do so well on the back streets and alleys of a great city as they usually do upon the farm. I have mentioned this before.

But, coming back to waterways, I believe in the improvement of waterways, because it would open up new stretches of country that have been unpopulated even since colonial times. It is not commonly known that one-half the arable land in the area of the thirteen original States is still awaiting the settler, or the coming of the tiller of the soil. Even as you are discussing irrigation in the West; even as you are proposing reclamation for other sections, we still have this eastern land available, already irrigated and awaiting the settler.

Now, if it is a good thing to open up the 148 rivers that traverse the Atlantic seaboard, as I contend it is, to say nothing of the tens of thousands of navigable miles of river elsewhere, would it not be a good thing also to give our assistance to the opening up of good roads, which also induce the urban population to become suburban, and which give encouragement to the man who tills the soil. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman is a member of the Ways and Means Committee, from which we must expect legislation to provide this $25,000,000. I wonder if the gentleman would be betraying any secrets of the committee if he would inform the House where this money is to come from.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is a question of responsibility that I am leaving to the majority, who have not yet unfolded their plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I simply want to add, in the interest of fairness and from the national viewpoint, that the city and the country could get together more quickly and there would be a better understanding all along the line if we should open up the avenues of communication and make transportation easier by rail, by road, and by water. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, our National Government early in its beginning favored national aid for good roads. The policy was continued and maintained until 1840. Then it was abandoned. There was no question at that time in the minds of the early statesmen of our country about the constitutionality of national aid for good road purposes. They were mainly the very men who had the making of the Constitution itself, and as there was no serious criticism or division of opinion at that time on the subject, I do not think there should be in this day and generation.

I was gratified to hear the statement of the gentleman from the great city of Philadelphia, Mr. MOORE, and I think he properly stated this proposition. This is not a contest between the city and country; this is a great national question involving the development and upbuilding of the entire country. We could not possibly have the city prosperous without the country being prosperous, and, on the other hand, we could not build up the country districts without the city receiving the benefit from it. We have an immense empire extending from ocean to ocean—3,000,000 square miles, with an average population of 30 to the square mile. The great burden of providing national highways, for cheap transportation, for building up our country, for making rural life more agreeable and more attractive, is too stupendous a financial burden upon the States and local communities to carry forward without the assistance of the National Government. If Congress could give millions of valuable acres of land out of the public domain for the construction of railroads and thus aid in building up the western country, I think we have reached the point where Congress can appropriate money out of the Public Treasury to still further the development of our country and the prosperity of the rural districts of all the States of the Union. [Applause.]

It is no excuse to say where is the money coming from. I have great respect for the leader of my party, but if that argument should prevail against this proposition, the question of how the majority are going to raise this revenue by a "stamp tax" we will prevent this House from practically doing anything in view of the fact that we have at present a deficit in the Treasury.

When we come to pass on the President's recommendation to expend $300,000,000 to put the country in a proper defensive state and give us an increase in the Army and an effective Navy, then those of us who believe it is a patriotic duty of Congress to make provision for a larger Army and an adequate Navy can not shirk or avoid our patriotic duty in this House by stopping to question or consider whether the taxation in order to meet that expense is going to be a stamp tax or some other tax that is unpopular. The public sentiment of this country I have found to be overwhelmingly, and has been for many years, that out of the billion dollars we vote out of the National Treasury we should vote a portion of that for the great national undertaking of the construction in connection with the States and counties of a public-road system. [Applause.]

I favor raising the necessary money for this and other needed legislation by increasing our tariff duties and not by a stamp or direct tax.

I recently made a trip to the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands, and one thing which attracted my attention more than anything else and which I think was a great agency for developing these new colonial possessions was the system of magnificent highways constructed in the islands. They have made them blossom like the rose. What we have done there in that line has received the commendation and the admiration of the world. If we can go seven or eight thousand miles away from our native shores to inaugurate an improvement which has developed these islands, why can not we begin our charity, our patriotism, and our good work right here in the 48 States of the American Union? [Applause.]

The farmers of this country have had nothing out of the National Treasury of direct observable benefit except the rural delivery system. They are expecting, and have a right to expect, rural credit legislation, and in connection with that, the inauguration of national aid for good roads. There are several changes I would favor making in this bill, but if not made in the House we can urge the Senate to make them. Let us do something for good roads now. Let us make a beginning, and later we can amend or improve the law. One objection I have to this bill is that it does not carry a larger sum of money than $25,000,000. It ought to be $50,000,000, and we should appropriate as much money for roads annually as we do for rivers and harbors. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GORDON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 3518. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

RURAL POST ROADS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, what policy shall be adopted by Congress respecting national-road legislation? The opinion is almost unanimous among the Members of both Houses that good roads are a necessity; that it is desirable that the Federal Government contribute in some measure to their construction and maintenance, and that ample authority is found in the Constitution to permit appropriations by Congress for this purpose. The only question is as to the method of procedure.

In common with a number of other Congressmen, I have introduced a bill to provide for national aid to the several States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads, and while the pending measure does not entirely conform to my idea of what a good roads bill ought to be, yet I intend to give it my heartiest support because I know that the Committee on Roads has given most careful consideration to this legislation. Like most all of the other bills, the Shackleford bill contemplates an annual expenditure of $25,000,000 for road construction and maintenance by the Federal Government, to be apportioned among the States and to be expended under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Secretary will apportion the money appropriated among the States, after deducting a sum necessary for administrative purposes and a further sum sufficient to provide for an allotment of $65,000 to each State, on the basis of population and the mileage of rural post roads and star routes. In this respect the pending measure differs from the bill which I introduced. It appears to me that it would be more equitable to the Western States to apportion the money—one-third according to the number of Senators and Representatives to which each State respectively is entitled in Congress, one-third in accordance with the ratio which the area of each State bears to the area of the United States, and the remaining one-third according to the mileage of rural delivery and star routes. I have no doubt, however, but that the committee had good reasons for adopting the method of dividing the appropriation as provided in this bill.

The bill before us very properly provides that in allotting Federal aid the Secretary of Agriculture shall deal with the States as units and not with the counties or other subdivisions, as has been proposed in the bills which passed this House on former occasions. After groping around learning costly lessons by experience, we have finally reached the conclusion that there is too much local control in the business of building roads. The most efficient plan that has as yet been devised in the United States for the construction and maintenance of public roads is to create a State highway department. Over one-half the States have already adopted this method of supervising their road work, and the passage of this bill means that before very long every State in the Union will provide by law for a State highway department or a State highway engineer having authority to supervise and direct the construction and maintenance of the public roads and highways of the State.

According to the terms of this bill the State highway departments will submit plans of proposed construction to the Secretary of Agriculture, who will then determine in each case the proportion of the estimated cost to be borne by the Federal Gov-

ernment, which shall not be less than 30 nor more than 50 per cent, the balance to be contributed by the State. The money expended by the States on road work is raised by direct taxation. By requiring the States to contribute from one-half to two-thirds of the cost of any road the Federal Government obtains the advantage of the watchfulness by the taxpayers of the State over State expenditures, because the State highway departments can not waste Federal appropriations without also wastefully expending State funds.

Pleas for economy have always fallen on deaf ears in Congress. The fear of an empty Treasury is the only check on appropriations. If all of the revenues of the Government, however, were raised by a tax on incomes, the profession of watch dog of the Treasury would soon be as popular at Washington as it now is in the State legislatures. It is said that at present the best insurance for a long congressional career is never to vote to increase a direct tax or to reduce an appropriation. Since the sentiment for economy in Congress is purely academic, it is certainly the part of wisdom to enlist the support of the payers of direct taxes in the States in guarding the expenditure of Federal road funds.

By recognizing and encouraging the establishment of State highway departments we permit each State to solve its own road problems. The State of Maine is one of the summer playgrounds of the Nation, and the people there find that it is profitable to build roads for the use of tourists who come to enjoy the climate and the scenery. Kansas is no summer resort, but the farmers of that Commonwealth produce enormous crops of corn and wheat, that are expensive to market when the roads are bad. A system of highways designed for Maine would give poor satisfaction in Kansas. Why should not each State be permitted to use the funds received from the Federal Treasury in the manner that will serve its people best?

There is no sound basis for the fears of those who believe that State control of highway construction means that interstate roads will not be built. They insist that main lines of railroads were built first and the branch lines came afterwards. This statement is not historically correct, except as to the land-grant railroads of the West, and their prompt completion to the Pacific coast as a military necessity was stimulated by the aid received from the United States. Every large railway system east of the Mississippi is made up of a number of short lines that have been united into through routes. These combinations were not made until the traffic between distant points reached such a volume that through trains were necessary. Whenever interstate travel by automobiles reaches such proportions that continuous highways are demanded, then the State highway departments will not have any great difficulty in agreeing upon common meeting points on the State boundary lines. The American people will ultimately get all the highways that they want, but the kind of roads they need most will be obtained first.

I am glad that section 5 of this bill contains the following language:

> * * * that the roads which may be constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act shall include earth, sand-clay, sand-gravel, and other common types of roads, as well as roads of higher classes; one of the purposes of this act being to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming communities.

Let us not despise the dirt roads, for they are like the common people whom "God must love, because he has made so many of them." In our hope for highways of perfect construction, we should not fail to give consideration, if not praise, to this humble servant of internal commerce. As Gov. Major, of Missouri, than whom there is no better friend of good roads, said in his remarks to the Committee on Roads at the hearings last year—

> It is the dirt road, representing the first leg of the journey, and over which moves the traffic of the Republic, that serves the Nation most. These roads reach out like tentacles into the country life, and their improvement will mean more than any other one achievement which can be brought about. The farmer, when he makes a haul, must gauge his load not by the macadam road over which he passes a part of the distance, but by the bad dirt road he must travel. When it comes to determining what character of roads shall receive Federal aid, I ask what are you going to do about the dirt road—the real road of the people?

There will be some objection to the improvement of dirt roads with appropriations from the Federal Treasury by those who favor the construction of highly improved national highways connecting the State capitals and large centers of population, but, in my opinion, the national-highway advocates are now willing to accept this bill as a compromise. Personally I have never countenanced the abuse that has been heaped upon the heads of those who hope to see this country gridironed with highly improved touring roads. It has been charged that the sentiment for national highways has been fostered and organized by the manufacturers of automobiles and road-making machinery. Associated with them are the owners of patents for road materials and the makers of blasting powder. It is said that, in order to influence public opinion, representatives of these industries secure appointments as delegates to good-roads conventions and that money is furnished to pay the expenses of organizers who travel over the country laying out routes for national highways. No one has suggested that there is anything wrong in all this activity except that subscriptions have been collected in some towns that were left off the routes as afterwards located.

In truth, the work done by these manufacturers in behalf of national highways has served a most useful purpose. They have promoted the organization of highway associations all over the country and convincing arguments in favor of better roads have been given the widest publicity. The American Automobile Association, in its advocacy of national highways, has also rendered a great service. There was no real good-roads movement in America until this association and others interested in the construction of improved ways of travel put their shoulders to the wheel. The only legitimate criticism that can be made against this demand for national construction of highways is that it comes from a special interest and does not take into consideration the needs of all the people.

The Committee on Roads has been criticized for defining a "rural post road" to mean "any public road over which mail is or might be carried," but I believe that the committee acted wisely in adopting this language instead of confining Federal appropriations to roads actually used in the delivery of the United States mail. Rural-delivery routes begin and end at the same place—the post office. They go out in circuits and follow for only a part of the way the market roads that the farmers use to reach the trading centers. To confine Federal aid to the rural-route mileage, as provided in former bills, would not assist the commerce of any community, because the average load would still be measured by the unimproved condition of the intermediate roads. Continuous roads not only serve the public better but they are much cheaper to maintain. All public roads and highways, while kept up and maintained as such, have been declared by law to be post routes. This declaration was proper because every road is potentially a post route. Endless delay would ensue if a special act of Congress were necessary every time a new rural route was established or an old route changed to cover new territory. It is neither wise nor necessary that the expenditure of Federal funds be limited to the roads actually traveled by a rural carrier, roads that go zigzagging over the country, dodging around among the section lines.

According to the table printed as a part of the report of the Committee on Roads favorably recommending the passage of this bill, Arizona will be entitled to a total allotment of $117,512 each year. There is no doubt in my mind that the State of Arizona will make excellent use of this money. The legislature of my State has provided for an annual tax levy sufficient to raise the sum of $250,000 as a State road fund, so that we have the money available for the State's share of the cost of any road approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. Arizona has also provided for a State highway department under the supervision of a State engineer, so that we can meet the requirements of this bill in the matter of dealing with the State as a unit.

In all frankness, I must say that there is some division of sentiment among the people of my State as to just what should be done in the way of legislation providing for Federal aid in the construction of good roads, but I have explained to everyone who has asked me that I intended to vote for any good roads bill that might be placed upon its passage. I am anxious to see something done by Congress to assist the States in this most important work, and the only way to get Federal aid is to appropriate the money from the Treasury. Undoubtedly experience will teach us that some features of this bill should be changed, but we can safely leave the perfection of our highway legislation to future Congresses. There never will be a better time to initiate this policy than at the present moment. The Spaniards have a proverb which says that "the road to to-morrow leads to the house of never"; let us talk no longer about "Mañana," but do it now. [Loud applause.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. OAKEY].

Mr. OAKEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this interesting discussion has seemed to be a sort of forum for new Members, and that is my excuse for these few words. I am not concerned, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, that this bill was a part of the platform written at Baltimore, because that interesting document has been relegated to the field of political fiction by Executive order. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I am not going to discuss the fact that we all want good roads, because it is an axiom—we all do. I was born on a farm in the congressional district of President Wilson, and one of the great trials of my young life was the bad roads of that community. Coming to Washington, I found that macadam roads now surround that farm, built by taxpayers through a very efficient State organization of the great State of New Jersey. I now have the honor in part to represent another one of that cluster of States that were the pioneers in good road building. We have now a very efficient State organization. We have spent many millions of dollars, and are preparing in the future to spend many more, to make our highways worthy of the splendid history of our little State.

We do not think it quite fair, my friends. I have noticed on this floor that all of those States that have not been efficient in road building, that have not established public-highway commissions, that have been laggard, perhaps, in this great improvement, are in favor of this bill. Our people have been taxed, and particularly those who ride behind gasoline engines, for the splendid improvement of the highways of our State, and we do not think it quite fair that we should pay at least a part of the burden of those who have not done so.

That this is a question concerning the movement of great military adventures in the future I do not believe. I do not think that that is a serious problem in this discussion; but, my friends, as an inexperienced Member I could not help but think, in the last few days of this discussion, of where we are going. Within the last few days I have heard discussed on this floor propositions of Federal aid for various and divers things—aid to fight the chestnut blight, aid to fight the citrus canker, aid to fight the rabies in coyotes of the Northwest, special educational aid, special sanitary aid for the rural districts, to which appropriations I do not object collectively. I have therefore wondered when and where it will stop. It seems to me that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois got at the meat of this situation. Can this Government, under its present condition and what seems imminent to us in the future, afford to levy more stamp taxes to build rural roads? Is it not rather the obligation of those who surround and live along those highways to do as we have done, and with pride for their States and their communities at least attempt to inaugurate the same system?

I believe that this bill will not only be used to inaugurate this system in the States which have not already done so, but that it is the hope that the Federal aid will be asked and instituted to continue it, and I appeal to you, my colleagues, that it is not fair, that it is dangerous, to go further.

A gentleman on the other side a few moments ago said, "What is $25,000,000 in a movement like this?" Twenty-five million dollars is a lot of money in the present state of the Federal Treasury. [Applause.] Therefore I ask that in the name of fairness, that in the name of our future difficulties, financial and otherwise, we be a little careful rather than that we give so much solicitude to the populistic appeal to the people, that we give a little more care in safeguarding the Treasury of this great Republic against possible contingencies that seem likely to arise. [Applause.]

I am not particularly interested in the constitutionality of the proposition, because, in the first place, I do not know whether it is constitutional or not, and, in the second place, that ancient document has become irrelevant among friends.

The proposition to build roads in rural communities has many times been considered in this House. If the proposition to expend $25,000,000 as an initial performance is successful, it is perfectly apparent that future appropriations for this purpose will be very large. I am, therefore, very strongly of the opinion that this is a bad precedent and an unfortunate time for such legislation.

The number and variety of our tax laws are not only becoming a burden but an irritating feature of our daily life. In my judgment, the stamp tax is the most odious of them all. If the tremendous expenditures now asked by the administration are in any sense to be put into force, this so-called stamp tax will be indeed a thing of beauty and a joy forever. This bill asks for an appropriation of $25,000,000 to build roads in communities where in some sense, I think, they ought to do it themselves. This is my principal objection to the bill under consideration.

[By unanimous consent, Mr. OAKEY was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I am an advocate of the general proposition connected with the question of good roads. I have some slight knowledge of their construction, and have been associated with good-roads legislation in my own State.

In the locality which I have the honor to represent in part we have some 350 miles of State roads. Those State roads are approximately portions of what will eventually be a trunk-line system.

We also have a system of county roads, which are under the supervision of a commissioner, for which county appropriations are made for maintenance, and which are in no sense State roads.

This bill seeks to authorize a Federal-aid appropriation of $25,000,000 for road construction in the several States. There is, to my mind, a very great difference between Federal aid for roads and Federal construction of roads.

Four things are clearly defined in the bill, the balance are stated in rather vague and indefinite terms. First comes the $25,000,000 item; second, that amount is to be placed in the hands of a department official; third, by a system of gift distribution the amount is to be divided among the several States; and, fourth, that after such division is made control of the same is lost to the Federal authorities.

If this measure was seeking to put into operation an initial system of Federal trunk-line roads there would seem to be little or no objection to the proposition, but under the circumstances it does not appear to me that it is an opportune time to enact the measure now reported.

Reference has been made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], in his brilliant speech, to the fact that the larger States, and particularly New York, should have no hesitancy in giving part of their means to assist the other States. I will say that I believe New York State has always been a cheerful divider. As far as my knowledge goes, I think that no Federal appropriation has been afforded to the State or city of New York which has not been more than doubly repaid by either direct or indirect participation in the Government revenues. Furthermore, the subject of good roads is not a vital question at the present time nor is it one that has to be solved immediately. This Chamber is supposed to be the financial office as well as the legal office of this Government. We are expected to be careful of our own expenditures and to be rather more than careful about voting away the money of other people.

If instead of a minus Treasury we had a plus Treasury, if we had large revenues that provided for a surplus that could be fairly divided, if we were not confronted with complications throughout the world that may call for large appropriations to be made by this Congress, to be expended for what might be called involuntary expenditures, it possibly might be a proper time to consider this measure; but in view of the fact that we have little or no surplus, that we are already considering increasing our present internal taxation, I believe this entire subject should be deferred until matters of much graver importance are definitely settled. Believing as I do that this is not a good business measure to present at this time I can not, under the circumstances, justify myself in supporting the same.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to use the remainder of his time?

Mr. DUNN. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Seven minutes.

Mr. DUNN. I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

[Mr. LANGLEY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state to the gentleman from New York that he has two minutes remaining.

Mr. DUNN. I yield back that time, Mr. Chairman.

[Mr. SHACKLEFORD addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of this committee comes from a part of the country which can not be expected to understand Massachusetts. In Massachusetts we have had the civilization of the public school; we have had free labor; we have built our own roads; we have been industrious; and we have been saving. The gentleman comes from that part of the country in which he was brought up under the civilization of the shotgun; that part of the country where the people, his forbears, thought that the only proper relation between capital and labor was that capital should own labor in fee simple. And so, Mr. Chairman, they have accumulated no money in his part of the country. I am sorry to say it is their own fault, and no wonder they wish to vote it out of other people's pockets. I have been in the House a good many years, and I have never

yet, when I intended to speak of a man in debate, failed to notify him beforehand so that he might be present. I have read over and over again the rule which forbids personalities in debate, but the gentleman from Missouri was very successful some years ago when he reeled like a drunken man up and down this floor, imitating the leader of his own party because, forsooth, he was left off from a committee that he thought he deserved to be put upon. [Applause on the Republican side.] And since that time the gentleman has been so often indulging in personal remarks that he has forgotten they are against the rule. Now, let me say to the gentleman that no matter who it is in this House, on either side, the man who says that the motives of those of us who are backing this movement for preparedness are on account of a desire to keep up any stock, or every stock, of any ammunition manufacturers speaks with an unclean mouth. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the amendment, for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Missouri a question. While the language to which he has called attention in this amendment is perfectly understood by those of us who are here to vote upon it, is it not true that the language could be construed to apply to any city street, New York or Chicago, if anywhere in that street a strip of street might be found on which the houses were not less than 200 feet apart, so as to be carried further than the intent of the amendment?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. It undoubtedly could, if the gentleman assumes both the State highway department and the Secretary of Agriculture would be guilty of bad faith. It can not be done without their consent. It could only be done with both of them approving it, which is hardly possible. We must impute good faith to the officers who have power conferred upon them, and I believe they will administer it according to the spirit of the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree to that; but it seems to me that the language could be made so clear that even a man who did not want to act in good faith could not misinterpret it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I desire to submit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment. Page 1, line 9, after the word "thousand," insert "five hundred."

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment to the committee amendment is to make it read "twenty-five hundred inhabitants" instead of "two thousand." I do it for this purpose: For a good many years the Census Bureau has been classifying rural and urban communities as follows: Those under 2,500 inhabitants as rural communities; those over 2,500 as urban. The thought of the people of this country has run along that line. Thousands of reports, essays, editorials, histories, and other documents have been issued, as well as thousands of speeches delivered, based upon the thought that 2,500 inhabitants is a fair, though an arbitrary, dividing line between urban and rural communities. Two thousand might just as well be taken for the dividing line in the bill if it were not for the long usage of the several departments of the Government, especially the Census Bureau. All the accumulated figures with reference thereto are in the line of 2,500 instead of 2,000. I think it ought to be accepted by the committee. I understand that 2,500 was selected by the Census Bureau from a long line of observation, covering years, that up to about that limit the towns served the immediate demands and purposes of the surrounding communities, but did not extend trade or influence beyond the next neighboring towns; that ordinarily towns of larger population became manufacturing centers and became subject to manufacturing and transportation influences, and because inhabited by manufacturing and transportation people these towns became commercial centers and spread their sphere of influence and trade beyond their immediate urban neighbors.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Two thousand is a perfectly arbitrary number placed there.

Mr. SLOAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. As far as I am individually concerned, I see no difference between 2,000 and 2,500.

Mr. SLOAN. It would conform to the census practice and with the various documents they have given out for many years when distinguishing and talking about rural communities.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I am not authorized by the committee to accept the amendment, but individually I see no difference between 2,000 and 2,500. It is merely arbitrary now.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, there are one or two propositions in this amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri to which I would like to call the attention of the committee. There is a feature in the last two lines of the amendment that has been handed around, which says:

That not more than $25,000,000 shall be appropriated under the provisions of this act for any fiscal year.

It seems to be an attempt on the part of this House to limit the appropriations to the mere trivial sum of $25,000,000 a year for future Congresses. Now, the result of this amendment, if it should be adopted, would be that this would become permanent law, and next year when I offer an amendment in the next Congress to increase this appropriation from $25,000,000 to $50,000,000 for that purpose, and the year after next when the gentleman from Missouri moves to increase the appropriation from $50,000,000 to $75,000,000——

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman is an optimist.

Mr. HOWARD (continuing). It would be subject to the point of order. Now, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is a bad amendment to adopt, because we all believe and feel when this horrible European war is over that the nations of the earth will get together and establish a court of arbitration for the settlement of future differences; that the navies and the great standing armies of the countries will be gradually disarmed each year until there will be no more navies or armies in existence, and all the tremendous sums we are appropriating now for the maintenance of the Army and Navy can be used upon public highways and in building up the material welfare of the country. For that reason I hope there will not be included in this bill the language:

That not more than $25,000,000 shall be appropriated under the provisions of this act for any fiscal year.

Mr. HOPWOOD, Mr. KENT, and Mr. WINGO rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOPWOOD].

Mr. HOPWOOD. Mr. Chairman, possibly what I have to say will not be worth saying, but I have some feeling about this measure that I desire to express. To begin with, I feel the gentleman from Missouri went far afield in attacking the gentleman from Massachusetts and the State of Massachusetts. I have had the pleasure of standing under that old elm tree up there, and I have had the pleasure of standing at Concord Bridge and at Bunker Hill, and any man who can stand at any one of those places and not feel patriotism rise within his breast and make of him a nobler and better man is not a true American. [Applause.]

I do not agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] in all he said the other day when he was arguing for preparedness here. I am for preparedness. He has made a study of that question, and he gave figures to support his contention. He has gone into the matter so fully that I was delighted to hear him. With much of what he said I agreed. We probably will find, however, that we will not wholly agree with any man here as to his opinion on any particular subject. However, I think we have gone far afield when we have brought in our differences of opinion on preparedness on such a peaceful thing as a road. I am for this bill, or I was. [Laughter.] I am sorry to be at difference, the first time I come here, with the leader on my side of the House. I am sorry that the question of the city and country comes up here. I am neither from the city nor from the country. I am from a town of about 15,000 people, which is neither one nor the other.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPWOOD. I will.

Mr. MANN. One of the unfortunate things about being the selected leader of a party is that very often upon matters that are totally nonpartisan, such as this one, the leader of a party is put in an embarrassing position. I never have felt in the House that I should be deprived of the right to express a personal opinion, because gentlemen might be afraid that I would soon speak as the Republican leader on the floor. I will say to my friend, and to all other Republicans, that there is no party question involved in this measure that I know of. I hope gentlemen will not feel that they are under the slightest obligation to vote the way I do, however I vote, upon such a proposition. [Applause.]

Mr. HOPWOOD. That relieves a new Member very much. However, I thought this question was nonpartisan. I so viewed it, and I felt that each Member had a right to a personal opinion on the question.

So just a word about it. I happen to live on the old Cumberland Road, which was the first road and the greatest road ever built in this country by the National Government. I came across those mountains the other day when coming to the session of

this Congress, and I left my town—Uniontown, Pa.—on the farther side of the mountains—the western ridge of the mountains—in the morning at 9 o'clock, and I arrived here at 6 o'clock in the evening, simply because that old Cumberland Road is kept in such a magnificent condition that it is as good as your magnificent streets here in the city, and I came flying over at the rate of 30 or 40 miles an hour.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What is the Pennsylvania speed limit?

Mr. HOPWOOD. Perhaps I ought not to have told that. I may get into trouble yet, although I think the limitation will probably save me now.

I want to say that I think we are all for good roads. It is only a question of how to get them. We used to build them in the township and have the supervisors attend to it. Then afterwards the county took a chance at it, and aid was given to the supervisors. Later on the State took it up, and the State of Pennsylvania is contributing now to the extent of three or four million dollars a year to help her counties build roads. Now, the National Government is asked to go back 75 or 100 years and take up what it started to do at that time and again aid in the building of roads. I think there is plenty of room in this great road-building propaganda in the United States to allow the Federal Government to take a part. I am sorry we can not take a greater part, and in view of the fact that our finances are not in the best of condition, probably $25,000,000 is all we can afford to appropriate at this time. However, I am favorable to that amount to start with. It is not a very large sum. If we find the money with which to run this Government at all, out of that money we can take this $25,000,000. So I am favorable to the bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Can not the gentleman withhold that until we get through with this other amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KENT] is recognized.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, our President has stated that there is a vast amount of difference between State rights and State functions. The bill we are considering is a question in point. This matter of road building is peculiarly local in its nature. It concerns first the landowner, concerns next the small community, and next the county, next the State, and, last of all, the Federal Government. I believe that when the Federal Government goes into the business of road building it will open up a larger pork barrel than even the rivers and harbors bills could open. There will never be any limit or end to such legislation or such appropriation.

I happen to have the misfortune of owning a great many more or less useless acres of land in this country, and I would not have the gall or the nerve to go to the Federal Government to ask for one cent for road building in any locality where I am personally interested, and I do not believe that other landowners, small or large, should ask for Federal subsidy. We can not have the roads superintended from Washington. It is utterly impossible. They must be cared for and sustained by local communities, and any adequate system of inspection and preservation from Washington is an absurdity. Without a Federal inspection and repair Federal money would be dumped in a sewer. The roads must be maintained, if they are going to be good for anything, day by day, week by week, year by year, and that can never be done from the Central Government. It must be done by local communities, acting in their own interests and spending in conformity with those interests. Therefore I stand here opposed to Federal appropriations for what is fundamentally the duty and the obligation of local communities, and which is for the benefit of individuals under the fallacy of fee simple land tenure, which can only be controlled under taxation by local communities.

Some of us talk about money for such appropriations as though it came out of the air, as though it did not cost anybody anything. All taxes have one source, the pockets of our people.

The question of national defense is another question, but, as it has been dragged in, I must state that it is one in which I am interested along with every other American citizen. Money for this purpose is an insurance fund. How large that insurance fund should be I do not know and nobody here can tell. It is an insurance fund for the preservation of our national existence, for a demonstration of democracy amongst a self-contained, self-restrained people. No one has fought more bitterly against preparation for war than I have. No one has been a more ardent advocate of peace than I have been. And yet it seems to me that when you are out in a lot where there is a dangerous bull, or going down a street where you are liable to meet a mad dog, you feel better if you have a pitchfork for the bull or a club for the dog. [Laughter and applause.]

That is our situation to-day. I used to believe that the world was becoming civilized, but I have lost some of my confidence in that assumption. I hope that we shall go ahead and play this game as a good man would play a game of poker. [Laughter and applause.] We must be able to call the bluff of people who seem to the rational to be rabid and insane, and then when the insanity has passed away we can pull in our horns and stop all talk of war insurance. But we must have the cards to justify a call; and, as we are dealing for ourselves, if we do not have them, that is our fault.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. KENT. Yes; with pleasure and gratitude.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I just wanted to inquire what peculiar game it was that the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. KENT. Pinochle. [Laughter.]

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. KENT. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. In playing that game, which one is to be the loser? There must always be a loser, as I understand.

Mr. KENT. I know, but the bluffer sometimes wins in playing—in pinochle, I mean. [Laughter.] Anyhow, we must be able to make the bluff good.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Delaware rise?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. To discuss the amendment.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment pending before the House.

Mr. MANN. I make a point of order that the debate on the amendment has closed.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the point of order that there is one amendment pending, and an amendment to that amendment, and we must dispose of that before discussion is in order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the amendment reported. Is the gentleman from Missouri going to vote for it?

Mr. SHACKLEORD. I have no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out the figures "2,000" and inserting "two thousand five hundred."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, of course those are figures written in the amendment. I would say strike out "2,000" in figures and insert "twenty-five hundred" in words.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment. I send it to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WHEELER] offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHEELER offers the following amendment to the amendment: After the word "year" insert the following: "and for the fiscal year 1917 and annually thereafter there is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $25,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this act."

Mr. WHEELER. Now, Mr. Chairman, so far as this very important——

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes a point of order. What is the point of order?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WHEELER] is recognized.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this very important amendment owing to the fact that it is possible, if this bill should be enacted into law, that the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate or in the House might refuse to appropriate.

True, under the present administration this amendment means nothing, for we are all well aware of the fact that at the end of this fiscal year there will be no money on hand, and the same would be true if the present administration were in power for the next 25 years to come. [Laughter.] My Democratic friends over here admit privately, and, of course, confidentially, that on March 4 next there will be a change of administration, and under an economical administration we shall undoubtedly have a balance every year.

Therefore, gentlemen of the House, I considered it important that this amendment be adopted, because, as I have just stated, in the event one of the Committees on Appropriations refuses to appropriate the money, under the next administration of the country we shall have funds on hand at the end of the year to go on and help build good roads. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this committee has no authority to make an appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out the word "more," in next to the last line of the amendment, and inserting "less."

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I attempted to explain the object of my amendment a while ago. It is this: As the amendment is now written, it puts a limitation upon the appropriation, whereas by striking out "more than $25,000,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "less," we leave unshackled the succeeding Congresses to do as they please. In other words, Mr. Chairman, it unleashes those patriotic gentlemen who would like to see, at some future time, a greater amount of money appropriated for this beneficent piece of legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it may be entirely unnecessary, yet there are so many Members of the House who are not yet fully familiar with the practice of the House that I am going to say a word about this portion of the bill. The practice in the House is that committees which do not have the right to bring in appropriations, as a rule, instead of appropriating money for a specific purpose, bring in a bill for the authorization of an appropriation, so that appropriations may be segregated in certain bills, so that Members may find upon an examination of appropriation bills whether an appropriation bill has been made for a specific purpose, and not be required to search through the entire volume of the statutes to see whether an appropriation is carried in some local or special bill.

Under the provisions of this bill, if enacted into law, and under the rules of the House, an appropriation of $25,000,000 can be reported from the Committee on Appropriations in the sundry civil bill, if that shall be the bill that carries this item, as would naturally be the case; and if the committee does not bring in the item in the sundry civil bill and it is not carried in any other bill, any Member in the House is entitled to offer an amendment on the floor, when the bill is under consideration, to make the appropriation of $25,000,000. That amendment would not be in order unless we had previously authorized it by law, because the rules forbid an amendment for an object which is not authorized by law, with certain exceptions, and this would not be one of the exceptions. So that, after all, the orderly way of making the appropriation for this or any other purpose is first to authorize it by law, and then it goes without saying that, as a rule, where Congress has spoken by special law and made an authorization, the Committee on Appropriations brings in the appropriation in accordance with the authorization of law. Only the other day we appropriated $2,000,000 for the Alaska railroad. When the bill for the Alaska railroad was brought in it carried an appropriation. The House struck that out and made the authorization, leaving it to the Committee on Appropriations, nearly every member of which was opposed to the Alaska railroad, to bring in the appropriation when necessary; and they brought in an item of $2,000,000 on the urgent deficiency bill the other day because they knew very well that, as far as their duty was concerned, it was to obey the will of Congress as spoken by the Alaska railroad bill.

Now, I do not think that we ought to make the appropriation unlimited. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] has offered an amendment which takes off the lid entirely. If his amendment should prevail, Congress, in a spasm of hysterics, might appropriate $250,000,000 or $2,500,000,000, and it would be in order in the House, or an amendment to that would be in order in the House. After all, while we are wise and, in the main, cool and conservative, the House and every legislative house, guards itself and its own Members by rules against acting too hastily, on the spur of the moment, without consideration.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. If the authorization was limited to $25,000,000 a year, and in the next sundry civil appropriation bill an appropriation bill was brought in for $27,500,000, would it not be subject to the point of order?

Mr. MANN. It would be subject to the point of order, but any Member or the chairman of the committee could then offer an amendment for $25,000,000 a year as provided by law.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I understand my colleague [Mr. MANN]. Do I understand my colleague to say that we may not anywhere legislate and provide a permanent appropriation, and that an amendment so providing would not be in order?

Mr. MANN. I will say to my colleague that I did not speak on the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. I quite agree with my friend from the standpoint of orderly legislation.

Mr. MANN. I was not discussing the amendment which was ruled out on a point of order.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I move to strike out the last word. In the last Congress I voted against this bill and I will vote against it now. I think the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] enlightened the House very well upon the purpose behind the bill and the future of these appropriations. I look upon this as the entrance of the camel's nose under the tent and the proposed legislation as the glorification of pork.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield just a minute?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. With pleasure.

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman is not condemning me for my frankness, is he?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. No; it would be hard to condemn the gentleman from Georgia; I know him too well. But I wish to say that the purpose of this legislation is apparent in the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia, who puts up, unconsciously perhaps, the warning signal. We are appropriating to-day $25,000,000, but he said that in the succeeding Congress, somebody, recognizing the beneficent work that this Congress has done, will be asking for $50,000,000. Later on another gentleman, recognizing the beneficent work of that succeeding Congress, will be asking for $75,000,000, and so it will go on until it amounts to $300,000,000 or $400,000,000.

I am very glad that the statement has been made, in order that Members of this House may know what they are doing when they vote upon this bill. I believe that the purpose of it is wrong. Good roads are local matters, and Federal care is improper and unwise. I believe this Government of ours has problems enough upon its hands. For one, I wish at least to defer this appropriation for roads, because a greater problem confronts this Nation, something for the consideration of the people, not only along the seaboard but throughout the length and breadth of the Nation. I believe in deferring to the admonitions of those who are charged in an executive way with the concerns of this Nation. I take stock in their warnings and give heed to them, and I believe it is the duty of this Congress in a paramount way to give consideration to the question of national defense. [Applause.] I do not believe in appropriating this money when we have not got it. I believe, first and foremost, in making provisions for that thing which concerns us as a Nation in maintaining our national life. This Nation was worth fighting to establish. It is worth fighting, if necessary, to maintain. [Applause.] I am one of those who do not take a great deal of stock in the magic of men jumping up in a minute by the million to defend their country without any previous preparation, and so I hope this Congress will at least defer this legislation until we have given consideration to those weightier and far more important questions that confront us to-day. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 1, strike out the word "agriculture" and the succeeding words to and including "marketing farm products," and insert "the manufacture and sale of automobiles."

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment simply to put the bill on an honest basis. I represent two of the greatest agricultural counties in the State of New York.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes after debate, and it is too late.

Mr. PLATT. I want to say that I have never had a letter from a farmer in favor of this bill, but I have had a letter from an automobile manufacturer in my district and several from automobile clubs. There are 60 organized granges in my district, and they are frequently passing resolutions and sending them to me, but have sent none in favor of this bill. They know what the bill is; they know that it is a bill written by the automobile manufacturers. It will not do the farmers any good. This talk about its being for the benefit of the farmers is all bunk, and most of the oratory about the down-trodden farmer is hypocritical bunk. In speaking about the bill passed last year I said that there have been more foolish things advocated for the benefit of the farmer than crimes committed in the name of liberty. I suppose that nothing can stop the passage of this bill. It is one of those bills that everybody in private conversation says ought not to be passed, but there are only a few of us who dare to vote against it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. I will.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the gentleman believe that the bill we passed last year is better than this bill?

Mr. PLATT. I think from the standpoint of the farmer it was, but I was against that, too.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Did the gentleman vote for the bill in the last Congress?

Mr. PLATT. I did not.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I should not take the time of the House at this moment to reply to the jocular remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], for I realize they were made in part facetiously, as he admits, were it not that in his attack on Boston his long-range verbal artillery somewhat peppered me as well as my State, saying that I opposed the bill from the national-defense standpoint because of the powder company in my State. I commend to him the geography he used to study in school when he makes the statement that because there are certain factories making powder within the boundaries of my State I dared to get up here to-day and give my reasons why I should vote against his bill. I realize that he was in part facetious, but if his remarks should be taken seriously by any person or by any who read them, I want to say a little on the other side. The gentleman from Missouri has said so much about a certain "war-bride" stock, the factories of which are not contained in any one section, for they are scattered all over this Union, that I have probably as much right to accuse him of having bucked the market and lost as he has to impute unfair motives to me. [Laughter and applause.] I should probably have just as much right to say that the other day when there was a debate on the embargo question, and the great Missouri mule was brought up, that he was perfectly willing to have an embargo on everything except the animal that hauled the engines of war. [Laughter.]

I do not impute any sinister motives to him, but I think I would have as much right to impugn his motives on the question of embargo as he has to stand up here and attack a stock on Wall Street and then lay me over to the charge that I voted against his bill for the reason that I wanted to favor that business.

I gave my reasons for voting against the bill in a speech earlier to-day. I said your President came here upon the opening day of Congress, and if there were two salient points in his message that impressed one, regardless of how they felt on the preparedness question and revenue, it was the fact that the question of national defense and the question of revenue was to the fore. And yet we see this committee bringing in here to-day a bill which will take $25,000,000 out of the Public Treasury before even the questions brought forth in the message of the President are considered. As I said this morning, you, or a majority on your sade, are struggling to-day to meet the revenue situation. I do not mean to stand up here and point out as a new Member—for I am a new Member and I accept the gentleman's accusation—and try to tell the leaders on both sides what to do, but I can not vote for this bill, benefiting my State as it does in the way of some money being given it by the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Delaware has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware asks that his time be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK. I object. I will withdraw the objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, if any gentleman objects, I make the point of order that he must stand in his place.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. BLACK. I had already withdrawn the objection.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. As I said this morning, Mr. Chairman, my State has as much area in agriculture as any of the congressional districts in the Eastern States. I realize that under this bill it will get $103,000, but the people of the State will have to raise $103,000 more. I realize it is far easier for me to vote yea on this bill than it is to vote nay, but I believe that when you have conscientiously considered the bill and the debates upon it and have reached the conclusion that you should vote against it, that that should be enough, and that Members should not come in here and try to impugn your motives, whether they do so in a joking vein or seriously. I reiterate that this bill will be of some benefit to my State, but I am willing to go to the people there next fall with my reasons for voting against it. I do not think we should enter into an expenditure of this amount, and it will call for a larger amount in future Congresses. In other words, although this will benefit my State, I believe in considering the measure from the viewpoint of a national legislator rather than from the fact that it will help any district. [Applause.]

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 4, of the amendment, after the word "year" insert "*Provided, however,* That no such aid shall be given except as a part of a comprehensive plan for a complete system of highways connecting the several States, which plan shall be prepared and published by a board composed of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Postmaster General within six months after the passage of this act."

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is not subject to a point of order. This is a limitation purely upon the language of the bill.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. It seeks to create a board.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from Missouri to make the point of order?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I make the point of order, although I can reserve it. The point of order I was about to make was that the amendment proposes to create a board, which is not germane to that section of the bill, but I shall withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri withdraws the point of order.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that has been offered by the committee, and of which we all have printed copies, seeks to uphold the constitutionality of this bill by referring to three great departments of the National Government, and by specifying that the roads proposed to be constructed under its provisions may be used for the transportation of interstate commerce, so that it will come under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution; the transportation of military supplies, so that it will come under the constitutional power to raise and support armies; or for the transportation of postal matter, so that it will come under the power of Congress to establish post offices and post roads.

Mr. Chairman, this bill with this amendment proposed by the committee purports to be a national bill. One of the reasons why I have always been a Republican is because the Republican Party has stood ever since its birth in favor of having the National Government do things that are national in scope and character. This bill, however, as it comes to us from the committee, even with this misleading amendment, has nothing national in it. There is no more justification or excuse for this

bill than there would be for a bill appropriating money out of the National Treasury to construct schoolhouses in the different States of the Union, or for a bill to construct police stations in the different States of the Union, or for a bill to construct sewers in the different cities and towns of the United States. If, however, the amendment which I have offered—and offered in good faith—is adopted, the bill will be national in character.

I have taken the committee at its word, and in my amendment I have provided that before any aid can be given out of the National Treasury under this act there must be a comprehensive plan, established, prepared, and published by a board representing these three great departments of the Government which are named in the committee amendment, namely, the Secretary of War as representing the moving of military supplies and forces, the Secretary of Commerce as representing the transportation of interstate commerce, and the Postmaster General as representing the interest of the National Government in post offices and post roads. With such an amendment providing for the preliminary preparation and publication of such a comprehensive plan of which every mile of road built under the provisions of this bill must be an integral part, we men who believe in a National Government for national purposes can support a bill of this kind, but in its present form, never.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman support this bill if we adopt his amendment?

Mr. DALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DALLINGER) there were—ayes 63, noes 112.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the amendment be amended by striking out the figures "25," in line 11, and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "40."

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment in good faith. The amount of the appropriation, after all, will rest with the Committee on Appropriations each year. That committee can report no appropriation at all, or if it wishes, it can report any amount up to the amount fixed as a limit by this bill. My idea is that we ought to fix a limit higher than $25,000,000. I anticipate that there will come a time when the Treasury of this country will be in better shape than it is now, when the annual revenues of the Government will be sufficient to meet its necessary expenditures and leave a fair surplus in the Treasury, and the Appropriation Committee ought to have a wider latitude than this bill gives. I do not believe that the amount should be unlimited, as was proposed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD], but I do think we ought to raise the limit that can be appropriated to at least $40,000,000 in any one year. Now, while I have the floor, Mr. Chairman, I want to briefly express my views upon this bill. I think the committee amendment, as amended, should be accepted. I think it improves the bill from a legal point of view. I have had some misgivings as to the constitutionality of this measure. This amendment of the committee broadens the scope of the bill and goes a long way toward removing what I consider a constitutional objection to it as originally drawn. The power of the Federal Government to enter upon a policy of improving the public roads in the several States is not very clear in my mind, but it must be limited to those purposes enumerated in the Constitution. I think the Government clearly has the right to establish post roads and such other roads as may be used for interstate commerce. The other purposes mentioned in the bill are incidental to these purposes, and will not, I hope, prove to be a vital objection to the bill. I am in favor of this bill as it is amended, or proposed to be amended, because I believe we ought to go just as far as we can within constitutional limitations in improving the public roads of the country.

I am in favor of it because the people of the district which I have the honor to represent are deeply interested in the improvement of public highways. I am in favor of it, because it will encourage the people of the different States to help themselves in the improvement of their roads. The burden of building good roads is a heavy one—too heavy to be borne entirely by the people of the immediate vicinity of the roads. Where the roads are so constructed as to be beneficial to the country at large, as postal or interstate roads, I believe the Federal Government should aid in their construction. In Illinois we have a law under which the different counties can secure State aid to the extent of half the cost of the road, under certain conditions. We think this is a good law, for it has greatly encouraged the construction of hard roads. I believe this bill, if it passes, will likewise encourage the building of good roads all over the country, especially those roads that are used for post roads and for through travel or commerce between the States. And this leads me to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that I am in favor of this bill for another reason which has not been emphasized as much as I think it should have been by those who have spoken in favor of the bill. It will prove a great blessing to the rural mail carriers of the country. I had occasion recently to address a communication to all the rural mail carriers in my district—174 of them, I think—and I asked them this question: "Have you any suggestion as to the proposed legislation that would help the service?" The answer that came back from nearly every one of these rural carriers was, "Give us better roads."

And, Mr. Chairman, I think if there is a class of Government employees who, more than all others, deserve the consideration of this Congress, it is the men who deliver the mail over the country routes. [Applause.] They are the men who have to go out in all kinds of weather and deliver the mail to the homes of the people. The expense of maintaining their equipment, as I am informed by the carriers of my district, is from $300 to $600 per year, and a large part of this is due to the bad roads these men have to travel during at least a part of the year. And if we can adopt any legislation within constitutional limitations that will remove some of the burdens from the rural mail carriers of the country and make their lives and their labors better for them, I think we should do it. [Applause.]

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DENISON. I will.

Mr. PLATT. Does not the gentleman think the Post Office Department could make their lives a little pleasanter if they tried?

Mr. DENISON. That may be true, that the Post Office Department might do so; but I do not believe the Post Office Department will do it, so I think Congress ought to do so. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, the rural carriers in my district deserve better conditions than they now have to labor under; they——

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I understand the gentleman from Illinois is favorable to this bill whether his amendment is adopted or not.

Mr. DENISON. Yes, sir; I am going to vote for it.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. And the gentleman in good faith believes the amount ought to be increased to $40,000,000?

Mr. DENISON. In answer to the gentleman's question, I will say that I believe the Appropriations Committee ought to be authorized to go that far. We are entering upon a new policy in passing this legislation. And while I do not believe it would be wise for the committee to recommend an appropriation of the full amount while the National Treasury is in the present impoverished condition, still, as I have already said, I hope and believe the time will soon come when we will return to our former method of raising revenue for the Government, and we will have a surplus in the Treasury to use for this purpose; and if we are going to start now and enter upon this new policy of aiding in improvement of the public roads, we ought to put the limit of the amount that can be appropriated high enough to do some good; the Appropriations Committee can then appropriate more for this worthy purpose when we do get into a better financial condition. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the people of Illinois, I am sure, would welcome Federal aid in the construction of the great Lincoln Highway, which is planned to cross this country from one coast to another. The agitation for this great highway has already encouraged the plans for other through highways which will prove to be a great benefit and blessing for the country. I have the honor to represent that old district in southern Illinois that was once represented in this House by Gen. John A. Logan. There are few, if any, names more sacred to the people of my district than that of Gen. Logan. There has already been planned and laid out another great interstate highway known as the Logan-Lee Highway, which begins somewhere away down in the heart of the country where the name of Lee is held so sacred, and runs north through the State where Logan lived, until it intercepts the Lincoln Highway. The people of my district and State, as well as of many others, are deeply interested in this great interstate road, which, while it may have in the beginning been somewhat inspired by sentiment, will just as surely result in a great material benefit to the people of the

States through which it will pass. I am in favor of this bill, because I believe that the Federal Government should encourage and aid in the construction of such interstate highways, and I hope the amendment I have offered will be adopted and that the bill as amended will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to amend the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana and Mr. SHACKLEFORD demanded a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I called for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 33, noes 99.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the section strike out the period and insert the words: "And no appropriation shall be made during the year 1916."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I have long been an advocate of Federal aid for good roads. I advocated it long before I came to Congress, when the question of Federal power in this direction was not so generally admitted as it is now. I believe the pending bill is the best bill that has been before the Congress upon this subject [applause], but, Mr. Chairman, where is the money coming from to pay this $25,000,000 this year? I have listened to the debates which have gone on, and I have heard no suggestion from any source as to where the revenue is coming from to meet this expenditure now. Our Treasury to-day, Mr. Chairman, is practically empty. The deficit is growing from day to day and from month to month. In view of that situation, what is the duty of the Members of Congress in this regard? Is it to vote to launch into new fields of expenditure involving $25,000,000? Would a prudent business man conduct his own business in that way?

If any Member of Congress in his business life was met with the condition that we are confronted with in our Federal Treasury, would he begin a new expenditure, although it might be a wise policy under normal conditions? Would he do it, not knowing where the money was coming from to meet this new expenditure? Now, Mr. Chairman, the majority, it is true, is responsible not only for the appropriations that are made, but for the revenues to meet them; but at the same time, Mr. Chairman, every Member of this House has the responsibility upon his shoulders as to voting for appropriations. We on this side have no right to vote for every appropriation that comes before us and against every tax that comes before us and then afterwards go out upon the stump and charge the majority with not being able to conduct this Government in a competent way. [Applause.] And, Mr. Chairman, every Member of this House, it seems to me, in this crisis in our financial affairs, so far as the condition of the Treasury is concerned, ought to vote against every new field of expenditure that is not necessary. That means not only a vote for the amendment I have proposed, that simply provides no appropriation shall be made during the year 1916, but it means that he will not vote for any public-building bill involving new expenditures that are not necessary or a river-and-harbor bill, involving new projects that are not necessary, but will confine himself in voting for only necessary appropriations. And, Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the committee that the deficit that now exists in our financial affairs——

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Grows out of the ordinary expenditures of government.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. What is the deficit to-day?

Mr. LENROOT. I have not looked it up to-day.

Mr. GORDON. The surplus was $40,000,000 day before yesterday.

Mr. LENROOT. When I say the deficit, I mean the deficit that has grown up between the surplus that existed at the time the Democrats went into power and the surplus that exists to-day.

Mr. GORDON. What the gentleman means is there is no deficit, but an actual surplus of $40,000,000; but it is less than it was formerly? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LENROOT. What I mean is, if there had not been a large surplus when the Democrats came into power there would be an actual deficit in the Treasury to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the situation. What do you propose to do about it? As I said, these are ordinary expenditures. No one in this House believes for a moment, no matter what we think about preparedness, that the appropriations for naval and military purposes will be less than they were last year; and so with every other department of the Government. How, then, can you justify an expenditure, however wise it may be under normal conditions, that is not necessary now?

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a plain, common-sense business proposition, and the Members of this House ought to be brave enough and courageous enough to face it as a business proposition. My district, Mr. Chairman, would benefit probably as much as any by the money that would be received from this appropriation this year, but I am satisfied that my constituents desire me to treat these great questions in a business way; and I am satisfied to leave the matter with them, so far as my individual vote is concerned upon the amendment I have proposed. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, there is some force in the argument made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. He is very thoughtful and does not usually speak without saying something material, but this time I think he is unduly alarmed.

This is not an appropriation bill. It is a bill to authorize appropriations which shall be made by the proper appropriation committee and that has to go to the Senate and be there considered. If it should become a law at this session of Congress, it will be time enough for the watchful gentleman from Wisconsin to raise his objections against a bill reported by the proper appropriation committee. The appropriation committees are honest and faithful. Surely the Appropriation Committee would take into account the exigencies of the Treasury. We are asking here only for an authorization. If it shall pass both Houses and receive the signature of the President it will then be soon enough to consider whether we will make an appropriation this year or not, and, if so, the amount of such appropriation.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. We have fought it along for four or five years. Do not put this log across our pathway now. But if it becomes a law I will join the gentleman, or any other thoughtful gentleman, in safeguarding the Treasury. If an appropriation should be made under the authority we are seeking here to give, if one should be reported, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] can call on me to stand by him to see that no improper appropriation is made, taking into account the condition of the Treasury. But I ask him to impute to the Appropriation Committee just as much honesty and patriotism in that regard as he and I have ourselves. They will not make an appropriation if it is not warranted.

Mr. LENROOT. I do impute that same honesty; but the gentleman is aware, as I am aware, that the Appropriation Committee very properly, when we authorize an expenditure, deems it its duty to make the expenditure authorized by law.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, this does not provide that $25,000,000 shall be expended, but that the appropriation shall not in any year exceed $25,000,000, and if the money is not in the Treasury an appropriation committee would not be called upon to make an appropriation of that sum or of any other sum.

Mr. TILSON. May I ask the gentleman if this becomes a law will he ask the Appropriation Committee to make an appropriation this year?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Well, I do not know until I see what the amount of money is and how much we can expend and all conditions that surround it. If I think it is proper, I certainly would ask the Appropriation Committee to do it, but I would be governed by the exigencies of the situation.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman agree not to ask for any money this year?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Agree with whom?

Mr. TILSON. Well——

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. The House is not authorized to enter into any agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HAYES. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 59, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

With the kindliest of feelings toward the able chairman of the Roads Committee, I direct his attention to the fact that he misquoted on this floor my statement made on Saturday last. I wish also to say that with the very high regard I have for the distinguished John Dalzell, who so ably and for so long represented his district in this House, I would dislike to think if he were present now he would cast his vote for this measure.

I wish also to inform the gentleman that I am a friend and not an enemy to the American farmer, and already in this House I have cast several ballots in the interest of that distinguished citizen of the Western States. But I rise now not to discuss this question of good roads nor to defend the State of Massachusetts, for, as a great statesman once said on this floor, she needs no defense. But I do rise to defend the principle that is involved—a great principle that had its development, if not its birth, in the great State of Massachusetts—and that is the principle of local self-government.

And this principle which has done so much for our whole country, while it carries with it privileges and advantages, also entails duties and responsibilities; and from the earliest history of the town government of New England, the caring for its highways has been a prominent feature.

The Puritans were to some extent trained in the principle of Democracy through the struggle with King James and the church. By reason of this struggle they discovered and adopted the principle of congregational independence. Each church was in itself a little republic, and from this practice probably came the principle of town government so peculiar to New England.

And here on the broad acres of this North American continent a splendid opportunity was afforded for the trial and development of this great experiment for the benefit of humanity.

So in Massachusetts this principle is firmly established. They have come honestly by it, and they have learned to love it for the things it has done. Had it not been for the privileges it afforded the individual the ranks of the emigrants in pioneer days would not have been so readily filled, and more, the quickness with which New England rose to strike for independence, giving courage and hope to the other colonies, was largely due to the splendid independence and individualism developed in the town governments of Massachusetts, and which government in somewhat modified form has been transplanted to other States in the form of township government.

I suggest to those who have so severely criticized Massachusetts not to be too caustic in their denunciation. Remember the sturdy, independent character of the New Englander, with his strong individuality, is traceable to the principle for which they now so stoutly contend and which principle contributed much to the splendid fight against an unjust principle of taxation in colonial days.

New England has a right to be proud of her numerous little republics, dotted as they are all over her various Commonwealths and in no State more developed than in Massachusetts, with the possible exception of Rhode Island, where the spirit of local independence is evident in the two capitals of that State.

And while we are in these days tending strongly toward centralization, so strongly, my friends, that if Hamilton himself could stop in and see us now he would be proud of his handiwork.

But let us, gentlemen, instead of heaping strictures on the Massachusetts Members for their stand, just recall what local self-government has done for our whole country and remembering the loyalty with which this principle was maintained by the immortal Jefferson as an antidote to the dangers of centralization, had we better not be careful of our action before ruthlessly brushing aside a principle so dear not only to New England but the people of this entire Nation? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COLEMAN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this section and amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] asks unanimous consent that the debate on this section and amendments thereto be now closed. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, does that exclude a substitute for the section?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] that we agree upon the time for closing debate.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the debate on this section close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I desire five minutes in which to discuss the amendment.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Then I withdraw my request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's request is withdrawn. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUDDLESTON:

"Page 2, line 4, after the words 'fiscal year,' insert the words 'and no appropriation exceeding $5,000,000 shall be made for the year 1916.'"

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, the roads bill as it now stands authorizes an appropriation of $25,000,000 for the current year and for each subsequent year. My amendment, which has just been read, proposes to limit the appropriation for the current year to $5,000,000, so that the $25,000,000 appropriation will begin in 1917.

We are making an experiment with this roads bill. Why should we make such a colossal experiment? The law must be tried before we can know whether it is workable and will be satisfactory. There is no need to make the trial on such a large scale.

This bill has been criticized severely. It is said that it violates Democratic principles; that it places too much power in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture; that its intended benefits are too much bound up in red tape; that the control of its benefits will be in the hands of State highway boards and engineers who will distribute them not according to merit but as a matter of political favor. It is further charged that the bill is really an automobilists' bill and not a farmers' bill, and that it will result in the construction of trunk lines of road for the chief benefit of tourists and automobilists, and that the dirt roads and the bad roads back in the rural districts will not be able to get any of the money. These are serious criticisms and should not be dismissed lightly. They have been fortified on the floor of the House with logical arguments, and evidently there is basis for them. It must be admitted that we can not know how the law will work nor whether it will be satisfactory until it has been tried.

The $5,000,000 appropriated for 1916 will give an opportunity for the trial of the law. It will be ample for organization and experiment. The people will have notice of what they may expect and will be given an opportunity to avail themselves in future of the beneficent provisions of the bill.

It is an admitted fact that our National Treasury is not in good condition. Attention has been called in a very forcible way to the fact that our revenues are not sufficient to meet our expenses. That is a question that this Congress will have to wrestle with. Except for the fact that the European war found a surplus in the Treasury there would have been a deficit. This is indeed a serious situation.

The situation calls for the practice of rigid economy. The Democratic revenue law of 1913 was a success prior to the outbreak of the war. It was drafted to meet conditions as they were at that time. Since the outbreak of the war there has been a great falling off in revenues. This is due to the decrease in importations from which tariff duties would have been collected, and also a decrease in revenues from spirits, beer, and tobacco, caused by prohibition laws and by the hard times which decreased the consumption of such things.

Appropriations made by the present Congress must be provided for by the revenue bill which will be presented later. Normal conditions will not return to this country until the close of the European war. Our importations of foreign goods are yet far below normal. Those countries are unable to manufacture, prices are greatly increased, and it seems likely that it will be several years before our importations will reach their normal level. Until that time there should be the exercise of the strictest economy in national expenditures.

We can not spend money without first placing it in the Treasury. The only way that this can be done is by taxation, direct or indirect. Every appropriation which Congress makes means an added tax laid upon the people. The $25,000,000 appropriation for an experiment in national aid to roads represents heavier taxes which in all probability will be laid upon the necessaries

of life. It means that the workingman must pay more for his clothing, food, and other necessaries of life. It must come out of the people and we should be careful how we spend this money. I am not willing to experiment on such a colossal scale when the cost must be borne by the masses. This experiment will perhaps mean the retention of the sugar duty, which means a tax of 1 cent per pound on every pound of sugar consumed in this country, an increase in the price of 1 cent per pound.

No necessity can be shown for the large appropriation of $25,000,000 for the first year. All large appropriations should be closely watched until that period when we may expect normal revenues from tariffs and from internal taxes. For these reasons I think the amendment which is in the interest of economy should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] to the committee amendment.

The question being taken, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the adoption of the committee amendment as previously amended.

The committee amendment as previously amended was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the whole bill, which I ask the Clerk to read. It is to strike out the enacting clause and insert the following:

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McKELLAR offers the following substitute for the whole bill: "Strike out all of the bill except the enacting clause and insert the following"——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that amendment is not in order. The House has just inserted, by way of amendment, section 1. It is too late to move to strike out a thing after the House has inserted it by a vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, then I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry as to when will be the proper time to offer the bill of last year as a substitute for the pending bill?

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to the gentleman asking unanimous consent for leave to offer it now, as far as I am concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman that the proper time to offer a substitute will be after the bill has been read under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is my notion about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is the bill which we passed last year, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk to be read at this time, and I ask unanimous consent to offer it now as a substitute for the whole bill.

Mr. MANN. If we can avoid reading it, I shall not object.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I have no objection to the gentleman offering it, if it will not take too much time.

Mr. MANN. Let us dispose of it now.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] asks unanimous consent to offer a substitute for the whole bill at this time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Now, can we have a limit on the debate?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am perfectly willing. I want very little time myself.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Five minutes?

Mr. McKELLAR. If there is any gentleman on my side who wants to talk, I should like to see him have an opportunity. I do not want more than 5 minutes myself.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I should like 5 minutes.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Then I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment be closed in 10 minutes, of which 5 minutes be yielded to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman that the substitute be inserted in the RECORD without reading.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Everybody knows about that bill, which is the one we passed last year, and I ask unanimous consent that it be offered without reading?

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the gentleman will not ask that, because I should like to have the bill read.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman wants to have it read, it is not very long.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is not very long, and I think the Members of the House ought to hear it.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Then I will ask unanimous consent that the bill be read, and that there be 10 minutes' debate, of which 5 shall be yielded to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that there be 10 minutes' debate, to be divided between the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the proposed substitute, as follows:

That the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, may aid the States and the civil subdivisions thereof in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads in an amount not exceeding $25,000,000 in any fiscal year; that out of said amount which may be so expended in any fiscal year shall be paid the expenses incurred by the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of this act, and that to administer the provisions of this act he is authorized to employ such engineering and other assistance and incur such expenses in the city of Washington and elsewhere as may be necessary; that after deducting from said $25,000,000 a sum sufficient to pay the expenses of administering this act by the Secretary of Agriculture the portion of the remainder which may be expended in any State in any fiscal year under the provisions of this act shall be determined upon the following basis, to wit: Sixty-five thousand dollars in each State and the balance in the respective States, one-half in the ratio which their total population bears to the total population of all of the States, as shown by the next preceding Federal census, and one-half in the ratio which their total mileage of rural post roads bears to the total mileage of rural post roads in all of the States, as shown by the report of the Postmaster General at the close of second quarter of the last preceding fiscal year; that on or before the 20th day of January in each year the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare and file in his office a statement showing the amount which under the provisions of this act may be expended in each State during the next fiscal year and the proportions thereof which may be expended under section 3 and section 4 of this act and transmit by registered mail a copy of such statement to the governor of each State on or before the 31st day of said January: *Provided*, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1914, the Secretary of Agriculture shall so prepare and file said statement and transmit copies thereof to the governors of the respective States within 60 days after the final passage of this act: *And provided further*, That the term rural post roads, as used in this section, shall be held to mean any public road outside of incorporated cities over which the United States regularly carries rural mails either by free rural delivery or star-route carriers.

SEC. 2. That on or before the 1st day of January in each fiscal year each State highway commission, or in the event there is no such highway commission then the governor of each State in conformity to the laws of such State, or in the absence of any law of such State on the subject, may elect whether Federal aid to the construction and maintenance of rural post roads in such State shall be given under the provisions of section 3 or section 4 of this act, or partly under both sections and the proportion under each, by filing a written statement of such election in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided*, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1916, such election shall be made within 45 days after the final passage of this act. If the said State highway commission, or where there is no such commission the governor of any State, shall refuse or fail to make such election as provided by this section, then within 10 days after the time in which said governor is authorized to make such election has elapsed the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine said matter.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with the officers of the several States having lawful authority in that behalf in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads. That between the 1st day of February and the 30th day of June in each fiscal year the Secretary of Agriculture and the officer, or officers, of each State having lawful power to act for the State may jointly consider and determine the roads in such State which, under the provisions of this section, may be constructed and maintained during the next fiscal year and the material, character, and manner of such construction and maintenance; that the several States shall afford such inspection and supervision of said construction and maintenance as shall be required by the Secretary of Agriculture; that in no case shall the United States bear more than one-half of the cost of the construction and maintenance of any road under the provisions of this section; that the Secretary of Agriculture shall not commence such joint construction of any road in any State until the portion of the cost thereof which is to be provided otherwise than by the United States has been made available.

SEC. 4. That certain roads in the States which are adapted to use by the United States as rural post roads shall be divided into three classes to be known as class A, class B, and class C.

Class A shall embrace roads upon which no incline is steeper than is reasonably necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, well drained, with a road track composed of macadam or other material of equal utility and cost, constructed and maintained in such manner that it shall have a smooth, firm surface.

Class B shall embrace roads upon which no incline is steeper than is reasonably necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, well drained, with a road track composed of shells, gravel, or a proper combination of sand and clay or other material of equal utility but less expensive than macadam, constructed and maintained in such manner that it shall have a smooth, firm surface.

Class C shall embrace roads upon which no incline is steeper than is reasonably necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, with adequate drainage and ample side ditches, with a roadway constructed so as to quickly shed water into the side ditches and kept crowned and compacted by dragging or other adequate means so that it shall be reasonably passable for wheeled vehicles.

That on or before the 1st day of March in each fiscal year the governor of any State may file in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture a statement setting forth the location and the number of miles of roads in such State which he claims to be in each of classes A, B, and C, respectively; and if such State have a State highway department then his said statement may be accompanied by a report from such State highway department showing the total number of miles of roads in such State in each of classes A, B, and C, the location of such roads, a description in detail of their physical features, the material, manner, and, as far as may be, the cost of their construction and the manner and cost of their maintenance.

That the Secretary of Agriculture shall consider such statements and determine which of the roads mentioned therein are in class A, which in class B, and which in class C, and make a report of his said

determinations to the respective governors, filing such statements, on or before the 20th day of the following June.

That no charge shall be made for so considering and determining such statement of any governor if the same shall be accompanied by a report from the State highway department of such State as hereinbefore provided; but in all other cases there shall be deducted 10 per cent of the amount which shall be payable on account of the roads in such State under the provisions of this act.

That at the end of each fiscal year the United States shall pay on account of the roads so determined to be in classes A, B, and C, as follows: On each mile in class A the sum of $60, on each mile in class B the sum of $30, and on each mile in class C the sum of $15: *Provided*, That if in any State the aggregate of said sums would exceed the amount which for that fiscal year has been apportioned to such State under this act to be expended under the provisions of this section, then said sums per mile shall be reduced pro rata so that their aggregate shall not exceed said amount.

That nothing whatever shall be paid by the United States under the provisions of this section for any road which does not clearly come within the requirements of class A, B, or C as hereinbefore defined.

That such payments shall be made to such officers in the respective States as the governors thereof shall indicate as being lawfully entitled to receive the same by the Treasurer of the United States upon warrants drawn upon him by the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided*, That this act shall not be construed as authorizing any governor to create any new office.

That such payments of money made by the United States as hereinbefore provided shall, during the ensuing fiscal year, be applied to the construction, maintenance, or extension of the respective roads for which paid and that in addition thereto the State or civil subdivisions thereof shall, during said ensuing fiscal year, expend in the construction, maintenance, or extension of said roads an amount equal to the amount so paid by the United States; that if such sums are not so expended upon the construction, maintenance, or extension of said roads, respectively, during the ensuing fiscal year, then at the end of such fiscal year nothing whatever shall be paid by the United States on account of any road upon which there has been a default in such expenditure; that the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine whether such expenditures have been so made, and to aid him in such determinations that the proper officers of the State shall make such showing as he shall require.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall have power to make all needful rules for the proper administration of the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. That necessary bridges and culverts shall be deemed to be a part of the respective roads constructed, improved, or maintained under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. That this act shall be in force from and after July 1, 1916.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, the bill that has just been read as a substitute for the pending bill is precisely the same bill, word for word and letter for letter, except that 1916 is substituted for 1914, as the bill that was passed last year by a vote of about 7 to 1. It is almost precisely the same as the bill that was passed two years ago in a preceding Congress by quite a large majority. The difference between the two measures is this: This substitute has all of the provisions about State highway commissions and the designation of certain roads to be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture that the present bill has. In addition it has a provision that all the roads of the country shall be divided into three classes—class A, class B, and class C. The State can elect to have the funds expended for upkeep on all of the roads in the State or district or it can leave the matter to the State highway commissions just as reported by the committee. What is the difference in practical language? It is simply this, that one of these bills, the substitute bill I offer and the one you passed last year, is really and truly a bill for the benefit of the farmers of the country, for the country people through which the roads pass. The present bill is a bill for the automobile associations, to a very large extent.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; but I wish the gentleman would be brief, for I have only five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The substitute offered is the bill that was passed last year?

Mr. McKELLAR. Word for word and letter for letter except that 1916 is substituted for 1914.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman lives in a farming community and has just gone through a very interesting campaign.

Mr. McKELLAR. Quite the contrary; I represent Memphis, Tenn., one of the largest cities in the South.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Let me ask the gentleman, Was this an issue in his campaign?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And did the farmers in his section want this kind of a bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. They did; the farmers want this kind of a bill, if I am any judge. I want to tell you why. Under the present bill it depends upon the local State highway commission whether any particular district gets a dollar of this money. That commission has a right under this bill to select the particular roads they can spend the money on. They can spend the money on one road or in one or three counties in the State. Your district may be left out entirely under the terms of this bill. If you pass this bill, there may be some trouble at home. Now, this substitute provides that all the people shall receive the benefits of this act, and the money is to be distributed in a more equitable way, or distributed in a way that we believe will be a great incentive to road building, not in a special locality but in all parts of each State.

It is a question for you to determine whether you are going back on what you did four years ago or two years ago and adopt a different system. The present bill is for the benefit of certain roads, largely automobile roads, and the substitute is for the benefit of the whole people. I want to say frankly that if the substitute is voted down, I am going to vote for the bill reported out of the committee. Why? I am for road building just as I am for education. I will vote for any kind of a road bill just as I will vote for any kind of an educational bill, because I believe that the best way to aid the people is to build up the educational facilities of our country and to build up the roads of our country. [Applause.]

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, one can do but little in the brief space of five minutes toward affording a full and sufficient answer to the contentions of a speech like that of the gentleman from Tennessee which is related to, and concerned with a bill not before the House, and one moreover with respect to which a large portion of this body is not informed. In the exceedingly limited time at my disposal I will give the best answer that I can to objections, to the pending measure urged by the gentleman from Tennessee. These objections, I maintain are not well taken.

As a Member of this House, I have been a friend of Federal aid to roads for a longer time than my friend from Tennessee and actively concerned during that period in the preparation of the bills that have embodied this principle. I do not think that anyone who is acquainted with my record would accuse me of reporting, or otherwise indorsing a bill that favors the automobile interests as against those of the farmers. The fact about this bill, or rather the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee is that it appears to have entered into a party fight in the State of Tennessee, as a sort of campaign issue. But this fact does not furnish a sufficient ground for replacing the committee bill, with the pending substitute. We have tried to point out the reasons that impelled the committee to report the pending bill in its present form. The bill of last year was a good one, but the bill of this year is better, and one that in the light of our last year's experience we consider more likely of passage. The situation therefore that confronts the committee is whether we will reject the substitute and pass a bill that we have reason to believe will be successful in the other body, or accept the substitute of our friend, in order to meet the local exigencies in Tennessee, and thereby imperil the entire measure, at the other end of the Capitol. The bill of last session contained two sections in the alternative, one relating to the construction of roads by the Federal Government and the States, in cooperation——

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I have but five minutes and can not yield—and the other classifying the roads, with a view to the payment of certain fixed sums by the Federal Government, in the way of maintenance. The classification clause was opposed by the Department of Agriculture, and was the subject of bitter attack upon this floor. Further it was strenuously assailed in the Senate of the United States. Having all of this in mind, and desiring to pass at some early date in the House a bill that would stand a reasonable chance of enactment by this Congress, we eliminated section 4 of the bill of last year, the classification section, and amplified section 3, so as to make it the pending bill. This section provides as efficiently for the farmers as it is possible for any bill to do, that embodies the principle of Federal aid, and at the same time is concerned with being fair to all the interests and all the sections, of all the country. I am opposed to imperiling a good bill, merely to meet a local situation in one State, as developed by the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and the reply of the gentleman from Tennessee. Most emphatically, this is not an automobile bill. Take this measure just as it has been reported, and it will be noted that the selection of the roads to be built, or maintained, is left to the road departments of the several States. Hence the quota of each State will be applied in conformity with the policy of that State. For instance, the quota of the State of Massachusetts from which we have heard so copiously this evening, will be administered by the local authorities of that State.

If Massachusetts favors automobile roads, I am free to say that it will be possible under the operation of this bill for Massachusetts to apply every dollar of her quota toward the construction of automobile roads, unless checked in this direction by the veto of the Agricultural Department. On the other hand if the policy of that State favors the application of her

quota in aid of a general system of roads for the benefit of all the people of that State, farmers included, I undertake to say that this bill will fit in with that policy.

I desire to say one thing further in this connection, and that is that all of the objections urged to this measure by the Representatives from the great cities of the Union have been founded upon an absolute misapprehension of the scope and purpose of the bill. This bill is not a sectional measure. It was not conceived in antagonism to the cities, or designed to hinder their development. Further while it may be applied in one State upon any one type of roads preferred by that State, it was not designed with a view to favoring any special type of road construction. It was designed for the exclusive benefit of neither the cities, the automobile concerns, nor I may say, the farmers. On the other hand it is a bill that by reason of its flexible capacity of adaptation to the local policies of the several States concerned in road improvement will concurrently benefit the cities, the farmers, and if, you please, the automobile concerns, and the automobile owners, since you can not construct even a purely farmer's road without an incidental benefit to the concerns that build, and the citizens who operate that wonder-worker of the day, the modern automobile.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RUCKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7617 and had come to no resolution thereon.

CONTESTED ELECTIONS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CLERK'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1916.

SIR: I have the honor to lay before the House of Representatives a list of contests for seats in the House of Representatives for the Sixty-fourth Congress of the United States, notices of which have been filed in the office of the Clerk of the House, and also transmit herewith all original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto, as follows:

State of Massachusetts, eleventh district.
State of Wisconsin, fourth district.
State of South Carolina, first district.
State of Connecticut, fourth district.
State of Illinois, at large.
State of Pennsylvania, twentieth district (withdrawn by request of contestant).
State of New York, twentieth district.

The Clerk has opened and printed the testimony in all of the above cases. In compliance with the act approved March 2, 1897, entitled "An act relating to contested election cases," such portions of the testimony in the above cases as the parties in interest agreed upon, or as seemed proper to the Clerk, after giving the requisite notices, have been printed and indexed, together with the notices of contest and the answers thereto, and such portions of the testimony as were not printed with the original papers have been sealed up and are ready to be laid before the Committee on Elections.

Two copies of the printed testimony in each case have been mailed the contestant and the same number to the contestee. The law in reference to the briefs of both the contestant and contestee in each case has been compiled with as far as possible upon receipt by the Clerk of said briefs.

So far as the briefs have been furnished to the Clerk, they are ready to be laid before the Committee on Elections upon the order of the House, together with a tabulated statement, which has been prepared by the Clerk, showing the number of pages of testimony and the present status of each contested-election case, and all the papers in connection therewith.

Massachusetts, eleventh district, Francis J. Horgan *v.* George Holden Tinkham.
Wisconsin, fourth district, W. R. Gaylord *v.* William J. Cary.
South Carolina, first district, Aaron P. Prioleau *v.* Richard S. Whaley.
Connecticut, fourth district, Jeremiah Donovan *v.* Ebenezer J. Hill.
Illinois, at large, J. McCan Davis *v.* William Elza Williams.
Pennsylvania, twentieth district, A. R. Brodbeck *v.* C. William Beales, contest withdrawn by request of contestant.
New York, twentieth district, Jacob A. Cantor *v.* Isaac Siegel.

Yours, respectfully,
SOUTH TRIMBLE, *Clerk of the House.*

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 3518. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 4716. An act to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River; and

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

REFERENCE OF CONTESTED-ELECTION CASES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the following reference of contested-election cases.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Committee on Elections No. 1: The contests in the fourth district of Connecticut, the first district of South Carolina, and the State of Illinois at large.

To Committee on Elections No. 2: The contests in the eleventh district of Massachusetts and the twentieth district of Pennsylvania.

To the Committee on Elections No. 3: The contests in the twentieth district of New York and the fourth district of Wisconsin.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DRUKKER, indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. FOCHT, on account of death in his family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the American merchant marine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman to extend his remarks in the RECORD? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a statement of Senator VARDAMAN on the subject of the national defense.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it appears to me it would be out of order for the House to extend a request to insert certain remarks of a United States Senator when, with all due respect to that great body, they use most of the space in the RECORD already for stating their views. Unless there would be some special reason why this should be done, I certainly would be impelled to object.

Mr. MANN. I was going to ask where was this speech made?

Mr. BAILEY. This was a statement given out to the press.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I think I shall have to object to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] objects.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 25, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9897) for the relief of T. L. Love, surviving partner of Robert Love & Son; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 8712) granting an increase of pension to Mary Y. Tarbox; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 9905) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to expend $150,000 to restore to proper condition the frigate *Constitution;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 9906) to establish a council of national defense; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 9907) to establish postal savings banks, to enable the Government to borrow money directly from the people, and to market its bonds directly to the people in small and varying denominations through the medium of the post office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 9908) to authorize the sale of lands allotted to Indians under the Moses agreement of July 7, 1883; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 9909) to authorize the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Missouri River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 9910) to establish a preparatory military academy at or near Fort Douglas, Utah; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9911) to amend sections 2, 13, and 14 of an act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen," etc., approved March 4, 1915; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 9912) validating certain applications for and entries of public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 9913) for the reduction of postage on first-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 9914) making appropriations for a radio station on Unga Island, Alaska; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 9915) to provide for an examination and survey of the harbor at Cape Vincent, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9916) to regulate the rural mail service in the State of Indiana and fixing compensation of rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 9917) to amend the act of August 30, 1890; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 9918) to donate to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., for park purposes, the tract of land known as the powder-house lot; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 9919) for the maintenance of actions for death on the high seas and other navigable waters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 9920) granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Minidoka and Cassia, State of Idaho, to construct a bridge across Snake River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 9921) to grant the right of appeal to employees in the Federal classified civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 9922) to amend section 90 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, so as to place the county of Walthall in the Jackson division of the southern district of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARK: A bill (H. R. 9923) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Mitchell or the county of Baker, both of the State of Georgia, acting jointly or separately, and their successors and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Flint River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 9924) for the regulation of salaries in the custodian service of the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 9925) for the erection of a public building at Modesto, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9926) to exclude Hindu laborers from the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VENABLE: A bill (H. R. 9927) providing for an examination and survey of Pearl River, Miss., between Jackson and Edinburg, Miss.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 9928) to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to common carriers of interstate and foreign commerce and within the District of Columbia, and combinations in restraint of trade; to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. THOMPSON (by request): A bill (H. R. 9929) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to adjudicate and determine the amounts equitably due by the Mississippi Choctaws for services and expenses incurred in their behalf in the matter of identification and removal to the Choctaw Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STOUT: A bill (H. R. 9930) to amend the act of February 11, 1915 (38 Stat. L., p. 807), providing for the opening of the Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma: Resolution (H. Res. 102) to print 2,000 additional copies of the soil survey of Bryan County, Okla., for use in the House document room; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. GARDNER: Resolution (H. Res. 103) requesting the Secretary of the Navy to send to the House of Representatives certain information with regard to Rear Admiral Fletcher's order of February 13, 1915, and also with regard to day individual (battle) target practice of fleet for 1914 and 1915; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) proposing an amendment to part 16 of section 8 of Article I and section 2 of Article II of the Constitution of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 116) providing for a change of policy in the manner of handling the reservoir waters at the headwaters of the Mississippi River and its tributaries in Minnesota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 9931) granting an increase of pension to Ann Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 9932) for the relief of George W. Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9933) granting a pension to William Welsh; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9934) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Earl W. Shaffer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 9935) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 9936) granting an increase of pension to Alice Knight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9937) granting an increase of pension to Ralph E. Truman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 9938) granting a pension to Bridget Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURGESS: A bill (H. R. 9939) granting a pension to Bessie Yarbrough; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 9940) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Radcliff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9941) granting an increase of pension to Mark V. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9942) granting an increase of pension to David McCrory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9943) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES: A bill (H. R. 9944) granting an increase of pension to Seymour H. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: A bill (H. R. 9945) to amend the military record of John Gallegher, alias John Cunningham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 9946) waiving the age limit for admission to the Medical Corps of the United States Navy in the case of John B. Bostick; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9947) granting a pension to Jay A. Griffith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9948) for the relief of the Kern County Mutual Building & Loan Association, of Bakersfield, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 9949) for the relief of the M. A. Sweeney Shipyards & Foundry Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 9950) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Hallenbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 9951) for the relief of William Redder; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 9952) granting an increase of pension to A. L. Burket; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9953) granting an increase of pension to Jane C. Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 9954) granting a pension to Fannie Boswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN. A bill (H. R. 9955) granting an increase of pension to William J. Gleason; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 9956) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. De Coursey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9957) granting an increase of pension to William A. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9958) granting a pension to David W. R. Manson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 9959) to cancel the allotment of Davie Skootah on the Lummi Reservation, Wash., and reallot the lands included therein; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 9960) for the relief of the Portland Co., of Portland, Me.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9961) granting an increase of pension to Jennie J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 9962) for the relief of Truman R. Peters and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 9963) granting a pension to David A. Kooker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9964) granting a pension to Abraham H. Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 9965) granting an increase of pension to Irene L. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 9966) granting a pension to William A. Shively; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9967) granting a pension to Edmond L. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 9968) for the relief of the legal representatives of W. H. Mills, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 9969) for the relief of Jonas Archiquette; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9970) granting an increase of pension to Amanda S. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9971) for the relief of Harold Holst; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 9972) granting a pension to George Iran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 9973) granting an increase of pension to Frank H. Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9974) for the relief of Joseph Stoich; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCRACKEN: A bill (H. R. 9975) granting a pension to Cecil G. Thorn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9976) granting a pension to Charles A. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 9977) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9978) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin T. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9979) granting an increase of pension to Newton Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9980) granting an increase of pension to John Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9981) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Edmonds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9982) granting a pension to Barbara Mott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9983) granting a pension to James A. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 9984) granting an increase of pension to James V. Chenoweth; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9985) granting an increase of pension to James Jordan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9986) granting a pension to Homer Meloy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9987) granting a pension to Elsie E. Gathright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9988) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Hawkes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9989) to correct the military record of William Alexander and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 9990) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9991) granting an increase of pension to Richard Starr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9992) granting a pension to Ida M. Sterling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 9993) granting an increase of pension to Nora McEnhill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 9994) for the relief of Samuel H. Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9995) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to execute and deliver a deed in favor of and to Ida Seymour Tulloch, Roberta Worms, and Ethel White Kimpell for sublot 38 of original lot 17 in reservation D, upon the official plan of the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 9996) granting a pension to Mary C. Herrington; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9997) for the relief of Charles P. Morse; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 9998) granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Cummins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9999) granting an increase of pension to John M. Langsdale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10000) granting an increase of pension to John Toner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 10001) granting a pension to J. Frank Cornman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10002) granting a pension to William E. Noakes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 10003) for the relief of the estate of the late Jesse R. Stubbs; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10004) for the relief of the estate of the late Thomas C. Fuller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 10005) granting an increase of pension to Robert Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10006) granting an increase of pension to Walter J. Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 10007) for the relief of William H. Woods; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 10008) granting an increase of pension to S. Maria Little; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 10009) granting an increase of pension to Milton A. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10010) granting a pension to A. J. Wacaster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10011) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Mathews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Honolulu Chamber of Commerce, urging consideration of the Nawiliwili Breakwater project; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also (by request), memorial of the Greek-American League, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 8255, for relief of Benjamin Ammons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of citizens of Burton, Kans., protesting against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Memorial of Commercial Club of Nashville, Tenn., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petitions of depositors in the banks of Kansas, protesting against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of Gloversville, N. Y., silk mills, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petition of business men of Appleton City, Windsor, Leeton, Archie, Knobnoster, Pleasant Hill, Montserrat, Centerview, Holden, Chilhowee, Blairstown, Warrensburg, Strasburg, Kingsville, Urich, Calhoun, Montrose, Rockville, Creighton, Garden City, East Lynne, Harrisonville, Belton, Raymore, and Peculiar, cities and towns in the sixth congressional district of Missouri, in favor of that is known

as the Hinebaugh bill, proposing the enactment of legislation which will compel concerns selling goods directly to the consumers entirely by mail to contribute their portion of funds in the development of the local community, county, and State into which said goods are shipped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of House bill 7074, for the relief of Emma S. Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 8545, for the relief of Rebecca Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 6579, for the relief of Amy Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of Gardner, Ill., favoring a tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Grand Lodge of the German Order of Harngair, of Illinois, favoring an embargo on shipment of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of Boston Post Office Clerks' Association, Branch No. 5, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, favoring House bills 7654 and 7655, to retire postal employees and to prohibit the discharge of the employees of the Postal Service for certain disabilities; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Stork Bros., hosiery manufacturers, of Adamstown, Pa., favoring protection for manufacturers of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEATON: Memorial of library committees in session at Chicago, Ill., asking that libraries be exempted from the provisions of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of Griffin Button Co., of Shelton, Conn.; New England Cotton Yarn Co., of New Bedford, Mass.; Phoenix Underwear Co., of Little Falls, N. Y.; Knoxville (Tenn.) Spinning Co.; Elk Cotton Mills, of Dalton, Ga.; H. R. Epler & Sons, of Reading, Pa.; Anniston (Ala.) Yarn Mills; and E. C. Beeten & Sons, of Carlisle, Pa., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Papers to accompany House bill 8423, for the relief of Robert F. Risley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Stockton (Colo.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9848, granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9474, granting an increase of pension to Rebecca J. Calhoun; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Papers in support of claim for special pension for Jennie J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Irene L. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Gorham Manufacturing Co., of Providence, R. I., favoring appropriation for Government work in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LOUD: Petitions of sundry citizens of Bay City, Mich., favoring Federal censorship of moving pictures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of M. G. Esch, John H. Gerth, Joseph Hecking, and others, of Philadelphia, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORIN: Petitions of James Devlin and Henry J. Heitman, of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Gilbert S. Graves and 44 citizens of Oswego, N. Y., favoring national censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of F. N. Darling and 31 citizens of Cazenovia, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OAKEY: Petition of J. Broadbent & Son, of Connecticut, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Petitions of the Lees Button Co., of Leominster; Shivreffs Worsted Co. and Star Worsted Co., of Fitchburg; and Ætna Mills, of Watertown, Mass., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLATT: Petitions of sundry citizens of Middleton, N. Y., protesting against tax on tooth paste; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Baldwin Post, No. 6, Grand Army of the Republic, of Elmira, N. Y., advocating preparedness, the protection of our citizens, and the honor of our flag; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petitions of Kalamazoo Amusement Co. and Koch & Buchter Orpheum Theater Co., of Kalamazoo; and Wonderland Theater, of Vicksburg, Mich., protesting against Federal censorship of moving pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of A. J. Brosseau, of Albion, Mich., favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of C. Moore Co., of Westerly, R. I., favoring the passage of the bill to encourage and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of F. E. Spencer, of Guilford, Conn., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. A. Watts, of New Haven, Conn., favoring passage of House bill 8435—1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petitions of theaters of the United States, relative to equitable distribution of any tax the present Congress may levy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *January 25, 1916.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we know that every path of human activity leads to Thy throne. We have never been able to get away from the consciousness of human responsibility. Thou hast taught us to look forward to the judgment of our own lives without fear. Thou hast taught us that our lives will be in review before Thee. The ideals that we seek to work into the plan of human life and government are derived from Thee, and that which we write into law must stand the test of the divine law. Grant us Thy grace to see the larger meaning of life and law in the light of Thy life and of Thy law. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

LIST OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 255).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules of claims amounting to $47,525.33 allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under provisions the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, etc., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

LIST OF JUDGMENTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of judgments rendered against the Government by the district courts of the United States under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887, submitted by the Attorney General, and which require an appropriation for their payment, etc., amounting to $5,006.89 (S. Doc. No. 253), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims amounting to $27,695.12, which have been presented to the department and require an appropriation for their payment (S. Doc. No. 252), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a communication from the General Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, transmitting a tabulation of a referendum vote on the question of making a marked increase in the development of the foreign commercial service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in the Department of Commerce and the Consular Service in the Department of State, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MYERS. I present a petition from the city and county officials of Montana, in convention assembled, praying for an appropriation of $1,000,000 for the Flathead Reclamation project in that State. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD, together with the signatures of the chairman and the secretary, and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the President and Congress of the United States:

The city officials, county assessors, county commissioners, county clerks and recorders, county treasurers, county surveyors, and county auditors of all the cities and counties of this State, in joint convention assembled at Butte, Mont., most urgently request the President and the Congress of the United States for an appropriation of $1,000,000 for construction work on the Flathead irrigation project, to be passed by this session of Congress for work during the current year.

The estimated cost for this project is $6,500,000, and Government reports show that the project is less than 25 per cent completed, and at the present rate of receiving appropriations it will require 25 years to complete the project.

The settlers entered upon these lands at the urgent request of the Government, under promise that their lands would be irrigated and opportunity afforded them to provide a living for their families and make payments on their land.

The dilatory methods of the Government in handling this project has been manifestly unfair, and they feel that the Government should come to their assistance and make appropriations that will assure completion of the project in an economical and businesslike manner, thereby insuring water at an early date and greatly reducing the cost per acre of this project. The lax methods of the Government are resulting in the absolute confiscation of the settlers' rights and property.

In view of the foregoing facts, we do most urgently request that a large appropriation looking toward the speedy and economical completion of this project be passed by this session of Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

DAVE KEHOE, *Chairman.*
ROBT. LEAVENS, *Secretary.*

Dated at Butte, Mont., January 18, 1916.

Mr. DU PONT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Newark, Del., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Pomona Grange, No. 1, Patrons of Husbandry, of Stanton, Del., praying for an investigation of the so-called foot-and-mouth disease and for the reimbursement of cattle exhibitors at the National Dairy Show, Chicago, Ill., for losses sustained, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Emerson Paper Co., of Wendell, N. H., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARDING presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the ratification of the Nicaraguan Canal option treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying that appropriations be made for the improvement of the Ohio and Scioto Rivers, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Congregational Church of North Olmsted, Ohio, praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Dayton, Ohio, praying for a readjustment of the compensation paid railroads for transporting the mails, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of Massillon, Ohio, and a petition of sundry citizens of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the printing of the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations as a public document, which were referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Coshocton, Ohio, remonstrating against an increase of the tax on intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Ohio, remonstrating against the proposed reorganization of the Rural Free Delivery Service, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Marion National Mill Co., of Marion, Ohio, remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called mixed-flour law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Congregational Church of North Olmsted, Ohio, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of the Society of Friends of Flushing, Ohio, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Congregational Church of North Olmsted, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation making it a misdemeanor to put fraudulent statements as to contents of bottles and packages of medicine, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. GRONNA. I have some letters from farmers in my State, one from Fred Kraft, of Enderlin, N. Dak., which calls attention to the monopoly now existing in twine.

I also have a letter from Victor A. Rendon, general attorney for the Commission Reguladora del Mercado de Hennequin, which relates to this same question.

I ask that these letters be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I ask this reference because a resolution was referred to that committee for report with reference to an investigation whether there is a combination controlling the price of sisal and binder twine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That action will be taken.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of sundry United Spanish War Veterans of Austin, Minn., praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the State Normal School, of Mankato, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Medical Society of Blue Earth, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to remove the high cost of drugs and chemicals necessary in the treatment of the sick and injured, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oswego and Albany, in the State of New York, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. LIPPITT presented petitions of the Rhode Island Textile Co., of Robert D. Mason Co., and of the Rhode Island Card Board Co., all of Pawtucket; of the W. & K. Co., the Waterhouse Worsted Co., the Franklin Process Co., and the Colwell Worsted Mills, all of Providence, in the State of Rhode Island, praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRYAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Orlando, Miami, Cocoanut Grove, Zellwood, and Lake Helen, all in the State of Florida, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fort Meade, Fla., praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fort Meade, Fla., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HUGHES presented petitions of sundry citizens of New Jersey, praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Paul Revere Club, of Camden, N. J., praying for the placing of an embargo on the exportation of munitions of war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 66) thereon.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 539) for the relief of Thomas F. Veno, submitted an adverse report (No. 67) thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan 1,000 tents and 1,000 cots for the use of the encampment of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Birmingham, Ala., in May, 1916, reported it without amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was recommitted the bill (H. R. 562) to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, authorizing a Postal Savings System, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 65) thereon.

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 2408) to prevent usury, provide penalties for its violation, and for other purposes, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which was agreed to.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 6 to pay Letitia D. Maxham, widow of Azro J. Maxham, a sum equal to six months' salary, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 46, authorizing the Committee on Woman Suffrage to employ a stenographer to report hearings, etc., reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 49, authorizing the Committee on Appropriations or any subcommittee thereof to employ a stenographer to report hearings, etc., reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 63, authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs during the Sixty-fourth Congress to employ a stenographer to report hearings, etc., reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 69, authorizing the Committee on Indian Affairs to employ a stenographer to report hearings, etc., reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 73 authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to employ a stenographer to report hearings, etc., reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 74 authorizing the Committee on Public Lands to employ a stenographer to report hearings, etc., reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 75 authorizing the Secretary of the Senate to pay to Mary Meyer, niece of Jacob C. Donaldson, late a skilled laborer in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, etc., reported it without amendment.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 70 submitted by Mr. OVERMAN on the 17th instant authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to employ a stenographer to report hearings, etc., reported it with an amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably Senate resolution No. 78 authorizing the Committee on Interoceanic Canals to employ a stenographer temporarily, and I call the attention of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] to the report.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interoceanic Canals be authorized to employ a stenographer temporarily and that the said stenographer be paid at the rate of $50 per month for each day of such employment, not exceeding four months, and that such services be paid for out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

INDIAN ALLOTMENTS.

Mr. JONES. On yesterday I introduced a bill, being Senate bill 3774, to authorize the sale of lands allotted to Indians under the Moses agreement of July 7, 1883, and it was referred to the Committee on Public Lands. I ask that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 3911) granting a pension to Sarah R. Naylor;

A bill (S. 3912) granting an increase of pension to Henry Pletcher;

A bill (S. 3913) granting a pension to Joseph F. Bartini;

A bill (S. 3914) granting an increase of pension to Mathias Eyer;

A bill (S. 3915) granting a pension to W. H. Deistine, sr.;

A bill (S. 3916) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Dripps;

A bill (S. 3917) granting an increase of pension to Charles Brown;

A bill (S. 3918) granting an increase of pension to Robert F. Law;

A bill (S. 3919) granting an increase of pension to John Williams; and

A bill (S. 3920) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah B. White; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 3921) for the relief of W. S. Hosack; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 3922) authorizing and directing the managers of the soldiers' homes to designate and set aside one of the homes for the exclusive use of the widows of soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 3923) for the relief of the heirs of John W. Massey; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3924) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Roach; and

A bill (S. 3925) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Carpenter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 3926) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David H. Hartson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3927) for the relief of the legal representatives of Francis Busch, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3928) to accept the cession by the State of Washington of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mount Rainier National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 3929) validating certain applications for and entries of public lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3930) for the relief of Mary L. Butland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 3931) for the relief of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of Arkansas; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3932) to authorize the employment of persons in the District of Columbia and in the field and other necessary expenses in the administration of the national parks and the Hot Springs Reservation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 3933) to reimburse the Navajo Lumber & Timber Co., of Arizona, for a deposit made to cover the purchase of timber; and

A bill (S. 3934) to reimburse the Navajo Timber Co., of Delaware, for a deposit made to cover the purchase of timber; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 3935) granting a pension to Ella C. Moody (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3936) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ballinger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona:

A bill (S. 3937) providing for the setting aside of certain lands within the Coronado National Forest for the use and benefit of the University of Arizona; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 3938) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Johnson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LIPPITT:

A bill (S. 3939) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca R. Potter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 3940) granting an increase of pension to Jennie M. Chapman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 3941) granting a pension to Flora Sroufe (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 3942) to correct the military record of Stephen A. West; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAGE:

A bill (S. 3943) granting an increase of pension to Rosa L. Tobin (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3944) granting an increase of pension to Sophia E. Bissonett (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 3945) to protect the public against dishonest advertising and false pretenses in merchandising; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 3946) to establish a Reserve Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 3947) to amend section 20 of an act to regulate commerce, to prevent overissues of securities by carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 3948) for the improvement of the Narrows of Lake Champlain, N. Y. and Vt.; to the Committee on Commerce.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. CUMMINS. I submit a proposed amendment to the so-called Philippine bill (S. 381), which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed and to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Add a new section, properly numbered, as follows:

"SEC. —. The President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, three commissioners to cooperate with the Philippine Legislature in preparing and submitting a constitution or plan of government for the people of the Philippine Islands as an independent nation. The constitution or plan shall be one best adapted to protect and preserve the rights and liberties of the people of the islands and most likely to be efficient in maintaining law and order and in promoting progress and prosperity.

"Among other things, it shall provide for the complete possession and sovereignty on the part of the United States, in perpetuity, of such coaling stations and naval bases as may be prescribed by the President of the United States. The said constitution or plan of government shall be prepared by the Philippine Legislature and submitted to the said commissioners, and if approved by the said commissioners, or a majority of them, and adopted by the said legislature, it shall then be submitted to the qualified electors of the Philippine Islands for approval or rejection at an election to be appointed by the Philippine Legislature after not less than four months' notice.

"If a majority of the electors voting at said election shall approve the said constitution or plan of government and thereby indicate their desire for complete separation from the United States, as well as their approval of the particular constitution or plan, the said Philippine Legislature shall proceed to the establishment of the government so authorized, and when it is ready to assume the full government of the islands the President of the United States shall withdraw the military force of this country and all the representatives of this Government and thereafter shall treat the government so established in the Philippine Islands as a separate and independent government, and the relation of the United States toward such government shall thereafter be the relation which is sustained toward all other foreign powers."

AMENDMENTS TO URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. ROBINSON submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for commencement of a post-office building at Fordyce, Ark., from $500 to $10,000, intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 9416), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the commencement of a post-office building at Mena, Ark., from $500 to $10,000, intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 9416), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF SUPERINTENDENT OF COAST AND GOEDETIC SURVEY.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 79), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing.

Resolved, That there be printed 1,000 additional copies of the Report of the Superintendent of Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year 1915 for the use of the Senate document room.

THE ATLANTIC FLEET IN 1915 (S. DOC. NO. 251).

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask that Executive Document B of the Senate, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, entitled "The Atlantic Fleet in 1915," be printed as a public document. The injunction of secrecy was removed two or three days ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPEECH BY HON. WILLIAM J. BRYAN ON PROHIBITION (S. DOC. NO. 254).

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I present a speech by William J. Bryan on prohibition, which I regard as one of the best discussions of the subject I have ever seen. I ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator from Texas ask to have it printed as a public document or in the RECORD?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not believe we ought to put so many speeches in the RECORD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing with a view to its publication as a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator desires to ask that it shall be printed as a public document, I have no objection to making that order now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that it be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be printed as a public document, then.

FLOOD AT YUMA, ARIZ.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I introduce a joint resolution, which I should like to have the Secretary read, as I purpose to ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 86) for repair and rebuilding of the levee at Yuma, Ariz., was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas a flood in the Gila River has destroyed the levee erected by the Government at the town of Yuma, Ariz.; and

Whereas the waters from said river are overflowing the said town and destroying the property of its citizens; and

Whereas the waters of said flood are now 5 feet or more in depth over the business center of said town; and

Whereas the said flood waters, if not quickly restrained, will ruin the people and now threatens to ruin the Government irrigation project at said city: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the sum of $50,000 is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the repair and rebuilding of said levee; that said sum shall be immediately available and the work shall be done and money expended by the director of the irrigation project stationed at said town or by any engineer detailed at once by the Secretary of War for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The joint resolution has not been to a committee?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. No; it has never been referred. I will state to the Senator that I received only yesterday evening a telegram from the mayor of Yuma. I wish the Secretary would read the telegram for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

[Telegram.]

YUMA, ARIZ., *January 24, 1916.*

Senator MARK SMITH,
Washington, D. C.:

Government levee built 25 years ago for protection of Yuma broken by floods. Business section of town under 5 feet of water. More than half of the buildings collapsed and great distress and loss to every inhabitant here. Please procure immediately $50,000 for reconstruction of good levee. Kindly answer by wire what you can and will do for

immediate action. This levee is not under the jurisdiction of the Reclamation Service.

W. A. MOSER, *Mayor.*
J. A. DONOVAN,
Chairman Board of Supervisors.
E. S. KIRKPATRICK,
President Commercial Club.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate, before the matter is submitted for its decision, that 20 years ago or more a levee was built for the protection of Yuma against the rising waters of the Gila River, on the banks of which stream the city is located. There is a vast irrigation project there known as the Yuma project.

An unprecedented fall of snow, followed by warm rains from the mighty watershed of the Gila, the Salt, the Colorado, and their tributaries, has brought down an enormous flood, which has broken this dike, and the city to-day is under 5 feet of water.

I know, under the rule, the joint resolution ought to go to a committee. I am informed, as my colleague is informed, by various telegrams of these facts; and inasmuch as the Government is taking three-fourths of the valuable lands of the State for its own purposes, and now proposes to rent the balance for its own use, I think it is nothing but proper to these people that we should forego the question of a mere reference of the joint resolution to a committee. The impossibility of quick action under the circumstances arises in the outset from the difficulty of getting the committee together, and while we are going through with this program the people there will be drowned out. That can be prevented by providing for a sufficient number of men to do the work. The people are ruined by the flood and have not the money to do it for themselves. I hope there will be no objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I am not going to object to the present consideration of the joint resolution, but I want to know from the Senator if any of this money is to be used for the amelioration of the condition of the people whose property has been destroyed? Are those people suffering for the necessities of life now?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have no doubt about their suffering.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to ask the Senator further, can this work be done immediately—before the flood goes down—and if not, are such floods very frequent there?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The floods are not frequent. The levee has prevented flooding of the city on ordinary risings of the river; but this is an extraordinary occasion. The whole of the northern part of the State of Arizona is under water at this time, the flood being occasioned by the melting of snows, of which I have spoken. If we can get this assistance, we can now stop the flood from overflowing further the levee. We can get the men if we can get money enough there to stop it, and thus save the people from absolute destruction and from want for the necessities of life, which must follow the destruction of their homes.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona will understand that I am not opposing the consideration or the passage of the joint resolution; but I thought, as it proposed to provide for the construction of a levee, that it would hardly be necessary to take such expeditious action. If, however, the Senator assures me that it is for the protection of those people, I shall have no objection to the prompt consideration of the measure.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The joint resolution itself explains that it is for the protection of the people. When all property of the victims of this unfortunate condition shall have been swept away—as it will if this relief is delayed—then they must become, many of them, the objects of our solicitude and perhaps of charity.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona if he will further assure us that there is no "pork" in this proposition? [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If there were, I should not object to the passage of the resolution when I consider how Arizona has been treated by the Federal Government, and the condition of those for whom I plead. The Senator who asks assurance that there is no "pork" in the proposition does so in good nature, and probably to call attention to the injustice done certain bills in which he and his constituents are interested almost as deeply as I feel on the pending resolution. I accept his pleasantry in the spirit which animates his inquiry. But this is no matter to call forth even pleasant inquiry, for I see, and hope every Senator here will see, the tragedy hanging over my friends and constituents in this hour of their distress.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am especially interested in this very matter, but I do not believe that it is right to have a joint resolution offered in the Senate and considered immediately, without being referred to a committee, when, under the rules, it should be so referred. The committee can act within four or five hours if the emergency is such as to justify it.

Mr. President, rather than to have the rules violated, notwithstanding I am interested in the passage of the resolution, I shall object to its immediate consideration, or until it has been considered by a committee of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I should like to ask the Senator, if the Senate will bear with me a moment, how are we going to get the committee together to-day? Those people in Arizona are being drowned out of their homes.

Mr. SMOOT. I think, Mr. President, that the Senator can get the committee together.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I do not think so, for I have tried it often enough, and have found it impossible to get any committee together under such circumstances.

Mr. SMOOT. I believe the Senator can get the committee together if the emergency is such as he has here described it.

Mr. President, I do not believe that we ought to begin this proposed system of legislating. We have committees for the consideration of legislation; under the rules this joint resolution should go to a committee, and for that reason I ask that it be referred.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If it were a question of saving a man from hanging, then I suppose the question should go to a committee while the execution was going on.

Mr. GALLINGER. Regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I hope the Senator will withdraw his objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, while this discussion is out of order, if I may have unanimous consent for a few minutes, I should like to submit some brief observations in connection with the request preferred by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH].

If this matter is to be acted on at all without conformity to established procedure, it must be done quickly and by an entire suspension of the rules and regulations which govern the expenditure of public money for the purposes indicated in the joint resolution. A system has grown up that, I think, is entirely too restrictive of the rights of Congress, but it is recognized as a system, and its rules and limitations are applied in all cases that come up where a state of facts similar to those recited in the preamble of the joint resolution exists.

The conditions at Yuma can be duplicated 50 times over in different sections of the country. I recall a situation down on the Red River, in Arkansas, in Texas, and in Louisiana, where similar conditions have occurred not only once but half a dozen times in the last two years; but fettered, as we have been, by the regulations imposed by Congress itself we have been unable to get any relief, or the hope of it. If this particular case in Arizona appeals more strongly than cases elsewhere, I am perfectly willing to make an exception by keeping my mouth shut here; but if the joint resolution goes to the Committee on Commerce it will take the usual course, which is to send it to the War Department for a report from the Engineers, and much will depend upon the character of the report that is made.

It is not a fact that Congress has up to this time committed itself to building levees for the mere purpose of protecting cities against inundation or the ravages of overflow.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If the Senator will permit me, I can make that clearer to him by referring him to what Congress has already done.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I will be through in a few seconds.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. This levee was built by Congress itself not for the purpose simply of protecting the city, but for the purpose of protecting the Government's own land.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Irrigation projects are built out of a special fund consisting of the proceeds——

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Oh, this has nothing to do with irrigation.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I thought the Senator stated that it would likely affect irrigation works.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It is likely that the waters will flow across into irrigation works.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I probably relied more upon the recitals of the preamble than I did upon the statement of the Senator. I certainly do not want to put the Senator in the attitude of making statements that I question, because I do not.

If the matter is of that supreme urgency that appeals strongly to the sense of liberality on the part of Congress, then it ought to be whipped through without any word about it; but if it is to take the regular course, I notify the Senate now that that

course has been subjected to many limitations that at times have proved inconvenient. I think they are too restrictive, and I think sooner or later the whole subject will have to be presented to Congress for relaxation of the restrictions that are now imposed upon the Committee on Commerce and upon the Congress of the United States. In attempting to escape the complaints represented by the universal outcry against the "pork" proposition in connection with the river and harbor bill we have created another institution that is no better than the pork system; and as between the two systems I think the pork system a better one than the one we have got now, because it is subjected to all sorts of favoritism and we have been confronted habitually with reports in favor of some propositions and unfavorable reports in connection with better ones; but as long as it is a system recognized by Congress and finding its authority in a solemn statute passed by Congress and approved by the President, I think we must pay some attention to it.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is entirely right. The showing made in the telegram which has been read is not different from showings that can be made elsewhere, and does not approach in any possible degree the ravages from the sudden overflows that recently took place on the Ohio River and sections of the country there.

I could detain the Senate longer if I felt disposed to bring to its notice all the instances where damage has been inflicted upon the people and upon their property by sudden visitations in the form of overflows. If the Senator from Utah persists in his objection—and it is a very proper one, though, probably, I would not make it; but, being made, I have no hesitancy in saying it is a very proper one; and when it is made the proposition will have to undergo the routine established by Congress in such cases.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, that statement of the Senator from Arkansas shows the Senator from Utah just what I apprehended when I asked for unanimous consent for the consideration of the joint resolution. If the joint resolution goes to the committee—and there is involved three or four days waiting for a report from the War Department and reports from the committees of Congress—it will be too late to do anything about it, so far as the people in the neighborhood of Yuma, Ariz., are concerned, for that river is still rising, according to the last reports I have had.

This case does not in any way stand on all fours with any other problem in the United States. Arizona is a State that had been held as a Territory for many years, and almost every resource of that State has been taken by the Federal Government, and the action sought to be taken will be along the line of protecting Federal property almost to as great an extent as it will be toward protecting individuals and the town of Yuma.

As I have said, the Federal Government has taken our lands and Arizona has only very limited resources. We can tax only our towns, our herds, and our mines; the Government has the balance of the valuable land, and is now going to take the rest of it; is going to impound our own waters and use them as it pleases, according to the terms of a bill now before this Congress. In that aspect of the case, with an emergency facing us, with distress and ruin confronting the people of the city, the Government itself, having built the original levee to protect its own property, as well as that of the city, and that levee having broken, with the consequence that there is an unprecedented flood there, I am going to say, with this condition facing me, that unless we can get relief this morning, probably it will come a long while too late.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, while I am in full sympathy with all the Senator from Arizona has stated, it does not change the condition one particle so far as the Senate of the United States is concerned.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the Senator will wait a moment; I will not take more than a minute.

Another consideration, Mr. President, is that if this joint resolution goes to the House of Representatives the same information will be asked for by the House before it will pass upon it. Therefore, it will not hasten the passage of the resolution one hour to have it considered now without reference to the committee, and consequently I think that it just as well for the information to be secured by the Senate committee as to have it secured by the House committee, because it will have to be secured at last before the resolution can pass the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will go to the Committee on Commerce, then.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Do I understand that the Senator from Utah has objected?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. I feel compelled to do so.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I deplore, but can not prevent, the Senator's action. I will try to get early action by the committee.

THE FRIGATE "CONSTITUTION."

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution offered by me yesterday, which went over, be now laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution, which the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 76) submitted by Mr. GALLINGER on the 24th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to communicate to the Senate all facts bearing on the present condition of the frigate *Constitution*, now lying in the Charles River, Boston, and also an estimate of the amount of money that will be required to put the frigate in a condition of good repair, with a view of retaining the vessel as a historic relic of the early days of the American Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, pursuant to the notice given yesterday, I ask that Order of Business No. 33, being Senate joint resolution 60, which was under consideration yesterday, be now taken up.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Comerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the first amendment offered by the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, this joint resolution provides for the investigation by a joint committee, made up of members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House and of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate, to determine what further legislation, if any, should be passed by Congress relating to interstate and foreign commerce. The joint resolution also defines the power of that committee.

Mr. President, if I were satisfied that this joint resolution, if passed, would not be used as a buffer to prevent any legislation along the lines of the proposed investigation, I would have no objection to it, and I would not put anything in the way of the proposed joint committee in getting any information that it might be able to secure by means of such investigation; but, in my judgment, if we pass this joint resolution, we will be continually met with an objection to the passage of any further legislation regarding interstate railroads and the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the statement will be made that such legislation should not be taken up until this investigation has been completed.

It is the opinion, I understand, of those who are behind the joint resolution—and I am satisfied that they are right in that respect—that this investigation will take a great deal of time; that it will run beyond this session of Congress at least. I judge from the remarks of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] that it is deemed wise by those who father the joint resolution that legislation affecting railroads engaged in interstate commerce should not be undertaken now because a presidential campaign is coming on, and we can not legislate in as sober-minded a condition as though such a campaign were not coming on.

Mr. President, that objection can be urged against practically all legislation of a general character that can prossibly be proposed. That objection, if good, can be urged against the Philippine bill that we now have as the unfinished business before the Senate. That objection can be urged against the rural-credit legislation that we are expected to take up soon. That objection can be raised against the bill now on the calendar, reported from the Committee on Commerce, regarding the building of dams for the purpose of developing electric power on navigable streams; and the same objection can be urged against the bill that was reported this morning from the Committee on Public Lands providing for the building of dams upon streams upon public lands.

So that it seems to me, if the objection of the Senator from Nevada is good, that, on account of a political contest that is coming on next summer and next fall, we should not pass this legislation, then we might just as well adjourn now and go home. The objection will apply to a great many of the appropriations that will be contained in the various appropriation bills that will be before the Senate.

I would be glad indeed, Mr. President, if we could consider this legislation, as well as all other legislation, free and absolutely divorced from any question of politics. According to my idea, we ought to consider all legislation free from partisan influence; but if partisan influence is going to interfere with this legislation, I see no reason why it will not to the same extent interfere with all legislation, at least all legislation of a general character. If I had my way, there would be no partisanship in this Chamber in the consideration of any legislation of any character.

Soon after the present administration went into office a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives the effect of which was to give the Interstate Commerce Commission power to regulate the issuing of stocks and bonds by interstate railroads. This bill was introduced partly, I presume, if not entirely, on account of a pledge made in the Democratic platform that the Democratic Party would enact such legislation if given the power. With that part of the Democratic platform I was then and am now in entire accord.

This bill passed the House of Representatives after a great deal of consideration there. It came to the Senate and was referred to the Interstate Commerce Committee. They had extended hearings on the bill and reported it to the Senate. It was on the calendar of the Senate during the first session of Congress after the incoming of the present administration. It remained there until that session adjourned. It remained there during the entire short session, and no effort whatever was made to pass the bill.

I have always regretted, and have so expressed myself to a great many of my Democratic friends in this body, that some action was not taken upon this bill; but it seems that all at once a change came over the majority, and they decided that the bill should not become a law. There is no doubt but what the strong hand which stopped the progress of this legislation was extended across its path from the White House. While the Senator from Nevada regrets that if legislation of this kind should be taken up now politics might enter into it, I fear that if not the object, at least the real thing that is intended to be accomplished by this resolution is partisan. I fear that it is going to be used by the Democratic Party in the coming campaign as an excuse for not legislating not only upon that subject but upon others. It seems to me, therefore, that there is more politics in passing it than there is in defeating it.

The Democratic platform adopted at the Baltimore convention contained this provision:

> We favor such legislation as will effectually prohibit the railroads, express, telegraph, and telephone companies from engaging in business which brings them into competition with their shippers or patrons; also legislation preventing the overissue of stocks and bonds by interstate railroads.

I presume the President of the United States was trying to avoid the consequences of that particular provision of the platform when, on December 7, 1915, in his official message to Congress he used this language:

> In the meantime may I make this suggestion? The transportation problem is an exceedingly serious and pressing one in this country. There has from time to time of late been reason to fear that our railroads would not much longer be able to cope with it successfully as at present equipped and coordinated. I suggest that it would be wise to provide for a commission of inquiry to ascertain by a thorough canvass of the whole question whether our laws as at present framed and administered are as serviceable as they might be in the solution of the problem.

Further on he says:

> It seems to me that it might be the part of wisdom, therefore, before further legislation in this field is attempted, to look at the whole problem of coordination and efficiency in the full light of a fresh assessment of circumstance and opinion as a guide to dealing with the several parts of it.

I presume, Mr. President, that this resolution has been introduced by the Senator from Nevada with a view to carrying out that recommendation of the President. In other words, the President advised that before any further legislation be had an investigation should be had; and now we are brought face to face with the proposition that in carrying out that suggestion we shall enter upon an investigation that will perhaps take up two or three years. At least, it will go beyond the campaign now before us.

But, Mr. President, in connection with the President's advice that we should not further legislate on these matters, I want to read from another message that he delivered soon after he became President, while perhaps the pledge in the Democratic platform was fresher in his mind. That was on January 20, 1914. The one I have read from was delivered December 7, 1915, nearly two years after this from which I shall now read. In that official message the President used the following language:

> In the second place, business men as well as those who direct public affairs now recognize, and recognize with painful clearness, the great harm and injustice which has been done to many, if not all, of the great railroad systems of the country by the way in which they have been financed and their own distinctive interests subordinated to the interests of the men who financed them and of other business enterprises which those men wished to promote. The country is ready, therefore, to accept, and accept with relief as well as approval, a law which will confer upon the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to superintend and regulate the financial operations by which the railroads are henceforth to be supplied with the money they need for their proper development to meet the rapidly growing requirements of the country for increased and improved facilities of transportation.

Between the delivery to Congress of this message in which the President advocates this legislation, and the other message, delivered over a year later, in which he asks us not to legislate but to investigate, what has taken place? Instead of this committee being appointed to investigate as provided in this resolution, we ought to have the committee investigate to see why the President changed his mind. We ought to have the committee investigate to give information to the country as to why, following soon after his election to that great office, he advocated in good faith carrying out that provision of the platform upon which he was elected, and then, in the face of the next campaign in which he wants to be reelected, he comes again officially before Congress and asks us to stay our hands. There is fruitful ground for investigation if this committee wants to undertake it.

Mr. President, I propose to show that the President knew what he said and was right in the message that he delivered in December, 1914, and that he had absolutely closed his eyes in the face of abundant evidence, for some reason known to himself alone, when he delivered the other. If you will search through his messages, you will find at no place any reason that he has given why he wanted to confer that authority upon the Interstate Commerce Commission in December, 1914, and why he wanted to withhold it in June, 1915.

Mr. President, for many years the Interstate Commerce Commission has been asking Congress for authority to superintend the issuing of stocks and bonds by interstate railroads. There is an abundance of evidence officially in the records of the Interstate Commerce Commission to convince any man, I think, that there is some legislation, as the President said in his message, that ought to be enacted. He said, in December, 1914—

> Business men * * * recognize, and recognize with painful clearness, the great harm and injustice which has been done to many, if not all, of the great railroad systems by the way in which they have been financed and their own distinctive interests subordinated to the interests of the men who financed them.

I am going to show, I think, that that was and is the case. I want to say, to begin with, that I would not go as far as the President did in his condemnation of the financial conditions of the railroads. It may be that he had more information than I have. If he did, there is all the more reason why there should be an investigation made as to why he has taken it all back. I would not charge, as he intimates—he does not charge it directly, but he intimates—that this has been true of many, if not all, of the great railroad systems.

Mr. President, as far as I know, there are many of the great railroad systems of the country that are operated upon an honest, fair business basis; and it is only because I should like to see remedied the condition that has applied in the past to some of the railroads, by which financial pirates have ruined some of the greatest railroad systems of the world, that I am taking the floor now and calling the attention of the Senate to the fact that no investigation is necessary. Investigations have been made, and I am going to produce to-day some of the evidence that those investigations have brought forth.

Every railroad, being a quasi-public institution, ought to be managed with absolute honesty. Many of the difficulties with which honest railroads as well as others have been confronted have come about because of the rotten financial management and control that has resulted in the ruination of some great systems of railroads and in taking away from thousands and thousands of honest stockholders the earnings of a lifetime.

Every railroad stock and every railroad bond ought to be as substantial and as good as a Government bond. If we had honest management of the finances of the railroads of our country, that would be the case. Then any man with savings, any trustee with trust funds, would be able to invest in the stocks or bonds of railroads knowing that the investment was going to be honestly dealt with, honestly handled, and that there would be no danger of some financial manipulation going on

behind the scenes by which he might be absolutely ruined. As it has been, it has been more or less a gambling operation to invest in stocks or bonds of interstate railroads.

That is the condition I want to remedy, and I am appearing now as a friend to honest railroads. I should like to have a law passed that would put behind the bars men who steal millions, the same as you put behind the bars men who steal pennies.

Mr. President, the Interstate Commerce Commission transmitted a report January 26, 1914, showing the result of their investigation of several railroads known as the Frisco System. I am only going to quote brief extracts from these various reports, because if I made no attempt to brief it would take days to produce all the evidence that is at hand. They say:

The difficulties of the Frisco were of a financial and not of an operating character.

There is the difficulty. That has been the cause of the downfall of railroads. That is the reason why honest railroads often have a difficult time to get money. It is because honest people are afraid to invest their money in the stocks and bonds.

In this Frisco case the Interstate Commerce Commission go on to show how the men who were controlling the finances of the railroads ruined it; how they organized syndicates composed of financial men outside and the officers of the railroad itself inside, and through these syndicates bought and invested in various things—branch railroads, stocks, and bonds. After summarizing various of these investments they sum up one part of their report as follows:

The profits realized by syndicates and trust companies on the sale of the Frisco were as follows.

Then they itemize the different corporations in which they had improperly and wrongfully invested the money which belonged to the stockholders, making a total loss in that one item alone of $8,444,706.51.

They go into details with some of the companies. Here is one of them, and I am going to read only their conclusion. After they had examined the evidence and made an investigation of one company they say:

Organizing the new company and disposing of the securities through this syndicate was not a labor of love on the part of those who composed the syndicate. The commissions received by them amounted to $494,894.44, and their profits on subscriptions were $1,783,207.15.

This syndicate, composed of officers of the company mainly who were occupying positions of trust, who if they had been honest ought to have represented the stockholders, who were all drawing salaries for their positions, and some of them large salaries—this syndicate went into some land business. The commission gave it in detail here, and they say:

The land deals, the cash bonuses, and the syndicate's exploitations resulted in a profit to the syndicate of $892,487.21.

And they wind up:

The effect of the entire transaction was that the syndicate secured a profit of $3,011,929.75, which included the profits on land, the cash donations, and the syndicate's operations.

Mr. President, it would be interesting, if I wanted to take the time to go through this report and show in detail how each one of these things was operated. It is sufficient to say that in every instance it was done by men who were occupying positions of trust and who were drawing salaries from the stockholders whom they were robbing.

If the Senator from Nevada hired me and paid me a salary for the purpose, let us say, of buying horses, and I went out and bought a team for $400 and then turned it over to him at $800 I would be called a robber and a thief. I would be arrested and sent to jail. But if other officers, with myself, who were officers of an interstate railroad, holding in trust the finances of thousands and thousands of honest people, knew of some property that that railroad perhaps ought to have and could buy it for a million dollars, and if then, with my other associates also drawing a salary, we would buy it for a million dollars and turn it over to our employer for $2,000,000, I would be doing just exactly what time and time again has been done by the financial pirates who have made fortunes for themselves by practically stealing it, not from an ordinary person but from some persons for whom they were occupying positions of honor and trust and were paid immense salaries.

Mr. President, the committee does not need to investigate. They can have access to this evidence. They can get it. The President probably knew something about it when he delivered that first message, when fresh from his victory he was anxious to carry out the pledge he made to the people and asked us to enact a law. He knew it then. He has forgotten it now.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I do not want to interrupt the continuity of the Senator's argument, but sometime before he takes his seat I suggest this question: Does not the proposition as presented by the appointment of this committee raise a different question, and that is the question whether or not regulation and control is not of itself breaking down, whether or not that is the proper system and method to deal with the transportation question? In other words, does not the President—perhaps I should not refer to the President, because I do not know just what his views are on this question, but do not those who seek now, after 20 years of experience in reference to regulation and control, to reenter upon the question of investigation admit by that proposition that they are really investigating the question whether regulation and control is the proper method by which to deal with the railroad question?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I might just as well answer that now as at any time. As I said at the beginning, I would have no objection to this investigation being made if I was sure that it was not going to be used as an argument against any legislation of this kind in the future. The investigation along the lines suggested by the Senator from Idaho would be valuable. It would be a good thing to engage on, but while we are investigating these same things which I have already pointed out, and more that I am going to point out may be going on all over the country, do we want to practically say by our silence that while we believe in punishing the man who robs his neighbor or who steals his purse we are in favor of remaining quiet while men rob millions that have been contributed in pennies, often by widows and orphans? Not only that, but it has the effect of ruining or at least injuring all honestly managed railroads in the United States.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. I was led to submit that question to the Senator by reason of the fact that there is much argument being adduced in these days to the effect that the regulation and control of transportation through commissions is a failure. I want to read, with the permission of the Senator, an authority upon this question, so that it may receive his attention before he closes:

Governmental control, which we are undertaking so extensively and with so light a heart, sets up not a reign of law, but a reign of discretion and individual judgment on the part of governmental officials in the regulation of the business of stock companies owned by innumerable private individuals and supplying the chief investments of thousands of communities. I can see no radical difference in principle between governmental ownership and governmental regulation of this discretionary kind. Regulation by commission is not regulation by law, but control according to the discretion of governmental officials. Regulation by law is judicial, by fixed and definite rule, whereas regulation by commission is an affair of business sense, of the comprehension and thorough understanding of complex and various bodies of business. There is no logical stopping place between that and the actual conduct of business enterprises by the Government.

Such methods of regulation, it may be safely predicted, will sooner or later be completely discredited by experience. Commissions in the future as in the past will reflect rather public opinion than business discretion. The only safe process, the only American process, the only effective process is the regulation of transactions by the definite prohibitions of law, item by item, as experience discloses their character and their effects, and the punishment of the particular individuals who engage in them.

Mr. President, there is a statement of a defect in the subject of regulation or control by commissions at all, which I apprehend is one of the things into which this committee is going to inquire. In my judgment we must assume there is a deeper problem than that which appears upon the face of this movement.

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator from Idaho did not quote his authority. He said it was distinguished authority. I should like to have it quoted.

Mr. BORAH. I have been criticized here so much for being familiar with the President's writings, I thought I might permit it to stand upon its own merit. That is a statement from the President made some several years ago.

Mr. NORRIS. I think we all understood it was from the President.

Mr. BORAH. But I presented it here for the reason that it seems this committee has no occasion to go into the investigation of facts as to what law we should have if we are going to continue to regulate and control public corporations through commissions. We have sufficient facts, as the Senator is demonstrating, beyond question, to legislate now.

Mr. NORRIS. That is my idea.

Mr. BORAH. It must be, Mr. President, that this committee proposes to go into the deeper and profounder question whether or not regulation and control is the proper method to deal with transportation.

Mr. NORRIS. I would be glad to have them investigate that; I would be glad to get any information we can; but as to whether we ought to have some legislation now, I do not believe there can be any doubt.

The Interstate Commerce Commission investigated the New Haven road. They have two reports on the New Haven road and they are both exceedingly interesting.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was not giving the Senator my attention during the first part of his speech, and I wanted to inquire of him whether at any stage of his speech he has indicated what additional legislation he thinks we ought to have?

Mr. NORRIS. I have not, but I am going to do so before I get through.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator had not so indicated at some other point in his speech I was going to ask him, before he finishes his remarks, if he would do so.

Mr. NORRIS. I intend to do that before I get through, and if I should forget to do it, I would be glad to have the Senator from North Carolina or some one else call my attention to the fact that I have forgotten it.

When I was interrupted I was about to make some comments and read some facts from the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission on the New Haven road, and again the trouble is all financial. In other words, like the commission said in regard to the Frisco system, the trouble is with its financial operation. It is because the men who control the finances of the railroads have not been fair but in many cases have been downright dishonest that we have many of the receivers and much of the congestion and much of the difficulty that now stares the country in the face in the interstate transportation problem. The Interstate Commerce Commission say:

> June 30, 1903, the total capitalization of the New Haven Co. was approximately $93,000,000, of which $79,000,000 was stock and $14,000,000 bonds. The mileage then operated was 2,040 miles. On June 30, 1912, the capitalization, excluding stock premiums, was $417,000,000, an increase of $324,000,000, while the operated mileage was 2,090, an increase of 50 miles.

So they go on somewhat in detail and analyze their statement and wind up with this language:

> This would leave the sum of $204,000,000 which in nine years had been expended in operations outside its railroad sphere. This fact of itself is a most significant one, which, standing alone, might well require explanation. Attention is here directed to some of the purposes for which and the manner in which this vast sum has been invested.

Then they start out and show the various investments that were made. They organized, like the men in managing the Frisco did, various subsidiary corporations, bought and sold subsidiary railroad stocks and bonds, steamship lines, navigation companies, steamboats, and other things. In speaking of the New York, Westchester & Boston Railway as one of the subsidiary companies where they spent a lot of this money, the commission said:

> Here, therefore, is an enterprise which has cost the New Haven Co. $12,000,000 in excess of the value of its property upon its own showing. Again the question arises, What has become of this $12,000,000? In case of the Rhode Island Co. it was possible to locate the corporation, if not the individual, which had ostensibly obtained the money, but in this case it is impossible from anything upon the books of the New Haven Co. to do this even approximately. So far as those records go this money has vanished into thin air.

The New Haven Co., or those who controlled its finances, had a great deal to do with the company organized by Mr. Billard, and after going over that at some length they say:

> It may be that the true inwardness of this transaction is not yet understood; but the accounting officers of the New Haven Co. have been heard in testimony, the president of that company has been heard in explanation, and upon this record as it stands the New Haven Co. has given away of the funds of that company to Mr. Billard and his associates or to the stockholders of the Billard Co., whatever that may be, between $2,500,000 and $3,000,000 of the property of the New Haven Co.

In another place the commission say:

> The purpose, or at least the effect, of this New Haven bookkeeping is to utterly becloud those operations so as to render any intelligent understanding of them almost impossible. If the thing done is legitimate, why not do it in a direct way? If the purpose be honest, why clothe it in the habiliments of the mountebank? The mere fact that such methods are employed inspires distrust. No man can examine the history of the New Haven Co. for the last nine years without a feeling of doubt and uncertainty. The use of such methods in the management of public utilities should not be tolerated.

In a further investigation, Mr. President, made by the commission of this same railroad, printed July 15, 1914, the commission further commented upon the financial operation of this great system of railways, one of the greatest systems in the world. They use this language:

> The New Haven system has more than 300 subsidiary corporations, in a web of entangling alliances with each other, many of which were seemingly planned, created, and manipulated by lawyers expressly retained for the purpose of concealment or deception. Ordinarily in investigations of this character evidence is easily adduced by placing the witnesses upon the stand, but in this investigation the witnesses other than the accountants for the commission were in the main hostile, and with few exceptions their testimony was unwillingly given.
>
> The result of our research into the financial workings of the former management of the New Haven system has been to disclose one of the most glaring instances of maladministration revealed in all the history of American railroading.

You do not need to have any committee make an investigation in order to ascertain those facts. A commission, better equipped to investigate than any committee either of the Senate or of the House, have given you not only their conclusions, but all of the facts; they have presented all of the evidence, and it is accessible to every Member of Congress. The commission further say:

> The difficulties under which this railroad system has labored in the past are internal and wholly due to its own mismanagement. Its troubles have not arisen because of regulation by governmental authority. Its greatest losses and most costly blunders were made in attempting to circumvent governmental regulation and to extend its domination beyond the limits fixed by law.
>
> The subject matter of this inquiry relates to the financial operation of a railroad system which, on June 30, 1903, had a total capitalization of approximately $93,000,000, of which $79,000,000 was stock and $14,000,000 bonds. In the 10 years from June 30, 1903, this capitalization was increased from $93,000,000 to $417,000,000, exclusive of stock premiums, or an increase of $324,000,000. Of this increase approximately $120,000,000 was devoted to its railroad property and was expended for betterments and equipment. This leaves the sum of $204,000,000, which was expended for operations outside of its railroad sphere. Through the expenditure of this sum this railroad system has practically monopolized the freight and passenger business in five of the States of the Union. It has acquired a monopoly of competing steamship lines and trolley systems in the section which it serves. The financial operations necessary for those acquisitions and the losses which they have entailed have been skillfully concealed by the juggling of money and securities from one subsidiary corporation to another.

They further say:

> SIGNIFICANT INCIDENTS.
>
> Marked features and significant incidents in the loose, extravagant, and improvident administration of the finances of the New Haven as shown in this investigation are the Boston & Maine despoilment; the iniquity of the Westchester acquisition; the double price paid for the Rhode Island trolleys; the recklessness in the purchase of Connecticut and Massachusetts trolleys at prices exorbitantly in excess of their market value; the unwarranted expenditure of large amounts in "educating public opinion"; the disposition, without knowledge of the directors, of hundreds of thousands of dollars for influencing public sentiment; the habitual payment of unitemized vouchers without any clear specification of details; the confusing inter-relation of the principal company and its subsidiaries and consequent complication of accounts; the practice of financial legerdemain in issuing large blocks of New Haven stock for notes of the New England Navigation Co., and manipulating these securities back and forth; fictitious sales of New Haven stock to friendly parties with the design of boosting the stock and unloading on the public at the higher "market price"; the unlawful diversion of corporate funds to political organizations; the scattering of retainers to attorneys of five States, who rendered no itemized bills for services and who conducted no litigation to which the railroad was a party; extensive use of a paid lobby in matters as to which the directors claim to have no information; the attempt to control utterances of the press by subsidizing reporters; payment of money and the profligate issue of free passes to legislators and their friends; the investment of $400,000 in securities of a New England newspaper; the regular employment of political bosses in Rhode Island and other States, not for the purpose of having them perform any service but to prevent them, as Mr. Mellen expressed it, from "becoming active on the other side"; the retention by John L. Billard of more than $2,700,000 in a transaction in which he represented the New Haven and into which he invested not a dollar; the inability of Oakleigh Thorne to account for $1,032,000 of the funds of the New Haven intrusted to him in carrying out the Westchester proposition; the story of Mr. Mellen as to the distribution of $1,200,000 for corrupt purposes in bringing about amendments of the Westchester and Port Chester franchises; the domination of all the affairs of this railroad by Mr. Morgan and Mr. Mellen and the absolute subordination of other members of the board of directors to the will of these two; the unwarranted increase of the New Haven liabilities from $93,000,000 in 1903 to $417,000,000 in 1913; the increase in floating notes from nothing in 1903 to approximately $40,000,000 in 1913; the indefensible standard of business ethics and the absence of financial acumen displayed by eminent financiers in directing the destinies of this railroad in its attempt to establish a monopoly of the transportation of New England. A combination of all these has resulted in the present deplorable situation in which the affairs of this railroad are involved.
>
> THE NEW YORK, WESTCHESTER & BOSTON RAILWAY CO.

They say that is one of the subsidiary companies—

> The Westchester is a story of the profligate waste of corporate funds. The road was not necessary as a part of the New Haven system. It parallels other lines already owned by the New Haven and traverses territory which the New Haven already served. That it was recognized as unnecessary by the New Haven itself at its inception is evidenced by the fact that the New Haven sought an injunction to restrain the construction of this road on the specific ground that it was not in answer to any public necessity and paralleled its already existing line.
>
> The enormous sum of $36,434,173.25 was expended for a road only 18.03 miles in extent, which is being operated at an annual loss of

approximately $1,250,000, and which will have to increase its earnings four and one-half fold before it can pay its operating expenses and fixed charges. It is inconceivable that this enterprise could have been entered into by the New Haven as a result of the mandates of good judgment and proper railroading.

I have been reading mostly the summarizing by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the various enterprises. I want to read some of the details of one of them. As an incident in one of these transactions, where they had spent millions of dollars in getting this short railroad—and it was necessary, I judge, by reading between the lines, to control a lot of politicians—they expended over a million dollars in this operation. The commission said:

In explaining how these negotiations were conducted, Mr. Mellen testified that it was intended that one share of New Haven stock should be exchanged for three shares of Westchester stock.

Just before this he testified that Westchester stock was worth about 10 cents a pound; it was practically worthless; and they were giving one share of New Haven for three shares of worthless stock.

When the New Haven stock was not immediately at hand he issued to the messenger who brought Westchester stock a duebill, which was in terms an order on himself to pay on demand to bearer the specified number of shares of New Haven stock or its equivalent in cash at $150 per share, with accrued dividends. Many of these duebills were not presented until Mr. Mellen's connection with the New Haven was severed, and five of them, aggregating $50,000, approximately, are still outstanding. During the time the duebills were outstanding Mr. Mellen collected the dividends on the New Haven stock which they represented, and at each dividend period unknown messengers would appear in his office at the Grand Central Station, in New York City, and demand these dividends, which Mr. Mellen would then pay with his personal checks, so drawn that the identity of the persons cashing them could not be ascertained.

And thus they spent in this way to unknown persons more than a million dollars.

Witnesses who were officers of some of these companies appeared before the commission and testified that they acted as "dummies" under the directions of Robbins and of attorneys selected by him.

And, by the way, Robbins was an attorney of the New Haven road, getting a salary from that corporation.

Some of them handled, without any knowledge of the nature or purpose of the transactions, checks approximating $3,000,000.

In speaking of the Billard Co., the commission says:

All the assets of the Billard Co. belong to the stockholders of the New Haven Railroad. All the money sunk in its operations belonged to the New Haven Railroad.

A suit should be maintainable by the New Haven against Billard and all who have participated in this fraud upon the stockholders.

I read that opinion of the Interstate Commerce Commission right there for the purpose of emphasizing the need of legislation that will permit an action by the ruined corporation, and, if not by the corporation, then by the stockholders, against the persons who have committed the wrong to recover the damages they have sustained.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator know of any existing law under which that can be done?

Mr. NORRIS. I presume there is such a law. I presume under the laws of the States, probably, that kind of an action could be maintained; but the practical difficulty of applying it renders it almost an impossibility, as has been demonstrated in the New Haven case. There were some suits instituted there, but nothing has ever been recovered.

Mr. KENYON. I introduced, some years ago, a bill along that line, which was pretty carefully drawn by those who thought they knew the subject; but it rests in the usual mausoleum for bills of that character.

Mr. NORRIS. But the Senator does not think, therefore, does he, that we ought to spend two or three more years investigating to see whether we ought to have that kind of a law?

Mr. KENYON. I think we have enough evidence on that subject now.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will ask the Senator from Iowa——

Mr. NORRIS. I would prefer that the Senator would direct his question to me. I do not want to yield the floor.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Then I will ask the Senator from Nebraska to ask the Senator from Iowa whether he pressed the bill to which he referred before the Interstate Commerce Committee. I have no recollection of the consideration of that bill being urged.

Mr. NORRIS. Since the Senator from Nevada has asked that question, I will let the Senator from Iowa answer it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to say to the Senator from Iowa that I always give very great consideration to any urgency upon his part for the consideration of any measure.

Mr. KENYON. I want to answer that in this way: I introduced, I think three or four years ago, a bill to give the Interstate Commerce Commission power to make uniform classifications in freight rates. That bill passed the Senate and went to the House. The railroads then became very active and hearings were had in the House, but the bill did not pass the House and Congress adjourned. I introduced the bill again at the next session of the Senate, and it went to a subcommittee, by whom hearings were held, lasting nearly all summer, but I have never heard what became of the bill. My experience with it was so absolutely discouraging that I have not pressed it as perhaps I should have done, but in view of the argument now being made I shall try to do so. In the meantime I would be glad if the Senator from Nebraska would ask the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee what has become of the bill giving to the Interstate Commerce Commission the right to make uniform classifications?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state that I will send over to the committee and ascertain what the status is at present. I can not recall the exact status of that bill.

Mr. NORRIS. I shall have more to say, Mr. President, a little later on, when I get through with these citations, about legislation of the nature of that in regard to which the Senator from Iowa has interrogated the chairman of the committee.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state to the Senator from Nebraska that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is able to furnish the information for which he asks.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I prefer not to be led off on another issue.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, it seems to me the Senator from Nebraska ought to be willing to have the Senate furnished with the information.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, I will yield. Go ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. To anybody; to the Senator from Arkansas first.

Mr. ROBINSON. I merely desired to answer the inquiry made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] as to what action had been taken concerning the bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to make a uniform classification of freight rates.

During the last Congress the bill was referred to a subcommittee of which I was chairman, and prolonged hearings were had upon the bill. The subcommittee reached the conclusion that no legislation should be had at that time, for the reason that the classification is now being made by the carriers themselves. The work is progressing with a fair degree of rapidity, and to impose that additional work on the Interstate Commerce Commission, as now organized, would simply overwhelm them with burdens which they could not perform satisfactorily either to themselves or to the public.

So far as I know, no action has been taken concerning the measure since its reintroduction during the present Congress by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. May I inquire of the Senator from Arkansas if any report of that kind was filed with the committee?

Mr. ROBINSON. No, sir. No report was made.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in speaking of "dummy" corporations the Interstate Commerce Commission uses this language:

The frequency with which dummy corporations and dummy directors appear in this record leads to the conclusion that some one high in the counsels of the New Haven had an obsession upon the subject of the utility of such sham methods. The directors of the Billard Co. confessed that they were dummies and knew nothing of its operations. Why men of respectability and standing as these appear to be should lend their names as dummies passes comprehension.

In the organization of one of the steamship companies the young lady stenographer was made president, and a youth of 21 years of age by the name of Grover Cleveland Richards—

I presume it was on account of his name—

was selected as treasurer of another company.

Clerks and irresponsible persons were drawn upon to supply the demands for dummies in the financial joy riding by the management of the New Haven.

* * * * * * *

Thus, throughout the entire story of deception, the New Haven management vainly endeavored to hide the true facts behind these dummy individuals and dummy corporations.

* * * * * * *

While stock in the New Haven road was listed on the New York Stock Exchange a large portion of its funds were invested in "blue-sky" corporations, the officers of which knew nothing of the purposes or assets of the companies of which they were managers or officers.

The Senator from Illinois referred to one of the officers of the Frisco Road—and, by the way, he was also an officer of the Rock Island—going before a Republican club and making a speech. I want to read what the commission have to say about the politics of this railroad. They say:

The New Haven Railroad had no politics. It was Democratic in Democratic States and Republican in Republican States. As Mr. Mellen testified, its effort was always to "get under the best umbrella."

Then follow several contributions that were made for political purposes. Often in their examination they found that these contributions and expenditures were not traceable directly to political parties and political committees, but from various circumstances, and from the fact that no other explanation could be made, and circumstantial evidence bearing upon the particular transaction, they were of the opinion that they had been used for political purposes, or at least for purposes beyond what they ought to have been used for.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator regard the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission as trustworthy and sufficient?

Mr. NORRIS. I regard the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission as trustworthy. Unless there were some circumstances surrounding the case that would throw some suspicion on it, I consider that it would be just as trustworthy as a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator knows of no such circumstances?

Mr. NORRIS. Not in this case nor in any other case to which I will refer. There have been charges in the railroad rate case that improper influences were used and had some effect, but I am not referring in any way to that case.

In summing up the investments in one of these subsidiary companies the commission say:

From all of the foregoing and from a careful consideration of the method in which expenditures, not specified herein, have been made, it is submitted that a reasonable estimate of the loss to the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. by reason of waste and mismanagement will amount to between $60,000,000 and $90,000,000.

The splendid property of the New Haven Railroad itself will be called upon for many a year to make up the drain upon its resources resulting from the unpardonable folly of the transactions outside the proper field in which stockholders supposed their moneys were invested.

But honesty and efficiency of management of this property as a railroad only will, undoubtedly, in time, restore its former standing.

You will notice here that they say that their losses are between $60,000,000 and $90,000,000. In another place in the opinion they said that the amount of money belonging to the New Haven stockholders improperly used was $204,000,000. Of course in this investment of $204,000,000 outside of railroad business proper there was some saved, resulting, as they say here, only in a net loss of between sixty and ninety million dollars.

Now, I want to read the conclusion that was reached by the commission in this case:

This investigation has demonstrated that the monopoly theory of those controlling the New Haven was unsound and mischievous in its effects. To achieve such monopoly meant the reckless and scandalous expenditure of money; it meant the attempt to control public opinion; corruption of government; the attempt to pervert the political and economic instincts of the people in insolent defiance of law. Through exposure of the methods of this monopoly the invisible government which has gone far in its efforts to dominate New England has been made visible. It has been clearly proven how public opinion was distorted; how officials who were needed and who could be bought were bought; how newspapers that could be subsidized were subsidized; how a college professor and publicists secretly accepted money from the New Haven while masking as a representative of a great American university and as the guardians of the interests of the people; how agencies of information to the public were prostituted wherever they could be prostituted in order to carry out a scheme of private transportation monopoly imperial in its scope.

* * * * * * *

Most of the directors of the New Haven accepted their responsibilities lightly. They failed to realize that their names gave confidence to the public and that their connection with the corporation led the public to invest. When these directors were negligent and serious losses resulted therefrom they were guilty of a grave dereliction of duty and a breach of trust that was morally wrong and criminal in its fruits.

Here are some of the recommendations they made:

Directors should be made individually liable to civil and criminal laws for the manner in which they discharge their trust. A corporation can be no better or worse than those who operate it. It should be just as grave a crime to plunder stockholders or the public through a railroad corporation as it is to personally rob an individual.

They conclude by saying:

The insuring of honesty throughout the management of the great railroads of the country is a most important question before the people to-day, and only when through exposure of wrongdoing and an awakened public conscience coupled with effective laws this result is produced, may railroading be placed upon the high level that it should occupy. The revelations in this record make it essential for the welfare of the Nation that the reckless and profligate financiering which has blighted this railroad system be ended, and until this is fully done there will be no assurance that the story of the New Haven will not be told again with the stockholders of some other railroad system as the victims.

I submit, Mr. President, that to put that recommendation into law requires no investigation of an extended nature by a joint committee of the House and the Senate.

I wish to conclude what I have to say by reading some extracts from another report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, made in the case of the Rock Island Railroad. In order that we may first get an idea as to just exactly what the Rock Island is, I will read a paragraph from the beginning of the opinion:

In 1902 the main line of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. extended from Chicago to Denver, with branch lines to St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Kansas City. The territory served is one of the richest and most prosperous in the country and the system's ramification of branch lines insures to it a large volume of tonnage. It was then thriving and its prospects were promising, its stock selling in the markets of the world at more than $200 a share. In 1914 the shares had fallen to $20 and the road is now in receivers' hands. The evidence shows that the earnings of the railway company have steadily increased, and that in 1914 they were the largest in its history.

And yet it went into the hands of a receiver.

It seems to me that that simple statement tells a story that we ought to heed, Mr. President. In 10 years the stock of this company fell from $200 to $20 a share, and then the company went into the hands of a receiver, as they show in here, altogether and entirely on account of financial mismanagement. The earnings increased every year, and last year, 1914, they were greater than they had ever been in the history of the company.

Much the same method was used here by the officers of the company that was used in the other cases to which I have referred. We find that these men who were getting salaries from this railroad company were continually organizing syndicates for the purpose of buying subsidiary corporations, dealing in various things, using the money of the railroad company to do it with, and always making a profit out of it themselves. I believe there is one instance, at least, where one man became the agent of the other corporation to sell it, so that he got a commission from the other corporation for making the sale and he got a commission from the Rock Island Co. for making the purchase, in addition to which he drew his own salary. Many of the salaries, in my judgment, were much larger than they ought to have been, even though the officers had been faithful to their trust.

The officers of this railroad company, in addition to practicing the methods pursued in others of buying from some other company and selling to the company which they represented, gave direct bonuses to themselves; and the Interstate Commerce Commission gives some illustration about it.

Following are specific instances shown of record of the contributions referred to:

J. E. Gorman, first vice president in charge of freight and passenger traffic, was secretly paid $18,750 per annum, making his total compensation $43,750, whereas the pay roll showed $25,000.

C. A. Morse, chief engineer, received a salary of $15,000 per annum and a secret bonus of $3,000 on the first of each year.

Upon the retirement of R. A. Jackson as general solicitor, he was given $100,000 in cash.

As an inducement to L. F. Loree, chairman of the executive committee, to relinquish, after 10 months' service, a joint contract with the railway company and the Frisco under which he was to receive a salary of $75,000 per annum for a period of five years, and in addition was to be paid a bonus of $500,000 at the expiration of the contract, he was given bonds of the railway company of a par value of $450,000. This was borne equally by the two companies, and the proportion of the railway company was charged to profit and loss. The total amount borne by the railway company in this transaction exceeded $250,000.

C. H. Warren, vice president, was given by the railway company $150,000 in par value of the common and $105,000 in par value of the preferred stock of the New Jersey company and $50,000 in cash. There was no board authorization for the latter expenditure, the item being represented in the records of the railway company merely by a voucher signed by D. G. Reid.

The New Jersey corporation was a subsidiary of the railroad company.

R. R. Cable, a member of the executive committee, received from the railway company $30,000 in bonds of the Iowa company—

That was another subsidiary company—

then worth $24,500, for his services in the acquisition of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway Co., and he was paid by the latter company $85,000 in the same transaction. Mr. Cable also received another contribution, which will be referred to later.

Robert Mather, vice president, was given $25,000 in cash.

George T. Boggs, director and secretary of the board of directors of the railway company, was given $15,000 in cash when he retired from the secretaryship of the railway company.

Then they appropriated several millions of stock of their own company. After they increased the capital stock of the Rock Island to $10,000,000 at one time and several millions at another and used the proceeds for the purposes for which it was issued and had some stock left, they divided it among themselves. So

that these men who were occupying positions of trust for this company and drawing large salaries—I have a list of their salaries—were continually robbing the people whom they were expected to represent.

Speaking of some voucher payments, some irregular payments, they say:

Another voucher in favor of the Liberty National Bank of New York City, in exchange for a cashier's check issued to Robert Mather for $25,000, is charged to "general expenses" under "operating expenses." This voucher refers to a miscellaneous file shown by the index thereto to have comprehended "contributions to campaign committee." The file, however, was not produced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, a small measure that I was interested in was reported this morning when I was out of the Chamber attending a committee meeting.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ascertain if the Senator wishes to take the bill up now?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask my colleague [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] if they will not agree to temporarily lay aside the unfinished business, or if I shall be recognized by the Chair I can proceed with the matter which has been before the Senate.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will say that I prefer the Senator shall proceed with his speech, because I promised the Senator from Utah that I would not ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside this morning.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, if I can get recognition, I will proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has the floor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will explain to the Senator from Nebraska that I was not here this morning because I was attending a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which is considering the urgent deficiency appropriation bill. At 2 o'clock the subcommittee meets again and I shall have to return.

Mr. NORRIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 76, which has been favorably reported from the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think it will then be necessary for me to ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the purpose stated by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not necessary.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not necessary, as the Senator from Alabama after the regular order was called up obtained the floor and asked unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution. It does not displace the unfinished business.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I can not consent to that course because it would displace the unfinished business. I ask that my request be put first.

Mr. SMOOT. No, it would not displace the unfinished business unless it led to discussion and we were discussing the joint resolution at the time we adjourned. Then it would displace the unfinished business.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am aware of that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will put the request of the Senator from Nebraska to the effect that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside by unanimous consent for the specific disposition of the joint resolution in hand. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LOAN OF TENTS AND COTS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan 1,000 tents and 1,000 cots for the use of the encampment of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Birmingham, Ala., in May, 1916.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to make a short statement as to the purpose of the joint resolution. It is in the usual form. It has been customary in the past when these encampments were held, either by the Grand Army of the Republic or by Confederate veterans, to loan to them tents and cots. The joint resolution I have now called up is prepared in the same form as other measures that have been passed in years gone by. Accompanying it there is a letter from the Secretary of War stating that the property will be available, and the joint resolution provides that the persons getting the tents for this encampment shall give bond for their safe return to the Government without injury. It is necessary to pass it at this time, so that they may be advised as to whether they can have the use of tents for the purpose of the encampment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Wait just a minute, until I read the letter from the Secretary of War. [After a pause.] I do not object.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator from Nebraska permit me to give a notice that to-morrow, at the expiration of the morning business, I shall call up the pending joint resolution?

Mr. NORRIS. Continuing the reading where I was interrupted, the commission says:

Without this file it is impossible to state the purpose for which the money was expended, but the generalization "contributions to campaign committee," in the light of the practices indulged in by the syndicate in question, is clearly suggestive.

The books of the railway company reveal payments aggregating $44,066.05 to the Denver Post. The vouchers attached read, "for advertising in editorial and news columns." Other entries show that three of these vouchers, aggregating $20,000, cover a refund that this newspaper received at the rate of 25 cents per hundred on its freight carried over the lines of the railway company from points in Wisconsin.

Another voucher is for $50,000 to S. M. Felton, for the railway's proportion of amount "paid by E. H. Harriman and his associates for money expended by them to secure the discontinuance of a line of road being constructed in 1900 between Peoria, Ill., and Clinton, Iowa, as per agreement between R. R. Cable, chairman of the board, and E. H. Harriman."

The commission, in considering an arrangement which this company had then with the St. Louis & San Francisco Railway, wind up their comment by saying:

The final result of this transaction is that the railway company has sustained a loss estimated to be about $6,500,000.

Speaking of another deal they say:

Its net loss from this transaction, including interest, was $906,420, and this, added to its loss in connection with the other coal company above referred to—

This was in regard to the purchase of the stock of another coal company—

makes a total loss of more than $1,300,000 as a result of its coal deals. If the advances to the coal companies can not be collected it will result in an additional loss of $2,500,000.

Bear in mind, Mr. President, that when this loss occurred to the railway company the officers of the railroad company composing the syndicate that was in the deal aways made what the railroad company lost.

The aggregate losses sustained by the railway company in connection with the foregoing transactions may be summarized as follows.

And then they itemize it. I will put those in the RECORD, with the permission of the Senate, without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

AGGREGATE OF LOSSES.

The aggregate losses sustained by the railway company in connection with the foregoing transactions may be summarized as follows:

Expenses of maintaining and housing holding companies, more than	$290,000.00
Frisco deal, approximately	6,500,000.00
Alton deal, approximately	6,370,000.00
Trinity & Brazos Valley Railway deal, more than	4,500,000.00
Consolidated Indiana and Dering coal companies, at least	1,300,000.00
Contributions or gratuities to officers and directors, about	1,000,000.00
Venner transaction	217,000.00
Miscellaneous and unexplained expenditures	72,523.45

These items show an aggregate loss to the railway company of more than $20,000,000. In addition thereto, it is to be noted that prior to June 30, 1914, the railway company paid to financial institutions, in connection with the issuance of bonds, commissions aggregating more than $1,600,000, and suffered discounts of more than $17,700,000.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, they were unable to get all the facts in regard to all these transactions. In one case Mr. Reid, when

interrogated with a view to ascertaining his profits from the various transactions, explained that he always burned his books at the end of each month. Mr. Reid was one of the board of directors, and he drew a salary of $32,000 a year.

In speaking of the deal with the Consolidated Indiana Coal Co. they say:

Although R. A. Jackson, vice president and general counsel of the railway company, was receiving a salary of $50,000 a year, he was paid $10,000 by the railway company to draw up the incorporation papers—

Of another company, remember.

The price paid for the coal property owned by the consolidated company was estimated to be substantially more than it was actually worth, and ever since its incorporation it has been operated at a loss.

Prior to June 30, 1914, the railway company had made advances to the coal company aggregating $2,354,453.19. The railway company received interest on these loans at the rate of 4 per cent per annum, computed monthly, up to June 30, 1910, when all such interest payments were discontinued. The loss on the part of the railway company attributable to this venture can not be computed exactly, but the loss in interest charges alone since 1910 has amounted to more than $400,000. As the operation of the coal company has for some time been conducted at a loss, there is little prospect of the railway company being reimbursed for the advances made by it.

Now, Mr. President, this railroad company went into the hands of a receiver. This syndicate, organized mainly by men who were officers of the company, put it in the hands of a receiver when it was unnecessary to go there, and they did it because it was to their financial profit to do it. The commission said:

The syndicate decided to put the railway into a receivership—

Now listen to this—

The general counsel of the railway company, at the suggestion of W. H. Moore, a member of the syndicate, drew the bill asking for a receivership, and engaged an attorney, ostensibly to represent the other side. The bill was placed in the hands of this attorney, with the name of the complainant omitted, and he was instructed by the general counsel to locate some creditor of the railway company willing to act as complainant.

Now, here were the officers of a railroad company, drawing large salaries, going around over the country to find a creditor of the company who would make a complaint asking for the appointment of a receiver. They draw the papers and put them in the hands of another attorney and send him out to hunt such a person who was willing to be made plaintiff. Here we find the officers of the company hunting some one to bring suit against them, and when they found him they confessed judgment in the suit they persuaded him to bring. This is high finance with a vengeance. We ought to tell the President that no investigation is necessary to remedy such highway robbery.

But let us read further of the doings of these financial comedians. The commission go on as follows:

There was an agreement between the general counsel and this attorney as to the parties the latter would recommend to the court as receivers, the general counsel agreeing to instruct the attorney appearing for the railway company to acquiesce in the recommendation so made.

The board of directors of the railway company was not informed of the intention to file a bill for receivership, and at no meeting of the board was any authority ever given for such action. Members of the board of directors not in the confidence of the syndicate were kept in ignorance of the fact that such a bill had been prepared. The stockholders had no information of the purpose to put the railway company into a receivership, although a stockholders' meeting was held after the date upon which the receivership bill was completed by the general counsel, and this general counsel attended the meeting. According to the testimony, the bill was completed by the general counsel March 29, 1915, and the fact that it was to be filed whenever desired by those in authority was known only to certain insiders. The testimony clearly establishes the fact that the railway company could easily have paid the debt of $16,000 upon which the receivership application was based, and that arrangements probably could have been made to meet all pressing obligations of the railway company.

The creditor at whose instance the receivership application was filed appeared as complainant by request. R. P. Lamont, the president of the American Steel Foundries, the complainant, testified that he would not have thought of bringing such a proceeding against the railway company unless he had understood that it would be regarded as not unfriendly, but as a friendly act to oblige the railway company. He only consented that his company should appear as complainant when he was assured that this course was in accordance with the wishes of the railway company and that his company was not to have any care or expense in the preparation of papers or payment of counsel fees. The suit was not a bona fide proceeding to collect a debt, but was instituted to carry out the purpose and schemes of the syndicate controlling the railway.

* * * * * * *

It is a forceful commentary on the methods by which a great railway may be manipulated into a receivership when it is noted that the general counsel, after drawing the bill for a receivership, sold his stock, and the local counsel, who represented the railway company in the receivership proceedings, owned no stock in the railway company, and that none of those directly participating in the receivership proceedings had any financial interest in the railway company. The real owners of the railway, the stockholders, the security holders, and the directors, except those composing the syndicate and in its confidence, were in ignorance of the receivership application.

The property of the railway company will be called upon for many years to make up the drain upon its resources resulting from transactions outside the proper sphere in which stockholders had a right to suppose their moneys were invested. This record emphasizes the need of railway directors who actually direct. There are too many passive directors who acquiesce in what is being done without knowledge and without investigation. A director of a railroad is a quasi public official who occupies a position of trust. A director who submits blindly to the exploitation of his company is a party to its undoing, and he should be held responsible to the same extent as if he had been a principal instead of an accessory before the fact. The greater his prominence the greater his responsibility and the greater his dereliction. Obviously a man of large affairs could not attend to all the details in intricate transactions, but it is inconceivable that a director of ordinary business prudence and sagacity would sanction large expenditures without an inquiry as to the purposes of such disbursements. So long as this situation exists, however, it suggests the need of a law to charge such directors with individual responsibility for the dissipation of corporate funds.

There is a recommendation to the committee of the need of a law to charge the directors with individual responsibility for the dissipation of corporate funds. Now, they conclude:

The Clayton Antitrust Act—

Says the commission—

which becomes effective October 15, 1915, will make it unlawful for any person at the same time to be a director in two or more competing corporations, any one of which has a capital, surplus, or undivided profits aggregating more than $1,000,000, but common carriers are expressly exempted from its application. It should be just as grave an offense for an official of a railway to be faithless to his trust for financial gain as it is for an elected official of the Government to betray his trust for money reward.

By this case the need of some limitations—

Here is another recommendation—

on the issuance of stocks and bonds by common carriers, whether directly or through holding-company devices or otherwise, is again demonstrated.

Mr. President, in this case the men who were occupying positions of trust, employees of the corporation, after they had run the value of the stock of the Rock Island road in 10 years from $200 down to $20, not satisfied with that, formed a syndicate composed of themselves and some financial men outside the railroad company with the deliberate purpose of putting the railroad company in the hands of a receiver. Their own attorney, drawing a salary paid by the stockholders, drew at their direction the bill to file in the court asking that a receiver be appointed.

Then he went out and hunted a man who was a creditor and brought him back as the complainant in the case. This was unknown to the balance of the directors. It was unknown to the stockholders, although that general attorney, drawing a salary, as I said, was present at a stockholders' meeting with that bill in his pocket. Secretly they combined to do this and to hold off until they manipulated the stock that they owned, as the report said, and made money out of it, and then filed the bill, and made no objection, of course, on the part of the railroad company, although the commission says it was a fictitious suit, and consented to the appointment of a receiver, and had an arrangement in advance that some of the very conspirators who were in it, not satisfied with the ill-gotten gains they had made so far, should be appointed receivers.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. What was the name of that attorney?

Mr. NORRIS. He was at the time the general counsel of the railroad company. I do not see his name here. I do not believe I have the name of the general attorney.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I think the Senator does an injustice to one very good man. The receivers appointed for the Rock Island were not both of them conspirators.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not think they were.

Mr. KENYON. I understand it was arranged that the conspirators should be appointed, but the court rather shocked the financial looters by appointing Judge Dickinson as one of the receivers. The other receiver since that time has retired and is defendant in a suit brought against himself and several others by Judge Dickinson, as receiver, for a great many million dollars.

Mr. NORRIS. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Iowa. I perhaps would have forgotten to mention that; I, of course, do not want to do any injustice to Judge Dickinson. My judgment is that he is perfectly competent and perfectly honest, and he is doing very good work as receiver.

Mr. KENYON. I know that Judge Dickinson opposed it just as much as the Senator would have done.

Mr. NORRIS. I submit that the conspirators never had Judge Dickinson in mind. They had their own men alone in mind, and they instructed the other attorney they employed to represent the other side to consent. But it is true, as the Senator from Iowa says—and I am very glad that he has said it—the court refused to carry out the disreputable scheme, and appointed Judge Dickinson as one of the receivers.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator is familiar, is he not, with this suit that Judge Dickinson as a receiver has brought against these eminent men?

Mr. NORRIS. I knew the suit was pending, and I think it is still pending.

Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], who was honoring me with his presence but has gotten weary and retired, asked me if I was going to suggest any remedy.

Mr. President, I wish to suggest a remedy. The Interstate Commerce Commission has suggested it in various opinions I have read, but in the syllabus of one of the cases they substantially specify what they think ought to be done. I want to read that:

In the opinion of the commission the following propositions lie at the foundation of all adequate regulation of interstate railroads: (a) Every interstate railroad should be prohibited from expending money or incurring liability or acquiring property not in the operation of its railroad or in the legitimate improvement, extension, or development of that railroad; (b) no interstate railroad should be permitted to lease or purchase any other railroad, nor to acquire the stocks or securities of any other railroad, nor to guarantee the same, directly or indirectly, without the approval of the Federal Government; (c) no stocks or bonds should be issued by an interstate railroad except for the purposes sanctioned in the two preceding paragraphs, and none should be issued without the approval of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, there has been a bill of mine pending before the Interstate Commerce Committee since January 9, 1914, that I think specifically meets the suggestion made not only by the Interstate Commerce Commission, but that would commend itself to any man who would read the evidence and the reports of the investigation made by the Interstate Commerce Commission in the various railroads to which I have alluded. We ought to have a law, and we can have it. We ought to have it, it seems to me, without any further investigation than is necessary to put the bill itself in proper shape so as to do the things that they have marked out. In addition I think it ought specifically to provide that the corporation injured shall have an action against the persons who do the injury, and that if the corporation itself refuses to take the necessary steps, any stockholder can take such steps, and in such a case he ought to be allowed to recover as part of the judgment attorney fees.

The same bill has been introduced in this Congress. It is S. 3669. It provides—

That it shall be unlawful for any common carrier, subject to the provisions of this act, to purchase, either directly or indirectly, the stock or the corporate property of any other corporation without having first obtained the consent in writing of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Interstate Commerce Commission shall not grant such consent until after investigation and examination it is satisfied that the ownership of such stock or corporate property is not intended as a device or subterfuge, and that the same is fairly necessary for the purpose of carrying out the proper and legitimate objects and duties of such common carrier.

Any officer—

Now we come to the penalty. It seems to me that that is important, and in this bill there is in every instance a criminal penalty—

Any officer, member of the board of directors, or other official or employee of such common carrier who shall use any of its funds, or vote in favor of the use of such funds, to acquire the stock or other property of such subsidiary corporation without the consent in writing as aforesaid of the Interstate Commerce Commission having been duly given, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000 and be imprisoned in the penitentiary for a term of not less than six months nor more than two years.

Will any honest director object to that? Can there be any possibility of injuring any such man if that were placed on the statute books? If that had been on the statute books, do you suppose these things would have happened? It would have been impossible, particularly if one of the other sections were placed there, to conceive that men, in the face of that kind of law, would have violated it.

I believe, Mr. President, if this had been on the statute books the story of the New Haven and Frisco and Rock Island would not have been necessary. They would have been doing now what they were doing when the conspirators undertook to ruin them, a legitimate, profitable, and honest business.

Here is another section:

SEC. 20b. That the board of directors of every common carrier subject to the provisions of this act shall keep correct and accurate minutes of all the proceedings of said board. Such minutes shall clearly show, without any equivocation or concealment, the expenditures of all moneys authorized to be expended, a correct description of all properties purchased, all contracts entered into, and all other business transacted by said board. Such minutes shall at all times be open to the inspection of any stockholder and to the inspection of the Interstate Commerce Commission and its duly authorized agents. In the discretion of the Interstate Commerce Commission such minutes or any part of the same may be made public.

Then follows a penalty for the violation of that provision.

Mr. President, if those two sections had been on the statute books the sad tales that are only illustrative of the possibilities which may exist under our laws as they stand now could not have been told.

Would such provisions injure an honest man? Can any honest director say that by any possibility he could have been injured if he was doing his duty honestly, if this had been the law?

There are two other sections in this bill, Mr. President, meeting the other conditions which the Interstate Commerce Commission has shown ought to be remedied. I ask, without reading it, that the entire bill may be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The bill referred to is as follows:

A bill (S. 3669) to amend section 20 of an act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, as amended, to provide for certain penalties, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 20 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended, be further amended by adding to said section 20, sections 20a, 20b, 20c, and 20d, as follows:

"SEC. 20a. That it shall be unlawful for any common carrier, subject to the provisions of this act, to purchase, either directly or indirectly, the stock or the corporate property of any other corporation without having first obtained the consent in writing of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Inerstate Commerce Commission shall not grant such consent until after investigation and examination it is satisfied that the ownership of such stock or corporate property is not intended as a device or subterfuge, and that the same is fairly necessary for the purpose of carrying out the proper and legitimate objects and duties of such common carrier.

"Any officer, member of the board of directors, or other official or employee of such common carrier who shall use any of its funds, or vote in favor of the use of such funds, to acquire the stock or other property of such subsidiary corporation without the consent in writing as aforesaid of the Interstate Commerce Commission having been duly given, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000 and be imprisoned in the penitentiary for a term of not less than six months nor more than two years.

"SEC. 20b. That the board of directors of every common carrier subject to the provisions of this act shall keep correct and accurate minutes of all the proceedings of said board. Such minutes shall clearly show, without any equivocation or concealment, the expenditures of all moneys authorized to be expended, a correct description of all properties purchased, all contracts entered into, and all other business transacted by said board. Such minutes shall at all times be open to the inspection of any stockholder and to the inspection of the Interstate Commerce Commission and its duly authorized agents. In the discretion of the Interstate Commerce Commission such minutes or any part of the same may be made public.

"Any officer of such common carrier, or member of the board of directors thereof, or secretary or other officer of said board, who shall conceal any item of expenditure of money, or purchase of any property, or make any false notation or entry in the books or records of such common carrier for the purpose of such concealment, or who shall assist in making any attempt to conceal the same so that the expenditure of said money or the purchase of said property shall not be fairly and honestly shown by the records of such common carrier, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $5,000, and shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary for a term of not less than 1 year nor more than 10 years.

"Any officer or member of the board of directors of such common carrier, or any person acting as fiscal or financial agent of the same, who shall, either directly or indirectly, instruct, advise, or request any official or employee of said common carrier to make any false or misleading record or entry upon the books or records of said common carrier, with the purpose of concealing or covering up any expenditure of any money or the acquisition of any property or of the perpetrating of any other deception in connection with the business of such common carrier, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $10,000, and be imprisoned in the penitentiary for a term of not less than 3 years nor more than 12 years.

"SEC. 20c. That any officer, member of the board of directors, attorney, agent, or other employee of any common carrier subject to the provisions of this act who shall, either directly or indirectly, pay any money, or give any ticket or pass, or other property of such common carrier to any public official of the United States, or of any State, county, municipality, or district, for the purpose of influencing or controlling such official in the performance of any official act, or who shall use any of such funds or property of such common carrier for the purpose of wrongfully and fraudulently influencing or controlling any National, State, county, or municipal board or commission, or other public official in the granting, changing, or withholding of any privilege, right, claim, franchise, or right of way, or who shall use any of the money, tickets, passes, or other property of such common carrier for the purpose of influencing or controlling any political committee, convention, primary, or election, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $10,000 and shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary for a term of not less than 1 year nor more than 15 years.

"SEC. 20d. That any person guilty of any of the offenses charged in section 20a, section 20b, or section 20c shall be personally liable to said common carrier and to the stockholders thereof for any loss or damage resulting from such illegal act, and the stockholders of said common carrier, either singly or collectively, are hereby authorized to maintain an action in any court having jurisdiction for the recovery of such loss or damage. If, after being requested so to do by any stockholder, the officials of such common carrier refuse or neglect to begin such action, and the same is commenced by a stockholder or stockholders and judgment is rendered in his or their favor, the expense of such litigation, together with fair and reasonable attorney fees, shall be a lawful claim against such common carrier, and can be recovered in any court having jurisdiction."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in conclusion let me ask, Is any investigation necessary by a joint committee to gather additional evidence? Is it not up to us to remedy the situation? How can men longer delay when time after time the instrumentalities of government which we have provided by law have called our attention and the attention of the world to these financial conditions that can be so easily remedied by the enactment of a simple statute? Does any man doubt that they ought to be remedied? Is there any man who wants to stand up here or elsewhere and say that the story that can be told of these railroads, as the Interstate Commerce Commission intimates, may be told any day with regard to another railroad? It seems to me, in the face of platform pledges made by our Democratic friends, in the face of the official recommendation of the President that we should meet this proposition, that we ought to pay no attention to the other recommendation of the Chief Executive, wherein he turns his back upon the course that he had so bravely started out to follow, and asks us to be silent.

Mr. President, I fear, if this resolution is enacted, that from now on we shall always be met, when we undertake to remedy this situation, with the proposition that this is a subject under investigation by a joint committee and that, therefore, we shall do nothing.

It seems to me that the time to act is now; that before this Congress adjourns we ought to enact some law that would remedy this situation, though there are those who say that we have legislated too much in reference to the railroads and other corporations and do not need any further legislation. If it was harassing, that objection might be good; but this is not adding any difficulty to regulation. It is simply compelling men who occupy positions of trust to be honest; that is all. No man ought to object to that, unless he wants to indulge in such financial operations as have brought ruin to many of these stockholders.

It is not only stockholders, as everybody knows, who are ruined and injured, but, of course, the general public in the end are also injured; other investors are injured; honest railroad men are injured; honest men who want to make honest investments in railroad stocks and bonds are injured, because under the present conditions they do not want to go into a gambling institution and run the risk of losing their savings.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, it seems to me that anything I may say in support of the bill now before the Senate, together with the amendment proposed by the learned Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], would be a twice-told tale vexing the dull ears of a drowsy Senate. I have been very much interested and entertained by the multiplicity of plans and the variety of programs for the settlement of this great problem. The point from which the question is viewed by different Senators and the widely varying shades of thought and conclusions presents rather an interesting psychological phenomenon.

I am reminded of a plan proposed by a black-faced comedian whom I heard some weeks ago. Borrowing from Mr. Dooley, he said that when Dewey sank the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay, he did not know whether the Philippines were canned goods or islands, but now he said he knows they are islands; he knows they are an issue, and he knows they are "a durned nuisance." He said, however, that he was not in favor of selling them to Japan or of giving them to Russia or to China, but he believed in home consumption and home production, and he was going to the next Democratic convention and propose a plank for the platform which would provide that we should swap these islands to England for Ireland and raise our own policemen. [Laughter.] That seems to me just about as reasonable and in accord with the eternal fitness of things as some of the other plans which have been proposed for the settlement of this problem.

Mr. President, it is rather unfortunate that every question considered by the Senate these days must bear the burden or take the coloring of the Senatorial mind upon what is called "Preparedness"—a term which I fear will stand out in American history as a colossal marker of the turning point in the life of this Nation. Well, I rather think the Philippine question has something to do with "preparedness." There is no doubt in my mind, while I have no fear whatever, and do not think any nation beneath the stars is thinking about or has ever seriously thought about attacking the United States through the Philippine Islands—still as a matter of fact if such an attack is contemplated by any nation, or if an attack should be made at any time in the future by a foreign power, there is no question but that the Philippine Islands would be the Achillean heel at which they would first shoot. It is the most vulnerable point in all of the American possessions. The remoteness from our shores and the heterogeneity of the population all contribute to the vulnerableness of the situation. I do not think, however, that we ought to be moved in the settlement of this problem by apprehension of remote contingencies or difficulties which may arise in the future, all of which seem to be magnified by the distorted visions of statesmen who are apparently suffering from the effects of abnormal environment.

I repeat emphatically, that I do not believe there is a nation on earth that ever thought seriously of taking the Philippine Islands from the United States, and I am very sure there is not a nation on earth that could take the Philippine Islands from the United States and hold them against our wishes. As was very eloquently and ably stated by the learned Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], on yesterday, the affluence of whose eloquence and strength of argument always appeals compellingly to me, these questions should be settled upon their own merits—they must be solved, if at all, as they would be in normal times, and the legislative mind should not be moved by the hobgoblins and ghosts that appear in the shadows caused by the crimson torch of war, or the specters in the brains of those who are suffering from the effect of this wave of war lust which is sweeping over the country and temporarily dethroning the reasons of men throughout the world. Let the deliberate judgment of the American statesmen, unmoved by fear, unclouded by the greed for gain, undisturbed by the lust for power, or the pride of empire, assume the reins of government and settle these questions for the future as well as for the immediate present. We should not forget that to-day, well lived, will have a far-reaching effect upon the affairs of to-morrow.

Mr. President, I have endeavored to think profoundly, and I do feel deeply, on this question of "preparedness." There are fundamental objections to it which the superficial observer, I fear, may overlook. Beneath the gilded crest are concealed pernicious policies which will override, indeed absolutely destroy, the vital principles of Democracy, and, unless we shall be careful, overthrow our free institutions. I am one of those who believe that to do the biddings of predatory interests, the goal of whose every effort is big profits, or to follow the lead of the military experts whose natural leanings are for a greater Navy and bigger Army, whose tastes naturally lead them rather to prefer absolute to free government—I say for this administration to follow the lead of such influences will be a mistake, the disastrous consequences of which posterity shall be unable to correct. To express my opposition to "preparedness," as that term is now understood, with its train of inevitable evils, I find it rather difficult to command language. The poverty of my own vocabulary causes me to reach out for help. That my feelings may be vocalized and my thoughts uttered I am going to adopt the language of another whose genius for expression is world renowned, as the better expression of my own views. That which I shall quote from him came as the limpid water from the spring of pure Democracy, unclouded by the mud of politics and untainted with the poison of personal interests. The craving for reelection—the lure of place—the pride of power—and the flattery of pampered interests had not fastened their clammy clutches upon his heart and fired his ambition. The arguments he made then are unanswerable, because he stated the truth, unalloyed by selfish interest. Speaking on the question of "preparedness," the necessity for quadrupling our Army and doubling our Navy, thus outraging the genius of our Government, violating the history and traditions of the Democratic Party, and as the legitimate consequence of illegitimate conditions, piling up higher, and higher still, the burden of taxation upon the backs of the toiling millions of this country, that distinguished citizen said:

"It can not be discussed without first answering some very searching questions. It is said in some quarters that we are not prepared for war. What is meant by being prepared? Is it meant that we are not ready upon brief notice to put a nation in the field, a nation of men trained to arms? Of course we are not ready to do that; and we never shall be in time of peace so long as we retain our present political principles and institutions. And what is it that it is suggested we should be prepared to do? To defend ourselves against attack? We have always found means to do that and shall find them whenever it is necessary without calling our people away from their necessary tasks to render compulsory military service in time of peace.

"Allow me to speak with great plainness and directness upon this great matter and to avow my convictions with deep earnestness. I have tried to know what America is, what her

people think, what they are, what they most cherish and hold dear. I hope that some of their finer passions are in my own heart—some of the great conceptions and desires which gave birth to this Government and which have made the voice of this people a voice of peace and hope and liberty among the peoples of the world; and that, speaking my own thoughts, I shall, at least in part, speak theirs also, however faintly and inadequately, upon this vital matter.

"We are at peace with all the world. No one who speaks counsel based on fact or drawn from a just and candid interpretation of realities can say that there is reason to fear that from any quarter our independence or the integrity of our territory is threatened. Dread of the power of any other nation we are incapable of. We are not jealous of rivalry in the fields of commerce or of any other peaceful achievement. We mean to live our own lives as we will; but we mean also to let live. We are, indeed, a true friend to all the nations of the world, because we threaten none, covet the possessions of none, desire the overthrow of none. Our friendship can be accepted and is accepted without reservation, because it is offered in a spirit and for a purpose which no one need ever question or suspect. Therein lies our greatness. We are the champions of peace and of concord. And we should be very jealous of this distinction which we have sought to earn. Just now we should be particularly jealous of it, because it is our dearest present hope that this character and reputation may presently, in God's providence, bring us an opportunity such as has seldom been vouchsafed any nation, the opportunity to counsel and obtain peace in the world and reconciliation and a healing settlement of many a matter that has cooled and interrupted the friendship of nations. This is the time above all others when we should wish and resolve to keep our strength by self-possession, our influence by preserving our ancient principles of action.

"From the first we have had a clear and settled policy with regard to military establishments. We never have had, and while we retain our present principles and ideals we never shall have, a large standing army. If asked, Are you ready to defend yourselves? we reply, Most assuredly, to the utmost; and yet we shall not turn America into a military camp. We will not ask our young men to spend the best years of their lives making soldiers of themselves. There is another sort of energy in us. It will know how to declare itself and make itself effective should occasion arise. And especially when half the world is on fire we shall be careful to make our moral insurance against the spread of the conflagration very definite and certain and adequate indeed.

"Let us remind ourselves, therefore, of the only thing we can do or will do. We must depend in every time of national peril, in the future as in the past, not upon a standing army, nor yet upon a reserve army, but upon a citizenry trained and accustomed to arms. It will be right enough, right American policy, based upon our accustomed principles and practices, to provide a system by which every citizen who will volunteer for the training may be made familiar with the use of modern arms, the rudiments of drill and maneuver, and the maintenance and sanitation of camps. We should encourage such training and make it a means of discipline which our young men will learn to value. It is right that we should provide it not only, but that we should make it as attractive as possible, and so induce our young men to undergo it at such times as they can command a little freedom and can seek the physical development they need, for mere health's sake, if for nothing else. Every means by which such things can be stimulated is legitimate, and such a method smacks of true American ideas. It is right, too, that the National Guard of the States should be developed and strengthened by every means which is not inconsistent with our obligations to our own people or with the established policy of our Government. And this, also, not because the time or occasion specially calls for such measures, but because it should be our constant policy to make these provisions for our national peace and safety.

"More than this carries with it a reversal of the whole history and character of our polity. More than this, proposed at this time, permit me to say, would mean merely that we had lost our self-possession, that we had been thrown off our balance by a war with which we have nothing to do, whose causes can not touch us, whose very existence affords us opportunities of friendship and disinterested service which should make us ashamed of any thought of hostility or fearful preparation for trouble. This is assuredly the opportunity for which a people and a Government like ours were raised up, the opportunity not only to speak but actually to embody and exemplify the counsels of peace and amity and the lasting concord which is based on justice and fair and generous dealing.

"A powerful Navy we have always regarded as our proper and natural means of defense; and it has always been of defense that we have thought, never of aggression or of conquest. But who shall tell us what sort of Navy to build? We shall take leave to be strong upon the seas, in the future as in the past; and there will be no thought of offense or of provocation in that. Our ships are our natural bulwarks. When will the experts tell us just what kind we should construct, and when will they be right for 10 years together, if the relative efficiency of craft of different kinds and uses continues to change as we have seen it change under our very eyes in these last few months?

"But I turn away from the subject. It is not new. There is no new need to discuss it. We shall not alter our attitude toward it because some amongst us are nervous and excited. We shall easily and sensibly agree upon a policy of defense. The question has not changed its aspects because the times are not normal. Our policy will not be for an occasion. It will be conceived as a permanent and settled thing, which we will pursue at all seasons, without haste and after a fashion perfectly consistent with the peace of the world, the abiding friendship of states, and the unhampered freedom of all with whom we deal. Let there be no misconception. The country has been misinformed. We have not been negligent of national defense. We are not unmindful of the great responsibility resting upon us. We shall learn and profit by the lesson of every experience and every new circumstance; and what is needed will be adequately done."

Mr. President, I wish merely to add to this quotation, that of all the times in the history of this Republic when our duty to the world demands that this Government shall talk peace, and act peace, and pray peace, and counsel peace, now is the time above all others to do it. If, after this conflagration which is sweeping over Europe, making of that fair land a veritable Golgotha, shall have ceased its ravages, the good offices which we ought to propose as a government to lead the war-mad nations of the earth back into the paths of peace shall be rejected or spurned, we shall have sufficient time then to talk about converting the American Republic into an armed camp. If the arbitrament of the sword must be the supreme law governing the world, the United States Government will be in a position to raise and equip larger armies, build bigger navies, and otherwise prepare ourselves for the great conflict of the future than any other country on the globe. But I am opposed to making this radical departure until we shall have exhausted every honorable and proper effort to lift the nations of the world out of the bogs and mire of brute force and place them upon the high plane of Christian civilization. It strikes me that to entertain any other view and pursue any other course brands our pretended faith in the Prince of Peace as a bloody lie, and our boasted civilization savagery thinly veneered. The extraordinary efforts of the President and other prominent advocates of militarism to force through Congress without proper consideration the "preparedness" bills can be accounted for only upon the theory that they realize, in order to bring about this radical departure from our time-honored custom, the iron must be welded while the war spirit is at white heat. They realize that the extraordinary character of the scheme can only be accomplished while the public mind is in a fevered state. I regard such efforts as a betrayal of the Democratic Party and a capital crime against posterity.

Mr. President, the bill before the Senate at this time carries with it a recognition of the God-given right of the Filipino to govern himself in his own country as his best judgment may dictate and his interests demand. It also redeems a promise which the American people gave to the Filipino when our Army planted the American flag upon that foreign land as an emblem of American authority without extending to its people the protective ægis of the Constitution. Whatever others may think, say, or do, I still believe that nations ought to respect their moral obligations, political parties fulfill their platform promises, sacredly as the private citizen demands that his neighbor shall observe and absolve his voluntarily assumed obligations. I have no more respect for the integrity of a political party, or the leaders of political parties who violate their platform promises, than I have for the integrity of the man who obtains goods under false pretenses, or the fidelity to the law of the highwayman who relieves the innocent wayfarer of his money at the point of a pistol. There can be no two distinct codes of morals for the individual and the Nation. It was thought after the sovereignty of Spain had ceased in the Philippine Islands by force of American arms that it was the duty of the American Government to aid the Filipinos in the establishment of a government of their own. No patriotic citizen of this Republic at that time imagined that the tyranny of Spain was

to be succeeded by American usurpation—our work was altruistic, and the good of the Filipino was the end devoutly sought. We were to assist these people, untrained in the art of self-government, to bring order out of chaos, to establish a government for them, to render just such aid as might be necessary until they should become accustomed to the uses of sovereignty, and after that to retire from the islands, wishing them Godspeed. As an evidence that that was the purpose of the American people, especially those who maintain allegiance to the Democratic Party—the party now in power and commissioned by the American people to direct the affairs of their Government—I am going to ask permission to insert just here as a part of my remarks the planks in the platform of the years 1900 and 1904, 1908 and 1912.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON in the chair). Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE PHILIPPINES.

We condemn and denounce the Philippine policy of the present administration. It has involved the Republic in unnecessary war, sacrificed the lives of many of our noblest sons, and placed the United States, previously known and applauded throughout the world as the champion of freedom, in the false and un-American position of crushing with military force the efforts of our former allies to achieve liberty and self-government. The Filipinos can not be citizens without endangering our civilization; they can not be subjects without imperiling our form of government; and as we are not willing to surrender our civilization nor to convert the Republic into an empire we favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to give the Filipinos, first, a stable form of government; second, independence; and, third, protection from outside interference, such as has been given for nearly a century to the Republics of Central and South America.

The greedy commercialism which dictated the Philippine policy of the Republican administration attempts to justify it with the plea that it will pay; but even this sordid and unworthy plea fails when brought to the test of facts. The war of criminal aggression against the Filipinos, entailing an annual expense of many millions, has already cost more than any possible profit that could accrue from the entire Philippine trade for years to come. Furthermore, when trade is extended at the expense of liberty, the price is always too high. (Platform, 1900.)

IMPERIALISM.

We favor the preservation, so far as we can, of an open door for the world's commerce in the Orient, without an unnecessary entanglement in Oriental and European affairs, and without arbitrary, unlimited, irresponsible, and absolute government anywhere within our jurisdiction.

We oppose, as fervently as did George Washington himself, an indefinite, irresponsible, discretionary, and vague absolutism and a policy of colonial exploitation, no matter where or by whom invoked or exercised. We believe, with Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, that no government has a right to make one set of laws for those "at home" and another and a different set of laws, absolute in their character, for those "in the colonies." All men under the American flag are entitled to the protection of the institutions whose emblem the flag is. If they are inherently unfit for those institutions, then they are inherently unfit to be members of the American body politic. Wherever there may exist a people incapable of being governed under American laws, in consonance with the American Constitution, the territory of that people ought not to be part of the American domain.

FILIPINOS AND CUBANS.

We insist that we ought to do for the Filipinos what we have done already for the Cubans, and it is our duty to make that promise now and upon suitable guaranties of protection to citizens of our own and other countries resident. (Platform, 1904.)

THE PHILIPPINES.

We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder which has involved us in enormous expenses, brought us weakness instead of strength, and laid our Nation open to the charge of abandoning a fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us, as we guarantee the independence of Cuba, until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers. In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our Government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases. (Platform, 1908.)

THE PHILIPPINES.

We reaffirm the position thrice announced by the Democracy in national convention assembled against a policy of imperialism and colonial exploitation in the Philippines or elsewhere. We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder, which has involved us in enormous expenses, brought us weakness instead of strength, and laid our Nation open to the charge of abandonment of the fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers. In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our Government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases. (Platform, 1912.)

Mr. VARDAMAN. I do not think anybody thought of our Government remaining in control of the Philippine Islands permanently until the speculator, the financial buccaneer, the commercial bandit caught a vision of what appeared to be opportunities for speculation and the acquisition of wealth. The fertile valleys then occupied by the peaceful natives, the great forests of valuable timber, and the mines buried beneath the mountains in that remote island empire excited the greed and cupidity of the American and stirred to the depths his avaricious spirit—a quality, I am sorry to say, characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon race. At that moment, and not until then, was born the purpose of permanent occupancy, benevolent American control, and the recognition of our God-imposed duty to lead the Filipino to a state of moral and intellectual excellency which could only be attained after generations of American discipline and control.

It is a peculiarity of human nature that whenever a man or a nation desires to do anything of questionable propriety they at once undertake to discover the unseen hand of Infinity leading them on or beckoning them to come. They always try to charge their diabolism to God Almighty. Rivers of blood have been shed, ambitions frustrated, and hopes blighted in the name of liberty or for the glory of God—while in truth it was all done to serve sinister, selfish ends, promote kingly ambition, or gratify royal vanity. I believe that if the personal profits to be derived from our holding the Philippine Islands were eliminated the opposition to this bill would dwindle in a day, and I want to say just in this connection further, Mr. President, that the longer American sovereignty exists in the Philippine Islands, the further you postpone the day of American withdrawal, the greater will be the vested interests by Americans, and therefore the more stubborn the opposition to restoring independence to the Filipino. Now let us consider for a moment what it has cost the American people in blood and treasure to take the Philippine Islands. It is variously estimated in dollars and cents to be somewhere between six hundred million and a billion dollars up to date, and it will cost something like $30,000,000 per annum to retain them in the future. That is the cost in dollars and cents, which is trivial compared to the cost in blood. A thousand American soldiers have been sacrificed in subduing the Filipinos and maintaining American authority there. How many brave boys suffering with tropical diseases have become incurably sick and insane, God alone can tell. The Filipinos have suffered also. In addition to having their rights violated, their homes despoiled, their country invaded, and every sense of right and justice outraged, they have suffered grievously in blood. It is stated by Judge Blount in his work on "American Occupation of the Philippines," page 395:

"In Batangas Province alone from 50,000 to 100,000 people died due to war, pestilence, and famine. According to the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey Atlas of the Philippines, Batangas in 1899 had a population of 312,192. The census of 1903 gives the population as 257,715. This means a casualty of 54,477. On December 15, 1901, the provincial secretary of Batangas reported that the war "had reduced to a little over 200,000 the more than 300,000 inhabitants which in former years the Province had."

Mr. Willis, in a work entitled "Our Philippine Problem," page 23, makes this remarkable statement: "Gen. J. F. Bell estimated in 1902 that one-sixth of the natives in Luzon died as a direct or indirect result of the war. This would put the death roll at at least 600,000 persons."

In the name of justice, Mr. President, if our people were not hardened by the greed for gold and the avarice for empire such a statement would so shock their sensibilities that the refusal of Congress to repair in part even at this late day the damage done, would visit upon the Members of Congress the scorpion lash of their disapproval and utter repudiation. And in the face of this fact which I have not heard disputed we are told that we are "holding these people for their betterment—to uplift them, convert them to the Christian faith, teach them the story of the Prince of Peace." I imagine that a religion of love that must be inoculated or taught by the use of a Krag Jorgeson rifle or a gatling gun as the hypodermic syringe with which to inject it will not be accepted with any degree of joy by the benighted savages of the Orient. Oh, no, Mr. President, this Congress can not be deceived by such duplicity, disingenuousness, and insincerity. There was no altruism in taking the islands against the wishes of the inhabitants thereof. There can be no philanthropy in retaining them longer.

I have never been able to understand the brand of a man's morals who would be in favor of robbing the American taxpayers for the purpose of maintaining sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and use the money taken from the American against his consent and force the Filipino to accept our benefactions against his wishes. But Senators tell us while "we ought not to have gone to the Philippine Islands at all; that, having gone there, we can not with grace or propriety retire." Rather strange logic, is it not? We have committed a mistake and committed it in an effort to render an unselfish service, but we can not rectify or correct the error without being guilty of infidelity to a trust. With all due respect, such contention does not arise to the dignity of second-class nonsense. It does not deceive anybody, either. If we made a mistake when we went to the Philippine Islands and drove out the Spaniards, murdered the

Filipinos and usurped the powers of government, the way to correct that mistake is to come away—give back to the Filipinos that which we have withheld from them—leave with them our blessings and sail away to the westward.

Mr. President, if the United States Government had done its duty to the Filipino in the beginning there never would have been a hand raised by the Filipino against American assistance. If we had assured them we were there to assist them in the construction and upbuilding of their own government and the moment we completed that work we were going to retire and leave them to work out their own salvation, assisted by our prayers, precepts, and kindly offices, they would have looked upon us as friends rather than enemies. But they knew we were not there for their betterment, and they know it now. They believed then, and they believed right, that their country was being held in order that certain American citizens might exploit them, rob them of their birthright. And now we are asked, for the good of the Filipino, to add to the crime of plunder the sin of deception. It will not do. There is nothing, however, new or unusual in this entire transaction. History is full of such instances. It is another evidence that human nature does not change. It is the same to-day, yesterday, and forever. But it is contended the Filipino is not capable of self-government. The English historian, Anthony Froude, said: "Popular forms of government are possible only where individual men can govern themselves on moral principles and when duty is of more importance than pleasure and justice than material expediency."

That is the Anglo-Saxon standard. When measured by that standard the Filipino will fall short. But the Filipino must not be measured by the Anglo-Saxon standard for the reason that no other race has ever reached the standard of Anglo-Saxon excellency in the art of self-government. But the Filipino is capable of maintaining a government suitable to his peculiar nature and congenial with his development. Self-government can not be taught. You can not inoculate a man with it as you would administer an anesthetic, nor is it a matter of schoolbook learning. It is rather a capacity born of generations of failures and successes. The evolution of certain truths, wrought by time and trials, that mysterious far-reaching influence of blood, a growing, accumulating, intensifying capacity resulting from generations of practice of the individual until at last it becomes the instinct of the race. No people have ever developed to a high degree the capacity for self-government while they were held as subjects. It is really more a matter of race than education. The illiteracy to-day among the Filipinos, if I have read history right, is not much greater than it was among the Americans when the Constitution of 1787 was adopted, and yet I know it to be a fact that the Filipinos would not be as capable of self-government if every one of them were a college graduate, speaking a half dozen languages, as the Americans were a century and a quarter ago. The fact is I do not believe that the best educated Filipino in the world is as capable of self-government as we practice it in America as the average illiterate sane, sound-minded Anglo-Saxon living in the rural districts of this Republic. Why, Mr. President, the majority of men who extorted the Magna Charta from King John could not read. No, it is not a question of schoolbook learning, but a question of race. Now, as a matter of fact, I do not think the annals of history contain an instance where a mongrel race has ever been able to maintain for any great length of time a stable form of government, and it is not fair to expect too much of the Filipino. Give the Filipino a chance and he will take care of himself—he will work out his own salvation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I shall be glad to yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to suggest to the Senator that some years ago we began to treat the Indians as separate nations, and we made treaties with them. Previous to that time we had great trouble with them, but when we established reservations and told them to go on those reservations, attend to their own affairs, have their own government, elect their own chiefs, and punish their own criminals, except for the crime of murder, they readily did it; and the result has been most wholesome as compared with the conditions which previously existed.

Mr. VARDAMAN. There is not any question in the world about that, Mr. President. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. And if the Indians obtained that benefit from administering their own affairs, why would not the same be true of a people who are educated, to some extent at least?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I agree with my friend about it. I agree with the Senator most heartily, and the only way you can develop that capacity is to let them exercise it. I have my serious doubts about the Indian maintaining unassisted a government in the form of our own.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. VARDAMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does the Senator from Mississippi or the Senator from Colorado think that the Indians who were upon these reservations were maintaining an independent goverment, or were they not exercising a sort of local self-government under the absolute control of the United States, precisely what is happening in the Philippines to-day?

Mr. SHAFROTH rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I will answer the Senator from Utah. I have no doubt in the world but that the Indians here in America are being treated in the proper way; but I should not be in favor, if the American Indians lived in one of the islands in the Pacific Ocean, of going there and taking charge of them in order to enforce upon them our civilization.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let me ask the Senator another question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi further yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. VARDAMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator from Mississippi thinks the method of governing Indians by putting them in reservations and giving them a certain measure of self-government was the ideal method, can the Senator tell us why he was in favor—as I assume he was, as practically everybody was in favor—of breaking up the reservation system? It is at an end now.

Mr. VARDAMAN. That has no bearing whatever upon this question. The Indians there violated the trusts that were reposed in them, and it was thought that their wild nature should be restrained. But wherever they have shown any capacity for self-government it has always been wise and prudent to permit them to exercise it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator tell us why we have not continued to permit them to exercise those powers?

Mr. VARDAMAN. As a matter of fact they do, to a very large extent.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh, we have broken up the reservation system, I think, almost altogether. I do not know of a single reservation of any consequence that is still left.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Why, certainly; they have nearly all been killed out, and we have put the remnant over here in Oklahoma. That would be the effect of the permanent occupancy by the United States of the Philippine Islands. If we hold them indefinitely, it is only a question of time when we would do as we did in the beginning, you know, in order to restrain those who declined to submit to American domination; we simply put them out of the way. People like the Filipino and the Indian always wither in the blasting breath of our benevolent civilization.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But we have gotten rid of the tribal system in Oklahoma. Those people are merged into our own citizenship.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Yes; and they have very largely been merged, in some instances, into our own race—a fact of doubtful benefit to the country.

A thousand years would not qualify the Filipino for self-government as we have it in America, and it is a waste of time to talk about it, but they are capable of maintaining a government good enough for themselves. And that is what this Congress is primarily interested in now. Just for the information of the Senators I want to call attention to the utterances of some of the leaders of public thought on the Philippine Islands. It shows, Mr. President, that the germ is there. They are—

> Troubled with the noble discontent
> That stirs the acorn to become the oak.

Analyze the profound thought and patriotic fervor attained by the great leader, Dr. Jose Rizal. He said:

> I do not mean to say that our liberty will be secured at the sword's point, for the sword plays but little part in modern affairs, but that we must secure it by making ourselves worthy of it, by exalting the intelligence and the dignity of the individual, by loving justice, right, and greatness, even to the extent of dying for them—and when a people reaches that height God will provide a weapon, the idols will be shattered, the tyranny will crumble like a house of cards and liberty will shine out like the first dawn.

No savage breast ever harbored such sentiments as that, and none other than the brain of a statesman ever conceived such noble thoughts. It is superb. It only shows "they love their land because it is their own, and scorn to give aught other reason why."

But it was not vouchsafed to him to see his dream realized, but just before the end came he expressed this sublime sentiment:

I die without seeing the dawn brighten over my native land. You, who have it to see, welcome it, and forget not those who have fallen during the night.

Mr. President, that indicates a deep yearning for liberty, a longing for freedom—and not the "desolate freedom of a wild ass," as somebody has said, but a burning desire to share in the government of his own country. I could quote at length from others who possessed in a marked degree the divine power of forethought:

"Men who, standing in the shadow of the night, were able to look beyond it, toward the coming light, and see far off with trance-prophetic eyes, the consummation of centuries." To deny such men the free use of their power and the gratification of their ambitions in their own country indicates a degree of selfishness on our part which would cause a man to burn down his neighbor's house to roast his eggs. But, Mr. President, I am not so much interested in the Filipino, however great my interest may be, as I am in our own Government. I would not carelessly violate our implied obligations to the interests in the Philippine Islands of American investors. I should like to make provision to protect those who have invested their money there, but, Mr. President, the question of dollars and cents, the question of personal profits, has no important place in this discussion. To say that the Government of the United States would prostitute its powers, punish an innocent, unoffending people, take from them the right to govern themselves in order that a few American financiers might receive large dividends upon their investments, is an affront to the intelligence, patriotism, and integrity of the American Government. We want to do the best we can for the Filipino, and we would also do the best that may be done for the American investor, but our first obligation is to our own country. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] on yesterday read an extract from a chapter in Froude's Cæsar which I think is very pertinent to this discussion. The historian says:

If there is one lesson which history clearly teaches it is this: That free nations can not govern subject provinces. If they are unable or unwilling to admit their dependencies to share their own constitution, the constitution itself will fall in pieces from mere incompetence for its duties.

Let us see to it that our own institutions and our own Government is protected. We should not knowingly do that which will recoil upon us. You can not have one form of government for the Filipino under the American flag and another form of government for the American under the same flag without doing violence to the very fundamentals of our home Government. "Safety first" is my policy. The Filipino is incapable congenitally, racially, unalterably of understanding the genius of our Government. We can not make citizens of them. That fact has been proclaimed by the Democratic Party and has received the constructive approval of the American people. We have experimented with this race question in the United States, and all agree that the body politic can not stand any more of the black virus of incompetency. We all know that race political equality means ultimate social equality—social equality will be followed in turn by race amalgamation—race amalgamation will produce race deterioration—race mongrelization, and that will be followed inevitably by disintegration and death of our civilization. Of course, Mr. President, I am speaking of races as diametrically different as the Negro, the Mongolian, and the white races.

The men and women who conceived our form of government and constructed our Constitution never dreamed we would engage in the business of holding subject provinces. It is therefore our duty to get out of the Philippine Islands and come back home, and come back to stay. In answer to the suggestions of some Senators that this Nation must expand and become a world power, that it is our duty to reach out and lead the benighted into the light, let me say, Mr. President, that is a fine sentiment. I want this Nation to become a world power, but I want it to be a world power for righteousness. I want to see it fulfill the hope and realize the dream of the incomparably great men and women who gave it being. I want to see America the biggest moral example that ever fired the imagination, delighted the human soul, or challenged the intellect of man. I want it to lead the world by its superb example of probity and justice to that high plain where the nations of the earth will adopt the principle of the golden rule rather than the rule of gold to guide them in their intercourse with each other. I want the American flag to be an emblem of liberty and the token of truth. When I was a boy living in the prostrate and bleeding Southland, after the simoom of war had withered our productive fields and laid waste to our lovely homes, where the gaunt blackened chimneys marked the trace of vandal warfare, our friends of the North were wont to point to the flag with pride and boast that beneath its sacred folds no man should wear shackles. Well, I like to contemplate it in that sense. I like to look upon it as an emblem of liberty, as a pledge of justice, as a guaranty of freedom to the Filipino in his own country as well as to the Americans; but, Mr. President, I am compelled with a sense of shame to admit that instead of the American flag that waves in the tropical breezes above the Philippine Islands being an emblem of liberty to the Filipino, it is an emblem of oppression, and its bright stars are dimmed, its white lines are stained with the tears and blood of an innocent people who have suffered, sacrificed, and died that they might be free and enjoy the liberty of free men in their own country, a privilege which we in America hold more precious than the ruddy drops that feed the patriot's heart. I sincerely hope the amendment proposed by the learned senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] may be agreed to, and the bill as thus amended passed. The American Senate will honor itself by such an act, and justice at last will have triumphed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I am always interested in any observations which the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] offers. He has taken opportunity to express his position in reference to the military and naval policy proposed by the President, and I believe it a good opportunity briefly to state mine.

I stand with the President in his desire for an efficient Army and Navy, such an Army and Navy as are demanded by our national responsibilities, our national rights, and our national existence. We can not blind ourselves to the fact that force is still the final arbiter among the nations. To be without the means of utilizing sufficient force to defend our rights among the nations, our national integrity, and to repel aggression is to court humiliation, misery, oppression, and defeat.

Now, what is the situation? We have said, through the Monroe doctrine, to the already overcrowded nations of Europe that they shall not establish colonies, acquire territory, or extend their system on the Western Hemisphere, with its spacious reaches of rich and undeveloped resources, and this position will arouse increasing antagonism and opposition.

We have said, through our immigration laws and some of our State land laws, to the greater part of Asia—the most populous division of the globe—that its peoples can not have the rights of citizenship in our country, that they can not even come to this country, except as students or visitors, and already this attitude has brought us on one occasion to the very verge of war with Japan. A large portion of our Mexican border is in a state of uncertainty and turmoil, and it is impossible to predict what developments may there occur or how long this condition may continue. It is a well-known fact that last fall we did not have in the entire United States a force half strong enough to cope with conditions on this border.

Furthermore, we have the Philippines, Hawaii, and the Panama Canal. Their protection and defense are imperative.

Again, we are a great exporting Nation, and it is absolutely essential to our economic existence and prosperity that our great export products, such as cotton, wheat, and so forth, have fair treatment on the high seas and in the world markets. In view of these facts, it would be folly to say that we are immune from war. In view of these facts it would be madness, as I view it, not to profit by the lessons of the European war in putting our land and sea forces on an efficient and modern basis.

The first lesson of the European war is the necessity of having sufficient reserve supplies of ammunition and equipment to meet an attack, and attacks generally come suddenly. The President proposes to put our coast-defense fortifications on a proper and secure basis and to acquire sufficient material and equipment for a land force of about 500,000 men. He does not propose a permanent, regular force of 500,000 men, but it is his opinion that we should have sufficient material and equipment on hand for an army of that size.

The President proposes an increase in the Regular Army of 38,000 men, bringing the total to 141,000, a total that will give us a mobile army in continental United States of only about 50,000 men.

In addition, he proposes to ask that a maximum of 133,000 men a year for three years agree to enlist for a military training course of one or two months in each of the three years, the men and officers of this volunteer force to be paid on the same

basis as the Regular Army while in training. They will then be furloughed for three years, with no other obligation than to return to the colors in the event of war or the imminence thereof. This volunteer force has been called the continental army. There is nothing compulsory about it, and if less than 133,000 men respond each year the Government will take them and do the best it can. The total number asked for per year is an average of about 120 men to each congressional district. These volunteers will be trained in their own section of the country.

The Navy plan contemplates such increase as will give us a total strength of 35 capital battleships in five years, with the necessary subsidiary ships. The Secretary of the Navy says that this will in all probability make us third among the nations in naval strength, England being first and Germany second.

The safest insurance against militarism and despotism in our Republic is to have the facilities for national defense on hand and readily available. If we do not have these in ready shape, it will be difficult to assemble them under stress of emergency without centralizing power and imperiling constitutional guaranties. In view of what Europe is suffering, we should congratulate ourselves that we have escaped so far, and should gladly pay the necessary cost of preparedness against war. Nothing will be more effective in preventing war, in securing our contentions and our rights, than knowledge on the part of the world that we are in position to utilize and mobilize in a reasonably quick time an adequate and effective land and sea force.

In raising the necessary funds I am in favor of an inheritance tax, of increasing the income tax, especially on the larger incomes, of an excise tax on munitions of war, and of an excise tax on alcoholic liquors equal to the protective tariff they now enjoy. The necessary funds can easily be raised in this way. As long as we have intoxicating liquors let them be heavily taxed. When they are abolished, as I am sure they will be, the inheritance and income taxes can be so laid as to take the place of the liquor tax. On men like Astor, the baby baron, who have acquired foreign citizenship while their incomes are derived from property protected by this Government, I am in favor of making the income tax double what it is on our own citizens.

I do not understand that the President insists on any particular method of taxation in raising the needed funds except as to an increase of the income tax.

I do not see anything approaching militarism in the President's plan. I am in favor of adequate appropriations for necessary defense, but not one cent for militarism or aggressive war.

I am in favor of the most rigid supervision of all contracts for munitions and supplies in order that exorbitant profits may be prevented, and of the manufacture by the Government itself, to the greatest extent practicable, of these munitions and supplies. It is hardly necessary for me to say that I am not in favor of compulsory service.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, no doubt there are many citizens of the United States who have business interests in the Philippine Islands and who would therefore like to see the islands permanently retained by the United States.

The American people as a whole, however, believe that the Filipinos should finally have independence. Few advocates of permanent retention by the United States have appeared to express their views or assert a justification for their position.

During the present discussion the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and others have demonstrated conclusively that the Democratic position on this subject is in favor of granting the Filipinos independence as soon as that can be done with due regard to the interests of our wards as the controlling factor.

While there is some variation in the language contained in the platforms adopted by the Democratic Party in 1900, in 1904, in 1908, and in 1912, no one can fairly resist the conclusion that it is the established policy of our party to permit the Philippine people to establish and maintain their own government upon such principles and policies as in their own opinion will best conserve their happiness and promote their progress. There have been no specific declarations by any political party in the United States against final independence for the Philippines. That policy, if it exists at all in the minds of any of our citizens, is prompted in part at least by selfish financial and commercial considerations, and if fostered or cultivated at all this is done half secretly rather than aggressively.

It seems to be the general conviction of the American people, expressed in speeches in Congress and in political campaigns, in newspaper and magazine articles and in platform addresses, that the permanent domination of the Philippine Islands by the United States is contrary to the spirit of our political institutions, which are based upon the principle that all peoples should enjoy the right of self-government when they choose to assert that right. The general state of the public mind favors early independence for the Philippines, because our administrative agencies are not peculiarly or specially designed or adapted to the control of dependent Provinces and peoples.

The danger of involving the United States in Asiatic politics through the activities of our Government in the Philippines has been discussed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]. When either of these Senators discusses a subject little remains to be said for the cause he espouses. When both of them present substantially the same conclusions, no room is left for opposing arguments. I may be pardoned for adding to what they have said on this particular phase of the question my own assertion that it is the general public opinion that the permanent retention of the Philippines would inevitably involve the United States in Old World controversies, and that our possessions and control of the islands has not added cordiality to our relations with any foreign power. This opinion of the public is the result of general circumstances and conditions rather than the product of specific knowledge touching the subject, but it is nevertheless entitled to consideration in dealing with this subject, for, after all, abstract truth has little influence in controlling the conduct of individuals or of nations. Both are actuated by what they believe to be the truth, and so far as consequences are concerned prejudice is often more powerful in controlling the fate of nations than intelligence. However, I believe that this general conviction of the public that our possessions in the Philippines constitute a menace to our own peace is founded in both reason and fact, as has been established by the arguments of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. It seems, right there, that we all lose sight of a very important thought—that while the possession of the Philippines by the United States imperils the United States, it is equally true that so long as the Philippines are a part of our possessions that fact imperils the Philippine Islands. The very history of those islands proves that they would not have been touched by the American Government had they not been a part of the possessions of Spain.

Mr. ROBINSON. I was just about to come to that feature of the discussion.

Mr. CLAPP. Then I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator need not do so. He has expressed the thought better than I could express it myself. I was just about to say that the controlling factor in the consideration of this question is the interests and the rights of the Philippine Islanders themselves, and that the security of the islands from attacks may depend upon the relinquishment of control by the United States rather than the retention of it by the United States.

Another reason, akin to the one that has been so aptly suggested by the Senator from Minnesota, justifying independence for the Philippines is found in the fact that the Filipinos themselves desire independence. This to me is a matter of emphatic importance. If I am correctly informed, the opinion predominates among the Filipinos that they are ready for self-government. When I review the history of the struggle for independence throughout the world, begun by the founders of this Republic and taken up by other peoples inspired by their example, I am convinced that this desire of the Filipinos for independence should be given great weight and should be recognized.

In this connection I refer to the oft-repeated argument that the Filipinos are not "competent" for self-government. I do not undertake, in this brief address, to discuss the question of what constitutes "competency" for self-government. Incompetency for self-government is the one argument into which all others resolve themselves against granting liberty and self-government to the Philippine people. It is true that the civilization of the Philippines differs in many respects from ours, but the same may be said of almost every other people on the globe. Race and climate and other conditions create distinguishing features in all civilizations, which are reflected in their social and political institutions. Who is the judge of when a people is competent for self-government? I assert that history vindicates the conclusion that a people must be the judge of their own capacity, and that to constitute any other nation the sole judge of when a people is or becomes competent for self-government is the basest sort of tyranny, the very source of all forms of oppression. Since, then, the Filipinos assert their right and capacity to govern themselves, according to the standards of liberty fixed by history we should accept their judgment rather than insist upon our own.

In my opinion there is only one reason why the Filipinos should not have immediate independence, and that reason is founded solely on expedience and convenience both to the Filipinos and to our own Government and people. Immediate independence would leave the islands in some respects in a state of confusion socially, politically, and industrially. It is therefore wise to take time for adjustment, to anticipate in so far as that can be done controversies and complications which would arise if independence were immediately granted, and to adjust them as fairly and as fully as possible in advance. This relates to many subjects and particularly embraces the property rights of American citizens in the islands. It would seem that two years is adequate for this purpose. It is certainly better to fix some specific time and thus settle all disputes as to our present and future policy in dealing with this subject.

This amendment has a peculiar value at this particular time. It is calculated to have an excellent moral effect on world politics. It will demonstrate the good faith, the sincerity of our pretensions to use the power of this Government primarily for the benefit of the Filipinos themselves, and emphatically contradict the implication that the real purpose of the United States in the Philippines is the exploitation of their resources for the benefit of selfish Americans. We have had many vexing questions to solve during recent years in connection with our foreign relations. Some of the most difficult are still pressing us. To declare now the policy of granting independence to the Filipinos at a fixed time will tend to strengthen the confidence of other nations in our declarations of unselfishness, and will materially aid in the peaceful and proper solution of the very difficult problems now confronting this Government in connection with conditions existing and incidents transpiring in Mexico.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator refers to this amendment as one that gives a fixed date for independence. I know the frankness and intelligence of the Senator. I should like to ask him how he reconciles the provision that the then President of the United States at the end of four years shall decide whether the provisions of the bill shall go into effect or not. It has occurred to me in reading this amendment, which, of course, has been submitted to the Senate for only two days, that far from making any definite decision of the question the introduction of that provision tends to confusion, to uncertainty, and to leave the whole matter that is involved entirely indefinite instead of being definite. It proposes at the end of four years to leave to the decision of one single man, of what political faith nobody now knows, whose opinion in regard to this particular subject nobody now knows, the solution whether or not the provisions of this bill shall really go into effect. It would seem to me, and I would be glad to have the opinion of the Senator upon the matter, that it would lead to great confusion.

Mr. ROBINSON. The amendment in the form which it is now presented provides that if, in the opinion of the President, at the expiration of the four-year period it shall be necessary or advisable for him to do so, on account of new or changed conditions, he can again submit the question to the Congress convening next after the expiration of the four-year period. But if Congress should fail to repeal or modify this legislation, the Filipinos would automatically acquire independence.

That provision does, in a measure, as suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island, diminish the effectiveness or revokes the feature of the bill granting independence within a definite time, but, in my judgment, that is no valid objection. Since the period of four years is allowed for the adjustment contemplated by the amendment and since new conditions are constantly arising, it may not be objectionable to give that power to the President, who is charged with negotiating with foreign nations interested in the subject for the neutrality of the islands.

It can not, I repeat, be objectionable to give the President that authority. I do not regard it as of the greatest importance and I would vote very cheerfully for the amendment without that feature.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator from Arkansas has referred to the external features of that provision, but the provision also instructs the President to take consideration of the internal condition of the Philippine Islands. He will have the great responsibility upon his shoulders of deciding whether at that time the civilization of the people of the islands is sufficient to answer the provisions of the bill. It is a very great responsibility to put on the shoulders of a single man.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is, indeed, a great responsibility, but this provision enables the President to share that responsibility with Congress, if he desires to do so, and in that sense it can not be objectionable to me.

Mr. LIPPITT. Does not the Senator from Arkansas think it will leave the Filipinos in a state of great doubt as to what their future condition is to be?

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not think so.

Mr. LIPPITT. Suppose——

Mr. ROBINSON. I have great respect for the opinions of the Senator from Rhode Island, and I imply from his statement that it would suggest a great doubt as to what the prospect for independence would be, but I think that the purpose of Congress will, beyond any material question, be carried out, and that the result of this legislation as it is now proposed will be to grant independence to the Filipinos at the expiration of four years, if not before.

Mr. LIPPITT. May I ask the Senator what he thinks would be the result of this provision if somebody of the opinion in regard to the Philippines that is entertained by ex-President Taft, for instance, should be elected President at the next election?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, there is no use of discussing impossibilities. It is not within the range of probability or possibility that anything so unfortunate as that would happen to the American or the Filipino people; but if that should transpire, the responsibility would finally be upon Congress.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If, as the Senator seems to indicate, there is objection to this provision because it does not fix a day certain, is the Senator willing to make it a day certain?

Mr. LIPPITT. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that I think the policy in regard to the Philippine Islands should be one of two things. It should either positively grant their independence on a day certain, or it should positively state that it is the purpose of the United States to carry on the policy that for the last 15 years has been of such unchallenged and unparalleled success that even the present Democratic Governor General of the islands has praised it in the most extravagant terms. I think that a half-and-half policy in connection with the Philippines is the most indefensible position that this body can take.

So when the Senator asks me that question, I answer with perfect frankness that my first choice in regard to the Philippine Islands is to help equip them for self-government. I think success in that is probably quite within our reach; but my second choice is to relieve them from all doubt of our future relation and have the courage of our convictions, which this bill has not, and say positively that we are going to do such and such a thing at such and such a time.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I merely want to say——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield further?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The answer to that is that this bill provides that while the President at the end of four years may take into consideration the situation at that time he has no power to prolong it longer than the adjournment of the Congress succeeding that time.

Mr. LIPPITT. Oh, Mr. President——

Mr. SHAFROTH. If no action is taken it is absolute independence at the end of five years and six months.

Mr. LIPPITT. If gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber had a thorough conviction as to the advisability of this step they would not leave it to the decision of a man who perhaps would be a President hostile to their policies to decide. If they were certain that the doctrine they were trying to put into legislation would be followed by success, if they were certain that the conditions in the Philipipne Islands as a result of this legislation would not be as they are in Mexico to-day, they would not put a string on this policy. They hope it will be beneficial, but are so doubtful about it that they hedge by putting the ultimate decision in the hands of a single man instead of settling it in Congress where the duty of decision belongs.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does not the Senator from Rhode Island recognize that to-day it is in the hands of a single man? He can not reverse this policy at the end of 18 months, but after four years automatically the sovereignty of the United States ends.

Mr. ROBINSON. Unless Congress shall in the meantime legislate to the contrary.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Therefore it is not in the hands of one man. At the most it is in the hands of the Government.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator will allow me, I simply invite attention to the duty of the President of the United States at the expiration of four years. If he decides that this independence is to be granted he decides what the policy of the United States will be. If he decides that it is not to be granted he throws the entire question open again for discussion. Upon what he does at the expiration of the four years will depend the future of the Philippine Islands, and the policy can not be decided until those four years have elapsed.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, by way of jest, I may say it is a matter of great disappointment to me that the Senator from Rhode Island has not changed his views since I have expressed mine concerning this important question. I had expected, of course, that he would yield his views when I began the discussion on this subject.

In addition to what has already been said on this proposition, the President is given power to resubmit this matter to Congress, and that is the sole effect of the provision. If before the Filipinos acquire their independence conditions have so changed that in the opinion of the Chief Executive of this Nation he is warranted in doing so, he may again call the matter to the attention of Congress, but if Congress does not recede from the position it now takes the independence of the Filipinos will be acquired automatically as the result of this legislation.

Mr. President, another reason for speedily granting independence is that it will shorten our defense line to grant the Filipinos independence and remove the cause of possible future controversies and conflicts. It is not my purpose now to discuss the subject of "preparedness." No one can seriously deny that the independence of the Filipinos will in the near future lighten our necessary naval and military burden. Surely this is an end to be desired. Whatever view we may take of the subject of preparedness and the necessity for a prompt increase in the Army and the Navy of the United States, the conclusion is inevitable that the military burdens of this Government are already great and are destined to increase.

The difficulty of granting independence will increase with time. Every year that passes will witness the formation of new ties binding us to the Filipinos—ties of a social, a political, and an industrial nature. New business enterprises in which Americans are vitally interested are constantly springing up in the islands, and these will strengthen the influences which will seek to compel their retention. It is therefore better now to declare as definitely as may be our political policy toward the Philippines, and that is exactly what this amendment seeks to accomplish.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] has expressed some apprehension as to the effect of the clause designed to secure the neutrality of the islands for a fixed period by treaty agreements. In order to afford the Filipinos that opportunity for the enjoyment of liberty which the United States has earned for them it seems necessary to secure them from molestation for a reasonable time. In the opinion of many who have studied this question, it is the duty of the United States to do this as a complement to independence. There can be, it would seem, little objection to sharing this responsibility with other nations, and at the worst the burden upon the United States would not be increased if other nations agreed to also guarantee the independence of the Philippines when granted or recognized by our Government. In answer to the suggestion that such an arrangement would involve us in "entangling alliances" with other powers, it may be said that in a sense this is true of every treaty that we make. Our entry into the Philippines may have been a policy in conflict with the recognized principles of the early fathers of this Republic. But we can not now escape the responsibilities which are the natural outgrowth of that policy. The enforcement of such a treaty and its observance would rest upon the same basis as would the observance and enforcement of the stipulations of any other treaty. Those suggest questions which may never arise and which will be dealt with fairly and conscientiously if occasion requires. The obligation is now upon us to protect the Philippines and it certainly would not be increased but would probably be diminished if other nations solemnly assume to share that burden. Public opinion in the United States seems to me to support the proposition that a guarantee of neutrality should accompany independence. The opinions of others who have devoted more attention to the subject may be of greater value than those of one whose duties here have not called him to a particular inquiry concerning this question.

It has been demonstrated to my satisfaction during the course of this debate that the Philippine Islands are not profitable possessions when the subject is considered from a purely selfish standpoint. Of course this is not now and can never become a controlling factor in determining our course toward a weaker people. This Republic is consecrated to the promotion of liberty and justice and, we will not, we must not, destroy or neutralize the wholesome effect of our occupation of the Philippines by dominating them in our own interests.

The time is at hand when me may with honor secure to the Filipinos the boon of liberty, and by the adoption of the pending amendment this gratifying result will be assured.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the pending amendment, but merely to make a suggestion or two with respect to it by way of amendment. I do so at this time that it may go into the RECORD, and I invite the considerate attention of the chairman of the committee and his colleagues and the Senator from Arkansas to the matter I am proposing.

A good deal of time has been taken in the consideration of this bill in discussing subjects wholly foreign to it and of some things that are related to it only in a somewhat remote way. I suppose the subject of preparedness has some relation to this subject. I have no thought now or hereafter during the consideration of this bill of expressing any views on the subject of military preparedness further than to say, which I do now, that in my opinion at the conclusion of the decimating war now raging in Europe there will be less likelihood of any great nation attacking us than for the last 50 years and a greater likelihood of peace so far as this country and the great nations of Europe are concerned. In saying that I do not wish to be understood as intimating that I am antagonistic to a reasonable preparedness, I think there is less occasion now for alarm from that source than before this war began.

Mr. President, the Senate is engaged upon a very serious and important business. This amendment proposes in a way to grant independence to the Philippines. It is proposed that we withdraw from all connection with the Philippines. As I have heretofore remarked more than once, with that general purpose I am in very hearty sympathy, but there are right ways and wrong ways, safe ways and unsafe ways of doing a business of this kind.

I can not but feel that this grave question ought not to be disposed of until Senators and everyone who shall have a voice in its disposition shall be well satisfied in his own mind that he knows, or is confident that he knows, what the effect of the thing to be done is likely to be. We ought not to enact legislation of this kind with undue haste. So far from that it ought to be done with the most careful and painstaking deliberation.

I did not see the last draft of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas until the Senate met at noon. During the day, more or less occupied with duties that demanded my attention, I have been able to give the amendment only a somewhat casual examination. In going over it I have written some amendments to it. I am not sure that the amendments will make it better or worse. I feel, Mr. President, that I ought to be sure in my own mind at least before I propose seriously, or propose at all, unless it be merely by way of suggestion, any amendment to the pending proposition.

There are just one or two of these ideas that I have attempted to formulate that I wish to put in the RECORD, as I have stated, with the hope the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], the chairman of the committee, and the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] especially may examine them and give the Senate the benefit of their mature judgment; and also the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] and others who have interested themselves especially in this legislation. I am not going to stop now to undertake to go into the matter in detail. It would be a little difficult for me to make myself understood unless Senators had the amendment before them and followed the reading. They can do that later.

Mr. President, I make this suggestion of an amendment to the so-called Clarke amendment. After the word "Philippines," in the twenty-first line, page 3, of the amendment, strike out the period, substitute a semicolon, and insert:

or if the President shall be unable to make a treaty or other binding agreement in the form hereinbefore stated with any of the said-mentioned principal nations, then to invite the cooperation of said nation or nations so refusing to enter into such form of treaty or agreement to make each for itself a treaty or convention with the United States obligating and pledging itself to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines and the government thereof.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If the Senator will yield for a moment, I will state that it seems to me a clause of that kind is very wise. There was a period of time when the Hawaiian Islands were the subject of controversy between various nations. England had them for a time, and Daniel Webster obtained an agreement with France and England that neither of those countries would

assume sovereignty over those islands, and it was absolutely respected as long as they remained an independent government. If we can not get the neutrality agreement in the sense of defending the Philippines with arms, we could have a negative defense in the way that they would not themselves attempt to subjugate the islands.

Mr. STONE. The text of the amendment is to this effect:

Immediately upon the passage of the act the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located, in the form of a treaty or other character of binding agreement, whereby the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines, and also to mutually obligate themselves, equally and not one primarily nor to any greater extent than another, to maintain as against external force the sovereignty of said Philippines.

It might be that some of these nations who are interested in that region of the world, it might be that all of them, would refuse to enter into a solemn compact or convention pledging themselves to use force if need be, for that would be the meaning of it, to maintain the political integrity and independence of the islands.

I have submitted an additional clause, an alternative clause, to which I ask the attention of the gentlemen in charge. I am not going to discuss it now; I merely wish to get it before them.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. McCUMBER. Do I understand that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri intends that this guaranty shall be obtained before we shall surrender authority? The amendment as it is now drawn leaves that to be acted upon after they have left our jurisdiction and when we have no control over them. Does the Senator think that that would be an opportune time to secure an agreement of that kind?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I intended to touch upon that. I do not think what I have suggested exactly touches that question, but I think it an important question.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me ask the Senator if he does not himself believe that it would be better to get any kind of an agreement concerning the future of the Philippine Islands while they are still in our possession and while it would be pertinent for us to secure such an agreement rather than after they have left our authority and ceased to be a part of our territory? It might be regarded as impertinent on our part then to ask any foreign Government to enter into an agreement with us to protect an independent government.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, just a moment later, after I had suggested one or two amendments, I intended to ask the Senators who are collaborating, I presume, in the preparation of this amendment to consider the very question suggested by the honorable Senator from North Dakota. It seems to me to be very important indeed.

If any nation should enter into an agreement with us of the nature we have in mind, we may well depend upon this, that, as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has stated, such nation or nations are not apt to make such agreement with us after we have withdrawn our sovereignty over the islands, recognized a government established by the people there as an independent nation, and have sent our accredited representatives to that Government. Far more apt would such nations be to look with favor on an invitation of the kind suggested in the amendment if extended before the sovereignty of the Philippines was established and recognized; aye, more apt still to look with favor upon such an invitation if our recognition of the independence of the Philippines in some way depended upon the entering into agreements or conventions in advance of such recognition.

Mr. President, I believe that the language of this amendment, though well thought out and though it embodies in the main a policy I approve and have long advocated, might be changed so as to accomplish the result more certainly than to leave it as it is, and in this connection I throw out this observation: The amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] and that offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], which is an amendment to the amendment, limits the neutralization, so called, of the islands to a period of five years from the date of the recognition and the withdrawal of our authority over them. I submit to Senators that it is not within, or hardly within, the range of probability—or possibility I came near saying, and I will say of possibility—that within five years after the United States has voluntarily abandoned the Philippines and withdrawn from the exercise of sovereignty over an area of such moment, some other nation would go in, attack the Filipinos, and undertake to absorb them within five years.

Why, Mr. President, an act of that kind would be an act of such insolence, of such an offensive character, as would arouse the indignation of every American, and I do not believe any nation on the earth would venture to do it within so short a period.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. I call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the fact that in the substitute that I have offered, to which the Senator has made reference, the language is "not less than five years." I thought it wise to give the President leeway for any term longer than five years.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I will vote for the bill with the five-year limitation upon it if Senators desire to put it that way, making it the minimum or the maximum, or leaving it to the discretion of the President; but I would do so with the very greatest reluctance and apprehension. I am not going to discuss the matter now any further.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to ask the Senator from Missouri to indulge me for just a moment.

Mr. STONE. I yield to the Senator; certainly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I ask if the Senator will permit me to request permission to insert in the remarks submitted by me a short time ago certain extracts from articles written by Filipinos, which go to show their capacity for understanding government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission to do so is granted.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The fact that I have to leave the Chamber at this moment is the reason why I asked the Senator from Missouri to permit me to interrupt him.

Mr. STONE. I am very sorry that the Senator from Mississippi has to go, for I am about through, and he has been giving attention to this matter.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should be very glad to listen to the Senator.

Mr. STONE. I should like the Senator from Mississippi to be present.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I ask the Senator just one other question right here?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Would not the fixing of any date for the limitation be equivalent on our part to an admission that we would consent to the islands being seized at any time thereafter?

Mr. STONE. Well, I would hardly go that far—that it could be interpreted as a consent on our part; but it would, of course, have the effect of withdrawing our responsibility for in any wise interfering unless by a mere formal protest.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri a question. The line of his argument and the question propounded by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] seem to involve an idea contrary to the one that I thought was intended to be worked out by those who are proposing this amendment. What we are attempting to do now is to get ourselves out of the Philippines as soon as possible, to wash our hands of all responsibility as to their independence, their mode of government, and so forth. It might aid us in extending independence to them to get the cooperation of other governments, but the responsibility is now on us, and it seems to me that whether or not the time when we declare their independence antedates the time when we ask the cooperation of other governments, our responsibility is in no wise lessened. This discussion seems to cause us to lose sight of the fact that our main object is to relieve ourselves of all responsibility in the Philippines as soon as may be.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I listen, of course, with interest to the suggestions of my friend from South Carolina, but I do not care at this time to be tempted into a discussion of this question. I am merely stating one or two things for the consideration particularly of the members of the committee. They may be of no value in their minds or of not sufficient value to induce them to make any change or suggest any change in the phraseology of the bill.

In line 23, on page 3, I suggest that the words "decline to do so" be stricken out, and that the words "decline to make or

enter into any or either form of treaty, agreement, or pledge hereinabove provided for" be inserted.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think the words "or fail" might be inserted in the Senator's amendment, so that it will read "decline or fail."

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I could not hear what the Senator from Missouri read. Would he object to again reading the clause which he wants inserted?

Mr. STONE. Of course I could read it again, but unless the Senator from Rhode Island was following me closely——

Mr. LIPPITT. I was following the Senator very closely; but would he let me read the amendment myself so as not to consume any time?

Mr. STONE. Certainly, I will hand the amendment to the Senator.

Mr. President, I am going to close with a brief reference to the closing paragraph of the Clarke amendment. As it appears in the pending amendment that paragraph reads:

> If any of the nations so invited to join the United States in such undertaking shall decline to do so, then the President shall include as parties to such convention or agreement such nations as may be willing to join therein and to assume such obligations; and if none are willing to so unite therein, then the President is authorized to give such guaranty on behalf of the United States alone for the period of five years from and after the expiration of said period of four years, or any extension thereof, and pending the existence of such separate guaranty by the United States, the United States shall be entitled to retain and exercise such control and supervision in the said Philippines as may be necessary to enforce order therein and to avoid external complications.

I would ask Senators—and I would have been glad to have had an expression from the author of this amendment if he were present, but for the moment he seems to be out of the Senate—what would be the effect if some of the nations, one or two of the nations, invited to join the United States in this suggested convention or treaty should do so and others should not? For example, let us suppose that Great Britain and Germany would consent to enter into such an agreement, but that Japan and France should decline to do so, what embarrassment would face the President in that situation?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I take it that that is one of the reasons why there is a reservation in the amendment as to a report being made to Congress before the expiration of the full four years. There is one year and about six months allowed for Congress to act with relation to the matter. The President can then report such suggestions with reference to it as he desires; and I take it that he would do so if only a few of the nations were willing to join in the arrangement.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Colorado is mistaken in that. The President is permitted to extend this four-year period only upon certain conditions. When I come to address myself to the amendment I shall point out that those conditions are inadequate and do not cover the conditions suggested by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, inasmuch as this matter of an international agreement with regard to the Philippine Islands is something that seems to be in the sole power of the United States Government to determine, the President at any time during the full period of four years, or during the period of a year and a half thereafter, could call the attention of Congress to and could secure the enactment of any legislation with relation to it that the situation at that time might demand.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I have prepared hastily, and therefore imperfectly, several amendments to the text of the pending amendment; but with what I have said I believe I shall not further detain the Senate this afternoon, especially as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] has expressed a wish to address the Senate.

Mr. LIPPITT. May I ask the Senator, merely detaining him a second, would he not ask to have his amendments printed in connection with the pending amendment, so that they might be seen as a whole?

Mr. STONE. I would do so if I had them in form.

Mr. LIPPITT. From the manner in which he stated them, I thought the Senator had them in the shape he desired.

Mr. STONE. No; I have simply written the amendments in the body of a copy of the pending amendment I have before me.

Mr. CUMMINS. Before the Senator from Missouri takes his seat, or after he has taken his seat, if he will honor me with his attention, I should like to ask him one or two questions with regard to the meaning of the amendment, which evidently he has studied with care.

I call his attention now to the last clause on page 4. Suppose the President has, after the two years and before the expiration of the four years, recognized the government established in the Philippines and has been unsuccessful in securing the cooperation of any other nation in the guaranty that is here proposed, is this act mandatory upon the President to enter into the guaranty that is here described, or is it within his discretion to do so or not?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I had supposed that if none of the nations entered into this proposed agreement or treaty the Government of the United States would be, in effect, under the text of the amendment, pledged to guarantee the independence of the islands, and that during that period it should continue to exercise the degree of authority set forth.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am, of course, speaking of the five years after the full recognition of independence or of the government established in the Philippines. The language of the amendment is:

> And if none are willing to so unite therein, then the President is authorized to give such guaranty on behalf of the United States alone.

I have been very much in doubt whether that language would require the President to give the guaranty or whether it would simply permit him to give the guaranty. If it simply permits him to give the guranty, or authorizes him to give it, then we are allowing that question to be determined by the President alone, which is rather a vast discretion to impose upon the President.

Mr. STONE. However that may be, Mr. President, it is hardly worth while for the Senator from Iowa and myself to discuss that question, for if we are going to enter upon the policy outlined in the part of the amendment read by the Senator, then there ought to be no doubt, in my opinion, as to what the attitude of the Government of the United States is. I would not leave it as a matter of discretion to the President, and if the language is subject to a criticism of that kind it ought to be changed.

Mr. CUMMINS. I agree with the Senator from Missouri that it ought not to be within the discretion of the Executive. While I am opposed to any guaranty of any sort after recognition and separation, yet, if we are to enter into the guaranty, it ought to be by the direction of the Congress and not through the will of the person who happens at that time to be President of the United States.

Mr. STONE. Of course, if I went into that I would have to discuss the subject at considerable length, which I am not desirous of doing at this time.

Mr. MCCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish to address the brief remarks which I have to make, which will only take me a few moments, both to the chairman of the Committee on the Philippines [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE].

I think there are three very patent defects in the amendment which has just been discussed. The first is in the matter of securing a guaranty, the second is in the time of securing that guaranty, and the third is in the five-year limitation of our interest over the islands. Now, I want to put this in the form of a question to the Senator from Missouri or the Senator from Nebraska: Why should we ask other nations to give a guaranty that they will join in the protection of the independence of the Philippine Islands? Would it not be far more easy for us to get a simple agreement of those nations that they would not interfere with the independence of the Philippine Islands, rather than an agreement that they would interfere with any other nation that should question their right to independence?

Suppose you adopt this provision in the form in which it now is, do you believe for one single moment, when you stop to consider it, that you could get an agreement, say, from Japan, or that she would enter into a guaranty, which would mean that she would wage war, if necessary, with another government in order to protect the independence of the Philippine Islands? Suppose, for instance, that Japan should reason along this line: "If Germany and America should get into war, the first act of Germany probably might be to attack the Philippine Islands. Now, if I enter into an agreement of this kind I must immediately become the ally of the United States to expel Germany from the Philippine Islands." Do you believe that Japan would enter into any such agreement, and do you believe that any other one of the great powers would enter into that agreement? Do you think you could get Germany to say, after we have left all control of those islands to the Filipinos themselves, that if Japan attacks those islands—and the moment Japan became involved in war with the United States, by the law of nations all treaty obligations between Japan and the United States would be abolished—do you imagine that Germany would enter into an agreement which would require her to say, "If Japan breaks the agreement or gets into war with the United States—which of itself would break that obligation—and attacks the Philippine Islands, we will become an ally of the United States in an attempt to get Japan out of those islands because she has guaranteed their independence"?

No, Mr. President, we will never get the guaranty of the great nations of the world to protect those islands from some other nation; but what we can do is this—and we would not be impertinent in asking it—we can say, just as I have indicated in a little amendment which I have presented:

The President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to indicate to the great powers of the world the desire of this Government to extend to the Philippine Islands and the Philippine people full and complete independence whenever it shall be warranted in the belief that such independence will be permanent and be respected by the other powers of the world.

Then I provide that the President be authorized to enter into such an arrangement with the other powers of the world, conditioned that this country will not surrender her sovereignty until she knows that that sovereignty will be acquired by the islands and will be respected by the nations of the world.

While those islands are ours, it is very proper for us to ask other nations of the world, "Will you respect their independence if we grant them their independence?" When those islands cease to be ours, it would be an act of impertinence on our part to attempt to get other nations to enter into an agreement with us to respect their independence, and, much more for the reasons that I have mentioned, to guarantee the independence of those islands. So, if we are going to get any kind of an agreement, that agreement ought, first, not to be a guaranty, because we will never get that, and it ought not to contain a specific time limit, because the moment that we fix a time limit we indicate to them and indicate to the world that our interest in the welfare and independence of the islands ceases upon a given date. We do not want to say that to the world. What we want, and what the islands want, is their independence, and, in my candid judgment, the nations of the world will be glad to enter into an agreement that they will not interfere with those islands if we surrender our jurisdiction over them.

Five years from now! Why should you fix 5 years? Why should you fix 10 years or 20 years? When we have an agreement on the part of the nations of the world to let them alone, that is indefinite; and it will take a new contract in all good faith for that Government to make the agreement with us, and we will have two parties to the contract.

I think we may just as well eliminate from our minds now the idea that after we have surrendered those islands we will ever get any agreement from any nation in the world that they will go to war with us or against us in order to protect the independence of those islands, and I hope we will be able to make the modifications that have been indicated in the last amendment. I think my amendment is far preferable, because the very first act is to get the agreement. The moment we have that agreement from the principal nations of the world, then the President is to call a constitutional convention in the Philippine Islands. As soon as that constitutional convention is held, a republican form of government organized, an election held, and officers elected under that, so that they start upon their life of independence, then, by a proclamation, the President of the United States gives notice to the world that they are a free and independent people. It is simple of operation and sure of operation if we want to allow the Philippine people their independence.

I wish to grant it to them; but I say candidly that I do not want to vote for a bill that will give them their independence before that independence has been secured by some kind of an arrangement with foreign nations. I do not want a guaranty, because I know we can not get it. I do want a simple agreement to let them alone before we take our hands off of them. Then, and at that time, we can secure such an arrangement.

I hope, Mr. President, that we will not tie ourselves to any preconceived, hurried draft of any amendment without stopping to think what its effect is going to be, or make it a partisan question in any manner, but that if we really want to give them independence, if we really want to secure that independence, we will take a simple and straightforward way of securing it. If we want a guaranty or an agreement, it will have to be obtained while that is our territory, and not afterwards.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I am very much in sympathy with a part of the view entertained by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. If we are going to get any guaranty of any kind, I think it ought to be obtained before we declare the independence of the Philippines. But I want to suggest a thought to the Senator from North Dakota.

It strikes me as a very unusual thing for us to ask any nation to agree not to interfere with the Philippine Islands. Suppose some other nation had a dependency that they contemplated releasing their sovereignty over, and they should come to us and say: "Now, we want you to agree, before we release this dependency, that you will never take it over as a part of your sovereignty." We would naturally inquire what there was in our past that would suggest the probability of our interfering with the sovereignty of a free and independent nation. On the other hand, there would be nothing that could be regarded as a reflection in our saying in advance to other nations: "We propose to surrender sovereignty over a people here that are not very well equipped for defense, and we invite you to join with us in a guarantee of their independence."

No nation could take any exception to that kind of an invitation, while it does seem to me that a nation would be inclined to take exception when we propose to surrender our sovereignty conditioned upon saying to nations that have shown so far no disposition to take the Philippines that we can not do it until they agree in advance that they will observe the independence of a free and independent country.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to press that same argument home to him in a question?

Mr. CLAPP. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Suppose Great Britain should say: "Now, Canada would like to be a free and independent government. We desire to give her that independence, provided we feel satisfied that her independence would be respected, and we ask you to enter into an agreement with us that you will also recognize and respect the independence of Canada." I can see that that would be appropriate; but if Great Britain should ask us to guarantee the independence of Canada, I can very readily see that we would say: "No; we will not interfere with Canada's independence, but we will not attempt to guarantee it by the force of this country."

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, it strikes me just the other way. Of course it is a delicate matter to talk about Canada, which is our neighbor; but I can understand how we could accept a suggestion from Great Britain that they proposed to separate from Canada, that Canada never had maintained any army or navy, was a peaceful country and unprepared for war, and "now we invite you, the United States, to join with us in an international agreement to maintain the integrity of Canada."

Of course I concede that it is going to be difficult to get any nation to agree to maintain the independence of a nation that is free, and of its own volition to get into involved propositions and conditions and situations that might invite war. But when we have lived side by side with these people, with nothing in our career—unless it is our recent exploitation of over-sea territory—that may have suggested to other nations that it is necessary to take a guaranty from us, it seems to me that it would not strike the people of the United States as a very agreeable proposition to have it suggested on the part of Great Britain that it would not do to sever her relations with Canada until she got an agreement from us that we would be decent and behave ourselves and not attempt the subjugation of Canada.

With this proposition of the Senator's we go to the other nations of the world, nations that have shown no disposition to interfere with the Philippine Islands, and we say, "We will let the Philippine Islands go if you will agree not to attempt to bring them under your own sovereignty." It strikes me that it would grate somewhat harshly upon any nation to say to them, in effect, "We would like to free these people, but before we can let them go we must have your guaranty that you will not try to subdue them."

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CLAPP. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. I thought the Senator from Minnesota was about to refer to an episode in our own history. I ask him whether the inquiry he has just mentioned, made of other nations, would not be the equivalent of asking them not to do what we did in 1898 and 1899?

Mr. CLAPP. That is what I say with reference to Canada, the illustration of the Senator from North Dakota. We have gone on taking over-sea territory, and England might be justified, in view of that history, in asking from us that we would let Canada alone. But we make that same suggestion, then, to every nation that we invite to join in an agreement, not to guarantee with us and with one another the independence of the Philippine Islands but that they will be decent and fair and not themselves interfere with that independence. It does strike me that that would not appeal very strongly to the ordinary nation.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CLAPP. Certainly.

Mr. LIPPITT. While the Senator is discussing these contingencies, I should like to ask him what he thinks we ought to do in case we asked some of these nations, and some of them should decline to agree, not to interfere with the Philippine

Islands. Suppose we asked Japan, suppose we asked Germany and England, and all three of them refused to agree that they would not consider taking over the Philippine Islands. Would we then abandon our control and interest in the islands, and nevertheless maintain and extend the Monroe doctrine—which that practically amounts to—to such far-off countries as the Philippine Islands? Would the Senator approve of that?

Mr. CLAPP. I would approve of that, because if I were the Japanese Government and this country said to me, "We will release the Philippine Islands upon condition that you will agree not to take over their independence and make them a part of your sovereignty," I would say, "There is nothing in the history of this Nation to warrant any such suggestion," and I believe every nation would refuse to accept the suggestion involved in that kind of a request.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, does the Senator think that Germany, for instance, would be more likely to enter into an agreement with us that she would guarantee the integrity of the Philippine Islands against Japan than she would simply to enter into an agreement with us that she would not interfere with the independence of the Philippines?

Mr. CLAPP. I certainly think so; because what is there in the history of that empire to suggest that it is unsafe to launch a people here upon a free and independent career without first getting their guaranty that they will not seize upon that independent nation?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I am speaking of the proposition of getting an agreement from Germany that she will guarantee the Philippine Islands against any encroachment of Japan.

Mr. CLAPP. As I said a moment ago, this proposition to get a guaranty of the other nations as to the integrity of the government of the Philippine Islands is a difficult proposition. For one, I do not believe in it; but I do think the nations would much more readily join in an invitation extended to them to come in together and guarantee collectively the independence of those islands. I think that would be far better than to go to these nations with the suggestion that "We can not let these islands go until we get a guaranty from you that you will leave them alone."

Mr. McCUMBER. But, Mr. President, if I may appeal to the Senator again, by the amendment which has been offered, we are saying this word not to one individual State but to all of them. They understand that before we cease our sovereignty or release it in any way we want an understanding with all of the countries. I confess that I can see no difference in the delicacy of the situation in asking all of the Governments to join with us in saying that they will refrain from any interference with the independence of the Philippine Islands and asking them to join together to go to war, if necessary, to protect the Philippine Islands against any country that should happen to be at war with us.

Mr. CLAPP. It is not so much an invitation to go to war. One is an invitation that appeals to the strength and the generous impulse of nations to help maintain the independence of these islands when we free them. The other is a suggestion that we, who took them once, will not now let them go until we get the guaranty of the other nations that they will not invade or take possession of the islands. One is an appeal to their generosity and to their strength. The other is the suggestion of a cupidity on their part that many of them, at least, have not done anything to warrant our suggesting.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside, and I give notice that beginning to-morrow I shall ask the Senate to take up the unfinished business immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business, so that it may be pressed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside.

FLOOD AT YUMA, ARIZ.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 86) for repair and rebuilding of the levee at Yuma, Ariz., and I direct the attention of the Senator from Arizona to the report.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution. It is the same matter I had up this morning, to be perfectly frank with the Senate. I have taken a poll of the committee, and no objection is urged by any member of it, and it is signed by all the committee to whom I have presented it, with the exception of one member.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What is the subject of the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To appropriate $50,000 to build a dam at Yuma, Ariz.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I am in favor of the joint resolution and have no objection to its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 26, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 25, 1916.

SURVEYOR GENERAL.

Frank P. Trott, of Phoenix, Ariz., to be surveyor general of Arizona, vice Frank S. Ingalls, whose term expired January 22, 1916.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

First Lieut. James S. Dusenbury, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from January 18, 1916, vice Capt. Curtis G. Rorebeck; resigned January 17, 1916.

Second Lieut. Ralph E. Haines, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from January 18, 1916, vice First Lieut. James S. Dusenbury, promoted.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

Camille Bringle to be postmaster at Wilson, Ark. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

I. V. Echols to be postmaster at Cotton Plant, Ark., in place of S. W. Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1916.

Pearl P. McCarroll to be postmaster at Walnut Ridge, Ark., in place of C. C. Cate. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1915.

CALIFORNIA.

Mary G. Mails to be postmaster at San Quentin, Cal. Office became presidential April 1, 1915.

COLORADO.

James A. Rutledge to be postmaster at Woodman, Colo. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

CONNECTICUT.

Daniel F. Finn to be postmaster at Jewett City, Conn., in place of William H. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1916.

James W. Green to be postmaster at Eagleville, Conn., in place of A. E. Vinton. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

John F. Oates to be postmaster at Windsor Locks, Conn., in place of C. Leon Wilcox. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1916.

Patrick L. Shea to be postmaster at Derby, Conn., in place of S. E. Chaffee. Incumbent's commission expires February 8, 1916.

FLORIDA.

P. M. Elder to be postmaster at Sanford, Fla., in place of C. F. Haskins. Incumbent's commission expires February 8, 1916.

GEORGIA.

H. J. Jolly to be postmaster at Cartersville, Ga., in place of Walter Akerman. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1914.

Buford L. Heartsill to be postmaster at Dalton, Ga., in place of John A. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1916.

David A. Trundle to be postmaster at Ringgold, Ga. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

ILLINOIS.

Joseph S. Senglar to be postmaster at Woodriver, Ill., in place of S. S. Hubbard, resigned.

Molly Webster to be postmaster at Salem, Ill., in place of J. C. Utterback. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1915.

INDIANA.

Henry O. Eldridge to be postmaster at Lagrange, Ind., in place of E. B. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1916.

Vern Hahn to be postmaster at Wakarusa, Ind., in place of Frank Fletcher, removed.

IOWA.

George F. Althouse to be postmaster at Ackley, Iowa, in place of S. D. Breuning, resigned.

James Duggan to be postmaster at Melrose, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Harold H. Holmes to be postmaster at New Albin, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Charles F. Irons to be postmaster at Garrison, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Fred L. Ives to be postmaster at Hamburg, Iowa, in place of David D. Darby, removed.

Magnus A. Merkel to be postmaster at Keystone, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Carl Reinecke, jr., to be postmaster at Elkader, Iowa, in place of Vellas L. Gilje. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1915.

William B. Trullinger to be postmaster at Farragut, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Philip D. Switzer to be postmaster at St. Charles, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Thomas J. White to be postmaster at Whittemore, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Clyde L. Woods to be postmaster at Garwin, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

KANSAS.

George E. Bentley to be postmaster at Burr Oak, Kans., in place of E. C. Hill. Incumbent's commission expires February 8, 1916.

Cecil Calvert to be postmaster at Quinter, Kans. Office became presidential October 1, 1915.

Dorothy F. Derrick to be postmaster at Hugoton, Kans. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

T. J. Foley to be postmaster at Chapman, Kans., in place of J. A. Whitehair. Incumbent's commission expires February 20, 1916.

Edward Grauerholz to be postmaster at Esbon, Kans., in place of J. J. Yapp. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1916.

W. L. Ringo to be postmaster at Girard, Kans., in place of T. R. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires February 20, 1916.

KENTUCKY.

J. Walter Payne to be postmaster at Paris, Ky., in place of R. K. McCarney, deceased.

LOUISIANA.

Charlton Fort to be postmaster at Minden, La., in place of Charlton Fort. Incumbent's commission expires February 7, 1916.

Floyd C. Mitchell to be postmaster at Zwolle, La., in place of F. C. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expires February 13, 1916.

MAINE.

A. W. Willey to be postmaster at Cherryfield, Me., in place of M. J. Allen. Incumbent's commission expires March 1, 1916.

MARYLAND.

Southey King White to be postmaster at Salisbury, Md., in place of J. T. Truitt, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS.

John P. McKay to be postmaster at Wellfleet, Mass., in place of E. I. Nye. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1916.

MICHIGAN.

Riley L. Compton to be postmaster at Rockford, Mich., in place of Neal McMillan. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1916.

Patrick F. Heenan to be postmaster at North Branch, Mich., in place of Albert Schell. Incumbent's commission expires February 20, 1916.

MINNESOTA.

C. H. Day to be postmaster at Albert Lea, Minn., in place of T. V. Knatvold. Incumbent's commission expires February 7, 1916.

Julia A. Keefe to be postmaster at Morton, Minn., in place of Otis W. Newton, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI.

Coke B. Wier to be postmaster at Quitman, Miss., in place of Coke B. Wier. Incumbent's commission expires February 19, 1916.

MISSOURI.

Edverda Barnes to be postmaster at Pilot Grove, Mo. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Thomas P. Diggs to be postmaster at New Haven, Mo., in place of W. J. Godt. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1916.

MONTANA.

Mary E. Turrell to be postmaster at Drummond, Mont. Office became presidential October 1, 1915.

NEW JERSEY.

F. J. Dushanek to be postmaster at Garwood, N. J., in place of Richard Watt. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1916.

Paul F. Edwards to be postmaster at Newfield, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1915.

Charles R. Grover to be postmaster at Atlantic Highlands, N. J., in place of L. S. Sculthorp. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

NEW MEXICO.

James W. Harmon to be postmaster at Melrose, N. Mex. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Skillman C. Hunter to be postmaster at Texico, N. Mex. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

NEW YORK.

Fay W. Amidon to be postmaster at Hilton, N. Y., in place of Minnie A. Daily. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

Warren C. Brady to be postmaster at Brushton, N. Y., in place of A. B. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

Walter F. Brown to be postmaster at Remsen, N. Y., in place of John W. Prichard. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1915.

Antoine N. Burton to be postmaster at Keeseville, N. Y., in place of Seraph E. Wolcott. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1916.

Henry J. Griffin to be postmaster at Bombay, N. Y., in place of C. R. Matthews. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1915.

E. J. Hanratta to be postmaster at Watervliet, N. Y., in place of Thomas C. Ross. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

Ernest D. Joslin to be postmaster at Voorheesville, N. Y., in place of Frank Bloomingdale. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1915.

James W. Larkin to be postmaster at Brockport, N. Y., in place of Burton H. Avery. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

Thomas O'Brien to be postmaster at Carmel, N. Y., in place of S. G. Cornish. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1916.

John W. Rose to be postmaster at Arlington, N. Y., in place of J. W. Rose. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

George W. Runyon to be postmaster at Spring Valley, N. Y., in place of John S. Van Orden. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

Ezra H. Welling to be postmaster at Monroe, N. Y., in place of Charles T. Knight. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1916.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Frank W. Miller to be postmaster at Waxnesville, N. C., in place of Thomas L. Green. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1916.

OKLAHOMA.

Alva P. Daniel to be postmaster at Commerce, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Ora E. McCague to be postmaster at Ralston, Okla., in place of Ora E. McCague. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1915.

OREGON.

Walter L. Hembree to be postmaster at McMinnville, Oreg., in place of Hervey M. Hoskins. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1915.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

James A. Barrett to be postmaster at Clover, S. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

TEXAS.

Mrs. Ross Manning to be postmaster at Madisonville, Tex., in place of C. J. Davis, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Ida J. Garrison to be postmaster at Lost Creek, W. Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 25, 1916.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Charles R. Williams to be United States attorney, district of the Canal Zone.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Robert M. Rawls, Athens.

GEORGIA.

R. P. Hicks, Wrightsville.
Albert C. Sweat, Nashville.

MASSACHUSETTS.

John A. Bell, Leicester.
Perry F. Brown, Northampton.
James F. Carens, Newburyport.
Arthur J. Coughlan, Maynard.
Edmund Daly, Hingham.
Joseph F. Murrman, Clinton.
William W. McLehose, Norton.
Thomas F. Meehan, Orange.
John P. O'Connor, Palmer.
Thomas A. O'Connor, North Easton.
Dennis T. Shea, North Scituate.
James E. Sullivan, Gilbertville.
William F. White, Mansfield.

NEW JERSEY.

John F. Sinnott, Newark.

NEW MEXICO.

Arthur F. Jones, Portales.
Edgar Savage, Elida.

NEW YORK.

Frank C. Sweeny, Valhalla.
Isaac W. Turner, Mount Kisco.

OHIO.

Frederick B. Mowery, Kingston.

OKLAHOMA.

John R. Reynolds, Hastings.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Benjamin H. Massey, Fort Mill.
Cecil S. Rice, Denmark.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn January 25, 1916.

F. H. Soll to be postmaster at Elkader, Iowa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *January 25, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

With gratitude welling up in our hearts to Thee, O God our Father, for the gift of life and the splendid opportunities to grow and expand it to full and symmetrical proportions "till we all come unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ," we come to Thee for wisdom, strength, and courage, that we may meet the responsibilities of to-day, for it will pass and come no more again. In service to our fellow men is life and liberty, joy and happiness. A generous thought, a kind word, a helping hand is ours to give. "Let us not be weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap if we faint not. As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men," and pass on our way in faith, hope, and love. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. ADAMSON. To make a request for unanimous consent. My colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. EDWARDS], delivered an address at the dedication of a monument erected by an appropriation made by Congress, under the auspices and direction of the Fine Arts Commission, and I request unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing that address in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by his colleague [Mr. EDWARDS] at a monument dedication. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the road bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimouse consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of roads. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of rivers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of rivers. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

THE COMMON DEFENSE.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for 20 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, in the quietude of my garden last summer and autumn I reached certain conclusions which I have hesitated to express, thinking that I might modify them. But as time has gone on and events have occurred, it has seemed to me even more certain that my conclusions were right than when I first reached them; and I think, in justice to myself and, I hope, with some slight benefit to the country, I ought to express those conclusions to the House.

It is well known in the House that I never have been a believer in a large standing Army, and I suppose that probably I have been properly classed among those who are sometimes referred to as the "little-navy men." But wise men ought to be able to peer, maybe indistinctly, into the future and to prepare to-day for what may come to-morrow. The world is in the most anomalous condition which mankind has ever seen. The greatest struggle of all the ages is going on now between the most powerful forces of the human race, between great nations and combinations of nations, until we are the only large, powerful nation not yet involved in that struggle. It is a break-up in the world, each side fighting not merely for its own existence, as it believes, but, as it seems to me, each side fighting with the determination to put the other side, as it were, out of business. We have never had such a thing in the world before, with the same powerful influences at work.

The laws of civilization, international laws, the laws of humanity, are usually disregarded, at least more or less, when two great forces are fighting for mastery. When two men are fighting, each believing that he is fighting for his life, each determined to take the life of the other, neither one pays much attention to the desires, the requests, or the demands of some less powerful person not engaged in the conflict.

I do not know, and no one knows, what will result from the present war. No one knows whether the aggression on either side against our interests may possibly, against our desires and contrary to our wishes, finally lead us, perhaps not into this struggle, but into some struggle which is the outcome of this one. I doubt whether a paper peace between the two struggling parties now, even if it could be entered into, would be even the beginning of the end. I think the present conflict is liable and likely to last for many years before it is definitely determined either that one or the other is the master or that neither can become the master. And it seems to me that the part of wisdom for us is to prepare ourselves fairly for any possible trouble that may come. [Loud applause.]

It may be that we will have no trouble. I hope we may not. In this war I am neutral. I think we ought to maintain peace

at all hazards. And yet the time may come when we shall not have the determination whether we can maintain peace or not, because, however much we may desire peace, it is not within our power, with the feelings which we have, to stand aggression too far.

It will be expensive to prepare for peace. Two years ago a billion dollars seemed a very large sum of money. No one would have believed two years ago that either England or Germany could carry on a war at the expense already involved, amounting to billions of dollars, where the interest on the indebtedness is sufficient to carry on the ordinary governmental work. And the end of that indebtedness is not in sight. What may come out of such immense burdens of debt in these countries, even when peace may be declared, no one can tell. Revolutions are not improbable, and revolutions in the history of the world have usually led to aggression and disputes and often to war with other countries. We can better afford to-day to spend hundreds of millions of dollars or a few billions of dollars in ample preparation for trouble and avoid it, if possible, than to wait for trouble and then spend untold billions before we are finally victors, as we would be. [Applause.] If we are involved in no trouble, we shall be getting off cheaply with the expenditures for preparation. If we should be involved in trouble, the money we spend now will be worth manyfold that which we would spend after the trouble began. [Applause.]

I know gentlemen are sincere in their belief that there will be no trouble. I sympathize with those who prefer to spend the money of the people in the way of investment, in aiding our own people at home, rather than for the support of idle armies or navies. But when the trouble does come, if it should come, there would be no dissentient voice against spending all our means, if necessary, to defend our country and our homes, and it were wise for us now, it seems to me, to commence our preparation.

I do not intend to discuss the details, though I have reached the conclusion myself that it were well, as an emergency measure, to increase our Regular Army to 250,000 or 300,000, or even half a million men [applause]; that we should increase or provide our fortifications, so that our coasts may be fairly, amply protected, and that we should provide a Navy which will be able to defend us on the sea. I have much more fear, in the end, of war with England than I have of war with Germany. [Applause.]

Events are coming rapidly in the world. We may sit by and wait in contentment, and yet it is our duty, as the managers of a great country and a powerful people, to provide for their protection against possibilities as well as against certainties. I think, then, that we ought to provide these great forces; that it ought to be considered as an emergency matter, entirely apart from the ordinary routine expenses of Government, without regard to partisanship or party lines. [Applause.] If England and France and Germany and Italy can consider their propositions without party lines, a country like ours ought to be able to sweep aside mere partisan considerations and try all to stand together, loyal to the country, in the effort to aid the administration of the Government.

I think, further, that we ought to provide in some way for the building up and the strengthening of our home industries, so that if we shall become involved in war we may be able to live within ourselves. [Applause.] And I think as far as possible that question should be considered entirely apart from former partisan opinion, in the hope that in some way we may get together in the interest of our country, if we should become involved in a struggle with a foreign power.

I have spoken thus very briefly, not with rhetoric or fancy phrase, because it seems to me that if there ever was a time in the history of our country when we ought to invite and receive expressions of opinion from all sides, this is one of the times, with a firm determination that out of it we will bring results; a combination of the opinions of all, without expressing the views of any, which we and all of our people may stand for, that we may uphold in the future our national honor and our national integrity; and, it seems to me, possibly our modern civilization, which I fear may break down on the other side of the water. Let us try to think what is for the best of our country, what we would do if we had each one the supreme authority and responsibility, if it were placed upon each one to determine whether he would take the chance of disaster in the future or prepare now to prevent that disaster. [Prolonged applause.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday, after the approval of the Journal; and, if such consent is granted, I propose to address myself to the subject, "The real causes for the necessity of getting ready."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] asks unanimous consent that on next Thursday, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table, he be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes, subject to the conditions imposed on all these speeches, that they are not to interfere with appropriation bills or privileged matters. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from West Virginia rise?

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. I rise for the purpose of asking the unanimous consent of the House that I be permitted to address the House to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal, on the subject of peace.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from West Virginia permit me to suggest that to-morrow is Calendar Wednesday, and that we have a very important bill up, where the time is necessarily limited?

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. I would quite agree with the gentleman from Illinois, but I fear I shall not be here Friday.

Mr. MANN. To-morrow is Wednesday.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. I will call it up later. I do not want to interfere with the business of the House. I would take only perhaps 25 minutes to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from West Virginia change his request to Thursday?

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. I shall not be here Thursday, Mr. Speaker. I will just let it go by for the present.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Washington rise?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. To ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN], I be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that next Thursday, at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN], he be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes, subject, of course, to the restrictions that are put on all these speeches. Is there objection.

There was no objection?

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE COMMON DEFENSE.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, except for the application of a general doctrine to a particular interest or, rather, to a particular locality, it would be gross impertinence on my part to address this House at this time upon the conclusion of the magnificent, patriotic, American address of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. [Applause.] I rise to do so because on the morrow the President of the United States journeys to the city which I have the honor in part to represent.

The President of the United States is the President of us all, whether we voted for him or not. He will be cordially welcomed in that great American city; welcomed for many reasons; welcomed because of the high office which he holds; welcomed because of his learning and ability; and welcomed because of his high personal character as a man. Yes; more than that; he will be welcomed because the errand on which he comes is popular in the community to which he goes.

There is another reason why he will be cordially welcomed, if the President chooses to avail himself of it. Personally I am of what passes in this country for old lineage. My most recent foreign ancestor came here in the eighteenth century, and I have only an intellectual appreciation of the fact that a man may be the best possible American citizen and yet retain a warmth of affection for the land of his birth or of his ancestry. But the President in that regard, going to that great American city, is doubly fortunate. I have no doubt that his biography, as published in the Congressional Directory, was submitted to him and is correct. Amongst other things, he says his father was a native of Ohio and his mother of Scotland, and his ancestry on both sides is Scotch-Irish.

In that city of over 5,000,000 people, now the largest city in the world, there are thousands among the citizens and the residents who can understand with an affectionate warmth the purpose which impelled the President of the United States in referring in his autobiography to the land of the birth of

his mother; and we, who are in whole or in part of Celtic ancestry—and there are many such in the city to which he is going—will agree with him that his mother, and therefore himself, came from one of the best race stocks that there is.

But the President of our country, if he will avail himself of it, can at once touch the heartstrings of the majority of our people by alluding to the fact, which must be present in his heart, that a man can be a loyal American citizen and yet love the customs, the songs, the people, and have an interest even in the present affairs of the country from which at least one of his parents came.

Mr. Speaker, many things are necessary under the general head of preparedness. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has spoken of both material and spiritual things which are necessary. For my part I purpose to speak largely along the lines of those matters which come under the head of spiritual rather than material preparation; for, first and foremost, if we are to be prepared for any emergency, we must be ourselves a united people. The Scotch-Irish people, of whom the President is one, belong largely to one great church, a church to which some of us here have also the honor of belonging, and which we hold in affectionate regard. In the old days of the Scotch kirk, when a member of one of those Presbyterian churches was starting out upon a journey or toward the accomplishment of a great purpose, it was the pious duty of a fellow member to give him a word of Scripture to be of assistance to him on his journey. Oh, I would that as a fellow Presbyterian I could, before the President made his recent address to this House, have given him a word of Scripture, which I now give him in all seriousness to take to that great city which I love. This is the phrase:

> But let all men be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath, for the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God.

If the President had had that phrase in his mind, he would have hesitated before, on very slight evidence, he used those particular words in which he segregated a portion of our citizenship, notably a certain portion born abroad. For the President is not unfriendly to people of foreign birth. I do him the justice willingly to admit that, and to call swiftly to the attention of this House the fact that the words of scorn which he heaped upon unknown and unnamed persons were followed in the next sentence by one of the most generous tributes to citizens of foreign birth ever uttered in this House by either President or Member. The President simply was misled by some one; and as he journeys to our great city, he can do the cause which he represents no greater good than by demonstrating that even a President of the United States is not too great nor too proud to apologize for a statement made almost without foundation.

For what are the facts about this allegation as to persons of foreign birth involved in plots? I have addressed two resolutions of inquiry, one to the President, one to the Attorney General. The newspapers inform us that the names have been sent to our Judiciary Committee, although the Judiciary Committee has not brought them to the attention of the House. And during these long months of war I find that of citizens of German birth there is just one, or possibly there are two, who have been even accused of violations of our neutrality laws [applause], Mr. Lyendecker, of New York City; and if Mr. Schulteis, of Illinois, is an American citizen of German birth, then the number is two instead of one.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BENNET. For a question; yes.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman mean to say to the House that he interprets the speech of the President to the effect that his criticism was directed toward people born of German parentage or in Germany?

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, the speech was interpreted by the country to relate to American citizens in this country who had been born subjects or citizens of the central powers; and the President, as a scholar of ability and a man of learning, should have realized that in the condition of the public mind his speech would have been so interpreted.

The President of the United States can, if he will——

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BENNET. For a question.

Mr. BORLAND. The President having clearly limited his remarks to actual offenders, why does the gentleman say that any such interpretation as that should necessarily be placed on his speech, when it was distinctly limited to men who were actual offenders against the American laws?

Mr. BENNET. Because out of a total foreign-born population in our country of something over 14,000,000 the proofs show that but one man has been even accused of a violation of our neutrality laws, a number so infinitesimal that neither the President of the United States nor anyone else in a high position of responsibility should have agitated our united citizenship by an implication which, coming from such a source, must have been considered to refer to large numbers. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. BENNET. Just for a question; but I desire to give notice that after that I shall not yield, as I see my time is short.

Mr. HEFLIN. Does not the gentleman know that when the President made that reference he referred only to those who were classed as anarchists in this country, those who were trying to blow up buildings and destroy powder works in the United States in their efforts to aid warring factions across the waters? Does not the gentleman know that the President did not mean to reflect upon the great body of patriotic Germans and Hungarians and others born on foreign soil but now obedient to our laws and loyal to our flag?

Mr. BENNET. I say again, patiently, that I have no doubt that the impression was conveyed to the country that the President did refer to people who were engaged in plots such as that, but also that he referred to those who were born under the jurisdiction of the central powers, and that if the President had investigated he would have found out that the accusation was against only one man who came within that class, and that being so, he ought not to have said it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the gentleman mean, then, that the——

Mr. BENNET. I said I would decline to yield further, and I must decline.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I regretted the speech that was made here by my warm personal friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], because it has made more difficult the task to which he and the President of the United States have addressed themselves, differing only in detail. We can not go forward as a united people unless we are united, and we can not be united if Representatives in Congress, or the President of the United States, or Members of the body at the other end of the Capitol by word or speech segregate any part of our common citizenship. [Applause.]

I did not rise to defend that large body of voters in my congressional district who are of German birth and ancestry, and I shall not defend them now, because the German stock in this country is as old as that of any other country. And if the gentleman from Massachusetts had exercised his memory—for he has the knowledge—he would have recalled that the very first Speaker of the House of Representatives was a German. [Applause.] He was the son of that distinguished Lutheran clergyman who rose in his pulpit during the Revolutionary War, preached a forceful sermon of adherence to the Revolutionary cause, and then, throwing aside the black cassock of the clergyman, stood revealed in all the panoply of a soldier of the American Army and demanded that those men who were loyal to the cause of the Revolution should follow him from the church to the field. [Applause.] He led from that building more than 300 of the staunch, sturdy Germans, members of that Lutheran congregation, and from that day to this citizens of German birth have needed no defense, and need none now.

It is the glory of this country that, coming from every race stock as we do, we have agreed so well, we have progressed so well, that we have differed so little. It is worthy of note, even by the newspapers of the city of New York, that amid all the toil, tribulation, and trouble and rumors of war that come to us from Europe, our five million from all races of stock continue to dwell and do business together, untroubled by the fact, so far as their relations one to the other are concerned, that across the water their kinfolks are engaged in a desperate, deadly struggle. We have with us a united people; and it is therefore the more regrettable that people in high position, first, the President of the United States, and then the gentleman from Massachusetts, following a bad example, should do anything to segregate us. From the first we have had in the city to which the President is going a desire to welcome the stranger of other faith. In 1657, when New York was a Dutch province and partly settled by English, it is to the honor of those English that when the Quakers, the members of the Society of Friends, came into the province and established a church a demand was made upon the governor that he should prosecute them. The sturdy English

citizens inaugurated a practice by sending a memorial to the governor, in which they said:

> * * * Neither stretch out our hands against them to punish, banish, or persecute them. * * * That which is of God will stand, and that which is of man will come to nothing. * * * Therefore, if any of these said persons come in love unto us, we can not in conscience lay violent hands upon them, but give them free egress and regress into our towns and houses. * * * This is according to the patent and charter of our town * * * which we are not willing to infringe or violate.

Thirty-one of these men stood to that document until their lands were forfeited rather than violate that early principle of the island of Manhattan. As we commenced, so we have gone on, as our President ought to know, in that mutual living together in comprehension, in forbearance, and training our young to have an absolute loyalty to the American Government.

I do not know the custom of other cities, and other cities do not know ours, but I want those here to know that at least once a week in every public school in the city of New York—and we have 700,000 children in our public schools—every boy and every girl is brought together in one big room, the American flag—our beautiful flag—is brought in with ceremony, and all rise and salute, and they say something like this: "I pledge adherence to my flag [applause] and to the country for which it stands, a Nation one and indivisible." [Applause.] It is that training from the earliest day which has laid the foundation for the loyal American patriotism which the President of the United States will find in the city of New York.

Now, was there dissatisfaction as to the President's speech here and to the speech made at the Manhattan Club? Certainly. Is there disloyalty? Not at all. I represent upon this floor next to the largest Democratic district in the city of New York. I think my friend BRUCKNER has a larger Democratic district than I have, but the Democratic majority over the Republican vote in the twenty-third congressional district was, according to the enrollment at the special election at which I was elected, nearly 13,000. I have a right to say some things from his fellow Democrats to our Democratic President.

Why was this overturn? On my personal merit? It would be both immodest and untruthful in me to make that assertion. Entirely on account of the tariff? I should like to be able to say that, but it would be inaccurate. Gentlemen like Mr. CAMPBELL and Mr. LONGWORTH, who came there and spoke on the tariff, contributed thousands of votes to me on election day; but that great district, more than 80 per cent of which is either foreign born or, like the President, children of parents one or both of whom is foreign born, voted for me because I made a campaign on the platform of an adequate national defense. [Applause.] If there is one voter of German birth and parentage in the congressional district, there are twelve thousand of them, and my reiterated speech in that campaign was that, if I was elected, I would come here as an American, to represent an American district in an American Congress; and I would not dare to go back to the twenty-third district, foreign born as it is, unless I so represented an American district in an American Congress. [Applause.]

Are our fellow citizens of German birth satisfied? No. What is it they demand? Simply that there shall be a uniform American policy adopted by the administration and enforced against all nations alike. Are they distressed when our Nation demands reparation for the death of our citizens? No; but they are distressed when they detect or think they detect in the administration of our laws a partiality as between nations. I do not agree with my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] that the great battle of democracy is being fought by Great Britain. The great battle of democracy and of progressive government is being fought now as for a hundred years in the United States of America. [Applause.] It is here that the present hope of the best government is, and it is here that our efforts should be devoted toward perfecting that government. Our fellow citizens of German birth note the sternness of the notes that went to Germany and they call upon us to note that as between the central powers and ourselves a solution of those problems is being reached, which bids fair to be creditable to both sides; but they also call upon us to note that there is no "strict accountability" note going to Great Britain, and they demand as Americans that we perfect an American policy and stand by it as against the whole of the world or any portion of it.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BENNET. How much time have I?

The SPEAKER. Four minutes.

Mr. BENNET. I will yield for a question.

Mr. GARDNER. Does the gentleman know of any German-American newspaper that denounced the sinking of the Lusitania?

Mr. BENNET. As I do not read German I can not say they did or did not. I am not defending that act, and my friend, with his excellent knowledge of English, I think understands my position correctly. What our citizens of German birth or extraction do protest against is the fact that we seem to be sinking into the position of a dependency or territory of Great Britain. My friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], if he is logical, holds that view, because he says that during the progress of the war we ought not to interfere with the violations of neutrality laws on the part of Britain. If we decline to interfere, then we become an ally of Great Britain, and if we are going to be an ally of Great Britain, let us have the old-fashioned American sturdiness and take the disadvantages with the advantages. If the gentleman wants us to be an ally of Great Britain, and if this House thinks that way—which I do not believe—let him introduce his resolution so that the American people can at least have the courage of Japan and not be in the present position of Greece. Do I overstate our position? Let me give one or two illustrations. A citizen of New York City, a diamond merchant, with an office for more than 20 years in Amsterdam and an office for more than 30 years in New York, desired to send $300,000 in gold on a neutral steamer from himself in New York to himself in Amsterdam to pay his own bills and was not permitted to do so by the British Government, although the shipment was on a neutral ship. A constituent of mine who earned every dollar that he made shipped $15,000 worth of furs to a Scandinavian country, to a neutral port on a neutral ship, from a neutral country, from an American citizen to, I think, a Danish subject, and they were seized and taken into Kirkwall, together with, I think, as I recollect it, something like 400 ships since the beginning of the war, in absolute violation of international law, both American and British.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] was quite correct. If we ever get into any contest, which God forbid, we stand a far greater chance, with these daily recurring instances of high-handed oppression to our citizens and our commerce, of getting into trouble with Great Britain than with Germany. For one I hope that we will get into trouble with neither, and I hope that the views of the President and those who think with him will prevail for preparedness, but beyond that and above that I most sincerely trust that the advisers of the President and the President himself, sympathizing as he must with persons of recent foreign birth, will recognize the necessity of removing the causes of irritation and uniting our people, whether of native or foreign birth, not on any policy of aggression, not into any speculation, but behind and upon an American policy for an American people, administered by an American Government. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 25 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to address the House for 25 minutes at the present time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Speaker, a very gratifying spectacle has been witnessed in this House this morning. When the people of the entire country are more or less excited in anticipation of some trouble that might possibly arise to see the East and the West, the North and the South, here standing as one man, as one country, having the interest of the country and its general welfare uppermost in heart, is a spectacle that the country ought to be and is proud of.

Mr. Speaker, let me assure the Members of this House that I sincerely appreciate this allotment of time to me, that I may submit some views I entertain in the presence of this, the greatest lawmaking body in the world—a great privilege and honor to any man—and I promise not to abuse that generous consideration or cause you to regret having extended to me this opportunity to, in my humble way, speak to you and through you to my people at home and the good people all over the land—the country of my birth and the country in which it is an honor and great privilege to live and to labor for those whom you love and those dependent upon you. I love my country and all the good people therein. I stand for one God, one country, and one flag. That flag floating out yonder in the crisp breeze represents the highest ideals of citizenship, forbearance, stability, and integrity, and a country where the word of God is the word of its people; where Christianity, which links humanity to God, is fully honored by a noble race of people, whose motto is: "Peace on earth, good will toward men."

We are living in a fast age and during stirring times. Nearly one-half of the population of the world is engaged in killing one another and destroying their neighbors' property, burning the homes of defenseless women and children during the absence in war of the heads of the families; old and indigent people, men and women and little children are starving to death and falling by the wayside to arise no more as flies in the autumn. Public buildings, historic palaces, railroads, bridges, stock, feed, barns, homes, and other property of at least ten nations of the earth are going up in smoke, leaving ruined countries, sick and starving people to fall and die away from their homes among strangers and in strange lands as the result of a cruel, wanton war.

In addition, nearly 10,000,000 soldiers have been destroyed—killed or crippled. Thousands of young men have kissed their parents, brothers, and sisters good-bye and have gone to the front—never to return. A cruel war of conquest, brought on by the rich and powerful, who usually stay out of range, while the poor men of moderate means are at the front doing the fighting and butchering. Great God, what a spectacle! Why, oh why, should the rich and powerful of my country want to involve our country in war? The monarchs of Europe brought on the present world's greatest war. The flower and manhood of that unhappy and desolate country is lying in unmarked tombs. The pride and hopes of those left behind are gone forever, as never again will husband and wife, father and child embrace each other as of yore. No, never; not this side of eternity.

The newspapers, especially those subsidized, are inflaming the public mind of our people. Some of them, and unscrupulous politicians, men who do not love this country and its great traditions, are sinning against the dignity and usefulness of their own Nation. Some of them are engaged in slandering our own great, honest, Christian President, Woodrow Wilson, maligning the President of their great country and mine, trying to embarrass the great chieftain of my country and theirs. But God is with him. He has kept the faith and preserved the command written in that great good book of all books, the Bible, which says, "Thou shalt not kill!"

The great rank and file of the good people of this Republic are with and behind you, President Wilson! The wives and mothers of this Republic are praying to God to give you wisdom and strength of character to stand firm as you are for peace and tranquillity in our land. They have reared their boys to love and cherish high ideals in order to engage in the various avocations of usefulness in life, and not to kill.

When I was a child the ravages of the War between the States destroyed the savings of a lifetime of my father and mother. When the war was over all was lost. Father and brother gone; nothing left; a careworn, widowed mother—God bless her memory—with seven orphan children, in poverty and rags, to struggle for a miserable existence. I know what war means, especially to women and children. I know in fact the misery and woe left in its wake, and I stand here to-day an advocate of peace. I believe in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. That is what our Constitution means; that is what that flag, the symbol of this Nation, represents.

It is charged that war on the German Empire should have been declared. What unfriendly act toward these United States was Germany ever before this war guilty of, except in her struggle with the combined forces of a great adversary? Why do not our people stay out of range? If two men are fighting with knives or pistols, an innocent bystander, or even a peacemaker, is often killed. We have been worse treated by England than Germany. England wrapped her ship in the American flag in order to deceive hostile countries and adversaries. Our ships have been sunk and the lives of our people destroyed by going into the range in which we have been warned not to go.

These things occurred at a time of great excitement of our neighbors, and we should be forbearing and tolerant, even more so than at any other time. Our worst enemies are at home. Men who, to enrich themselves and reap fabulous fortunes at the price of the dead and dying, the lame and the weak, would plunge our beloved country into war, with all its horrors, and involve us in a $10,000,000,000 war debt, all for the sake of greed and avarice.

I am for preparedness upon a reasonable and essential plan. Not for aggression but for defensive purposes only. My country's good, my country's progress among the nations of the earth, my country's standing before the world for peace are all higher and more sacred to me than my politics. Where is the true man who would not sacrifice his all for the good of his country—for the uplift and peace of his fellow man? If there be such a selfish man, let him stand before the great bar of public opinion and be subjected to the gaze of honest, patriotic men, and his leopard spots will quickly develop. Show me a man who can stand the insults, the gibes, and the slander, coming from a great horde of interested sources, uncomplainingly and meekly, that his country may live and prosper and exert an elevating influence for peace and Christianity after he has gone to his final reward, beyond the mystic river of time, and I will show you Woodrow Wilson. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It takes an iron-nerved man of a high and lofty purpose to withstand the slander being heaped upon our President by those so powerful in the financial world, wanting war, in order to double and triple and quadruple their already stupendous fortunes at the expense of the lives of the young men of our country.

Did I raise my boy and did you raise your boys to kill people? We reared them to live lives of Christians. But it is urged by the fighters that when a German submarine torpedoed and sank an American ship and caused the death of so many American citizens, that then and there diplomatic relations should have been severed and war declared upon that unhappy country from whence so many of our best citizens come and have prospered here among us, and where they are respected according to their conduct, the same as any other American citizens.

Mind you, this desperate war was going on on land and sea. The steamship companies were exacting desperately high freight and passenger rates, and for one trip through the war zone some paid likely as much as three trips in times of peace. The people knew the risk they were running. They took the risk and lost. So did the steamship company. Germany has admitted the submarine captain's mistake, and practically disavowed the act, and has agreed to pay the bill. It is true those precious lives can never be restored, but why go into the war zone? Why undertake to pass through it in the time of cruel warfare? Would any man on land undertake to pass between two men shooting at each other? Nor did Germany's submarine captain know but what that vessel was really an English vessel.

How about England? Her course has been disastrous to our commerce on the sea. She seized cotton from the South and was the principal agency which caused the loss, we are told by that splendid and noble Member of the House, Mr. HEFLIN, of Alabama, to the South of $400,000,000; and but for Secretary McAdoo, one of the greatest Secretaries since Stanton, the Southland, God bless her, would have been nearly bankrupt. But do not you fear! That southern pride, thrift, and chivalry will again come into her own.

What did Germany do, except during the time of this war, to hurt our country?

What has England ever done for our country that she should have done, except to use us? We have seen the hidden mystery, the writing on the walls of the old Capitol Building of this Nation, and even in the Speaker's chair, where one of her boisterous cavaliers once stood. There and then and other places at other times in history of the past you will find the answer.

Now, finally, we are all—the Members of this House and Senate and the President—styled traitors by certain yellow journals because we do not send an army into Mexico, take charge of and run the Government of that bleeding and almost destroyed Republic. The 17 men who were recently so cruelly, cowardly, and ruthlessly massacred in Mexico had been notified not to go into it; that it was not safe; that guerrilla bands were abroad; but they took the chance and lost all. I have no doubt it was done to bring on a conflict between the United States and the de facto government of Carranza, and by the Villa adherents, and perhaps by his advice and counsel, and I believe time will prove that others, closer home, were connected with the plot.

What has Carranza done? Here I insert his reply to our demands that the murderers be punished—put to death. He answered immediately through the accredited representative of the United States in that country, and here it is:

CARRANZA APPEALS TO AMERICAN PUBLIC—LAWLESSNESS IN BEST OF STATES MAY CAUSE LOSS OF LIFE—POINTS TO HIS DIFFICULTY—RAILROAD BESET BY BANDITS LONG AND WIDE AND HARD TO GUARD—OUTRAGE IS TO BE AVENGED—NONE, HE SAYS, CAN LAMENT KILLING OF AMERICANS MORE THAN HE—BELIEVES IT WAS DONE TO PROVOKE INTERNATIONAL TROUBLE—PERPETRATORS OF DEED OUTSIDE THE LAW TO BE PUNISHED BY DEATH—DELAY IN REPORT TO SENATE OF STATE DEPARTMENT DRAWS CRITICISM FROM FALL.

The State Department received last night Gen. Carranza's reply to its request that the murderers of the 17 Americans near Santa Ysabel be captured and punished. It came in the form of the following dispatch from Consul John R. Silliman:

QUERETARO, MEXICO, *January 16.*

SECRETARY OF STATE, *Washington:*

Department's telegram of January 13, 5 p. m., massacre Americans at Santa Ysabel, received at 8.20 and immediately placed before Gen. Carranza by me in person. Gen. Carranza said that he had already issued orders for the immediate pursuit, capture, and punishment of those responsible for the atrocity. He stated that he believed this

outrage was committed by men associated directly with Villa, and that it was done specially to provoke international trouble at this time. He said he had declared those responsible outside the law, to be punished with death if caught.

APPEALS FOR CONSIDERATION.

He appeals to the Secretary of State and to the public of the United States to consider the wide strip of the Central Railway, the great difficulty of guarding the entire distance, and the comparatively easy task of destroying a train or attacking a small place. He says that nobody can lament more than he such an atrocity or be more concerned about it, but that protection is relative and that even in the best regulated state outbursts of disorders and lawlessness may cause destruction of property and loss of life. He says he is expecting full reports from Gen. Trevino, and that all efforts will be made to protect Americans and any other foreigners who may be in the district. His belief is the massacre was made premeditatedly by a band, who fled at once after the raid.

SILLIMAN.

CARRANZA AUTHORIZES "ANY CITIZENS" TO KILL SLAYERS OF AMERICANS.

LAREDO, TEX., *January 16.*

Gen. Venustiano Carranza, as head of the de facto Mexican government, has issued an order authorizing "any citizens" to put to death bandits implicated in the killing of American mining men at Cusihuiriachio, according to a dispatch to-night from Queretaro. The dispatch also reported that Gen. Carranza to-day transferred his headquarters from Queretaro to Celeva.

"The act of a citizen in killing any of the participants in killing of foreigners at Cusihuiriachio would be considered an act of patriotism, and not of crime,' Gen. Carranza is quoted as saying.

"Should the bandits cross the American border I trust they will be captured and returned to Mexico for execution."

Since the publication of this information throughout the United States, the leading newspapers of our country are now publishing the following information under date of January 23, 1916, which I quote as follows:

MEXICANS WHO SHOT AKERS HEAP CURSES ON AMERICANS AS DEATH VOLLEY IS FIRED—DURAN BROTHERS DEFIANT AS THEY GO TO EXECUTION IN WEIRD JUAREZ CEMETERY—ELDER DECLARES HE ALONE KILLED AMERICAN RANCHMAN TO PROTECT HOME—REFUSE TO BE BLINDFOLDED—MANY WOMEN SPECTATORS.

EL PASO, TEX., *January 23.*

With a curse upon their lips against the American people, two young Mexicans, brothers, were shot to death by a Carranza firing squad in the Juarez cemetery at 6.07 this morning for the murder on Friday afternoon of Bert L. Akers, an American rancher, of Ysleta, Tex., while 50 Americans, including a number of women, looked on. Bernardo and Federico Duran, the executed men, went to their death standing shoulder to shoulder against the whitewashed adobe wall of the cemetery. They faced the firing squad with undaunted bravery, refused to be blindfolded, and fell together at the first volley.

Almost their last word was this challenge, flung at the small group of American newspaper men and friends of the murdered Akers:

"Watch and see how Mexicans die, you Americans—— "

KILLED TO PROTECT HOME.

The only plea of any sort was made by Bernardo Duran, the elder brother, a few minutes before the end. Standing beside the cemetery gate, he said, in his own tongue, to a correspondent, the only American who talked to the prisoners:

"We are dying for you Americans. Tell the world that. I shot the American because he was trying to force entrance to my home. I was defending my rights, as any man would have done.

"My brother here is entirely innocent. He didn't fire a shot, but they are going to kill him, too. Tell me, is that justice? He is being sacrificed to your American public opinion. We are not afraid to die, but why should an innocent man be killed? He is only 22 years old. I am 24. Some day we will be avenged."

WEIRD MARCH TO DEATH.

While the elder talked the younger brother stood beside him, hands pocketed and lips quivering slightly, but saying nothing. The prisoners were bound together by ropes.

The Juarez cemetery is a mile and a half from the jail where the condemned men spent their last night.

The morning air was cold, but they wore no coats when they emerged at 5.30 a. m. from the prison and took their place between six silent guards and set out afoot for the place of death. Beside the firing squad rode its commander, Capt. Alfredo Ortiz. With heads bent, the brothers strode along talking softly to each other. The guards, muffled in gaudy-colored blankets, shuffled beside them. Once or twice the elder brother's arm went caressingly over the younger's shoulder and he whispered a word of comfort.

The road to the cemetery is a gloomy one, even by day. It leads over a plain dotted with sickly mesquite and cactus. The last half mile before the cemetery gate the road straightens out and the white crosses are visible long before the gate is reached.

PASS THROUGH FATAL GATE.

Neglect has made the burying ground even more desolate than usual. The crosses stand awry over many graves. Few are erect. Standing thus at grotesque angles, they make weird shadows on the weed-covered turf and marble slabs.

Slowly the little procession approached the gate, which stands at the crest of a gentle rise.

Through that gate have gone hundreds of prisoners sentenced to death, most of them war captives. The Americans waiting at the entrance involuntarily shrank back as the prisoners and their guards arrived at the gate, which was swung open by the deaf old sexton, who has guarded it for years. It is of iron and it creaked upon its hinges as it opened.

MARCH TO DEATH HOUSE.

"Halt!" said Capt. Ortiz when the squad had advanced about 10 feet within the cemetery. The gate was closed and the spectators leaned over it. The reporter was permitted to enter and interview the prisoners. The order to advance once more was given, and the group marched toward the "death house" in the center of the graveyard, 100 yards away.

The white walls of this one-room hut shone in the moonlight. The gate was opened to admit the witnesses, who crowded close to the executioners.

It was 6 o'clock. The church bell tolled in El Paso and reverberated over the plain. Capt. Ortiz advanced and placed a soiled handkerchief over the younger man's eyes, but as soon as the officer stepped away he slipped it to his forehead and muttered, "I will die like Bernardo, with my eyes open."

Bernardo, who had stood quietly until now, broke out into a torrent of abuse, directed at the American spectators.

"Oh, for a carbine now in my hands," he shouted. "I'd show you Americans something. Our death will not go unavenged. Ah, watch and see how Mexicans die, you Americans—— "

SENDS PICTURE TO PARENTS.

A Mexican officer who had accompanied the Americans to the cemetery walked to the prisoners and said a word or two. The younger handed him a cheap little picture of himself and asked that it be sent to his parents in Santa Rita, N. Mex. The elder gave him his hat as a present. The policeman embraced them both, and Bernardo said:

"Por la causa" (for the cause).

The brothers spoke softly to each other as they turned and embraced.

"Ready!" said the captain.

"Take aim!"

Church bells in the ancient cathedral of Juarez began tolling to early mass.

"Fire!"

The brothers crumpled to the ground. Bernardo's arm, even in his death agony, lay across his brother's breast as though trying to protect him. A groan came from the writhing figure of the elder. With his dying breath he said clearly, "Oh, God, wait a minute."

Capt. Ortiz drew his revolver and advanced to the fallen men. Quickly he sent a bullet into the brain of each—the mercy shot.

The bodies were displayed to-day in Juarez, and several hundred friends of the murdered American viewed them.

This was indeed a pathetic case, well calculated to arouse both admiration and deep sorrow, but it shows President Carranza's determination to protect the lives and property of Americans in Mexico at whatever cost to his people, and that he is willing to make any sacrifice rather than have the United States Army and Navy invade his country. Tell me after that we ought to start upon a campaign of conquest and invasion and I reply let us first stop, look, and think.

What more could he say or do? The President has, as he should, given him a chance to make good. When the murderers are captured—and it is a big undertaking—and put to death in expiation of their horrible crime against God and his country, and the damage paid as required by international law and good conscience, what more can be expected of the new President of that wretched and disorganized country? Bear in mind war—guerrilla warfare—has been going on there for about three years.

Why do our people want to go there until conditions have righted themselves? It is the desire for greed and avarice which causes men to take chances. God pity the man or set of men who would rush our country into bloody war for the sake of private gain. We are told that it will require 275,000 soldiers, equipped with all necessary war munitions, and a part of our fleet; and the Lord only knows what the expense would be to take charge of Mexico. If we have to send the flag there, I want it to stay; but do not start it. A guerrilla war would at once ensue and would likely last 3 to 10 years, and cost our Republic possibly $7,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000. The majority of our young men going there would never return.

I am opposed to militarism; I am opposed to our Government going on a foraging or conquest tour. We received our dose when we took the Philippines, which we can not now let loose. It is the old bear story again. Only 15 per cent of the people in these islands can read and write. They still have the tribes of head hunters there. Get rid of the islands as soon as possible and on the best possible terms, if we want to be mercenary; keep on civilizing if we want to be noble, however expensive.

My information is that the war in Europe is costing 5 of the 10 nations involved approximately $73,000,000 daily, and I here insert a clipping considered reliable. Think and ponder over it:

SEVENTY-THREE MILLION DOLLARS NOW DAILY COST OF THE WORLD WAR.

PARIS, *January 16.*

After prolonged study of all available statistics, Alfred Neymarck, French economist, finds that the daily cost of the war to five of the belligerents has attained $73,000,000, divided as follows:

Germany, including advances to her allies, $20,000,000; France, $16,000,000; Great Britain, $19,000,000; Russia, $13,000,000; Italy, $5,000,000.

Italy's expenses must rise to more than $6,000,000 daily, however, for by the end of July she will have spent $3,000,000,000 altogether. The belligerent war loans to the end of last October totaled $24,000,000,000, of which the United States supplied $900,000,000. The allies have borrowed $14,000,000,000 and the central empires $10,000,000,000.

If war must come, I would like if possible to see an election first held by the people, and let them vote for or against war, with the understanding that if a majority favored war, the first army should be made up of those who voted for war. If this were understood before the voting, I am sure peace would win a sweeping victory all over the land, notwithstanding the

influence of the subsidized press, notwithstanding the power and influence of the money mongers abroad in the land. Oh, for another Christ to drive them this time out of the People's Chamber, that the common people can have a better chance in life! [Applause on Democratic side.]

Go and see the ministers and they will all cry out peace. Go and visit the homes of the wives and mothers of this land, and they will cry out, "Don't send our boys away to kill or be killed." Go among the farmers and listen to their story of peace. Go among the toiling people of the land, the poor people, who are expected to do the fighting, and they will all tell you that since this is to be a rich man's war, let them do their own fighting. Finally, go on the coming Sunday to the church house and there kneel down in prayer, asking God to guide you aright, and you will leave there with the cry of peace on your lips; which cry will be taken up and echoed until the clarion cry for peace and tranquillity will go up throughout the land. Let us sit steady in the boat and not be swept off our feet by interested and ulterior motives urged upon us. Our ship of state is in the balance throughout all the world. The eyes of a billion people are on us. Our own country is in a nervous state. Let us come out in the open where we can cry out to the people, "All is well along the Potomac. We are still sane in Washington." Woodrow Wilson, like the old-time religion, is good enough for me. [Applause on Democratic side.] He has piloted the ship of state through the crags and rocks of Germany, Austria, Russia, and France, and they did not touch him. He is now passing the shoals of England, and is dealing honestly and courageously with Mexico, and we are each and all behind him heart and soul and will stand or fall with him and the flag of our beloved Republic. My friends, all is well.

Cardinal Gibbons, that great and good man of whom his country is justly proud, in answering an invitation recently to address the National Conference on Immigration, is credited with sending the following answer:

> Though my official duties and increasing age prevent my doing all I should like, allow me to assure the committee of my heartiest sympathy with the work. Above all times now should our fellow citizens and compatriots be undivided in loyalty and devotion to the Stars and Stripes. May wisdom and forethought guide you and our national leaders for the best interests of our beloved country.

The exhibition of such patriotism, coming from such a high source, must give inspiration and comfort to our President and to millions of our people. We judge a tree by its fruit and a man by his love of country.

We have for the first time in my day an opportunity to grasp and take the bulk of the commerce of the world. What shall we do for our country and business men in this national emergency? Shall we be sane and patriotic or shall we pick a quarrel with some poor, oppressed, distressed, and broken-down neighbor and go to fighting? Do we want to help the business interests of this country, thereby giving employment and a higher wage to millions of our toilers? I advocate the acceptance and taking care of the wonderful volume of trade now persistently knocking at our door. In the sight of God and man, would it not be more Christianlike for us to accept the situation and be getting ready to feed and clothe these belligerent nations and sell them our products and help them rebuild their countries when this cruel war is over? A peaceful solution and avoiding war means everything to our country and people for the next 10 to 25 years. Peace means prosperity throughout our whole country. It means greater profits for our products in all lines of business and a higher wage than ever before paid in this country to our toilers.

In order to in part satisfy the demands coming from Europe now, even though the war is not ended in those ill-fated countries, our railroads are taxed beyond their capacity to handle the freight offered to them for transportation from the interior of our country to the seacoast. There is now afforded almost continuous employment at a better wage to the coal miners of this country than they have ever heretofore enjoyed. It has increased the price of coal from about 70 cents run of mine to $1.40 per ton, and for the first time in many years our coal operators, who deserve so much attention and encouragement at our hands, are beginning to realize almost a reasonable profit on their business. What a glorious state of affairs, my countrymen, this is, and oh, what a shame and a pity it would be if we should prove in this House and the Senate so narrow minded as not to take advantage of a situation not created by ourselves. Our iron and steel mills are running in full blast with orders a year ahead. Our farmers are beginning to reap the harvest they have so long been entitled to and laboring for. Our toilers throughout the country are now better satisfied than they have ever been; our business men are looking upon a bright future.

These are not political matters, but business matters deserving of our serious and honest consideration. Peace will give us and our country all we want; war will nearly ruin us. Are you with your country and mine? Do you love your country and its people? Do you love our traditions and institutions? Do you love the Constitution of this Republic? Do you want to see your country and all the people therein prosper? Do you want to see them happy and contented? If so, stand as the President stands—for peace. He sees this situation, and is fighting a battle royal against desperate influences that his country and his people may by their course set an example to the world to be emulated by future generations. All this great struggle he is making is in the interest of his country's good. He is not a politician, but a patriot.

I again thank you for your attention. [Applause.]

RURAL POST ROADS.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7617

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, with Mr. RUCKER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That out of any appropriation made under the provisions of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall deduct the sum which he shall deem necessary to defray the expenses of his department in the administration of this act and apportion the balance of said appropriation for expenditure under the provisions of this act in the several States in the following manner: $65,000 to each State, and one half of the remainder in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the population of all of the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census, and the other half of such remainder in the ratio which the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes in such State bears to the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes of all the States as shown by the latest available report of the Postmaster General.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, many gentlemen opposing this good-roads bill claim to be disturbed about "Where is the money to come from?" Some do not hesitate to say that it may interfere with the preparedness program. I consider these objections excuses and not reasons for their opposition.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday the Supreme Court of the United States declared the income tax constitutional. From that source this Government can raise many times as much money as it is now raising from the income tax as provided in the Underwood revenue bill, without burdening anyone. Mr. Chairman, I do not belong to that class of people who would say, "Lay on, Macduff." No, but I do believe that the wealthy of this country, those who have accumulated enormous fortunes, should be made to bear their legitimate share of the burdens of taxation. The Underwood revenue bill produced receipts, as follows, for the year 1915:

Customs receipts	$209,786,672.21
Internal revenue, ordinary	283,398,760.85
Corporation income tax	39,155,596.77
Individual income tax	41,046,162.69
Land sales	2,167,136.47
Miscellaneous	70,287,372.90
Total	697,910,827.58

This shows the income tax falls far short of receipts it should produce. I want it distinctly understood that I am not in favor of collecting one dollar of revenue from the stamp taxes. I think the time has come when this House should repeal the stamp taxes. [Applause.]

It has been proposed to continue indefinitely the stamp tax and to include in its provisions bank checks, notes, gasoline, and other articles included in the Spanish-American War tax. I trust my party will not call on me to vote for measures that place additional duties on checks, on notes, on gasoline, and other articles of like character. [Applause.] If we must have an emergency war tax, then let us levy duty on munitions of war. Munition makers are reaping unheard-of profits, then let those benefiting by the war in Europe bear this burden while others are suffering from the sudden outburst of this most horrible war of all times. [Applause.] Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to show you another source from which the revenue of this Government can be raised instead of stamp tax. The Constitution of the United States specifically provides that the Government may lay and collect taxes on imports, tariff duties, and refuses to delegate this right to the several States, thus recog-

nizing this as the principal source of revenue for the General Government.

Furthermore, this method of collecting tax has been the cornerstone of the Democratic Party. Three times the Democratic Party has been the dominant party since the Civil War, and each time declared for revenue tariff. The platform of 1884 reads as follows:

From the foundation of the Government taxes collected at the customhouse have been the chief source of the Federal revenue.

Upon that platform the Democratic Party won. [Applause.]

In 1892 the Democratic Party declared:

We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered.

Upon that platform in 1892 the Democratic Party again won.

In 1912 the Democratic Party took the exact language of the platform in 1892 in regard to the collection of the taxes of the Government by tariff duties for revenue purposes only, and upon that platform in 1912 the Democratic Party again won.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Party has won three times since the Civil War on the platforms I have just read. Then, Mr. Chairman, I contend that Democrats are following the landmarks of our fathers when duties are levied on imports for revenue, and I fail to find any precedents for a stamp tax.

Mr. Chairman, in 1900 the Democratic Party went after a strange god in its platform, and no mention was made of collecting customs duties on imported goods for Government revenue.

Mr. SLOAN. That was the exception?

Mr. TRIBBLE. I will answer the gentleman by saying this is my personal opinion; I did not say this critically, and my observation is the gentleman's own party—the Republican Party—has also made mistakes. I think the Democratic Party made a mistake when it made this declaration:

The burning issue of imperialism is regarded as the paramount issue in this campaign.

That is an important question, but not paramount.

Mr. Chairman, this stamp tax was imposed upon the people at a time when it looked as if it were absolutely necessary to collect more duties in some way. It was said that the tariff could not be revised at that time quickly enough for the purpose of getting the revenue. The Democratic Party considered it wise not to expect much revenue from the income tax, for the reason that the Supreme Court might declare the act unconstitutional; but now why not immediately increase its capacity as a revenue producer and at the same time revise other sections of the tariff bill on luxuries for the purpose of raising revenue?

Mr. Chairman, at this time there is no war in this country; normal conditions are returning. It is true we face a condition now caused by the European war demanding additional legislation for revenue purposes, but let us not depart from the landmarks of successful tax laws. The Underwood-Wilson tariff bill would have produced enough revenue under ordinary circumstances. We confront extraordinary conditions. On account of the European war there has been considerable reduction of imports from foreign markets and consequently less duty levied, making a deficit in our revenues. There would have been ample revenue collected at the customhouses from imported goods if we had had normal conditions, but I contend this condition should be remedied by increase of income tax, customs duties, munitions of war duties, or some other method, not stamp tax on articles of common use, annoying everybody. [Applause.] Should additional duties be placed on certain imports to meet this present emergency, when the emergency passes away then the duties can be restored as now provided in the Underwood revenue bill.

Mr. SLEMP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIBBLE. I yield.

Mr. SLEMP. Will the gentleman from Georgia give a list of the articles on which he desires to have the tariff restored?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to give a list of the articles on which the tariff should be raised. It may not be necessary to increase any custom duties when the income tax is properly revised and duty levied on munitions of war, but should it be necessary, only a few luxuries will meet fully the demand.

Mr. SLEMP. I just wanted to have the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I know the gentleman is in good faith in his inquiry. Mr. Chairman, there are three items I can furnish, and first of all I would say an increase of income tax, and if that does not produce a sufficient amount, if we are going to resort to stamp taxes, then, second, place duties on munitions of war; third, tariff duties on luxuries. I repeat, we are not engaged in war justifying continuation of the stamp tax and enlarging its provisions. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, this Congress should pass the good-roads bill now before the House. We must also pass a rural-credit bill with Government aid. Furthermore, we should also pass a merchant-marine bill. When the war began American vessels carried 8 per cent of our products to foreign countries. Of course, the merchant vessels of the warring countries were required for war purposes, thus giving the ships left on the ocean for transportation purposes a monopoly. Before the war cotton was shipped from Galveston to Liverpool for $1.10 per bale; after the war it has been costing $17.50 from Galveston to Liverpool per bale. Since I have been in Congress I have been contending that the Government should so construct auxiliary vessels for the Navy that they may be used for commercial purposes in time of peace. During the consideration of the last Navy bill I succeeded in cutting out of the bill on the floor of the House transports and hospital ships, over the protest of the other members of the committee, saving $4,500,000. These auxiliaries are not needed in time of peace and are purchased for temporary purposes in time of war. I am willing to vote for this class of vessels if the Government will use them as merchant vessels in time of peace. Should war come, such auxiliary vessels as scouts, transports, mine layers, fuel ships, hospital ships, supply ships, and ammunition ships could be secured instantly from the merchant vessels used by the Government for commercial purposes in time of peace. Annually we are spending millions for these small war vessels in the Navy. Why not put them and their crews to work in time of peace? That is the kind of merchant marine I favor, and if this Congress will adopt it the products of this country will be transported to foreign markets at reasonable rates and no longer will the transportation of a bale of cotton to foreign markets cost $17.50 per bale.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is recognized.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, it affords me great pleasure to see and note even a partial conversion of one of our Democratic friends.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. What is the amendment to which the gentleman is speaking?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am speaking to the amendment of the gentleman to strike out the last word. I am speaking in opposition to it.

I fear the gentlemen on the other side, from the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE], who has last spoken, and the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] yesterday, do not fully understand the condition of the Treasury. The gentleman who has just spoken says he would repeal the stamp tax. He is not in favor of it. Does the gentleman know that if that act was not put in force we would have a deficit, according to the statement of the President in his message, of about $84,000,000 for this fiscal year. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] yesterday spoke about surplus and deficit, in the inquiry he made of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. Apparently he understood that the surplus referred to the amount in the Treasury——

Mr. GORDON. Let us hear your definition of it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I hope the gentleman from Ohio will not look at me in that alarming manner. He overawes me by his awful presence. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, we have continued the stamp taxes for the rest of the year, but even that is not sufficient. We still will have a deficit of about $43,000,000 with it continued to the end of the fiscal year. With the continuance of the sugar tax there will be still a deficit of something like $28,000,000 for this year.

In speaking of deficits we mean the difference, the amount which our revenues are less than the amount of our expenditures. When we have a surplus, as we usually have under a Republican administration, we mean the amount which the revenues exceed the expenditures.

Now, the gentleman says that he would repeal the stamp tax, take off $80,000,000, and then he would get the amount necessary to make this up and what is needed for other expenditures, which were not referred to by the President, by levying a supertax on incomes, which he estimates, as I understand, would produce $100,000,000 to $200,000,000. But that would not be sufficient. He would have to have some further method of raising revenue besides that if we are to have expenditures like these, with the condition of the Treasury as it is to-day. On yesterday, when there was an inquiry about it by the gentleman from Ohio, the balance in the Treasury, excluding the

amount subject to the check of the disbursing officers, was about $50,000,000. The first of last June the balance had run down to $15,000,000, according to the daily statement at that time. Upon the basis which is now estimated we should, of course, add the amount which was in the fund for the redemption of national-bank notes. But even then it is apparent that we should reach the same condition or worse this year, and that we shall be doing as we did last year—carrying on the Treasury by paying the bills out of trust funds that are under the control of the department.

The President of the United States recommended—and very properly—that we ought to have an amount of at least $50,000,000 in the way of a net balance in the Treasury. How are we going to get it? By these indefinite suggestions made by the gentleman from Georgia? Nothing in that line will produce it. By raising the duty on some particular article? The establishment of a new duty on dyestuffs, for example, will not help us. I understand that is likely to be brought before the House soon. What we need—and the only thing that will bring us back to a point where we will have a free balance in the Treasury—is a Republican tariff, administered and prepared upon protective principles. And we also need an economy that has not been visible so far. There seems to be a tendency on the part of some Members—and it is not confined entirely to one side of the House—to vote for every appropriation, but a great reluctance to levy any tax to pay it. But taxes must come, and they will be increased if this bill passes in its present form and no different methods are devised for additional revenue. This is especially true if we are to carry out the program indicated in the President's message and add thereby two or three hundred million dollars of additional expenditure.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], the chairman of the committee, rise?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I wanted to make a request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Let us see how many amendments there are.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I want to see how much time we can devote to this section and amendments.

Mr. MANN. We would like 20 minutes on the section and amendments.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time for discussion of this section and amendments thereto be limited to 25 minutes, 5 minutes to be controlled by me and 20 minutes by the gentleman on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and amendments thereto be closed in 25 minutes, 20 minutes of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and 5 minutes by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 19, after the word "general," insert the following: "*Provided*, That no portion of this appropriation shall be used in the construction, maintenance, or repair of all toll roads."

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it necessary to discuss the amendment. It really speaks for itself. None of this money should be used on toll roads.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back four minutes and a half. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, let us have that reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 2, line 8, after the word "act," insert "not exceeding $750,000."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to place some limit upon the amount that can be deducted and set aside by the Secretary of Agriculture for the expenses of his department in construing this act.

This is a new proposition, and it will offer a fertile field to any department head so inclined to construct a department made up of political henchmen and to have road inspectors installed in office in each of the 48 States of this Union. I am satisfied that the great majority of the people in certain sections of this Union are pretty hungry for Federal funds, if the opinions as voiced by their Representatives here on the floor are any criterion of their desires, so that we ought to limit the opportunity offered by this bill for the appointment of a great army of Federal officials, and we ought to say, as was said in the bill offered last year and in the Sixty-second Congress, that there shall not be expended more than a reasonable sum in the expenses of the Department of Agriculture. I think in one bill the amount set out is $880,000, and I submit that $750,000 will be ample for the department to use in passing upon these plans and in making up its mind whether these roads for which is sought Federal aid are projects worthy of funds from the Federal Treasury.

I ask that this amendment be adopted; and I wish to state here that I have another amendment to this section which I desire to offer at the proper time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts yields back two minutes. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I did not catch the exact language of that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment again.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I will ask the Clerk to read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SLOAN: Page 2, line 7, after the word "sum," strike out the words "which he shall deem necessary" and insert the words "which shall be appropriated by Congress following estimates submitted by."

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is akin to the amendment just voted upon.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SLOAN. I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment I have presented is akin to the amendment just voted upon, upon which there was a very close vote.

The purpose of it, as those in charge of the bill will see, is to require that the Secretary of Agriculture, in performing this new piece of work that is delegated to him, shall be controlled in the same manner as he is controlled in any other public project which it becomes his duty as Secretary of Agriculture to execute or to have charge. In every appropriation bill that comes into this House the first thing arranged for is the salary for the head of the department, and the next is the allowance of salaries of those whom he desires to select for his assistants. There is no reason on earth that I can conceive why the Secretary of Agriculture should be given the discretion of spending at his own whim or will one dollar out of the $25,000,000 or all of that $25,000,000 for purely administrative purposes. There is nowhere indicated in this bill where he is denied that discretion. All I ask is that instead of leaving it to the arbitrary discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture it shall be submitted to the usual appropriating committee of this House, and then that appropriating committee will lay out what ought to be of the $25,000,000 a year for administration of roads. That will be separated and given first to the head of the bureau, if one be established, and next to the number of employees that may be allowed. So that any purpose a Secretary might have of making a political machine out of this work would be thwarted. It is so attempted to be thwarted in every other department of the governmental activ-

ities. I think that the committee ought to agree to this. The suggestion should be enough to have this allowed.

Think of the discretion allowed by this bill in its present form. The Secretary who obtains his position without the direct vote of anybody, is given a war-lord's control of a chest of $25,000,000. Of this vast sum he may use all or most of it for administering the road project, giving practically none of it or some of it for actual construction. He may employ 1 or 10,000 men in and out of Washington to do whatever he sees fit, these men with or without qualifications for any practical work. Further, he can deal with the State highway department almost as he sees fit.

While it is not expected that a Secretary would so abuse his privilege and the discretion conferred upon him, yet legislation should be framed so as to prevent such abuse instead of permitting it.

All the foregoing within the Secretary's discretion—discretion—that realm throughout which choice and will are unrestrained; where duty often waits upon ambition; when mild, unpenalized vice supplants virtue; where good may be but evil is liable to occur; where weakness waivers, strength sleeps, and where expedience outranks right. It is a domain always sought to be extended by its occupant and against which extension the greatest battles for human rights have been waged. Discretion is the realm of the monarch, it is an ever-decreasing field in a Republic. Constitutions and statutes are but means of contracting their limits. The more they are contracted the more of a Republic we have. Carranza, Huerta, and Villa would rule with discretion. Americans would prefer to see them restrained by constitutions.

What I have said about administrative discretion has no peculiar application to the present distinguished Secretary of Agriculture. It could have little application to him, as every man on this side is of the firm conviction, supported by the well-grounded fear of nearly everyone on the majority side, that before this bill can become operative his successor will be installed. But whether he be Democrat or Republican the discretion conferred is too great.

I was very much pleased with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] in his frank statement that we could have plenty of money to enter upon this road-building project, and for that reason I am in favor of it. I am in favor of helping the Democrats carry out at least this one lone and somewhat yielding plank of the Democratic platform known as the good-roads plank. From what the gentleman from Georgia said I notice that in 1884 they declared for a tariff for revenue only, and the same thing in 1892, and again the same thing in 1912; but I notice, further, that after four years from 1884 they were turned out of power, and four years after 1892 they were again turned out of power, and one year from now they will be turned out of power again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. MANN. I give the gentleman one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. SLOAN. Yes; I want to draw this conclusion, that three times in recent years the Democratic Party has come into power on its promises, and twice they have gone out on their performances; and the same thing will happen one year from now. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be read in the connection in which it occurs.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] asks unanimous consent to have read again the amendment offered. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SLOAN: Page 2, line 7, after the word "sum," strike out the words "which he shall deem necessary" and insert the words "which shall be appropriated by Congress following estimates duly submitted by him," so that the lines as amended will read:

"SEC. 2. That out of any appropriation made under the provisions of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall deduct the sum which shall be appropriated by Congress following estimates duly submitted by him to defray the expenses of his department in the administration of this act," etc.

Mr. SAUNDERS. According to the various prophecies made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN], if he is correct, if we leave the bill as it is, a Republican Secretary will have the opportunity to build up the dreadful political machine that he is talking about. So far as we are concerned, we are willing to take the chances with that, and to leave the bill as it is.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not think the gentleman's amendment helps the bill at all, and I hope it will be voted down.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been limited by an agreement.

Mr. MANN. There is an amendment pending, anyway.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. SAUNDERS) there were—ayes 40, noes 52.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 2, line 11, after the word "manner," strike out "$65,000 to each State and"; in line 12 strike out the words "the remainder"; in lines 14 and 15, after the word "half," strike out the words "of such remainder."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to put upon some equitable basis the distribution of this fund. During the debate upon this bill several gentlemen, notably the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], asked the reason why $65,000 was given to each State of the Union; and I have not heard or read any reason offered in reply by the proponents of this legislation. They take $65,000 and give it to each State, regardless of the needs, regardless of the population, regardless of the mileage of roads, and regardless of any other consideration. In the last Congress the only reason offered for awarding that amount to the States was so that their apportionment might come up to over $100,000. I submit if that is the true reason, then the $65,000 ought to be given only to the States which, under the other terms of the apportionment, would not receive $100,000; but if the State of Nevada gets only $36,000 without this $65,000, that is no reason why the State of New York and the State of Massachusetts should also get $65,000 each. There should be some just and equitable basis for apportioning every dollar of this sum that you are seeking to appropriate here for this purpose. I say it is rank injustice to fix an arbitrary amount of $65,000 and seek to distribute that among 48 States of this Union without any consideration or without any basis upon which the apportionment of the balance of this fund is considered. So, sir, I say that if you are going to attempt to pass this legislation and enact it into law and justify yourselves by saying that every dollar of this $25,000,000 is going to be equitably dispensed and apportioned, you ought to strike out this sum as fixed in section 2 and put the whole apportionment upon the same basis.

There is no more reason for taking $65,000 than there is for taking $200,000 or $10,000, and I submit that it is fair to all the States to put them upon the same footing, and not seek to carry up the amount into six figures by an arbitrary apportionment and computation such as has been arrived at in this section. I say, put the States on an equal footing, and do not increase the share of Rhode Island by $65,000 and also increase the share of Pennsylvania by $65,000 simply in order that Rhode Island may get over $100,000, because, if it were left as the amount ought to be left, Rhode Island would get $60,000, and then she would get only what she is justly entitled to under the basis of apportionment that is fixed in this bill. If you are going to seek to split up this apportionment and take one part of the appropriation and set it aside and say, "As to this part we will distribute this as a gratuity, regardless of mileage of road, regardless of population, or regardless of anything else except giving them some money," I say, that is wrong. It is not the correct way under the principle laid down by this bill. I trust that this amendment will pass.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, this provision for the flat payment of $65,000 to each of the States, was included in the bill that passed last year. It was thoroughly discussed, and the reasons, presented in its behalf, were satisfactory to the House at that time. Now, unless we include that provision for $65,000 flat, to each State, then Nevada, Delaware, Arizona, Wyoming, Rhode Island and Utah would receive such comparatively insignificant sums under our proposed scheme of apportionment, that the amounts appropriated for their benefit respectively, would be too small to be economically overlooked by the Department of Agriculture. So we provided this flat sum of $65,000 for each of the States, and then distributed the balance of the appropriation according to the plan reported in the bill. The payment of $65,000 to each of the States has taken a negligible amount from the sums that would otherwise have been received by the larger States, but it has worked out a very equitable result. The scheme of the bill is as fair and just a

plan of division, in my judgment as could be devised and a far better one than the plan proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts. Any plan submitted could be criticized from some point of view.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] one minute.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I can add nothing to the reasons stated by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] except this, that the idea of the equitable distribution of this fund that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] urges in his minority report is that the basis should be that of the rural population of a State to the total rural population of the country. Under that basis the New England States would receive much less than they receive in this bill, for the rural population of New England is 2 per cent of the entire rural population of the country. Therefore, inasmuch as no Representative from Massachusetts desires to protest against the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], which would take from his State some of the funds allotted to it under this provision, on behalf of the State of Massachusetts I protest, and I urge the equitable distribution which is provided for in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Five and one-half minutes.

Mr. MANN. I move to strike out the last word, and I yield my time to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

[Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read section 3 of the bill, as follows:

SEC. 3. That as soon as may be after the passage of any act making appropriations under the provisions of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare and file in his office a statement showing the amount of such appropriation he has set apart to defray the expense of his department in the administration of this act and the amount of the balance which will be available for expenditure in each State and transmit a copy of such statement to the State highway department of each State which has such a department and to the governor of each State which has not such a department; that the State highway department of any State, after receiving such statement, may apply to the Secretary of Agriculture for aid under the provisions of this act in the construction or maintenance of any rural post road in such State; and if, in his judgment, such road is one to the proposed construction or maintenance of which aid should be given under the provisions of this act, then he shall request such State highway department to furnish him with surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost of said proposed construction or maintenance and any other information which he may consider proper; that he shall examine said surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost and determine what would be the reasonable cost of such construction or maintenance and what amount of aid will be given under the provisions of this act to such proposed construction or maintenance, which shall in no case be less than 30 nor more than 50 per cent of what he has so determined would be the reasonable cost of such proposed construction or maintenance, and shall forthwith transmit to said State highway department a written statement of his said determinations; that upon receipt of such written statement the said State highway department may transmit to the Secretary of Agriculture a statement in writing notifying him that such proposed construction or maintenance will be undertaken upon the terms proposed; that thereupon the proper authorities of the State may, in accordance with the laws of such State, commence and prosecute said construction or maintenance in substantial compliance with said surveys, plans, and specifications; that when the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that said construction or maintenance of said road has been finished in substantial compliance with said surveys, plans, and specifications he shall cause to be paid to the proper authority of said State whatever remains unpaid of the amount which he has stated, as hereinbefore provided, would be given to aid said State in said proposed construction or maintenance of said road; that the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, from time to time make payments upon such construction or maintenance as the same progresses, but these payments, including previous payments, if any, shall in no case be more than the pro rata part of the United States of the value of labor and materials which have been put into such construction or maintenance.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to the language on page 3, line 7, where it says—

may apply to the Secretary of Agriculture for aid, under the provisions of this act, in the construction or maintenance of any rural post road in such State.

It occurs to me that you have omitted the most important thing that you and all desire who favor the passage of this legislation. It is not only the construction, which means the original building of the road, and the maintenance and continuation of the road, but it is doubtless intended that most of the money that is appropriated under the terms of this act, if it shall pass, ought to be, and will be, appropriated for the improvement of existing highways; and therefore it occurs to me that the word "improvement" ought to be inserted after the word "construction."

Mr. SAUNDERS. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will say to the gentleman that, so far as the committee is concerned, we are willing that the word "improvement" should be inserted.

Mr. TOWNER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to another matter. Immediately following that, in the next sentence, it says—

and if, in his judgment, such road is one to the proposed construction or maintenance of which aid should be given under the provisions of this act, then he shall—

So-and-so.

I think I understand what was the purpose of that language, but I greatly fear that it will not carry out the purpose of it. As the language reads, in my judgment, it will leave entirely to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture whether or not he will grant to any form of road which he may favor or refuse to grant to any road that he does not favor, because the qualifying words, interpreted grammatically, might be held to apply only to the clause that immediately precedes it and refer to aid under the provisions of this act.

I take it that is not the intention of the committee or those friendly to this bill. I think it is the purpose of the committee and those who favor this legislation that if at any time it is shown that any road shall fairly come under the provisions of this act, then it shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to do what the provisions of this act provide. I suggest language something like this, that instead of this language they should say, "and if the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that such construction, improvement, or maintenance is fairly under the provisions of this act, then," and so forth.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. BORLAND. How does the gentleman's language differ from that employed in the bill?

Mr. TOWNER. Very materially, because under the language that I propose the Secretary of Agriculture could determine whether or not it fairly came under the provisions of this act.

Mr. BORLAND. That is what must be determined under this act.

Mr. TOWNER. I think not; the language is very broad, which says, "if in his judgment said road is one where aid should be given"——

Mr. BORLAND. Under the provisions of this act.

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly; but as I said before, that qualifying phrase, as the Secretary of Agriculture might interpret it, might be held to allow him to refuse aid to any form of road which he might not approve. It occurs to me that the language is indefinite. I think we want this appropriation to be made under the terms of this act and not leave it to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture whether or not he will approve of it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 3, by striking out all after the word "construction," in line 7, down to and including the word "maintenance," in line 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Improvement or maintenance of any road in such State, and if such road shall come within the provisions of this act, then he shall request such State highway department to furnish him with surveys, plans, specifications, estimates of cost, and any other information he may consider proper. The determination of the proportion of aid to be given any project shall be left to the State highway department and shall accompany the application submitted on the part of the State. The Secretary of Agriculture shall examine said surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost."

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have sent to the desk is offered on behalf of the committee. The language of the bill as reported provided that whenever there was proposed to the Secretary of Agriculture any given project, and the Secretary approved the project, he should notify the State of the amount of aid that would be given, which in no case should be less than 30 per cent nor more than 50 per cent. During the general debate criticism of that language was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], and one or two others upon the ground that it would place too much power in the Secretary of Agriculture. The impression prevailed that it would enable him to refrain from giving to a State the quota to which it is entitled under the language of the bill.

In my remarks in general debate I endeavored to explain that the committee in including this language in the bill intended to meet this condition. For instance, take the State of New York, where construction work to the extent of $14,000,000 was engaged in last year, according to statements made upon the floor. That State receives under this bill about $1,000,000. The State of New York may prefer to have the aid to which it is entitled under this bill distributed on a great number of roads, receiving but 30 per cent, instead of having that aid given to a few roads and receiving 50 per cent, while in the States where there is no great road fund 50 per cent will be desired. In order to meet conditions prevailing in the wealthier States, we included that language. Under no circumstances could the Secretary of Agriculture have deprived any State of one dollar of the quota to which it is entitled under the bill. Nevertheless, after consideration, I was convinced that there was much merit in the criticism of gentlemen that too much power was placed in the Secretary of Agriculture under this language if, though he could not take from a State one dollar of its quota, he could, if he desired to establish a uniform type of road, require of the State of Wisconsin, say, that it should construct a road which met with his idea of what every road in the country should be, and if the State authorities did not propose such type of road he could give to that State aid only to the extent of 30 per cent, and by using that as a weapon force them to adopt a type of road which, while it might meet with his approval, would be entirely unfit for the uses of the people of the State of Wisconsin. Therefore the amendment provides that the determination of the amount of aid shall be left to the State, so that the State can do that which the committee intended it should be entitled to do under the language of the bill as reported.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I want to say that not only does the gentleman's amendment do that, but it corrects both of the objections to which I referred.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. In the construction of this language the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] was considered because it occurs in the same page and same line, and we believe there is merit in that suggestion, and that the word "improvement" should be inserted, because it is difficult to tell what construction would be placed on the language as the bill was reported to the House, and as it was the intention of the committee to enable a State to participate where a road was to be rebuilt as well as where a new trail was to be blazed. We feel, therefore, that the word "improvement" ought to be included so that there can be no doubt as to the meaning of the language of the bill.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do not desire to have five minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman whether it was his intention in this amendment to cut out all reference to the State paying 50 per cent of the cost of construction?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No.

Mr. BORLAND. Because that is what his amendment has done, and if his amendment does not intend that, it should be redrafted.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will say that there was no such intention. The amendment was hurriedly written, and that was omitted, and I will ask to have that inserted.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If I correctly understood the amendment, it leaves out the words "rural post" before the word "roads" that is used now in the bill in line 7.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do not think it makes any difference because the first section specifies the roads on which the aid could be given.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I thought it was done to make it conform to section 1 as amended.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I think it should.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I will say that that was the reason it was left out, that it might conform to section 1 as amended.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk advises the Chair that the committee has offered a new amendment, or at least has changed the amendment. Does the gentleman desire to have that reported?

Mr. BORLAND. I think the committee asked leave to make their amendment conform to their original intent. They withdrew the amendment and offered it over again.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the committee desire to have it read again?

Mr. BORLAND. I think it ought to be reported again.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I will ask unanimous consent to have the amendment reported as it now reads.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 3, by striking out all after the word "construction," in line 7, down to and including the word "maintenance," in line 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Improvement or maintenance of any road in such State, and if such road shall come within the provisions of this act, then he shall request such State highway department to furnish him with surveys, plans, specifications, estimates or cost, and any other information he may consider proper. The determination of the proportion of aid to be given any project, not to exceed 50 per cent of the total cost, shall be left to the State highway department and shall accompany the application submitted on the part of the State. The Secretary of Agriculture shall examine said surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost, and determine what would be the reasonable cost of such proposed improvement, construction, or maintenance."

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, may I have the substitute reported?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers a substitute to the committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 8, after the word "State," strike out all of the remainder of the section and insert, in lieu thereof, the following:

"*Provided*, That no payment of the appropriations herein provided shall be made to any State until an equal sum has been appropriated for by the legislature of such State, or provided by State, county, local authority, or individual contributions from within the State for the construction and maintenance of the public road provided for in this act.

"That whenever any State has complied with the provisions of this act, the amount which has been apportioned to be expended in such State, which is hereby appropriated, shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the warrant of the Secretary of Agriculture out of the Treasury of the United States to the treasurer or other officers of the State duly authorized by the laws of the State to receive the same, and such officers shall be required to report to the Secretary of Agriculture a detailed statement of the amount so received and of disbursements on forms prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposed by me is in line with previous legislation, and provides that States shall provide for an amount equal to the amount apportioned to the various States. It seems to me that it is safe and proper to leave the determination of the type of roads to be built to the people within the State. The people within the State have knowledge of the material available for the building of roads, the type of road required, and can better determine what type of road should be built than the Secretary of Agriculture. I simply offer it as being in line with legislation heretofore enacted, so that there may be no dispute of authority.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I do.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is precisely what the bill and what the amendment offered on the part of the committee propose to do, to leave the original selection of the type of road to be constructed to the State authorities. The Federal Government can put a veto on it, and you can not avoid it.

Mr. HAUGEN. But under the provisions of this bill every construction must be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. HAUGEN. Now comes the question——

Mr. SAUNDERS. And you can not get over that.

Mr. HAUGEN. Here comes the question. The Secretary of Agriculture—the director of roads—may determine that in our country it would be for the best interest of all concerned to construct a concrete road at an expense of five or six thousand dollars a mile——

Mr. SAUNDERS. No.

Mr. HAUGEN. And the State authorities might contend, as they do at the present time, that a gravel and clay road is the most available and inexpensive road, and therefore the clay and gravel road is preferred. Until that question has been settled the appropriation is held up, and no road built. In order to expedite matters I suggest that there should be no conflict between the authorities of the State and the Federal Government. This amendment is to avoid that and to expedite road building.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman has finished I desire to speak briefly in reference to the question raised. I see perfectly well what is in the mind of the gentleman from Iowa, and I thoroughly agree with him. If there is any one thing we worked over in the sessions of our committee, it was the provisions designed to leave the determination of the types of road to be constructed, improved, or maintained to the determination of the authorities of the States concerned. We have specifically provided in our bill, and in the amendment that we have just offered, that the State shall bring a project of road construction, maintenance, or improvement in the first instance to the attention of the Department of Agriculture, thus primarily determining the type of road that it desires to have constructed, improved, or maintained. There is however ample power to reject any project placed in the hands of the Secretary. On the exercise of this power he may conceivably reject all the projects submitted, save those that relate to the construction of the highest types of hard roads. He can simply say, "No," to any project submitted to him, giving any ground of objection that may occur to him as a sufficient reason for this action. He may even withhold his approval without giving any reasons therefor. In other words the Secretary of Agriculture may abuse that very discretion that we have confided to him with a view to the protection of the interests of the Federal Government. This of course is a possibility.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. But I have no apprehension in my mind that in the practical execution of this bill any Secretary of Agriculture will undertake to lay down the law to any State, and take the position that he will not approve any project submitted, unless it relates to the construction, or improvement of some type of road that he has prescribed. I am perfectly willing to take my chances in this respect, feeling assured that any Secretary of Agriculture that may be hereafter appointed will do his duty, and execute the law according to its spirit and plain intent. Should he fail to do so, he will hear from this body without regard to its political complexion.

Mr. HAUGEN. I suggest that the remedy is to turn the money over to the State when the State has appropriated an equal amount; that you turn the money over to that State and leave it to the discretion and judgment of the authorities of that State to suggest what type of road shall be built and where and when.

And when the States have completed an equal amount, as they do under the vocational educational act and various other acts passed by this Congress, then leave it to the determination of the State. We have many excellent men in the department in this country, and great men, but their enthusiasm is liable to carry them away. They have less knowledge of the material available for the building of roads and requirements of that country than the people in their own country.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that the difficulty about that suggestion is that as soon as you change this bill to meet the gentleman's views, you will arouse antagonism in some other quarter. We have adequately guarded the expenditure of the Federal portion of the money that will be expended in aid of road construction, and maintenance. Having had that in view, and it was proper to have it in view, we have given certain discretionary powers to the Secretary of Agriculture. These powers may be abused. That is always possible when discretion is vested in an official, but I do not think that as a practical proposition there is any danger of the results of abuse, and malfeasance that seem to be apprehended by some of the opponents of this bill.

Mr. TOWNER. Is it not true that the discretion is limited now, because under the terms of the provision the only discretion that can be exercised by the Secretary of Agriculture is whether or not the proposed road comes under the terms of this act?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I have stated that. He can simply put a veto on any particular project. He can not say affirmatively to a State that they must build this type of road, or that type of road, but, by abusing his discretion, I admit he can put a veto on any meritorious project. But I am not afraid of this action, as a part of a scheme by the Secretary of Agriculture to coerce a State, or direct its activities in road work along some prescribed course. He may of course err in his judgment with respect to some particular project. That is always conceivable with respect to any functionary filling a post calling for the exercise of discretion.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ROGERS. As I understood the amendment, it reads in part as follows:

The proportion of aid to be given any project, not to exceed 50 per cent of the total cost, shall be left to the State highway department.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Now, if the State highway department asks for 50 per cent from the Federal Government, as it would be apt to ask, and the Secretary thinks it is a proper project that 30 per cent of Federal aid be given, he has no course but to accept the 50 per cent that he does not believe in, or take the other?

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is true. The change in the bill as reported was made to meet the objection that the discretion originally lodged in the Secretary of Agriculture afforded him an opportunity to play politics with a State. Hence we have taken from him the power to determine whether aid to the extent of 30, or 40, or 45, or 50 per cent of the total cost shall be afforded. Under the amendment that power will be vested in the State making the application. This change will not add to or take from the amounts apportioned to the several States.

Mr. ROGERS. Does not the gentleman jump from the frying pan into the fire in doing that?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Not a bit.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I would like to ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Reserving the right to object, I should like five minutes. Can that be arranged?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I think so.

Mr. BORLAND. I would like five minutes.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Is the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE] present?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I am.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I ask that the time be limited to 30 minutes, and that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE] control half of it and that I control the other half.

Mr. WALSH. I object.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I regard this amendment, Mr. Chairman, as a very unfortunate amendment, and the substitute is a still more unfortunate proposition. I do not agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that in most of the States the State will ask for 50 per cent on each proposition it submits to the Secretary of Agriculture. I do not think that can be the intention of the amendment. This bill contains not only the word "construction," but now, if the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is accepted the word "improvement" and also the word "maintenance" will be included. The evil of the old bill two years ago was that the money under it could all be spent for the temporary upkeep of unimproved roads, where the money would disappear before the next spring mud had cleared away. Under this bill, if it is amended by either of these propositions, the same thing is true.

If the Secretary of Agriculture has no discretion as to how the Federal money is to be spent, but must approve a proposition put up to him by the State authorities if the road comes within the purview of the roads mentioned by the bill, then it would be possible for the State authorities, under political pressure in their own States, to divide out the money into infinitesimal amounts to each particular road district in the State, and if there were 3,000 to 5,000 road districts in the State, as there are in some States, they would have to satisfy the demands of each one of those road districts. The result would be that you would have no money for real road improvement. You would have a little money before the primary in August to put from 20 to 50 men to work, but you would have no money for road improvement that would last until the December snow.

Mr. HAUGEN. Does the gentleman think that we should leave it to the legislature of the State?

Mr. BORLAND. I think to leave it to the legislature of the State to appropriate 50 per cent would be a better proposition. I think in the original proposition that the Federal Government should contribute not more than 50 per cent or less than 30 per cent, that the "less than 30 per cent" was, in my judgment, as important as "not more than 50 per cent," because that made certain that 30 per cent of work done on certain roads in the State would be under Federal supervision. The 30 per cent provision is so material a contribution to the road that it will guarantee a certain amount of definite improvement on that road. But if the contribution were reduced to 1 per cent or one-half of 1 per

cent, it would be utterly impossible for the Federal money to be safeguarded.

Now, this wording still leaves in the words that "the Secretary shall demand such other information as he sees proper." But, if his hands are to be tied, I do not know what other information about these roads he could deem as proper to demand. I think he should have the right to demand other information, if he sees proper, to wit, the number of improved roads in the State, whether the State has any means of maintaining roads after they are constructed, and whether the taxing power is sufficient for that particular purpose. But if you are going to tie the hands of the Secretary and say that he must approve a proposition put up to him by the State authorities, you are going to have him in some States, I fear, not approve propositions for roads, but approve propositions for the temporary maintenance of unimproved roads.

There will be the pressure within the States, and naturally so, to divide the money equally between all the road districts, and that will give no road district enough to improve any road. Now, the Federal Government is not entering into any such proposition. To enter into such a proposition would be perfectly hopeless, and if we ever did enter into it there is not a man on this floor who would escape the constant effort to have that little driblet increased in favor of the local district. There was not a greater evil in the old bill, which was defeated two years ago, than that very proposition that all the Federal money could be and would, so far as we could see, be wasted in the temporary upkeep of roads.

If this money is going into roads, I am for it. If it is going into politics I am against it. I believe the farmers and the business men of this country would be against it in the latter event. They want roads and not politics, and they demand that there shall be legislation for the benefit of roads and not politics.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out a sufficient number of words to enable me to say something. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] is recognized.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a wide difference of opinion on this amendment and on the bill as to how far the authority of the States and of the Department of Agriculture should extend in the control, building, and maintenance of the roads to be aided by this legislation.

Indiana, I believe, according to the records, has more miles of good roads according to its area and its road mileage than any other State in the Union. We have built these roads at a very large expense to the taxpayers of the State. In a great many instances they have been built under the supervision and direction of overseers, who were novices at the business, and the precaution in the amendment and in the bill that provides that the Secretary of Agriculture must approve the plans and specifications is one of the valuable features of the bill, for the reason that some States, through political favoritism and otherwise, might select civil engineers for road work who would make plans that were faulty and to which no practical builder would give his approval.

Another matter, Mr. Chairman, and that is in the maintenance of these roads. It is not true that a road that is built under the specifications of a civil engineer necessarily wears out less rapidly than one that has been made by some competent country road supervisor. There is not anything in that argument, and gentlemen who have to do with country roads will agree with me on that proposition. Therefore, the purpose of the bill, to delegate to the Secretary of Agriculture the final word on the plans and specifications, is the one important feature of the bill and the one strongly favored by the people throughout the country who have been paying for the improvement of roads all these years, and many times spending money for improvements that are worth practically nothing. They are in favor of having some competent executive head pass upon all the plans and specifications for these roads and approve them before the people are asked to put up the money for their construction.

Therefore I feel, Mr. Chairman, that the argument of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is not only far fetched but irrelevant to the subject in hand; and while the committee has sought from every possible standpoint to protect this bill against the possibility of the expenditure of money by novices, or spending money upon roads that it would be impracticable to try to improve, it seems to me that we have fixed the authority in this bill exactly where it belongs. And moreover, if the Secretary of Agriculture——

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman misunderstands me. I am arguing for exactly and precisely the same thing that he is. I am arguing for this control by the Secretary of Agriculture over the plans and specifications.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; but I disagree with the gentleman as to the Secretary of Agriculture having jurisdiction as to what roads are to be improved. I insist that he should have supervisory control over the plans and specifications, but that the State, or the local road officials, should have the initiative in the matter, and the say-so, so to speak, as to what roads should or should not be improved with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BORLAND. Then the gentleman is opposed to the amendment.

Mr. BARNHART. No. I am in favor of the amendment.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I want to give a few observations on the merits of this bill which I, as a member of the Committee on Roads, helped to formulate and report for passage. The theory of this legislation is that it will help every section of the United States that will help itself in road improvement. For instance, any community that levies a road tax for the construction and maintenance of roads will receive from the Government 30 to 50 per cent of the cost of good roads and their upkeep if it will build them according to specifications that will make an efficient and durable road.

In the Indiana county in which I live the country at large would help to pay our road taxes and in fairness it ought to do so for two reasons. First, it would necessitate the building of all roads according to plans approved by Government experts; and second, the city automobilists who pay no road taxes wear out more roads with their big, high-powered automobiles than those who are now building and keeping up the roads. The public highway is the means of bringing the farmer close to the market and taking the market close to the farmer. If the roads are good the cost of transporting products is reduced to the minimum, and the farmer gains thereby, and he can also afford to sell his products cheaper to the consumer, because his marketing expense is reduced.

Mr. Chairman, I really have little to add to what I said in a speech on a similar bill in a former session of Congress; but I must call attention to the fact that if this demand for larger military preparedness is to be granted, good roads, over which military equipment could be rapidly and economically transported, are of first importance. And of all the preparedness we may provide, the money spent in improving roads is probably the only investment that will prove helpful in both war and peace. If we build these good roads, they will be useful if war should come, and if not—which God grant may be the outcome—the people can use the good roads profitably in peaceful pursuit of both business and pleasure. It is a good bill; it gives the rural taxpaying millions some direct returns for the taxes they pay instead of giving it all to rivers and harbors and to big cities, as has heretofore been done, and I earnestly hope it will become a law. It is high time the farmers and the dwellers in small cities and towns shall have some of the direct benefits of the Government taxes they pay.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not recognize the gentleman at this time.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS. Is it in order to propose an amendment to the committee amendment at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, there is a substitute pending, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. One is a substitute for the entire amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. The amendment that I desire to propose, Mr. Chairman, is to strike out the word "fifty," where it appears in the committee amendment, and substitute therefor the word "twenty-five."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the committee amendment by striking out the word "fifty," and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-five," so that the lines will read, when amended: "The determination of the proportion of aid to be given any project not to exceed 25 per cent of the total cost shall be left to the State," etc.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I assume that the purpose of a bill of this sort, as proposed in a Federal enactment, must be to stimulate the building of roads by the several States. I think that if it does not have that purpose, and in so far as it falls short of that purpose, it is not a proper subject of Federal supervision and legislation.

As drafted by the committee, this amendment would require the expenditure by the States, taken altogether, of the same $25,000,000 as is authorized to be expended each year by the Federal Government. That is, the States together would put in each year $25,000,000 just to match the $25,000,000 that was put in by the Federal Government.

Now, this is, as I say, a question of stimulation, a question of stimulating the activity of the several States to build roads. If the proportion of Federal aid were 25 per cent instead of 50 per cent, I think no one would dispute that the States would equally take the steps which would be necessary in order to get their quota of the $25,000,000 fund; and, of course, the result of changing the percentage would be that the States, taken together, would be obliged to put in $50,000,000 instead of $25,000,000. In other words, all the States would take the steps to get their respective allotments, and in order to do that they would have to put in twice as much on their own account to build State roads.

In other words, we would be getting an assurance of $75,000,000 a year on this project, of which the Federal Government would put in one-third, instead of the assurance of spending but $50,000,000, of which the Federal Government would be putting in one-half. It seems to me that there can be no objection to this proposal. It simply carries out the self-help idea and makes it stronger, and makes it certain that there will be more roads constructed throughout the Union as the result of the passage of this act. I think that it was a mistake for the committee not to leave some discretion in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, and that there might well be cases where the Secretary would say that there should be 40 per cent of Federal aid put in upon a certain project, but not 50 per cent. Yet under this plan the State itself must prescribe the amount which shall be expended, and the Secretary of Agriculture has no discretion whatever. He can simply say "Yes" or "No." I think that, in spite of what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] says, the State will in every case ask for the entire 50 per cent. That is the maximum allowed by the bill, and I can not imagine that a State will ever seek to get less than the maximum amount it is permitted to obtain.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the whole committee amendment on this point is ill advised, and if it is to be adopted we ought to change the maximum from 50 per cent to 25 per cent.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I should like to ask the gentleman, if we accept his amendment, will he vote for the bill?

Mr. ROGERS. I will vote against the bill with less enthusiasm if you accept my amendment.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RICKETTS] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I again renew my request that we may have some agreement as to the length of time that the debate shall continue on this section.

Mr. MANN. We would like 15 minutes on this side.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 25 minutes—15 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and 10 minutes by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 25 minutes—15 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and 10 minutes by himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman from Illinois use some of his time?

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to read an amendment which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. As I understand it, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] has an amendment to the amendment which has not beeen disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] to the committee amendment.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELSTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELSTON: At the end of the section insert the following:

"The apportionment to each State as herein determined shall be available to such State under the provisions hereof for a period of five years after such apportionment is made."

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON] five minutes.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in line with the observations which I made upon the bill the other day. In the State of California we have, in a way, temporarily exhausted ourselves by appropriations for good roads. We have spent $18,000,000 on the part of the State in building trunk-line roads within the last few years. The counties have contributed almost a like amount, and I should say offhand that we have recently spent, altogether, nearly $50,000,000. Now our plan is a contributory plan, something like the provisions of this bill, and I believe that most of the counties in our State would like to lie fallow for a while. I think they have stripped themselves of money available for these purposes for some time to come.

Another consideration that I wish to bring before the House is this: I see nothing in this bill providing for legislation within the State for the distribution of this bounty that comes from the Federal Treasury. For instance, we have a highway commission which was organized with the idea of spending State moneys only. If this bounty comes into our State, I venture to say that there is no provision at all on our books for the equitable distribution of this money to the various political units of the State or for its application to our State system. If our highway commission is notified that there is subject to its order something like $600,000 or $700,000, it will have no authority to proceed with its distribution. As we all know, executive officers have little discretion. Our commission might be blocked until legislation is passed that would permit equitable distribution of this bounty coming from the Federal Government. I imagine many other States would be in a like situation. Now, if such legislation is not passed in the State to meet the provisions of this bill, the State highway commissioner, or other officer in the State who receives this bounty or who is to dispense it, might distribute it by favoritism or preference. I can not conceive of any equitable or legal way to distribute it unless the States themselves legislate upon the subject. That may take several years. It may take several years for my State to put itself in a position where it can take advantage of this act. At this time we might be able to take advantage of this subsidy only by making a plea for maintenance. To make that plea we would have to stretch matters somewhat, because we might have to say to the Federal Government that we needed $600,000 or $700,000 a year for the purposes of maintenance, and we can not tell exactly what the construction of the Secretary of Agriculture will be as to the scope of the word "maintenance." He might say that our particular requirements in the way of maintenance do not mean maintenance according to his construction of the act. I imagine that it may take some time to prepare ourselves to receive the benefits of this bill. I believe five years' time is none too long for the money to lie in the Treasury to the credit of the State. Otherwise a State might lose its apportionment by lapse into the Treasury at the end of the biennial period.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of good roads. Having been born and reared upon a farm, in Warren County, Mo., I am, in my judgment, the better able to realize their necessity. The farmers of our country are important factors in our development and material progress. That which is for the benefit of the farmers must also be for the best interest of the merchants and people who live in the towns and cities. I represent a district in the great and splendid city of St. Louis, and I am sure I voice the best sentiments of that people in giving my support to any feasible scheme that will enable the United States Government to assist the State governments to establish better highways. The people of my district pay as great a proportion of taxes to the United States Government as perhaps 10 other districts in Missouri, outside of St. Louis and Kansas City. Yet we are willing to aid the farmers to the end that every possible facility be given to the establishing of good

roads in order that the commerce of the country may be marketed as easily and as cheaply as possible. Yet, Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of this Federal aid becoming a political asset, to be used by whichever party may be in power in the various States, as I fear would be the case should this amendment be agreed to. The United States Government should have the supervisory control and the authority to see that the money thus expended is for the benefit of the people generally, and to the end that some splendid roads and highways may result therefrom.

I have not much confidence in any legislation that the Democratic Party is able to enact. Since they have been in power, practically all the laws they have caused to be written in the statute books are injurious to the farmers and the people generally. But the farmers of this country are fast coming to realize and to know that their prosperity of the past and of the future has and must come from the wholesome laws of the Republican Party. This is also especially true as to good roads, for that will only be realized under the next Republican administration. Even should this bill pass, which I do not think there is any intention that it shall, there would be no money to carry out its provisions. To prove this, we have only to refer to the President's message delivered to this Congress on the 7th of December last. In that message, he said:

> Assuming that the taxes imposed by the emergency revenue act and the present duty on sugar are to be discontinued, the deficit in the general fund of the Treasury on the 30th of June, 1917, will be $235,000,000.

While the "war tax" or emergency revenue act, as the President calls it, was reenacted by Congress, since the President delivered his message, and while it is also evident that the "free sugar" act will be repealed, there will still be an enormous deficit in the Treasury. The President is now asking for millions for preparedness, and so forth, and therefore we all know that there will never be any appropriation made during this administration for good roads. This bill, therefore, is apparently only to try and jolly the farmers along until after the next election. "It is molasses to catch flies." The principal purpose of the Democratic Party is to stay in office, and to do this they are willing to go the limit to deceive the farmers and the people. This Democratic administration is even trying to convince the farmers that their prosperity now is due to laws enacted by them. The farmers well know, however, that their present prosperity is due to the war in Europe. For instance, they know that the sale of wheat to Europe during the first year that the Underwood tariff law was in force amounted to only $103,595,000, while during the first year of the war this increased to the sum of $316,262,000. This is due to the large armies in Europe that had to be fed. This is also a fact with reference to other things that the farmers sell. During the same period the sale of breadstuffs increased from $181,484,000 to $567,607,000; hay, from $790,000 to $2,263,000; meats and dairy products, from $138,736,000 to $243,098,000; sugar, from $4,341,000 to $36,816,000. Mules, which are raised by our Missouri farmers in abundance, increased from $622,000 to $18,041,000, and horses from $3,177,000 to $82,276,000.

The farmers are prosperous for the reason stated, as well as for the reason that our many factories and mills are in full blast now manufacturing products for the armies in Europe, and which gives to American labor employment, thus enabling them to buy foodstuffs in abundance from the farmers. For instance, we see from the statistics that during the year that the Democratic tariff law was in force prior to the war that we only sold to Europe wool goods to the value of $4,753,000, while during the first year of the war the sale of these goods increased to the extent of $32,057,000; during the same period we saw the sale of men's shoes for our European trade increase from $9,603,000 to $22,669,000; other goods manufactured from leather increased during this period from $43,390,000 to $90,804,000.

I know these facts not only from the statistics but because there are more shoes manufactured in my district than there is in any other in the United States. My district also manufactures much harness and saddlery that has been and is going to Europe. During the first year under the Democratic tariff law this country sold to Europe $793,000 worth of harness and saddlery, yet during the first year of the war we sold $18,434,000 worth. Missouri is a great zinc-producing State, but the Underwood tariff law would have ruined it entirely had not the war in Europe come along. Zinc is used in the making of shells, and so we increased our sales to Europe from $785,000 worth in the year before the war to $26,323,000 worth during the first year of the war. This is also true of lead, brass, steel, and other things that go to make shells and munitions of war. Our gain during this period for steel amounted to 186 per cent, firearms 285 per cent, wire 153 per cent, explosives 1,050 per cent, tools 175 per cent, medical appliances 231 per cent. Taking the same period we find that, in the first instance, our railroads were idle, cars were standing still, and railway business in bad condition; yet now these cars are all being used carrying provisions and munitions of war to the ocean to be sent to Europe. The shipyards are busy building ships for Europe; the automobile manufacturing industry is greatly increasing. We sold automobiles to Europe during the first year of the war worth $92,000,000—170 per cent gain over the year preceding that.

The farmers of our country are intelligent, and they have passed that stage when the Democratic Party can longer deceive and fool them. They know that protection to their industries is necessary, and that had not the war of Europe come they would be in the same condition to-day that they were in during the administration of Cleveland. Free cattle from Canada, Argentine Republic, and South America would have ruined that industry had not these countries found markets for their products over in Europe. The farmers of the country will take the first opportunity to restore the protective tariff. Otherwise they will suffer terribly when the war in Europe closes and these millions of men return to civil pursuits, and thereby compete with the people of this country in the products of the American farm, mill, and mine. Our first duty, therefore, is to drive from power the present administration, and then to encourage prosperity at home as a permanent thing. The protective tariff is absolutely necessary to do this. It raises the revenue to run the Government and is practically paid by the foreign manufacturers. It also protects our labor against the cheaper labor of those countries. It also protects us against child labor.

The Democratic administration realizes now that its Underwood tariff law has been a failure, and that the free-trade and revenue-tariff law such as they enacted will not suit the needs of the people of this country. We see the President of the United States now advocating a tariff board. He has already declared in favor of the protective tariff on sugar. Both of these things he declared against during his campaign for the Presidency. In fact, the Baltimore platform has been repudiated so many times by the President that I doubt if any of its framers would now recognize it. First, we find that he gave special indorsement to that provsion of the platform which allowed free passage to American coastwise ships through the Panama Canal.

When he had become the President he asked for and secured the repeal of that law. He has never told us why he changed his mind upon that. Some years ago the President regarded Mr. William Jennings Bryan with disfavor and wanted to destroy his influence with the party, yet as the Baltimore convention came on Mr. Wilson sought Mr. Bryan's support and acclaimed him a great Democrat, and Mr. Bryan supported Mr. Wilson at Baltimore, and Mr. Wilson appointed Mr. Bryan Secretary of State. Now we find the President in favor of preparedness, yet only a short time ago he was against that. Not over a year ago he was against a tariff commission, yet now he has come out publicly in favor of that. We do not know what he will do next. He has almost indorsed the Republican position upon the tariff, and probably before election time he will be a higher protectionist than any Republican ever was. Yet, Mr. Chairman, will the farmers of this country follow the President in his many changes? Will they not say at the next election that they would rather support the party that has fixed principles and maintains them year in and year out? The Republicans have been in favor of a tariff board for a long time. They had one established during the administration of President Taft, but it was abolished by the Democrats as useless. The position of the Republican Party on this question was clearly stated by President Taft in his letter of acceptance of the Republican nomination in 1912, when he said:

> The American people may rest assured that should the Republican Party be restored to power in all legislative branches all the schedules in the present tariff of which complaint is made will be subjected to investigation and report by a competent and impartial tariff board and to the reduction or change which may be necessary to square the rates with the facts.

It is only necessary to refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of past Congresses to find that the leaders of the Democratic Party have year in and year out declared that it was unconstitutional to collect tariff duties except for revenue. They called the protective tariff "tariff robbery." The platforms of the Republican Party have for years declared for protective tariff and for a tariff commission. The last declaration of my party upon this question was as follows:

> The pronounced feature of modern industrial life is its enormous diversification. To apply tariff rates justly to these changing conditions requires closer study and more scientific methods than ever before. The Republican Party has shown by its creation of a tariff board its recognition of this situation and its determinationto be equal to it.

We condemn the Democratic Party for its failure either to provide funds for the continuance of this board or to make some other provision for securing the information requisite for intelligent tariff legislation. We protest against the Democratic method of legislating on these vitally important subjects without careful investigation.

How fast the President is coming to the Republican position upon a tariff commission is evidenced by the fact that the position of the President is practically the same as that contained in the bill H. R. 154, introduced on the 6th of last December by Congressman NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, of Ohio. Section 3 of Mr. LONGWORTH's bill is as follows:

That it shall be the duty of said commission to investigate the cost of production of all articles which by any act of Congress now in force or hereafter enacted are made the subject of tariff legislation, with special reference to the prices paid domestic and foreign labor and the prices paid for raw materials, whether domestic or imported, entering into manufactured articles, producers' prices and retail prices of commodities, whether domestic or imported, the condition of domestic and foreign markets affecting the American products, including detailed information with respect thereto, together with all other facts which may be necessary or convenient in fixing import duties or in aiding the President and other officers of the Government in the administration of the customs laws, and said commission shall also make investigation of any such subject whenever directed by either House of Congress.

The thing that the farmers of the country want above everything else is good markets for their products. The protective tariff gives that to them. Mills, factories, mines, and everything are prosperous when that law is in operation. It has been so in the past, and it will be so in the next administration. We want a just tariff. We want a tariff that will equal the difference between cost of production at home and abroad. This principle takes into consideration cheap foreign labor, child labor, convict labor, and so forth. The important question is to establish that principle in law and to keep in there. Then we should have a tariff commission, as suggested by Republicans many times, and which we had in the last administration, but which was abolished by the Democrats.

This tariff commission should be charged with the duty of getting data that can be secured bearing upon the subject of tariff, and analyze, classify, and arrange the same so that it will be readily available for the use of the Congress, which, under the Constitution, is the only body authorized to fix the tariff. It should be a nonpartisan commission, and not such a commission as would be appointed by President Wilson should he have the power. Every commission that he has appointed, including the Federal Reserve Board, has been strictly partisan. The mind of the President does not contemplate the finding of efficient and patriotic men to gather this information except within his own party. For that reason a tariff commission appointed by the President would not be of any benefit. The present administration has failed utterly, even after it has shifted its position numerous times, and the people of this country who believe in protection are only waiting for the opportunity to correct the mistake which they made at the last election, when by dividing they allowed a minority party to come into power. All responsible for that are truly sorry, and they will make good their mistake in a patriotic way by giving their votes in the next election for the Republican candidates for President and Vice President. And, Mr. Chairman, the intelligent farmers of Missouri and of the Nation will do their part to bring this happy result about.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, for this reason, among many other good ones, I am pleased to vote for this bill for good roads in order to show my appreciation of the sturdy men and women of the farms—they who have done so much for our great Republic. My vote for this bill will not bring us good roads, as I have stated above, because we have no money in the Treasury; but it is a declaration that the Congress of the United States favors helping the farmers to market their products and to give them good roads for that purpose. But we will have to wait till the Republicans come into power and restore business and replenish the depleted Treasury before we can actually do anything along the lines indicated in this bill. But we have to start it going, and if only to establish the principle involved in the bill I hope, Mr. Chairman, that in its best possible shape it will become a law. [Applause.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 7, strike out all after the semicolon and insert the following: "That the proper authorities of the State shall be required to report to the Secretary of Agriculture on or before the 1st day of December of each year a detailed statement of the amount of money received under this act during the previous fiscal year and of its disbursement on forms prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture; that if any portion of the moneys received by the designated authorities of a State under this act shall by any action or contingency be diminished or lost or be misapplied it shall be replaced by said State, and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be apportioned to said State; that if the Secretary of Agriculture shall withhold from a State the whole or any part of an allotment of money under this act the facts and reasons therefor shall be reported to the President and the amount involved shall be kept separate in the Treasury until the expiration of the Congress next succeeding a session of the legislature of the State from which allotment of money has been withheld, in order that the State may, if it shall so desire, appeal to Congress from the determination of the Secretary of Agriculture. If the next Congress shall not direct such money to be paid it shall be covered into the Treasury."

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, as I have said before during consideration of this bill, I approve its purpose to provide money from the Federal Treasury to assist States in construction and maintenance of their highways; but the bill is faulty in some respects, and its operation will be cumbersome and expensive if enacted in its present form. My amendment is offered with the idea of lessening the expense of administration and to make the law more satisfactory to the States. The amendment follows as nearly as may be the provisions of the Lever agricultural-extension law, approved May 8, 1914, under which each State receives an allotment of money each year for agricultural-extension work, to be carried on by the agricultural colleges in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture. If the amendment is adopted it will not be necessary for the Secretary of Agriculture, before paying money to a State, to examine all work which has been done on all highways by employing a vast number of inspectors or clerks in the department. It would seem to me that if we are going to avoid danger of using too much of the money to be provided by this road bill for administration, if we are going to prevent or limit as far as possible the employment of inspectors to run over the States to look over the road work that has been done, causing all kinds of trouble, distrustful of the States, we should adopt this amendment. Many gentlemen of the House would, I think, be surprised if they knew how much of an appropriation made by Congress and intended for practical work is used by the departments in "administration." I recall that only a few years ago the Secretary of Agriculture and other officials of that department told the Committee on Agriculture of the wonderful things they had accomplished, of the results of their investigations and experiments and analyses, and of the great benefit they would be able to confer upon the business of agriculture of the country—that agriculture could be revolutionized—if they had opportunity of taking the results of their work directly to the farmers of the country in such form or in such a way as to make them easily understood and readily available. We said, "Then, all you need is money for practical work?" They replied, "Yes"; and on the recommendation of the committee large appropriations were authorized for practical work, and it was not at all satisfactory to us to learn later that the department was devoting a large portion of the appropriation and had arranged to use large portions for salaries of clerks and other employees in the department; that is, in administration.

But I should like to speak of the bill as a whole and of its purpose to provide Federal aid to the States in the construction and maintenance of highways. I shall, if I have time, refer again to my amendment, which is offered for the purpose of making the machinery of this bill correspond to that of the Lever law, by which the Department of Agriculture is operating smoothly and satisfactorily with agricultural colleges.

This bill, in its main features, has my hearty support. It does not meet my views entirely, but it is certainly a step in the right direction; it is a proper, although tardy, response on the part of the Congress to an insistent demand of the country. The amount of money which may annually be appropriated if this bill becomes law, is small, but later, when ineffective and oppressive revenue laws shall be repealed and a system of wise laws which always provide revenue sufficient for every proper activity of government are enacted, this law can be and will be amended and more money will be appropriated.

What are the important provisions of this bill? It authorizes an annual appropriation of not more than $25,000,000 to be used and disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, as follows: The Secretary shall deduct the sum which he shall deem necessary to defray the expenses of his department in the administration of the act and apportion the balance among the States in the following manner: Sixty-five thousand dollars shall be paid to each State and one-half of the remainder in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the population of all the States as shown by the latest Federal census, and the other half of such remainder in the ratio which the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes in such States bears to the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes of all the States; the State highway department of any State may apply to the Secretary of Agriculture for aid under this act in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads, and the highway department shall furnish the Secretary with

surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost of the proposed construction or maintenance and any other information which he may consider proper; after examination and approval of such surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost, the Secretary shall determine the amount of aid to be given, which, in no case, shall be less than 30 nor more than 50 per cent of the reasonable cost of such improvement; when such work of construction or maintenance shall have been completed, the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine whether or not the work has been done and finished in substantial compliance with the surveys, plans, and specifications which were submitted by the authorities of the State, and upon favorable determination of that matter, he shall cause to be paid to the proper authority of said State whatever remains unpaid of the amount allotted to the State under this act; the Secretary of Agriculture may make or cause to be made such inspection and examination of any road constructed or maintained under this act as he shall deem necessary, and, for that purpose, shall have power to employ such assistants, clerks, and other persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere, to purchase such materials and supplies, and to prescribe such rules and regulations for the administration of this act as he may consider expedient; all payments of money from appropriations of this act shall be made by the Treasurer of the United States upon warrants drawn by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The work of the committee in preparing this bill, or the result it has tried to reach, meets my hearty approval because it recommends Federal aid in construction and maintenance of the common highways of the country, and not construction of a few expensive trunk lines between large cities or over or through a portion of country to be reached or traversed solely or principally by sight-seers or pleasure seekers. The intent and plain purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for construction of roads from farming sections to railroad stations and market towns for practical, everyday, necessary use of the people in carrying on their business, and not for construction of roads for joy riding or for use of automobiles alone. Money available under this law will very likely for some years be used in building and maintaining highways over which rural mail is carried, roads in which the Federal Government, in conducting its post-office business, is directly interested. Improvement of post roads is, perhaps, the first duty of the Federal Government, and for some time this use of money will confer as much benefit and offer as much assistance and encouragement to the States as can reasonably be expected. And, besides, I believe that roads over which rural mail is carried are now the main roads or the principally traveled roads in almost every rural community. But as time goes on, as the wisdom of this law is proven by experience, and as larger sums of money are available the work can and will be extended to assisting the States in construction and maintenance of other roads. There is practically no limit to the need of good roads or to the benefit that will accrue from their construction. I am so much pleased with the evident willingness of Congress to admit its duty to the people and to see the work begun on a limited scale that I am not disposed at this time to criticize the plan proposed by this bill on the ground that it does not go far enough. It will prove the value of the policy and the good work will be properly extended.

Some gentlemen who have spoken in opposition to this bill evidently do not appreciate the need and the benefit of good roads; they seem not to know that a system of roads, properly constructed and maintained, is necessary to the improvement and development of every part of the country. Other gentlemen, while admitting the necessity and benefit of good roads, insist that the advantage is entirely local; that it is the duty of the people of portions of the country in which the advantage is to be enjoyed to bear all expense themselves; and that the purpose and effect of this bill will be to impose local duties and local burdens upon the Federal Government.

I hardly know what to say to these gentlemen, or, rather, hardly know how or where to begin to offer facts and arguments to convince them of their error. My time is limited, and, besides, the converse of the position taken by these gentlemen is so clear to me as the proper view to be taken that it ought not to be necessary to spend time and effort to disprove their statements. It is doubtful if there is any public improvement more necessary than the building of country highways, or any expenditure of public money (from whatever source it may come) that will result in greater development or conduce more to the general welfare of the country than in the construction and maintenance of our country roads. Good roads running between railroad stations and the farms, and leading from the farms to the market places, are absolutely necessary alike to the proper and profitable business of railroads and market towns and to the business of the farms. Construction of railroads and their proper management provide some of the facilities and solve some of the problems of transportation, but these problems will not be solved, in fact will not approach solution, until the people of the country, assisted as they must be by Federal legislation, are able to construct and maintain systems of highways connecting stations with farming sections of the country and with places not reached by railroads. Many of the railroads of the country have been assisted by contributions of money and other property by the Federal and State Governments; the building of railroads has very properly been encouraged and in some instances greatly assisted by donation of public land and by Government guaranteeing payment of the bonds of the companies. The people have usually approved the efforts made and the means used to encourage and assist in the construction of railroads; they know the necessity of railroads and they appreciate that wonderful growth and development have come as the result of their construction and operation. But while generally approving the assistance which has been given to railroads and, I may add, to rivers and harbors, the people feel the Government has overlooked the need of improved country highways, and has failed to perform its duty to encourage and assist in their construction.

The building and maintaining of good roads is not entirely a local need or a local benefit; the matter of expense of transporting farm products, whether the profit shall be large or small, does not concern the farmers alone; it concerns all the people. If there is no road from a farm to a market, or if travel over a road is difficult and expensive, the farmer may be unwilling or unable to dispose of his products; or if he takes them to market he may demand and possibly be able to receive higher prices than consumers are able or ought to be required to pay. The almost inevitable result of such a situation is, however, that the farmer, in spite of trouble and expense, will take his products to market and will receive therefor such price as the buyer is willing to pay, a price which will yield him smaller profit than his investment and his labor fairly entitle him to; smaller profit than he would have realized if he had had the advantage of a good road for the quick, cheap, and convenient transportation of his products.

Nearly every Member of this House at one time or another has talked about the "high cost of living"; many have assumed to tell us of causes or reasons for high prices, and occasionally some one rises and takes our valuable time to tell of a cure he has discovered. Members representing districts in large cities usually tell us the trouble is that farmers receive too much money for their produce; that the farmers are making too much profit. I have not time nor am I disposed to answer such statements, except to say that they are made by men who know nothing of the investment of the average farmer and nothing of the labor and other expense of the average farmer in producing his crops and in putting them on the market. Two or three years ago the then Secretary of Agriculture, James Wilson, after careful investigation, said that the average prices received by the farmers of the country are not more than one-half the prices paid by consumers. No; the farmers are not responsible for the high cost of living; farmers are not receiving too large prices or making too large profits. But it is true that it costs farmers too much—too much time, too much trouble, and too much money—to market their crops; and this loss of time and money is due to the poor condition of the roads over which they travel.

If roads were in good condition, farm products could be carried to market more quickly and easily and the farmers might be willing to accept lower prices than they now receive and still have larger profit, or the result might be that the farmers, reaching the consumer with less trouble and expense and dispensing with some of the middle men, would receive a larger part of the price the consumer pays. Either result will justify the use of money as provided by this bill; either would be satisfactory to the farmers; and they certainly are right in asking consideration of their welfare at the hands of Congress. And if advantage and profit are to be realized by both farmers and consumers, certainly their combined interests can not be ignored.

I can not agree with these gentlemen from some of the large cities who object to the use of Federal money in the improvement of highways over which rural mail is carried. They evidently feel that, inasmuch as the Federal Government has established the rural routes and maintains the Rural Mail Service, the highways ought to be constructed and maintained by State or local authority without assistance from the Government. They seem to think that the Rural Mail Service was established for the sole benefit of farmers, patrons of the rural routes, and that from a sense of gratitude for favors shown and benefits conferred upon them the farmers as a class ought to be willing to tax themselves to meet all expense of providing good roads

upon and over which the mail business, carried on for their convenience and advantage, is done. These gentlemen point to the fact that the Rural Mail Service is not self-supporting; that in fact it costs above $30,000,000 each year more than it yields in postal revenue; and they evidently think the service should be so reduced that its cost shall not be greater than its receipts. The theory upon which these gentlemen proceed is wrong. The Rural Mail Service is not for the convenience and advantage of patrons of the routes alone, it is for the benefit of the entire country, fully as much for the benefit of business men of the cities as for the patrons of the routes.

If one thinks the Rural Mail Service is for the sole use and advantage of the people of country districts, he should get information as to the amount and character of mail matter delivered by rural carriers. He will learn that publishers of daily newspapers reach farmers as easily as they reach city subscribers; that city merchants reach farmers with their advertisements as easily and almost as quickly as they reach the people of the cities, who were formerly their only customers; that farmers do not now find it necessary to depend upon weekly newspapers, but subscribe for and receive daily newspapers and also receive magazines and other publications as regularly and as generally as do the people of cities.

One who believes that the rural mails are for the benefit of only one class of our people—farmers and other patrons of rural routes—will change his mind as he learns the extent to which these rural patrons use the mails and avail themselves of the advantage which daily delivery of mail gives them of keeping in touch with what is going on in the world, and as he learns the manner and extent of use of the mails by people of the cities to keep in touch with the business of rural communities and with the farmers themselves.

In my opinion the business men and publishers of newspapers and magazines would make the first and most strenuous objection to the suggestion, if anyone were foolish enough to make it, that the system or policy of rural mail be abandoned or restricted. And that being true, as I am sure it is, why do residents of large cities, even Representatives of cities in Congress, tell us that patrons of rural routes ought to bear all the expense of Rural Mail Service or that the cost of the service should not be greater than its receipts?

The rural service is a part of the great mail service of the country, just as proper and just as necessary as the City Delivery Service. It would be unreasonable to say the character and extent of city service should be limited by its receipts or that the cost of post-office equipment, including cost of building, should be paid by the taxpayers of the city, and it is just as unreasonable to say that the expense of furnishing local equipment and facilities for the rural mail service, including construction and maintenance of highways, shall all be paid by the patrons of rural routes or by the taxpayers of local communities having advantage of the service.

Mr. Chairman, I should be willing to approve the purpose of measures like this even if I believed, as is contended by some Members, that it will confer greater and more direct advantage upon rural communities than upon the great centers of business and population. I shall not be deterred from supporting this bill because Members call it class legislation. Even if it were for the particular or more direct benefit of farmers, should it not be passed? It is true that farmers, as a class, have been benefited by Federal legislation, even by legislation intended for the direct advantage and profit of other classes, but in almost every instance the benefit to farmers has been indirect. Farmers as a class have been benefited by the development of great manufactures and by large industrial activities which have been encouraged and protected by Federal legislation, but the benefit to farmers has been indirect. It is urged that this bill, if it becomes law, will confer direct benefits upon farmers by furnishing Federal aid and by cooperating in the building of highways. Why not? It will give aid and encouragement to a class of our people who need relief from the burdens they have been bearing; it will be helpful to a class of our people who deserve consideration at the hands of the Government.

The bill before us is not entirely satisfactory. I believe it will result in the employment of too many men, agents of the Government, to inspect highways after they have been constructed, because the bill provides that before the money promised by the Federal Government as its share of the expense of constructing any road can be paid to the State, the work done on the road must be inspected, so that the Government may know the State has earned and is entitled to the money. This duty of inspecting roads involves inspection of every road upon which work is done by a State in cooperation with the Government, and a very large number of men must necessarily be employed for this purpose. Too much of the money appropriated by Congress for assisting and cooperating with the States, money which is needed and ought to be used in actual construction and maintenance of roads, will be used up in salaries and expenses of men running about the country; too much money will be used by the Government in "administration." And, besides, I dislike the employment of so many Federal employees for work in the States. The amendment I offer will, I believe, remove these very objectionable features. The Lever law of which I have spoken provides money to be paid to or to be available to the States, to enable agricultural colleges, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, to carry on extension work, like farm-management and farm-demonstration work.

Section 2 of that law provides that the cooperative work to be done by the department and the colleges "shall be carried on in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the State agricultural college or colleges receiving the benefits of this act."

In section 3 is found the following provision:

> That before the funds herein appropriated shall become available to any college for any fiscal year, plans for the work to be carried on under this act shall be submitted by the proper officials of each college and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

It will be seen that a similar provision appears in section 3 of this road bill. The highway department of the State is required to submit and furnish to the Secretary of Agriculture "surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost of said proposed construction or maintenance and any other information which he may consider proper," and if the Secretary shall approve these surveys and estimates he shall determine the amount of money to be paid the State for the proposed construction or maintenance and shall notify the State highway department of his finding. This road bill further provides that the highway authorities of the State may thereupon "commence and prosecute said construction or maintenance in substantial compliance with said surveys, plans, and specifications."

Up to this point the provisions of the Lever law and the provisions of this bill are similar. The following provision of this bill, the one that I point out as objectionable, is that, although the Secretary of Agriculture may have approved surveys and plans of a road and estimates of its cost and has directed or permitted the State highway commissioner to proceed with the work with the understanding that Federal money will be forthcoming, the Secretary will not be permitted—if this bill becomes a law—to make any payment to the State until he, the Secretary, "shall find that said construction or maintenance of said road has been finished in substantial compliance with said surveys, plans, and specifications."

This means, as I have said, the employment of a very large number of men whose duty it shall be to make actual inspection of every highway in the country to which the Federal Government is contributing money. Federal employees will overrun the States, and as I also point out, a very large part of the appropriations which this law will authorize will be used in paying salaries and expenses of these inspectors and in other respects for "administration." It seems to me that much of this objectionable employment and this use of large sums of money can easily be avoided by inserting in this bill a provision practically the same as the provision in the Lever law, which, as I indicate, provides that the proper officer of the State which has received Federal money under that act—

> Shall be required to report to the Secretary of Agriculture on or before the 1st day of September of each year a detailed statement of the amount so received during the previous fiscal year and of its disbursement on forms prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture—

And provides further—

> that if any portion of the money received by the designated officer or by any State for the support and maintenance of cooperative agricultural extension work, as provided in this act, shall, by any action or contingency, be diminished or lost or be misapplied, it shall be replaced by said State to which it belongs, and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be apportioned or paid to said State.

It is important to notice that the Lever Act contains a saving clause, or a clause that protects the authorities of the States against improper or unjust action on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture. This clause is found in section 6, and is as follows:

> If the Secretary of Agriculture shall withhold a certificate from any State of its appropriation, the facts and reasons therefor shall be reported to the President, and the amount involved shall be kept separate in the Treasury until the expiration of the Congress next succeeding a session of the legislature of any State from which a certificate has been withheld, in order that the State may, if it should so desire, appeal to Congress from the determination of the Secretary of Agriculture. If the next Congress shall not direct such sum to be paid, it shall be covered into the Treasury.

I wish to suggest to the committee which prepared this bill and now has charge of it in the House that the changes I sug-

gest by incorporation of features of the Lever law be given careful consideration. If this law shall be so framed as to give due notice to State authorities that Federal money must be used exactly or, as the act says, "in substantial compliance" with plans, specifications, estimates, and so forth, submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture, and that failure or refusal on their part fully or "substantially" to comply with the provisions of the law under which they receive money will make it necessary for the Secretary to withhold further payment of money, I believe every State will be anxious and willing to make "substantial" compliance with this law and with the demands of the Secretary. They certainly will not wish to have a horde of Federal employees—clerks from the department—running over the State, possibly as many inspectors as there are roads on which work under this act has been done, and possibly as many conclusions reached and reports made on the work done by the State, one road approved and another road similarly constructed, rejected.

I wish the committee and the House to give careful consideration to the danger that too much money, too large a part of the appropriation intended for and actually needed by the States, will be devoted to "administration." The annual appropriation to be made, if this law is enacted, is much too small to permit of frittering it away in salaries and expenses of clerks and inspectors, many of whom can easily and properly be dispensed with if the bill is amended in keeping with my suggestion.

I am not able to agree with those, or sympathize with the reason or excuse offered by those, who oppose this measure on the ground of "economy" or failing revenues. They admit the importance of good roads and the duty of our Government to supply financial aid to the States to construct and maintain them, but they say the present unfortunate condition of the Federal Treasury will not permit the appropriation of money—even the small sum of $25,000,000—for the purpose. One who uses this argument or offers this excuse practically says to the people of the country that, inasmuch as they, the people, have placed in control of our Government a political party which now, as always when intrusted with power, repeals laws by which revenue may be provided and deliberately enacts laws and pursues policies which fail, as such laws and such policies have always failed, to supply revenue, therefore the people are willing and ought to be willing to submit uncomplainingly, if not cheerfully, to the embarrassment, inconvenience, and loss which inevitably follow the failure of that political party to provide money for carrying on proper and necessary work or to enable it to do its duty to the country.

If it were impossible to obtain money authorized by this bill without embarrassing the administration in lines of work which must be carried on, I should not support this bill; I should wait a year or two until the old policy will be in force and laws placed on the statute books which will provide money; but I support the measure in the belief that even the unwise revenue laws enacted during this administration will supply money for this worthy purpose. This bill calls for only $25,000,000. Almost every day this session the Congress—of its own accord or on demand of some executive department—will or is liable to enact into law some measure carrying an appropriation which might be and ought to be reduced by at least $25,000,000.

The Congress is blamed for extravagant and altogether unnecessary appropriations, but the fault is not all with the Congress. The administration and the several executive departments are as much, if not more, to blame than the Congress for this extravagance. The committees of the House and Senate have prepared a table comparing, by bills, estimates of regular annual appropriations for the fiscal year 1916 (passed last year) with those for 1917 (to be considered at this session). This table shows that the executive departments have presented estimates which they demand shall be approved and enacted into law by this session of Congress carrying appropriations which are larger by $195,082,673.78 than their estimates and demands of last year, larger by $170,920,796.14 than all appropriations actually made by the Congress last year. This table, prepared by the House and Senate committees, shows also the total estimated revenues for the year ending June 30, 1917, and contains the following statement:

The estimated appropriations (demanded by the administration) for 1917 will be found in detail in the Annual Book of Estimates, House Document No. 27, transmitted to Congress December 6, 1915, and the estimated revenues for 1917 in the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1915.

The appropriations estimated for by the administration and demanded of this Congress are $1,285,857,808.16, and the estimated revenue out of which these appropriations are to be paid are $919,500,000; that is, the administration and heads of executive departments, acting together, are asking this Congress to appropriate $366,357,808.16 more than the Treasury will receive.

It is true the estimates of the administration include an increase of $46,806,971.48 for a larger Army and an increase of $72,255,354.36 for a larger Navy, and possibly the people of the country, or those who believe the administration's program of preparedness ought to be carried out just as he has presented it, will say that there is no evidence of extravagance; that the increases to be provided for Army and Navy account for the excessive demands appearing in the estimates; but the increases for the Army and Navy amount to only $119,062,325.84, whereas the total increase in the estimates is $195,082,325.78, or $76,020,347.94 greater than or in addition to increases demanded for Army and Navy. And, besides, it should be known that the administration reports to Congress the advisability of decreasing some of the appropriations; for example, decrease of $5,535,000 in the appropriation to be made for pensions, a decrease for which the administration is not responsible and for which it can claim no credit; that in spite of and over and above these decreases, for which no credit can be claimed, the total increase demanded is $195,082,673.78 larger than was estimated for and demanded last year, and larger by $170,920,796.14 than all appropriations made by Congress last year.

These facts and figures certainly fully support the charge that the administration and not Congress is most to be blamed for extravagance. But Congress can not escape responsibility. The executive departments make their demands, but Congress holds the purse strings. Congress has authority, if it has courage, to refuse extravagant demands of the administration, even if the estimates have been prepared and are urged with ability and vigor by members of the Cabinet and their able and persuasive assistants. So my conclusion is that $25,000,000 for the very proper purpose of building roads can be found by reasonable pruning of extravagant estimates and by exercise of reasonable economy by Congress in consideration of measures which involve large expenditures outside of the estimates and demands of the administration.

I believe the incorporation of these provisions of the Lever law, with such modifications as are necessary to accommodate them to this bill, will greatly improve it. But if the changes I suggest are not made, if the bill is urged for passage just as it is, I shall support it. I support it because I believe it is a step in the right direction; it is the beginning of a very proper effort on the part of the Federal Government to assist the States to carry on a most important and necessary work, a work which is very burdensome to the States and in which they sorely need the help the Government is abundantly able to give. This bill, enacted into law, will be a proper although a very tardy admission by the Congress of its duty to the country in a very important matter. The bill in its present form is faulty and the amount of money provided is small, but amendments can be made later and the amount of money can from time to time be increased to meet the needs and demands of the country. This law—when this bill is passed and becomes law—will, in my judgment, never be repealed, unless perhaps a better law involving this principle be enacted in its place; the policy herein declared and begun will never be abandoned.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I would not say anything on behalf of the committee in the way of criticism of this amendment, except that apparently it is intended to protect the Federal Government's interest, and I would not want any Member of this body to think that we would oppose any proper amendment that would safeguard some point overlooked by your committee. But I submit that this amendment is entirely superfluous and unnecessary. Why should the Secretary of Agriculture call upon the States to make reports showing what moneys they had received under this act, when that information was already primarily in the possession of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. This is to call on them for a report as to how the money has been expended.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will answer that. No money can be paid out by the Department of Agriculture to a State, until that State has satisfied the Department of Agriculture, that it has completed a project, or partially completed a project, in conformity with the requirements of the department. Hence when the department makes a payment, that payment is not made with reference to future expenditures, but is a payment for work already done. As between the Department of Agriculture, and a State, the Department of Agriculture is always apprised by its own records of every dollar that has been expended in that State.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The Secretary of Agriculture is apprised as to the money that has been expended in the State, but this bill directs him by actual inspection of the work to know that the money has been properly expended.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly, and that provision is intended to safeguard the Federal interest. The Department of Agriculture in the discharge of its duty can not, and ought not, to expend a dollar under this bill, until it is thoroughly satisfied that the work arranged for has been done in absolute conformity with the requirements of the department. Hence, as I have said, the payment is not one for future expenditures, but is compensation for work already done, and already approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. If the gentleman will permit, my position is that it ought not to be necessary for the Secretary of Agriculture to send out a horde of inspectors to make actual inspection; that he ought to treat the highway authorities of a State as the Secretary of Agriculture treats the agricultural agents of a State in the matter of using the money under the Lever law. If he discovers later that the money has been improperly expended, he can withhold the next appropriation.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Why talk about withholding the funds, on the ground that money has been improperly expended, when the funds can not be primarily expended, unless a State has conformed to this law, and satisfied the Department of Agriculture that it has so conformed? Mr. Chairman, I submit that when our expenditures under this statute will be controlled by such definite requirements with respect to the conditions under which payments shall be made by the Department of Agriculture, there is no occasion to encumber this bill with the proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McLAUGHLIN) there were—ayes 22, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

[By unanimous consent leave was granted to Mr. HELGESEN, Mr. DYER, and Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin to extend their remarks in the RECORD.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

The question was taken and the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent to have the amendment again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that has been adopted upon the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] has added to the bill the word "improvement" after the word "construction." I ask unanimous consent that, wherever the word "construction" appears in the bill, immediately following it shall be inserted the word "improvement," so that the phrase will read "construction, improvement, or maintenance," and that the word "improved" shall be written into the bill in all the sections immediately after the word "constructed."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that wherever in the bill the word "construction" appears the Clerk shall write the word "improvement," and where the word "constructed" appears the word "improved" shall be written in. Is there objection to this request?

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to having it inserted where this amendment was, but I think a request of that kind ought to be carefully prepared in advance and furnished to the Clerk, and not impose upon the Clerk the business of correcting a bill by reading it through to see where a certain amendment should go in.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Just as the gentleman prefers.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection. The gentleman can make his request later on, and I think nobody will have any objection to it if he specifies where the word should go in, so the Clerk will have something to guide him in making the correction.

The CHAIRMAN. The request for unanimous consent is withdrawn for the present.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out of line 9, page 4, the word "substantial."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 9, strike out the word "substantial."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That all construction and maintenance of roads under the provisions of this act shall be under the supervision and control of the State highway department of the several States: *Provided*, That until January 1, 1920, the amount which has been apportioned to be expended in any State which has no State highway department shall be available for expenditure in such State in such manner as shall be agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the governor of such State; that the Secretary of Agriculture may make, or cause to be made, such inspection and examinations of any road constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act as he shall deem necessary, and he may prescribe what reports shall be made to him by the State highway department of any State in relation to any road in such State to the construction or maintenance of which aid under the provisions of this act has been given or sought, when such reports shall be made, and the form and subject matter of the same; that the Secretary of Agriculture shall have power to employ such assistants, clerks, and other persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere, to purchase such materials and supplies, and to prescribe such rules and regulations for the administration of this act as he may consider expedient.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I had prepared an amendment upon this section providing for the striking out of the words beginning in line 4, after the word "State," down to and including the word "necessary," in line 8. I have not offered this amendment, and I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if, in his judgment, after this bill shall have been in operation and roads shall have been constructed under its provisions, it is the intention that there shall be a large number of men employed to go out and visit all sections of the United States to determine whether these roads have been built in accordance with the specifications of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the interrogation of the gentleman from Illinois, I will say that it is not. I have talked the matter over with the Secretary of Agriculture and consulted him in drawing that particular part of it. He expressed to me the desire that the bill should be in such form that it would not call for any expensive increases of bureaucracy in his department, and we have concurred with him. We have put the construction and maintenance under the control of the State highway departments, and the whole thing is to be done by the State departments, subject to the Secretary of Agriculture being satisfied that the work has been done in compliance with the plans and specifications. In order to avoid the necessity of going into the State to do what the gentleman thinks we permit, it is provided that the Secretary of Agriculture has power to call upon the State highway departments for full reports as to what has been done in every particular road and to supply any other information which the Secretary of Agriculture may ask to have supplied, and nothing can be paid until he has done that.

In another part of the bill which the gentleman has not called attention to all of that is amply provided for and provided for the specific purpose of reducing the number of Federal employees. Twenty-two members of the committee, everyone of them, worked diligently to bring about the very result the gentleman wishes and desires, and I believe that no bill could be framed that will call for a smaller number of Federal employees than the bill which we now present to the House, and I think the committee prides itself that we have so successfully accomplished that result. If the Secretary of Agriculture wants to know what has been done as to a particular road he asks the State highway department to furnish that information, and if he is not well satisfied he can ask for more information. It does not call for an inspector to go there and get it; but, of course, if some State highway department shows a disposition to overreach the Government as to this appropriation, undoubtedly the Secretary of Agriculture would, and he should, send enough inspectors to investigate the methods of that particular highway department to see whether or not it was acting in good faith toward the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his explanation, and yet I realize that in the administration of laws many times there comes a request from a department that they must have so much money for the purpose of employing men and sending them out over the country, and I am frank to say to the gentleman that, so far as the State of Illinois is concerned—and I believe it is the same in other States of this country—it seems to me that the sworn statement of the local highway department, transmitted to the State highway commission and from there certified by the governor to the Secretary of Agriculture, should be sufficient. Now, I notice down in lines 15 and 16 it says that he shall have power to

employ "such assistants, clerks, and others persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere."

I think that that might be cured by providing "as Congress may provide," so that no Secretary of Agriculture now or in the future may have an opportunity, or should have the chance, I will say, of selecting a large number of employees and sending them out over the country to examine every little piece of road that may be built under this bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. I do.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Under the provisions of lines 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18, page 5, it is proposed to turn over several million dollars of public funds to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture for the employment of clerks and the purchase of material. In other words, he can hire as many clerks in the city of Washington and outside of the city of Washington as he pleases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to speak for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOSTER. I offer this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 17, after the word "supplies" insert the words "as Congress may provide."

Mr. FOSTER. I offer this, Mr. Chairman, as a limitation upon the Secretary of Agriculture in the employment of men.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. If the gentleman will yield to me for a second, the committee makes no objection to that.

Mr. FOSTER. All right; I am willing.

Mr. MANN. What is that?

Mr. FOSTER. In line 17, after the word "supplies" add "as Congress may provide."

Mr. MANN. But what was the remark of the gentleman?

Mr. FOSTER. That there would be no objection.

Mr. MANN. I should think there would be a decided objection.

Mr. FOSTER. What I am trying to get at is, if I am unfortunate in not getting the right language——

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Shall be provided for by "law" instead of provided for by "Congress."

Mr. FOSTER. I will modify the amendment and make it "by law."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to vote for this bill and have no desire to take any extra amount of time in perfecting it, but there would be no authority of law for Congress to provide anything of the kind, and, if they did, of course it would not be under this appropriation of $25,000,000. It might have been better, I think, to have provided that Congress should make specific appropriation for the officials employed by the Government and pay for it out of the Treasury, and, possibly, outside of the $25,000,000. But that has not been the scheme of the bill. The scheme of the bill is to have all officials paid for out of the $25,000,000 which is appropriated each year.

Mr. FOSTER. I will say to my colleague that what I am trying to get here, and I believe the amendment would supply it, is to make the limitation upon the Secretary of Agriculture, whoever he may be.

Mr. MANN. But there would be no authority for inserting any items in the agricultural or other appropriation bill for these assistants. They would all go out on a point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. That should be made in the appropriation for this money for the good roads. Here is the authority.

Mr. MANN. Very well, the law would authorize the appropriation of $25,000,000 for the good roads. Now, if I am not taking too much of the time——

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN (continuing). As a matter of practice and under the law, when they make an estimate for this money, and they would be required every year to make an estimate, the department, under the law, would be required to put into the estimate the amount of money they expected to spend for clerk hire and other assistants in the way of officials, and also report how much had been expended in the previous fiscal year, and the Committee on Appropriations would have that before them. It is very likely that the Committee on Appropriations would bring in, as it would have a right to do, a limitation in the appropriation as to how much of this could be used for these services. That limitation would be in order, because it would be a limitation on the appropriation bill and the committee would have the figures before it from the department, both as to how much had been expended the previous year and how much the department was considering expending for the next fiscal year. But under the gentleman's amendment there would be no authority to insert an appropriation in the bill for these clerical assistants or other assistants, and the "gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MANN," or some other gentleman who watches appropriation bills, would make a point of order on it and it would go out, and we would have $25,000,000 a year to spend and no way of expending it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have more time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] wish to proceed for three minutes additional?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that they change the word by inserting "as may be provided by law."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 17 after the word "supplies" the words "as may be provided by law."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, now there is no provision of law, except this bill, on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. I will say to the gentleman when Congress passes an appropriation bill that furnishes the law.

Mr. MANN. Surely. When the Congress has passed the appropriation bill that furnishes the law, but during the operation of passing an appropriation bill we can not insert an item over a point of order in the House unless it is already authorized by law previous to the passage of the appropriation bill. I think that the gentleman's amendment would simply mean that where you say that these things can be done they will not be done unless you say they can be done. But what we are doing in the bill is saying that they can be done.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it puts a limitation on the Secretary of Agriculture to do that.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentlemen agree on what ought to be done, but do not agree upon the effect.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we are willing to risk that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 31, noes 5.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to extend my remarks in order to discuss more fully this bill, and I do not wish to take time for it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 24, after the word "State," strike out the remainder of line 24 and all of line 25, on page 4; also strike out all of lines 1, 2, and 3, on page 5, and all of line 4 up to the word "that" on said page.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, the effect of the proposed amendment would be to remove the apparent requirement that is being made on the different States to establish highway departments or commissions. The theory of this bill is that the United States Government shall treat with the States, first, through a highway department, if there be one. If there be no highway department established, then through the governor of the State. The effect of this bill, and especially that portion of it which I seek to have stricken out, would be to require a State, entitled to its apportionment of these funds from year to year, to go into the commission form of government by establishing departments, which some States in this Union do not particularly favor. It simply amounts to a means of coercion by the Federal Government; it says in effect that these States shall have a commission on highways or a highway department, which is not usually a representative department.

The governor is an officer elected by the people in every State, I presume, and directly responsible to the people, and he is the proper officer to deal with, unless the State itself sees fit to establish a highway commission. We guarantee through the Constitution a republican form of government to the States.

We will not abide a State departing from it. But here is a method and means for giving, at least in part, a government not elective, not responsible to the people, but a commission appointive, and only indirectly responsible to the people. I think it is an unwarranted power, or an unwarranted use of power, at least, to limit the time within which the Secretary of Agriculture should treat with the governor of a State. If we leave it this way, after the lapse of four years the State which has no highway department would not be entitled to receive the benefits of this bill or of the moneys that would be given to the State under this bill from the Federal Government. I say, therefore, the effect of this amendment would be simply to leave it as it is now, for the department to deal with the highway department or governor of the State, whichever the sovereign will of the State should elect.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the argument of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN], I will say that at the present time all the States of the Union have highway departments except eight. A few years ago only a very few of the States had highway departments, but it has been demonstrated beyond any question that the State that is interested in highway improvement and is making any progress in highway improvement establishes as one of the first steps to road improvement a State highway department. The highway department then engages a competent highway engineer.

A great many gentlemen have criticized this bill because it did not provide that a State shall be required to have a highway commission in the first instance before any aid was given. But this bill provides that by the year 1920 each State receiving aid shall have a highway department. I think this requirement is a very essential thing for obtaining good roads in a State, and it is very essential that the State should have a highway department in order to insure the proper use of its own road fund as well as the funds given to it by the Federal Government.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Is it not the purpose of this provision to force every State in the Union to have a highway commission?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Does the gentleman think the Government of the United States should force a phase of government upon any State which is not republican and representative in character?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will say to the gentleman that this is following the precedent of the Department of Agriculture in making the localities receiving aid comply with certain requirements, such as paying part of the salaries of agricultural agents. There is a provision in the agricultural bill that we passed at the last session of Congress which requires the States to do certain things before they can get any of that fund. It is necessary in order to get a State out of the old rut that it has been in for years, in order to insure the proper application and investment of funds appropriated by the Federal Government, to establish certain Government machinery for that purpose, and in this case, in order that the roads should be built in an intelligent manner, it is necessary to require them to have a highway department.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman again yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. In the law that the gentleman cites is it required that any State shall have any particular department of government that it has not already got?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. It makes the distribution of the funds appropriated by the Federal Government contingent upon the State doing certain things, and it provides that the State agricultural colleges shall do certain things before they can get the money apportioned to them.

Mr. SLOAN. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with particular attention to the arguments of gentlemen favoring this bill, because circumstances over which I had no control debarred me from the benefit of the debate on a similar bill that passed this House last year. I find with much regret that I am unable to support this bill as it stands and at this time.

I recognize that there are no politics in this measure. I recognize, too, that there is no geography or sectionalism in it. Certainly there ought not to be. Merely because a Member lives in a district which will derive no direct benefit from the bill is no excuse whatever for his voting against it, if, in his judgment, it will be for the benefit of the country at large. Personally, I am as much in favor of good roads in the country as any gentleman who favors this bill. I am as much in favor of legislation which may be for the benefit of farmers as any man in this House, I think. Certainly I am willing to go further than many, because I am willing to give the farmer not only good roads but adequate protection on everything that he raises on his farm. Upon due consideration I do not believe that this bill will at all provide the benefits its proponents seem to believe. But, at any rate, this is not a time, in my judgment, gentlemen, to pass this legislation. The condition of the Treasury is such that I do not think we can go ahead with reckless expeditures, even for worthy purposes. I call the attention of this House to the Treasury situation as it stands to-day. I hold in my hand the Treasury report of January 22, which is the last issued, and in it I find that there is, according to the new method of accounting, $102,000,000 cash balance in the Treasury.

Now, let us see how much of that we can draw on to pay the expenses of the $25,000,000 appropriation which will come if this bill passes. I find that in that $102,000,000 is included $53,000,000 of funds in the hands of disbursing officers. You can not draw on that. I find that there is subsidiary silver coin amounting to $21,000,000. You can not draw on that. I find that there is minor coin amounting to nearly two millions. You can not draw on that. I find that there is silver bullion to the value of about $6,000,000. You can not draw on that. I find that there are deposits in the Philippine treasury of over $6,000,000. You can not draw on that. And when you add up these various items you arrive at the situation that there is to-day in the United States Treasury less than $13,000,000 available cash balance, even figured in the most liberal possible way.

Permit me also to call your attention to the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations the other day. He made this remark, and it is significant, gentlemen. I asked the gentleman from New York what the balance in the Treasury would be if all debts now due were paid, and the gentleman from New York replied:

> The country would be bankrupt if we paid all the obligations from public funds.

The situation is simply this, that if you are to pay out $25,000,000 a year, you must provide a new form of taxation to do it, and any man who votes in favor of this bill must be willing to advocate some new form of taxation, probably a stamp tax, which was well described by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as being the most odious form of taxation.

I am fearful also, Mr. Chairman, that if you pass this bill it may be used by opponents of preparedness to prevent adequate expenditures for that purpose by this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I have two minutes more, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I do not like to object, but I should like to see if we can have some agreement as to limiting debate on this section?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I merely want to complete my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONGWORTH. As I say, Mr. Chairman, I am fearful that this may be used by gentlemen who are opposed to any increase in the Army and Navy this year by making it appear that we shall be compelled to resort to additional forms of taxation to raise even this money. Personally I am in favor of that degree of preparedness described in the patriotic and eloquent speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] this morning, a preparedness not only to resist invasion of our shores, but adequate also to protect every American citizen in his life and property wherever he may be. [Applause.] I am not willing at this time to risk the failure of adequate appropriations for preparedness because of this expenditure, therefore I am constrained to vote against this bill at the present time and in its present shape.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. With great reluctance?

Mr. LONGWORTH. With great reluctance.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section close in five minutes.

Mr. SLOAN. I have a couple of amendments that I desire to present.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Then I will ask that debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes—one half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] and the other half by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes—one half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] and the other half by himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE].

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, when I find the proponents of preparedness here opposing everything that goes to the protection of the people in the rural communities I am very much interested. I am interested in everything that they say and print in the RECORD. I am also interested in some of the things that they do not say. When the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] made his remarks as to his interest in the protection of that which the farmer raises, I am sure it was merely a slip of his mind that he forgot to state that he was also in favor of the same degree of protection for that which the farmer buys; and that, as a matter of fact, he knows that very little of the protection that he would put upon the country would be real protection to the farmer, and that the system of protection which he proposes would add enormously to the burden of the farmer's cost of living.

Since I have been a Member of this House I do not think I have ever cast a ballot against a reasonable degree of expenditures or any expenditures for the Army and Navy, and, in common with others here, I feel that the time has now come in the history of this country when a reasonable preparedness ought to be brought about in order that this country may maintain the position which it is entitled to occupy in international affairs. I do not care how it is necessary to raise the money, if we get the results for the people to which they are entitled. My own belief is that, if it is necessary, we ought to sell the bonds that are now in the Treasury and issue a new set of bonds in order to protect the people at home and in order to protect this country against other nations.

But, Mr. Chairman, whenever we take up a discussion in favor of good roads, some gentlemen say there is "pork" in it. If we discuss anything that increases transportation facilities, either by way of good roads or by river and harbor bills, some gentlemen say there is "pork" in it. If an effort is made here on the part of this Government to give governmental aid to rural credit, some gentlemen call it paternalism, but if it is for an appropriation that goes anywhere except in rural communities, then the man who proposes it is a wise and patriotic statesman, and it is a good form of government which carries it out.

I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts and others along the eastern coast who have been opposing this legislation, that the people of the South realize that practically every one of the munition factories is located between Norfolk and Maine. We realize that the population and wealth of this country are to be found there. We realize that below Norfolk there will be no attack on this country in all probability by any foreign power. We learn also from the experts of the Army and Navy that we do not need anything to protect the portion of the country south of Virginia. But coming here from the South, with our loyalty to this Government unquestioned, the people of the South want to stand behind this Government and occupy a place in it, and we ask but a small share of the appropriations. We are coming here asking in this bill that we be given some small measure of that to which we are entitled; and every gentleman here knows that for the past half century the South has been taxed far beyond what she has received from this Government. Under these conditions, Mr. Chairman, I hope that this House will enact some kind of a good roads bill at this session. I am ready to vote for it. I do not say this is the best bill that could be passed, but I say almost any bill that gives us better roads, almost any bill that gives us a better rural credit system, almost any bill that lightens the burdens carried because of bad roads and high rates of interest paid by the farmers will better the conditions under which the farmers of this country are now forced to live. [Applause.]

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 18, after the word "expedient," insert "*Provided*, That on payment to any State of any sum for the purposes herein set forth the same shall be made upon condition that should the State fail, neglect, or refuse to maintain in good order and condition the roads established through such national aid, said State should forfeit to the United States a sum equal to 3 per cent per annum upon the amount of money contributed by the United States for the same."

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is submitted, believing that this Government work is not done and responsibility to itself is not complete when it gives to a State enough money to complete the highways indicated, whether that of a post road, interstate highway, or a military road. Under this bill the State immediately after the completion of a road can relocate the road, dislocate it or terminate its existence, and there is no recourse whatever provided for the Government. So I submit that it is our duty to the country which we profess to represent to see that this money shall be paid to the State highway department only upon condition that if the State fails, neglects, or refuses to maintain the road for the purposes for which it was constructed, then for every year it shall so fail, neglect, or refuse it shall forfeit from the funds that may at any time be due from the Government to the State 3 per cent of the amount the Government had contributed to the construction of the road so allowed to go into disuse.

I know that in the discussion of some of these matters amendments are not very well received from this side of the House, and yet I am gratified to say that a number of criticisms that I have presented, although meeting with a storm of opposition at first, have entered into the bill, and so I offer this in absolute good faith, believing that the Government should not appropriate these sums to the State without having some recourse on the State to compel its carrying out the purpose for which the investment was made. We have the power because we have the money; we can withhold the money until the State agrees to maintain the road which was so constructed. If it fails, we can readily collect by withholding it. The zeal with which the State's interests in this bill are being looked after and the apparent overlooking of the Federal rights makes Congressmen appear more like legislators for the State, seizing the funds of the Government and distributing it as treasure trove, brigand loot. The Government is to give money in princely sums to build roads over which the United States mail may be carried, interstate commerce pass, or Government troops may pass. But with the expenditure of the money and the completion of the work the Government can not force the continuance or maintenance of the road one day for any of these purposes. The money is gone; there is no recourse. The State is playing the part of the Lothario who enjoys unrestrained companionship without the fetters of matrimony and under no accountability for the usual responsibilities arising thereunder.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, add to section 4 the following: "*Provided*, That should any dispute arise between the highway authorities of any State and the Secretary of Agriculture relative to the findings, acts, or doings of the Secretary of Agriculture under this act an appeal may be had to the President of the United States upon the record made by the parties to said dispute or upon additional evidence and hearing which the President may, in his discretion, demand."

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to submit this for the purpose of taking from the Secretary of Agriculture the final word on the last proposition that may be involved between the Secretary of Agriculture and the representatives of the State.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. I will.

Mr. BORLAND. Would not the gentleman refer it to The Hague tribunal for arbitration?

Mr. SLOAN. No; I would not refer it to The Hague tribunal, I would refer it to the gentleman from Kansas City.

Mr. MANN. That would be the same thing; both will be dead tribunals in the next Congress. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read section 5, as follows:

SEC. 5. That the necessary culverts and bridges shall be considered as parts of the roads constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act; that the roads which may be constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act shall include earth, sand-clay, sand-gravel, and

other common types of roads, as well as roads of higher classes, one of the purposes of this act being to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming communities.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out at the beginning of section 5 the following language:

"That the necessary culverts and bridges shall be considered as parts of the roads constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with patience and care to the discussion on the merits of this measure, which has been under debate in this House, sitting in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, during the past five days.

I should not again project myself into the debate, nor again seek to justify my action in presenting minority views on this measure, were it not for the fact that the proponents of the bill seem to have assumed that I am opposed to good roads, and that the sentiment of Massachusetts is contrary to the position taken by those who contend that well-built and carefully maintained roads are of decided benefit to any community—local, State, or National.

They do not really believe that, Mr. Chairman, for they know full well, or if they do not know they ought to know, or if they care to know they can easily ascertain, that the glorious old Commonwealth of Massachusetts has, since 1892, been engaged in highway construction along State-aid lines, and has built many miles of the best and most modern highways in the entire country, and has maintained them, and beyond this has educated the people in the numerous rural and suburban sections up to a high standard of highway construction and maintenance which has led to wise and economical expenditure of county and town appropriations.

These attacks on Massachusetts, these sneers and jibes at the Members from the Bay State, how weak and ineffectual they are, Mr. Chairman, and somewhat unseemly, too. Massachusetts has become accustomed to that, and we fully appreciate that success, prosperity, and contentment in the State as well as in the individual are wont to provoke envy and jealousy in the minds of those representing less enlightened and less advanced sections of the Union.

We have listened to the enunciation of the doctrine here on the floor of the House, apparently advanced with seriousness, that because the citizens of one section of the country have built up successful and prospering mercantile and manufacturing establishments in one part of the Nation, therefore they must be assessed more than their just and proportionate share of the expense of Federal activity in other parts of the Nation.

To pay this bill direct taxation must necessarily be resorted to in the present condition of the Federal Treasury, and direct taxation of the most obnoxious character must be imposed on the long-suffering public; that is, by stamp taxes.

Of the fifty-two millions raised by the emergency revenue tax during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, the State of Massachusetts contributed over two millions, and the States of Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania paid thirty-one millions, and a like proportion of the sum appropriated by this bill will be contributed by these same States.

The following table sets forth in more detail the information as to "who pays the freight":

Statement of emergency revenue receipts (act of Oct. 22, 1914) in the following-named States during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1915.

State.	Wines, champagne, liqueurs, cordials, etc.	Grape brandy used in fortifying sweet wines.	Fermented liquors (additional 50 cents a barrel).	Special taxes relating to manufacture and sale of tobacco, cigars, and cigarettes.	Special taxes, including bankers, brokers, theaters, bowling alleys, etc.	Schedule A (documentary stamps, etc.).	Schedule B (perfumery, cosmetics, etc.).	Aggregate.
Connecticut	$28,537.69	.....	$242,866.05	$35,380.14	$66,880.23	$264,743.75	$45,427.52	$683,835.38
Illinois	188,752.07	.....	1,941,663.95	163,347.92	367,064.66	2,292,855.98	573,121.87	5,526,806.45
Indiana	25,545.07	.....	475,065.09	83,949.94	152,116.87	374,006.19	29,409.38	1,140,092.54
Massachusetts	116,457.39	.....	764,029.30	69,230.78	208,124.34	915,431.60	128,903.90	2,202,167.31
New Jersey	64,022.03	.....	1,008,139.21	85,933.15	131,208.95	351,829.10	200,880.43	1,842,012.87
New York	478,860.00	$1,204.01	4,129,382.05	329,340.75	859,775.64	5,131,040.10	900,688.03	11,830,290.58
Ohio	100,703.11	.....	1,455,937.17	167,479.68	276,640.74	849,996.36	160,236.28	3,010,993.34
Pennsylvania	152,627.89	.....	2,302,505.27	298,851.11	537,521.84	1,523,038.68	119,510.83	4,934,055.62
Total collected (8 States)	1,155,505.25	1,204.01	12,319,588.09	1,203,503.47	2,599,333.27	11,702,941.76	2,158,178.24	31,140,254.09
Total collected in the United States	2,307,301.97	138,383.56	18,713,679.88	2,486,616.36	4,967,179.18	20,494,474.75	2,961,493.59	52,069,126.29

Let me also direct your attention to the attitude, with reference to this bill, assumed by one of the country's greatest newspapers, the New York Sun, as set forth in the editorial columns of its issue of the 25th instant:

A PROPOSED MONSTROUS PERVERSION OF LEGISLATIVE POWER.

The Shackleford so-called good-roads bill now before the House of the Congress is so preposterous in its purpose, so childish in its provisions to carry out its purpose, it has not seemed deserving of other than the casual and light treatment it has received, so far as we have observed, from the press of those States upon which the bill seeks to levy a tax of $25,000,000 annually for the benefit of States unwilling to improve their own roads at their own expense. It seemed fair to assume that so frank an attempt to hold up the National Treasury, to strip it of a sum in excess of one-half of the funds now available to meet the current expenses of Government, would be laughed out of the House. There are indications that such an assumption rested on faith unjustified.

The bill is drawn with cunning use of words designed to conceal its ugliness. There is soothing patter of "reasonable cost," of Federal supervision, of encouragement of roads "leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming communities" to aid in the conduct of the Postal Service.

Here, baldly, is what the bill authorizes: An appropriation annually of $25,000,000 for the construction and maintenance of rural roads. Out of this sum $65,000 is to be allotted to each State. Out of the remainder the Secretary of Agriculture is to allot his department such a sum as he "shall deem necessary to defray the expenses of his department in the administration of this act," and the remainder after such deduction shall be distributed to the States, "one half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the population of all the States, * * * and the other half of such remainder in the ratio which the mileage of Rural Free Delivery and star mail routes in each State bears" to the same mileage in all the States.

This language is, of course, designed to create the impression that here is something which would improve rural free delivery, which, by the way, cost the Government $49,000,000 last year. But a little further examination shows what is the real purpose of the bill. In its first section it is provided "that for the purpose of this act the term 'rural post roads' shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is or might be carried."

In other words, all rural roads are to be built and maintained largely at Federal expense. And away down in the last section of the bill is found this precious supplement to the "or might be" provision: "That the necessary culverts and bridges shall be considered as parts of the roads constructed or maintained under provisions of this act."

There you are. No longer need the supervisors of Wayback County face the horrid thought of taxing Waybackers for a bridge over Purling Creek. Uncle Sam will build it.

During the debate in the House on this bill Mr. MADDEN, of Illinois, and other gentlemen unafraid were eager to learn something about the whyfore of that initial gift of $65,000 to each State. Their curiosity remained unsatisfied. The contemplated roads are to be of "earth, sand clay, sand gravel, or other type," and the Secretary of Agriculture is to determine what part of the cost Uncle Sam shall pay, but it must not be less than 30 nor more than 50 per cent.

How beautifully the proposed allotment of the first year's appropriation works out these few comparisons reveal: In 1913 Alabama spent for State highways $127,000, and under the allotment would receive $579,000; Georgia spent nothing and would receive $722,000; while California, which spent $2,000,000, would get less, $504,000. Florida spent nothing and would get $202,000, but Connecticut, which spent $3,483,000, would get $258,000, to encourage her in well-doing.

Representative SHACKLEFORD is from Missouri. That State, according to a table prepared by the Department of Agriculture, has expended for State highways $1,421,983. Connecticut has spent $14,934,176; Massachusetts, $16,365,425; New Jersey, $7,192,268; Pennsylvania, $24,259,954; New York, $82,638,729. These States, with a few others which have spent their own money liberally for good roads, will be taxed for the greater part, much the greater, of this annual gift of $25,000,000 to States which tax themselves little or nothing for roads.

We hope for its own reputation that the House will not pass this bill. If it does, we believe it will die in the Senate. Should it not, we are confined to the hope that an attempt to exercise so monstrous a perversion of legislative power will not receive the approval of President Wilson.

Let me, in conclusion, recall the words of the distinguished Member from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] when, in referring to the failure of his own State to pay its share of the expenses incurred in eradicating the foot-and-mouth disease among cattle, the United States having contributed its portion of the cost, he spoke the other day as follows:

Now, what does that mean? It means that all the time the States are talking about rights and are ignoring duties, they are trying to unload upon Uncle Sam the burden of taking care of things which primarily belong to them [the States] to take care of.

How apt this utterance, and how well it fits the present attempt to shift onto the National Government a duty which many States have made no attempt, even, to fulfill.

I again direct your attention to the statements set forth in the report filed by me, and submit that none of these arguments have been successfully controverted:

[H. Rept. 26, pt. 2, 64th Cong., 1st sess.]

RURAL POST ROADS.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Roads, submitted the following minority views (to accompany H. R. 7617):

I am unable to concur with my colleagues on the committee reporting this bill, and respectfully submit herein my views on the proposed legislation appertaining to this important problem.

I do not believe that the Federal Government should invest itself with the responsibilities and liabilities coincident with the business of road construction and maintenance.

I am opposed to appropriating the sum named for any such purpose, especially at this time, when there are other matters of more pressing importance, and requiring the appropriation of large sums of money, pending.

The condition of the Federal Treasury at present is not such as to warrant appropriating any such amount for a purpose entirely new, under a scheme entirely novel in its details and scope. In view of such condition and because it has been necessary to resort to emergency taxation, which has been continued until December 31, 1916, I am of opinion that this proposed legislation can well be deferred until some future time, when our finances are in condition to warrant such an outlay.

Many States have already expended millions of dollars in the construction of roads suitable for all classes of highway traffic, and they should not now be called upon to contribute toward the construction of highways in foreign jurisdictions which have neglected this vital duty.

It should be noted also that the States which now have the more improved systems of highways will contribute the larger share to the project sought to be enacted into law by this measure.

The States of Connecticut, Massachusets, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, and Pennsylvania will pay into the Federal Treasury the larger proportion of the sum appropriated in this measure, and will receive in some cases less than one-quarter the amount paid in, while other States will receive relatively twice as much as they contribute to the Federal Treasury.

I can not agree with the definition of "rural post road," as set out in section 1.

I am opposed to the method of apportionment as proposed in section 2, and desire to direct attention to the fact that no allowance is made for that part of the population of the several States which live in the cities and thickly settled centers and which are not served by rural free delivery.

The discrepancies in the apportionment are in many instances glaring, for example:

Colorado, with a population of but 799,024, is allotted $252,168; Oregon, with 672,765 inhabitants, is allotted $248,792; North and South Dakota, each with a few thousands less than 600,000 inhabitants, are allotted $325,372 and $337,406, respectively; while Connecticut, with a population of 1,114,756, is entitled to but $258,838.

Turning to the mileage of rural free delivery and star routes, a similar discrepancy attains:

Louisiana, having 0.75 per cent of total mileage of these routes, is allotted $345,064; yet West Virginia, with 1.19 per cent of total mileage, receives but $340,688, and Montana, having 0.76 per cent of total route mileage, is apportioned but $192,998.

The views of my colleagues on the committee set forth that primarily it is the duty of the State to provide roads for the people, and it is respectfully contended that failure on the part of the State to perform its duty does not transfer that duty to the Federal Government.

It is also contended by the committee that the General Government has consitutional power to construct and maintain "post roads."

Assuming, but not admitting, this to be true, it is usually the practice, when the General Government erects, builds, or takes over any utility of commerce, manufacture, or agriculture that it likewise retains jurisdiction over it, while this bill expressly precludes the proper exercise of Government jurisdiction over a Government utility.

It will be claimed that because the Federal Government may justly contribute toward the construction and improvement of that which it utilizes, i. e., highways, in exercising its important function of mail transportation and delivery, that it ought to pay a part of the cost of the construction of such highways.

If this be the object sought, then certainly the share of the expense which the United States Government is required to pay should be in proportion to the use made by it of the highways, taking into consideration all the uses to which said highways are put.

To enact this legislation on the shallow pretext set forth would be to commit the Federal Government to a policy which would lead to enormous expenditures in the future, with but little benefit to the people as a whole, and it will lead to demands in the future from States which in the past have shamefully disregarded the duty owed the people within their borders that the United States bear the whole expense of road construction and maintenance.

It will discourage rather than encourage road construction under State auspices and will open wide the door for quibbling, criticism, and experimentation, all at the expense, in large measure, of States which have expended their own money for their own internal improvements.

This legislation in its present form, and in the absence of any provision for repayment to the Federal Government of a portion, at least, of the moneys expended, to my mind, is a piece of governmental paternalism which I can not favor.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH WALSH.

It is sought by those representing States hungry for a share of Federal funds to place Massachusetts upon an equal footing with the other States in the matter of apportionment, but to discriminate against her in the matter of taxation, by way of direct taxes which will be levied to provide this appropriation, and to allow her no credit for the millions she has spent in the past from money raised by taxes levied upon her own people, which taxes have been cheerfully paid, and which funds have been wisely expended, in constructing a system of highways which well may be termed the standard of the Nation.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to a good part of the debate on this bill and have read quite a number of the speeches.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to me for a minute?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and amendment thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been discussed with great ability and much earnestness. I have been wondering how able men can differ so widely upon a simple proposition like this. No one is to be criticized for his views on this or any other matter. We must assume that all are honest in their views. I have voted for every road bill that has been presented to this House since I have been a Member of it. This is the third bill that has been before the House since I came here. I shall vote for this bill. [Applause.] I can not now add materially to the discussion that has already taken place. Of course I believe that agriculture is our fundamental industry. I believe it is the duty of the National Government in every way possible to encourage that great industry. I believe the Federal Government should aid the States in building good roads. We do not do this as a gift to our farmers. But if we build good roads we do it on broad general grounds, that by so doing we strengthen the great Government of which we are proud to be citizens.

This bill provides that not to exceed $25,000,000 annually shall be appropriated, to be distributed among the States, to encourage the building of good roads. The State, to participate in this fund, must contribute an amount equal to that which it receives from the National Government. Under the provisions of this bill, Oklahoma would receive annually from the National Treasury something over $500,000. This would not build many miles of public highways. It would, however, be an encouragement and an incentive for our people to improve the character of our roads. In other words, this money would promote good road building. The National Government can not undertake to build roads for the States; it can, in view of the importance of good roads and their value to the Nation, take funds from the National Treasury as a means to insure greater activity in building good roads in the various States of the Union. I have been surprised that many of the Members of this House representing the great cities of the country have opposed this bill with vigor and ardor. No doubt they, in a large measure, represent the views of the majority of the people whom they represent; no doubt, too, they express their own honest convictions. I regret, however, that on this proposition there should seem to be an antagonism of interests between the city and the country. There is nothing more certain than that the country and city are really identical in interests. The city can not impoverish the country without in the long run impoverishing itself; the country can not grow and prosper without contributing bountifully to the wealth and development of the city. A proposition that means agricultural growth means commercial and industrial expansion. The country and the city are bound together by indissoluble ties which we can not break by either our speeches or our votes.

Some have insisted that national funds should be used only to build great interstate highways; yet we must remember that the flag floats over the most remote highway of this country.

The Constitution may not follow the flag, but the benefit of national appropriations should extend to every foot of soil over which the flag floats.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 23, after the comma following the word "earth," insert the word "earth-oiled," followed by a comma.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to take up the time of the committee, as I believe this amendment will be adopted unanimously. I have taken the matter up with the chairman of the committee, and I believe the members of the committee are favorably inclined toward this small amendment.

I wish to say one or two words in favor of the oiled road, which is not, as a matter of fact, recognized in this bill. I was very sorry the other day to have the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] attack the Illinois roads without any notice whatever when I was sitting beside him assisting him, so far as I could, in the passage of this bill. We admit that perhaps in certain parts of Illinois the roads are not up to what they ought to be, and I will concede to the gentleman the fact that he has good roads in Indiana, that he has a reasonable amount of blue sky in Indiana. He made one remark to the effect that more people in the United States cross the State of Indiana than any other State in the Union. I also concede that to be absolutely true. They always cross, but they seldom stop in Indiana. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, had the gentleman traveled in my section of the State over that thick black dirt—12 inches thick—that God Almighty placed there for the purpose of giving the people on the sand hills of Indiana something to eat, he would not have made the statement. There we used oil in the first place merely for laying the dust, but it was soon discovered that by treating the road properly, by putting a coat of oil on in the spring and again in the fall, and perhaps once after that, that we had what is absolutely a permanent road. Oil not only lays the dust, but it forms a foundation that is superior for the travel of wagons and automobiles. Therefore I trust that in view of the fact that all of the other amendments having been voted down, this one will be adopted without opposition. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That this act shall be in force from and after its passage.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out section 7. It is absolutely superfluous.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend on page 6 by striking out lines 8 and 9.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that it go out of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that all of section 7 may be stricken from the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the various sections in the bill where the phrase "construction or maintenance" occurs, except where the word "improvement" has already been inserted by amendment, and to insert after the word "construction" the word "improvement," and wherever the phrase "constructed or maintained" occurs to insert after the word "constructed" the word "improved," and I ask that the Clerk report those various places, which I have marked in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to return to certain portions of the bill for the purpose of offering an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "construction," on page 1, insert the word "improvement" in the amendment.

Page 4, line 2, after the word "construction," insert the word "improvement"; line 5, after the word "construction," insert the word "improvement"; line 8, after the word "construction," insert the word "improvement"; line 14, after the word "construction," insert the word "improvement"; line 16, after the word "construction," insert the word "improvement"; line 20, after the word "construction," insert the word "improvement"; line 21, after the word "construction," insert the word "improvement."

Page 5, line 6, after the word "constructed," insert the word "improved"; line 11, after the word "construction," insert the word "improvement"; line 20, after the word "constructed," insert the word "improved"; line 22, after the word "constructed," insert the word "improved."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to return to the bill for the purpose of offering the amendments referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill as amended to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RUCKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7617, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the previous question be considered as ordered on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the previous question be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments to final passage. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object to unanimous consent on the previous question at any time.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The motion was agreed to and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time; was read the third time.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Alabama rise?

Mr. HEFLIN. This vote is on the passage of the bill?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. I would like to have a roll call and have a yea-and-nay vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 283, nays 81, answered "present" 3, not voting 67, as follows:

YEAS—283.

Abercrombie	Crago	Harrison	Lesher
Adamson	Cramton	Hastings	Lever
Alexander	Crisp	Haugen	Lewis
Almon	Crosser	Hawley	Lieb
Anderson	Darrow	Hay	Lindbergh
Anthony	Davenport	Hayden	Linthicum
Ashbrook	Davis, Minn.	Heaton	Littlepage
Ayres	Davis, Tex.	Heflin	Lloyd
Bailey	Decker	Helgesen	Lobeck
Barchfeld	Denison	Helm	London
Barkley	Dent	Helvering	Loud
Barnhart	Dewalt	Henry	McClintic
Beakes	Dickinson	Hensley	McCracken
Bell	Dies	Hernandez	McCulloch
Black	Dill	Hilliard	McGillicuddy
Blackmon	Dillon	Hinds	McKellar
Booher	Dixon	Holland	McKenzie
Borland	Doolittle	Hollingsworth	McKinley
Britt	Doremus	Hood	McLaughlin
Browne, Wis.	Doughton	Hopwood	Madden
Browning	Dowell	Houston	Mapes
Brumbaugh	Driscoll	Howard	Martin
Buchanan, Ill.	Dyer	Howell	Matthews
Buchanan, Tex.	Edwards	Huddleston	Mays
Burgess	Ellsworth	Hughes	Miller, Minn.
Burke	Emerson	Hulbert	Moon
Butler	Esch	Hull, Iowa	Mooney
Byrnes, S. C.	Estopinal	Hull, Tenn.	Moore, Pa.
Byrns, Tenn.	Evans	Humphrey, Wash.	Moores, Ind.
Callaway	Farr	Humphreys, Miss.	Morgan, La.
Campbell	Fields	Igoe	Morgan, Okla.
Candler, Miss.	Finley	Jacoway	Morin
Cannon	Fordney	Johnson, Ky.	Mudd
Cantrill	Foster	Johnson, S. Dak.	Murray
Caraway	Fuller	Johnson, Wash.	Neely
Carlin	Gandy	Jones	Nelson
Carter, Okla.	Garland	Kearns	Nicholls, S. C.
Cary	Garner	Keating	Nichols, Mich.
Casey	Glass	Keister	North
Church	Godwin, N. C.	Kelley	Norton
Clark, Fla.	Good	Kennedy, Iowa	Oldfield
Collier	Goodwin, Ark.	Kincheloe	Oliver
Connelly	Gray, Ind.	King	Overmyer
Cooper, W. Va.	Green, Iowa.	Kinkaid	Padgett
Cooper, Wis.	Hadley	Kitchin	Page, N. C.
Copley	Hamilton, Mich.	La Follette	Park
Costello	Hamlin	Langley	Peters
Cox	Hardy	Lee	Pou

Powers	Scott, Mich.	Steenerson	Venable
Price	Scott, Pa.	Stephens, Miss.	Vinson
Quin	Sears	Stephens, Nebr.	Volstead
Rainey	Sells	Sterling	Walker
Raker	Shackleford	Stone	Wason
Ramseyer	Shallenberger	Stout	Watkins
Randall	Sherley	Sulloway	Watson, Pa.
Rauch	Sherwood	Sumners	Watson, Va.
Rayburn	Shouse	Sweet	Webb
Reavis	Sims	Switzer	Whaley
Ricketts	Sinnott	Taggart	Wheeler
Roberts, Mass.	Sisson	Tavenner	Williams, T. S.
Roberts, Nev.	Slemp	Taylor, Ark.	Williams, W. E.
Rodenberg	Sloan	Taylor, Colo.	Williams, Ohio
Rouse	Small	Temple	Wilson, Fla.
Rowland	Smith, Idaho	Thomas	Wilson, La.
Rubey	Smith, Mich.	Thompson	Wingo
Rucker	Smith, N. Y.	Tillman	Wise
Russell, Mo.	Smith, Tex.	Timberlake	Wood, Ind.
Russell, Ohio	Sparkman	Towner	Woods, Iowa
Sabath	Stedman	Tribble	Young, N. Dak.
Saunders	Steele, Iowa	Van Dyke	Young, Tex.
Schall	Steele, Pa.	Vare	

NAYS—81.

Allen	Gallivan	McArthur	Sanford
Bacharach	Gardner	McDermott	Siegel
Bennet	Gillett	Magee	Slayden
Britten	Glynn	Mann	Smith, Minn.
Caldwell	Gordon	Meeker	Snell
Capstick	Gray, N. J.	Miller, Del.	Snyder
Carter, Mass.	Greene, Mass.	Mondell	Stafford
Charles	Greene, Vt.	Moss, Ind.	Stephens, Cal.
Chiperfield	Griffin	Mott	Stephens, Tex.
Coady	Hamilton, N. Y.	Nolan	Stiness
Coleman	Hart	Oakey	Swift
Conry	Haskell	Olney	Tague
Curry	Hicks	O'Shaunessy	Tilson
Dale, Vt.	Hill	Paige, Mass.	Tinkham
Dallinger	Husted	Parker, N. J.	Treadway
Danforth	James	Phelan	Walsh
Dunn	Kahn	Platt	Wilson, Ill.
Elston	Kennedy, R. I.	Pratt	Winslow
Fitzgerald	Lenroot	Reilly	
Foss	Longworth	Rogers	
Freeman	McAndrews	Rowe	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Garrett	Gould	Hayes

NOT VOTING—67.

Adair	Dupré	Griest	Maher
Aiken	Eagan	Guernsey	Miller, Pa.
Aswell	Eagle	Hamill	Montague
Austin	Edmonds	Hutchinson	Morrison
Beales	Fairchild	Kent	Moss, W. Va.
Brown, W. Va.	Farley	Kettner	Oglesby
Bruckner	Ferris	Key, Ohio	Parker, N. Y.
Burnett	Fess	Kiess, Pa.	Patten
Carew	Flood	Konop	Porter
Chandler, N. Y.	Flynn	Kreider	Ragsdale
Cline	Focht	Lafean	Riordan
Cooper, Ohio	Frear	Lazaro	Scully
Cullop	Gallagher	Lehlbach	Steagall
Dale, N. Y.	Gard	Liebel	Sutherland
Dempsey	Graham	Loft	Talbott
Dooling	Gray, Ala.	McFadden	Ward
Drukker	Gregg	McLemore	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. STEAGALL (for road bill) with Mr. FAIRCHILD (against).

Mr. FERRIS (for road bill) with Mr. HAMILL (against).

Mr. GRIEST (for road bill) with Mr. LEHLBACH (against).

Mr. SCULLY (for road bill) with Mr. PATTEN (against).

Mr. CULLOP (for road bill) with Mr. MORRISON (against).

Mr. DUPRÉ (for road bill) with Mr. GOULD (against).

Mr. AUSTIN (for road bill) with Mr. HUTCHINSON (against).

Mr. ASWELL (for road bill) with Mr. KENT (against).

Mr. LAZARO (for road bill) with Mr. DEMPSEY (against).

Mr. KONOP (for road bill) with Mr. WARD (against).

Mr. BURNETT with Mr. HAYES.

Mr. MAHER with Mr. GRAHAM.

Until further notice:

Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. BEALES.

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. MCFADDEN.

Mr. BRUCKNER with Mr. LAFEAN.

Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLINE with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. LIEBEL with Mr. FOCHT.

Mr. AIKEN with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GARRETT with Mr. FESS.

Mr. ADAIR with Mr. FREAR.

Mr. BROWN of West Virginia with Mr. Moss of West Virginia.

Mr. EAGAN with Mr. PARKER of New York.

Mr. FLOOD with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. GREGG with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withdraw my vote of "nay" and answer "present," having a pair with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide that, in order to promote agriculture, afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm products, and encourage the development of a general system of improved highways, the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall in certain cases aid the States in the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads which may be used in the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, or postal matters."

On motion of Mr. SHACKLEFORD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. On this bill?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that all Members shall have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of H. R. 7728, Sixty-second Congress, first session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for two days on account of illness in his family.

THE PRINTING BILL.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 8664, known as the printing bill, be given privileged status, with one hour's general debate, subject to preference being given to consideration of appropriation, revenue, and regularly privileged bills, and with the definite agreement that while this bill is being considered it may be displaced at any time for the consideration of any of the aforesaid bills.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] asks unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 8664, usually known as the printing bill, shall be given privileged status, subject to appropriation bills and other privileged matters, and that the general debate on it be confined to one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, what is the object in the request in saying that there is a definite agreement that the bill may be displaced by certain other bills when a previous part of the agreement has said that the privileged status is subject to other bills?

Mr. BARNHART. That is a form of emphasis used in Indiana that is not common in Chicago. It is so as to make it clear.

Mr. MANN. It may be used in Indiana, but it would not be in any other civilized portion of the world. That is an agreement that would compel the House against its wish to take up an appropriation bill when it did not want to, which under the rules of the House ought not to be entered into.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not include that.

Mr. MANN. But I want it eliminated, so that there will be no question about it.

Mr. BARNHART. I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that this language was submitted to a former parliamentarian of the House, and that was the language in which it was prepared. The purpose of it was to make it clear what this unanimous consent is; and I might explain the purpose is that the bill will not get in the way of any appropriation, revenue, or any privileged bill. When the House has not anything to do we can proceed with the consideration of this bill.

Mr. MANN. There are no privileged bills, practically, except revenue bills, appropriation bills, the reports of the Committees on Accounts, Rules, and so forth. However, the latter does not report bills. I suppose this bill would be a pretty good bill to occupy the rest of the session when we are not considering appropriation bills. I do not think I will object. I think we can make very good use of this bill to head off the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] and various other gentlemen who have administrative measures that they want passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Carolina rise?

Mr. LEVER. I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. We have not gotten through with this other one yet.

Mr. LEVER. I understood the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] objected.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not hear him if he did. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] object?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do object.

The SPEAKER. That ends it.

THE WAREHOUSE BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 9419, known as the warehouse bill, be given a privileged status, with two hours' general debate, subject to the preference being given to appropriation and revenue bills.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] asks unanimous consent that the warehouse bill be given a privileged status, with two hours' general debate, subject to the conditions imposed as to privileged bills. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the taking up of the bills mentioned by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART]. I do not know when we are going to have an appropriation bill. It looks as though we would not have any this session until after the fiscal year has expired. [Laughter.] Some gentlemen on this side of the House still would like to be heard in general debate, and we would like to have a little more time on general debate on some bills.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Speaker, that I am quite willing to modify my request so as to reach an agreement as to the time for general debate. I had hoped that we might be able to get this bill on the floor on Thursday of this week, and if so, if the gentleman would suggest the amount of general debate he would like to have, I think we could easily agree about that before submitting the final request.

Mr. MANN. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I would be willing to agree on three hours' debate on this side.

Mr. LEVER. I modify my request, Mr. Speaker, and ask for three hours' general debate instead of two hours. Make it two hours on a side.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. We have to have some time for general debate.

Mr. LEVER. Then I suggest to the gentleman that we make it five hours, he to have three hours on his side and we two hours.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the warehouse bill, H. R. 9419, be given a privileged status, with five hours' general debate, two hours for the proponents of the bill and three hours for the opposition to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] asks unanimous consent that the warehouse bill be given a privileged status, not to interfere with privileged bills and appropriation bills, and that the general debate thereon be limited to five hours, two hours to be controlled by himself and three hours by the gentleman——

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

The SPEAKER. From Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN]. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I object, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects, and moves that the House do now adjourn.

INCOME-TAX DECISION.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the opinion of the Supreme Court on what is known as the income-tax cases be made a House document, and that 25,000 copies be printed and placed in the folding room to the credit of Members.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] asks unanimous consent that the decision of the Supreme Court in the income tax cases, recently delivered, be made a House document and 25,000 copies printed, to be placed in the folding room to the credit of the Members. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection whatever to having the act done or as to the number of copies to be printed; but I think a matter of this sort ought to have been introduced this morning as a resolution and referred to the Committee on Printing, so that if it were deemed desirable it could have brought in a report this evening, being privileged, and had it considered. I shall object to all requests of this sort that are not submitted to the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection for a moment?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that there were so many urgent requests for copies of this decision that I took the matter up with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART], and he inquired of the Printing Office as to the cost of printing the document, and ascertained that it would be a little less than $200 for printing the number named, and owing to the urgent demand on the part of many Members for copies of this decision I felt constrained to submit this request.

Mr. MANN. I think it will not make any difference as to the time when they would be printed.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois adhere to his objection?

Mr. MANN. I do.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the decision to which I have referred.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by printing the decision of the Supreme Court referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to the request. I think that is perfectly proper. I think that there ought to be a House document and a Senate document printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the decision referred to:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

(No. 140. October Term, 1915.)

FRANK R. BRUSHABER, APPELLANT, V. UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD CO. APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

(Jan. 24, 1916.)

Mr. Chief Justice White delivered the opinion of the court.

"As a stockholder of the Union Pacific Railroad Co. the appellant filed his bill to enjoin the corporation from complying with the income-tax provisions of the tariff act of October 3, 1913 (Sec. II, ch. 16, 38 Stat., 166). Because of constitutional questions duly arising the case is here on direct appeal from a decree sustaining a motion to dismiss because no ground for relief was stated.

"The right to prevent the corporation from returning and paying the tax was based upon many averments as to the repugnancy of the statute to the Constitution of the United States, of the peculiar relation of the corporation to the stockholders and their particular interests resulting from any of the administrative provisions of the assailed act, of the confusion, wrong, and multiplicity of suits and the absence of all means of redress which would result if the corporation paid the tax and complied with the act in other respects without protest, as it was alleged it was its intention to do. To put out of the way a question of jurisdiction we at once say that in view of these averments and the ruling in Pollock *v.* Farmers' Loan & Trust Co. (157 U. S., 429), sustaining the right of a stockholder to sue to restrain a corporation under proper averments from voluntarily paying a tax charged to be unconstitutional on the ground that to permit such a suit did not violate the prohibitions of section 3224, Revised Statutes, against enjoining the enforcement of taxes, we are of opinion that the contention here made that there was no jurisdiction of the cause since to entertain it would violate the provisions of the Revised Statutes referred to is without merit. Before coming to dispose of the case on the merits, however, we observe that the defendant corporation having called the attention of the Government to the pendency of the cause and the nature of the controversy and its unwillingness to voluntarily refuse to comply with the act assailed, the United States as amicus curiæ has at bar been heard both orally and by brief for the purpose of sustaining the decree.

"Aside from averments as to citizenship and residence, recitals as to the provisions of the statute and statements as to the business of the corporation contained in the first 10 paragraphs of the bill advanced to sustain jurisdiction, the bill alleged 21 constitutional objections specified in that number of paragraphs or subdivisions. As all the grounds assert a violation of the Constitution it follows that in a wide sense they all charge a repugnancy of the statute to the sixteenth amendment under the more imediate sanction of which the statute was adopted.

"The various propositions are so intermingled as to cause it to be difficult to classify them. We are of opinion, however, that the confusion is not inherent, but rather arises from the conclusion that the sixteenth amendment provides for a hitherto unknown power of taxation; that is, a power to levy an income tax which although direct should not be subject to the regulation of apportionment applicable to all other direct taxes. And the far-reaching effect of this erroneous assumption will be made clear by generalizing the many contentions advanced in argument to support it, as follows: (a) The amendment authorizes only a particular character of direct tax without apportionment, and therefore if a tax is levied under its assumed authority which does not partake of the characteristics exacted by the amendment it is outside of the amendment and is void as a direct tax in the general constituional sense because not apportioned. (b) As the amendment authorizes a tax only upon incomes 'from whatever source derived,' the exclusion from taxation of some income of designated persons and classes is not authorized and hence the constitutionality of the law must be tested by the general provisions of the Constitution as to taxation, and thus again the tax is void for want of apportionment. (c) As the right to tax "incomes from whatever source derived" for which the amendment provides must be considered as exacting intrinsic uniformity, therefore no tax comes under the authority of the amendment not conforming to such standard, and hence all the provisions of the assailed statute must once more be tested solely under the general and preexisting provisions of the Constitution, causing the statute again to be void in the absence of apportionment. (d) As the power conferred by the amendment is new and prospective the attempt in the statute to make its provisions retroactively apply is void, because so far as the retroactive period is concerned it is governed by the preexisting constitutional requirement as to apportionment.

"But it clearly results that the proposition and the contentions under it, if acceded to, would cause one provision of the Constitution to destroy another; that is, they would result in bringing the provisions of the amendment exempting a direct tax from apportionment into irreconcilable conflict with the general requirement that all direct taxes be apportioned. Moreover, the tax authorized by the amendment, being direct, would not come under the rule of uniformity applicable under the Constitution to other than direct taxes, and thus it would come to pass that the result of the amendment would be to authorize a particular direct tax not subject either to apportionment or to the rule of geographical uniformity, thus giving power to impose a different tax in one State or States than was levied in another State or States. This result instead of simplifying the situation and making clear the limitations on the taxing power, which obviously the amendment must have been intended to accomplish, would create radical and destructive changes in our constitutional system and multiply confusion.

"But let us by a demonstration of the error of the fundamental proposition as to the significance of the amendment dispel the confusion necessarily arising from the arguments deduced from it. Before coming, however, to the text of the amendment, to the end that its significance may be determined in the light of the previous legislative and judicial history of the subject with which the amendment is concerned and with a knowledge of the conditions which presumptively led up to its adoption and hence of the purpose it was intended to accomplish, we make a brief statement on those subjects.

"That the authority conferred upon Congress by section 8 of Article I, 'to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises,' is exhaustive and embraces every conceivable power of taxation has never been questioned, or, if it has, has been so often authoritatively declared as to render it necessary only to state the doctrine. And it has also never been questioned from the foundation, without stopping presently to determine under which of the separate headings the power was properly to be classed, that there was authority given, as the part was included in the whole, to lay and collect income taxes. Again it has never, moreover, been questioned that the conceded complete and all-embracing taxing power was subject, so far as they were respectively applicable, to limitations resulting from the requirements of Article I, section 8, clause 1, that 'all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States,' and to the limitations of Article I, section 2, clause 3, that 'direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States,' and of Article I, section 9, clause 4, that 'no capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration hereinbefore directed to be taken.' In fact, the two great subdivisions embracing the complete and perfect delegation of the power to tax and the two correlated limitations as to such power were thus aptly stated by Mr. Chief Justice Fuller in Pollock *v.* Farmers' Loan & Trust Co., supra, at page 557: 'In the matter of taxation, the Constitution recognizes the two great classes of direct and indirect taxes, and lays down two rules by which their imposition must be governed, namely, the rule of apportionment as to direct taxes and the rule of uniformity as to duties, imposts, and excises.' It is to be observed, however, as long ago pointed out in Veazie Bank *v.* Fenno (8 Wall., 533, 541), that the requirement of apportionment as to one of the great classes and of uniformity as to the other class were not so much a limitation upon the complete and all-embracing authority to tax, but in their essence were simply regulations concerning the mode in which the plenary power was to be exerted. In the whole history of the Government down to the time of the adoption of the sixteenth amendment, leaving aside some conjectures expressed of the possibility of a tax lying intermediate between the two great classes and embraced by neither, no question has been anywhere made as to the correctness of these propositions. At the very beginning, however, there arose differences of opinion concerning the criteria to be applied in determining in which of the two great subdivisions a tax would fall. Without pausing to state at length the basis of these differences and the consequences which arose from them, as the whole subject was elaborately reviewed in Pollock *v.* Farmers' Loan & Trust Co. (157 U. S., 429; 158 U. S., 601), we make a condensed statement which is, in substance, taken from what was said in that case. Early the differences were manifested in pressing on the one hand and opposing on the other the passage of an act levying a tax without apportionment on carriages 'for the conveyance of persons,' and when such a tax was enacted the question of its repugnancy to the Constitution soon came to this court for determination. (Hylton *v.* United States, 3 Dall., 171.) It was held that the tax came within the class of excises, duties, and imposts, and therefore did not require apportionment, and while this conclusion was agreed to by all the members of the court who took part in the decision of the case, there was not an exact coincidence in the reasoning by which the conclusion was sustained. Without stating the minor differences, it may be said with substantial accuracy that the divergent reasoning was this: On the one hand, that the tax was not in the class of direct taxes requiring apportionment, because it was not levied directly on property because of its ownership, but rather on its use, and was, therefore, an excise, duty, or impost; and, on the other, that in any event the class of direct taxes included only taxes directly levied on real estate because of its ownership.

"Putting out of view the difference of reasoning which led to the concurrent conclusion in the Hylton case, it is undoubted that it came to pass in legislative practice that the line of demarcation between the two great classes of direct taxes on the one hand and excises, duties, and imposts on the other, which was exemplified by the ruling in that case, was accepted and acted upon. In the first place, this is shown by the fact that wherever—and there were a number of cases of that kind—a tax was levied directly on real estate or slaves because of ownership it was treated as coming within the direct class, and apportionment was provided for, while no instance of apportionment as to any other kind of tax is afforded. Again, the situation is aptly illustrated by the various acts taxing incomes derived from property of every kind and nature which were enacted beginning in 1861 and lasting during what may be termed the Civil War period. It is not disputable that these latter taxing laws were classed under the head of excises, duties, and imposts, because it was assumed that they were of that character, inasmuch as, although putting a tax burden on income of every kind, including that derived from property, real or personal, they were not taxes directly on property because of its ownership. And this practical construction came in theory to be the accepted one, since it was adopted without dissent by the most eminent of the text-writers. (1 Kent. Com., 254, 256; 1 Story Const., sec. 955; Cooley Const. Lim. (5th ed.), *480; Miller on the Constitution, 237; Pomeroy's Const. Law, sec. 281; Hare Const. Law, vol. 1, 249, 250; Burroughs on Taxation, 502; Ordronaux, Const. Leg., 225.)

"Upon the lapsing of a considerable period after the repeal of the income-tax laws referred to, in 1894 an act was passed laying a tax on incomes from all classes of property and other sources of revenue which was not apportioned, and which, there-

fore, was, of course, assumed to come within the classification of excises, duties, and imposts which were subject to the rule of uniformity but not to the rule of apportionment. The constitutional validity of this law was challenged on the ground that it did not fall within the class of excises, duties, and imposts, but was direct in the constitutional sense, and was therefore void for want of apportionment; and that question came to this court and was passed upon in Pollock *v.* Farmers' Loan & Trust Co. (157 U. S., 429; 158 U. S., 601). The court, fully recognizing in the passage which we have previously quoted the all-embracing character of the two great classifications, including, on the one hand, direct taxes subject to apportionment, and, on the other, excises, duties, and imposts subject to uniformity, held the law to be unconstitutional in substance for these reasons: Concluding that the classification of direct was adopted for the purpose of rendering it impossible to burden by taxation accumulations of property, real or personal, except subject to the regulation of apportionment, it was held that the duty existed to fix what was a direct tax in the constitutional sense so as to accomplish this purpose contemplated by the Constitution. (157 U. S., 581.) Coming to consider the validity of the tax from this point of view, while not questioning at all that in common understanding it was direct merely on income and only indirect on property, it was held that considering the substance of things it was direct on property in a constitutional sense, since to burden an income by a tax was, from the point of substance, to burden the property from which the income was derived and thus accomplish the very thing which the provision as to apportionment of direct taxes was adopted to prevent. As this conclusion but enforced a regulation as to the mode of exercising power under particular circumstances, it did not in any way dispute the all-embracing taxing authority possessed by Congress, including necessarily therein the power to impose income taxes if only they conformed to the constitutional regulations which were applicable to them. Moreover, in addition, the conclusion reached in the Pollock case did not in any degree involve holding that income taxes generically and necessarily came within the class of direct taxes on property, but, on the contrary, recognized the fact that taxation on income was in its nature an excise entitled to be enforced as such unless and until it was concluded that to enforce it would amount to accomplishing the result which the requirement as to apportionment of direct taxation was adopted to prevent, in which case the duty would arise to disregard form and consider substance alone, and hence subject the tax to the regulation as to apportionment, which otherwise as an excise would not apply to it. Nothing could serve to make this clearer than to recall that in the Pollock case, in so far as the law taxed incomes from other classes of property than real estate and invested personal property—that is, income from 'professions, trades, employments, or vocations' (158 U. S., 637)—its validity was recognized; indeed, it was expressly declared that no dispute was made upon that subject, and attention was called to the fact that taxes on such income had been sustained as excise taxes in the past. (Ib., p. 635.) The whole law was, however, declared unconstitutional on the ground that to permit it to thus operate would relieve real estate and invested personal property from taxation and 'would leave the burden of the tax to be borne by professions, trades, employments, or vocations, and in that way what was intended as a tax on capital would remain, in substance, a tax on occupations and labor' (ib., p. 637), a result which it was held could not have been contemplated by Congress.

"This is the text of the amendment:

> "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

"It is clear on the face of this text that it does not purport to confer power to levy income taxes in a generic sense—an authority already possessed and never questioned—or to limit and distinguish between one kind of income taxes and another, but that the whole purpose of the amendment was to relieve all income taxes when imposed from apportionment from a consideration of the source whence the income was derived. Indeed in the light of the history which we have given and of the decision in the Pollock case and the ground upon which the ruling in that case was based, there is no escape from the conclusion that the amendment was drawn for the purpose of doing away for the future with the principle upon which the Pollock case was decided; that is, of determining whether a tax on income was direct not by a consideration of the burden placed on the taxed income upon which it directly operated, but by taking into view the burden which resulted on the property from which the income was derived, since in express terms the amendment provides that income taxes, from whatever source the income may be derived, shall not be subject to the regulation of apportionment. From this, in substance, it indisputably arises, first, that all the contentions which we have previously noticed concerning the assumed limitations to be implied from the language of the amendment as to the nature and character of the income taxes which it authorizes find no support in the text and are in irreconcilable conflict with the very purpose which the amendment was adopted to accomplish. Second, that the contention that the amendment treats a tax on income as a direct tax although it is relieved from apportionment and is necessarily therefore not subject to the rule of uniformity, as such rule only applies to taxes which are not direct, thus destroying the two great classifications which have been recognized and enforced from the beginning, is also wholly without foundation since the command of the amendment, that all income taxes shall not be subject to apportionment by a consideration of the sources from which the taxed income may be derived, forbids the application to such taxes of the rule applied in the Pollock case by which alone such taxes were removed from the great class of excises, duties, and imposts subject to the rule of uniformity and were placed under the other or direct class. This must be unless it can be said that although the Constitution, as a result of the amendment, in express terms excludes the criterion of source of income, that criterion yet remains for the purpose of destroying the classifications of the Constitution by taking an excise out of the class to which it belongs and transferring it to a class in which it can not be placed consistently with the requirements of the Constitution. Indeed, from another point of view, the amendment demonstrates that no such purpose was intended and, on the contrary, shows that it was drawn with the object of maintaining the limitations of the Constitution and harmonizing their operation. We say this because it is to be observed that although from the date of the Hylton case, because of statements made in the opinions in that case, it had come to be accepted that direct taxes in the constitutional sense were confined to taxes levied directly on real estate because of its ownership, the amendment contains nothing repudiating or challenging the ruling in the Pollock case that the word direct had a broader significance since it embraced also taxes levied directly on personal property because of its ownership, and therefore the amendment at least impliedly makes such wider significance a part of the Constitution—a condition which clearly demonstrates that the purpose was not to change the existing interpretation except to the extent necessary to accomplish the result intended; that is, the prevention of the resort to the sources from which a taxed income was derived in order to cause a direct tax on the income to be a direct tax on the source itself, and thereby to take an income tax out of the class of excises, duties, and imposts and place it in the class of direct taxes.

"We come, then, to ascertain the merits of the many contentions made in the light of the Constitution as it now stands; that is to say, including within its terms the provisions of the sixteenth amendment as correctly interpreted. We first dispose of two propositions assailing the validity of the statute on the one hand because of its repugnancy to the Constitution in other respects, and especially because its enactment was not authorized by the sixteenth amendment.

"The statute was enacted October 3, 1913, and provided for a general yearly income tax from December to December of each year. Exceptionally, however, it fixed a first period embracing only the time from March 1 to December 31, 1913, and this limited retroactivity is assailed as repugnant to the due-process clause of the fifth amendment and as inconsistent with the sixteenth amendment itself. But the date of the retroactivity did not extend beyond the time when the amendment was operative, and there can be no dispute that there was power by virtue of the amendment during that period to levy the tax, without apportionment, and so far as the limitations of the Constitution in other respects are concerned, the contention is not open, since in Stockdale *v.* Insurance Companies (20 Wall., 323, 331), in sustaining a provision in a prior income-tax law which was assailed because of its retroactive character, it was said:

> "The right of Congress to have imposed this tax by a new statute, although the measure of it was governed by the income of the past year, can not be doubted; much less can it be doubted that it could impose such a tax on the income of the current year, though part of that year had elapsed when the statute was passed. The joint resolution of July 4, 1864, imposed a tax of 5 per cent upon all income of the previous year, although one tax on it had already been paid, and no one doubted the validity of the tax or attempted to resist it.

"The statute provides that the tax should not apply to enumerated organizations or corporations, such as labor, agricultural, or horticultural organizations, mutual savings banks, etc.,

and the argument is that as the amendment authorized a tax on incomes 'from whatever source derived,' by implication it excluded the power to make these exemptions. But this is only a form of expressing the erroneous contention as to the meaning of the amendment, which we have already disposed of. And so far as this alleged illegality is based on other provisions of the Constitution, the contention is also not open, since it was expressly considered and disposed of in Flint *v.* Stone Tracy Co. (220 U. S., 108, 173).

"Without expressly stating all the other contentions, we summarize them to a degree adequate to enable us to typify and dispose of all of them.

"1. The statute levies one tax called a normal tax on all incomes of individuals up to $20,000 and from that amount up by gradations, a progressively increasing tax called an additional tax, is imposed. No tax, however, is levied upon incomes of unmarried individuals amounting to $3,000 or less nor upon incomes of married persons amounting to $4,000 or less. The progressive tax and the exempted amounts, it is said, are based on wealth alone, and the tax is therefore repugnant to the due-process clause of the fifth amendment.

"2. The act provides for collecting the tax at the source—that is, makes it the duty of corporations, etc., to retain and pay the sum of the tax on interest due on bonds and mortgages, unless the owner to whom the interest is payable gives a notice that he claims an exemption. This duty cast upon corporations, because of the cost to which they are subjected, is asserted to be repugnant to due process of law as a taking of their property without compensation, and we recapitulate various contentions as to discrimination against corporations and against individuals predicated on provisions of the act dealing with the subject:

"(a) Corporations indebted upon coupon and registered bonds are discriminated against, since corporations not so indebted are relieved of any labor or expense involved in deducting and paying the taxes of individuals on the income derived from bonds.

"(b) Of the class of corporations indebted as above stated, the law further discriminates against those which have assumed the payment of taxes on their bonds, since although some or all of their bondholders may be exempt from taxation, the corporations have no means of ascertaining such fact, and it would therefore result that taxes would often be paid by such corporations when no taxes were owing by the individuals to the Government.

"(c) The law discriminates against owners of corporate bonds in favor of individuals none of whose income is derived from such property, since bondholders are, during the interval between the deducting and the paying of the tax on their bonds, deprived of the use of the money so withheld.

"(d) Again corporate bondholders are discriminated against because the law does not release them from payment of taxes on their bonds even after the taxes have been deducted by the corporation, and therefore if after deduction the corporation should fail, the bondholders would be compelled to pay the tax a second time.

"(e) Owners of bonds the taxes on which have been assumed by the corporation are discriminated against, because the payment of the taxes by the corporation does not relieve the bondholders of their duty to include the income from such bonds in making a return of all income, the result being a double payment of the taxes, labor and expense in applying for a refund, and a deprivation of the use of the sum of the taxes during the interval which elapses before they are refunded.

"3. The provision limiting the amount of interest paid which may be deducted from gross income of corporations for the purpose of fixing the taxable income to interest on indebtedness not exceeding one-half the sum of bonded indebtedness and paid-up capital stock, is also charged to be wanting in due process because discriminating between different classes of corporations and individuals.

"4. It is urged that want of due process results from the provision allowing individuals to deduct from their gross income dividends paid them by corporations whose incomes are taxed and not gving such right of deduction to corporations.

"5. Want of due process is also asserted to result from the fact that the act allows a deduction of $3,000 or $4,000 to those who pay the normal tax; that is, whose incomes are $20,000 or less, and does not allow the deduction to those whose incomes are greater than $20,000; that is, such persons are not allowed for the purpose of the additional or progressive tax a second right to deduct the $3,000 or $4,000 which they have already enjoyed. And a further violation of due process is based on the fact that for the purpose of the additional tax no second right to deduct dividends received from corporations is permitted.

"6. In various forms of statement want of due process, it is, moreover, insisted, arises from the provisions of the act allowing a deduction for the purpose of ascertaining the taxable income of stated amounts on the ground that the provisions discriminate between married and single people and discriminate between husbands and wives who are living together and those who are not.

"7. Discrimination and want of due process results, it is said, from the fact that the owners of houses in which they live are not compelled to estmate the rental value in making up their incomes, while those who are living in rented houses and pay rent are not allowed, in making up their taxable income, to deduct rent which they have paid, and that want of due process also results from the fact that although family expenses are not as a rule permitted to be deducted from gross to arrive at taxable income, farmers are permitted to omit from their income return certain products of the farm which are susceptible of use by them for sustaining their families during the year.

"So far as these numerous and minute, not to say in many respects hypercritical, contentions are based upon an assumed violation of the uniformity clause, their want of legal merit is at once apparent, since it is settled that that clause exacts only a geographical uniformity, and there is not a semblance of ground in any of the propositions for assuming that a violation of such uniformity is complained of. (Knowlton *v.* Moore, 178 U. S., 41; Patton *v.* Brady, 184 U. S., 608, 622; Flint *v.* Stone Tracy Co., 220 U. S., 107, 158; Billings *v.* United States, 232 U. S., 608, 622.)

"So far as the due-process clause of the fifth amendment is relied upon, it suffices to say that there is no basis for such reliance, since it is equally well settled that such clause is not a limitation upon the taxing power conferred upon Congress by the Constitution; in other words, that the Constitution does not conflict with itself by conferring upon the one hand a taxing power and taking the same power away on the other by the limitations of the due-process clause. (Treat *v.* White, 181 U. S., 264; Patton *v.* Brady, 184 U. S., 608; McCray *v.* United States, 195 U. S., 27, 61; Flint *v.* Stone Tracy Co., supra; Billings *v.* United States, 232 U. S., 261, 282.) And no change in the situation here would arise even if it be conceded, as we think it must be, that this doctrine would have no application in a case where although there was a seeming exercise of the taxing power, the act complained of was so arbitrary as to constrain to the conclusion that it was not the exertion of taxation but a confiscation of property; that is, a taking of the same in violation of the fifth amendment, or, what is equivalent thereto, was so wanting in basis for classification as to produce such a gross and patent inequality as to inevitably lead to the same conclusion. We say this because none of the propositions relied upon in the remotest degree present such questions.

"It is true that it is elaborately insisted that although there be no express constitutional provision prohibiting it, the progressive feature of the tax causes it to transcend the conception of all taxation and to be a mere arbitrary abuse of power which must be treated as wanting in due process. But the proposition disregards the fact that in the very early history of the Government a progressive tax was imposed by Congress and that such authority was exerted in some if not all of the various income taxes enacted prior to 1894 to which we have previously adverted. And over and above all this the contention but disregards the further fact that its absolute want of foundation in reason was plainly pointed out in Knowlton *v.* Moore, supra, and the right to urge it was necessarily foreclosed by the ruling in that case made. In this situation it is, of course, superfluous to say that arguments as to the expediency of levying such taxes or of the economic mistake or wrong involved in their imposition are beyond judicial cognizance. Besides this demonstration of the want of merit in the contention based upon the progressive feature of the tax, the error in the others is equally well established either by prior decisions or by the adequate bases for classification which are apparent on the face of the assailed provisions; that is, the distinction between individuals and corporations, the difference between various kinds of corporations, etc. Knowlton *v.* Moore, supra; Flint *v.* Stone Tracy Co., supra; Billings *v.* United States, supra; National Bank *v.* Commonwealth (9 Wall., 353); National Safe Deposit Co. *v.* Illinois (232 U. S., 58, 70). In fact, comprehensively surveying all the contentions relied upon, aside from the erroneous construction of the amendment which we have previously disposed of, we can not escape the conclusion that they all rest upon the mistaken theory that although there be differences between the subjects taxed, to differently tax them transcends the limit of taxation and amounts to a want of due process, and that where a tax levied is believed by one who resists its enforcement to be wanting in wisdom and to operate injustice, from that fact in

the nature of things there arises a want of due process of law and a resulting authority in the judiciary to exceed its powers and correct what is assumed to be mistaken or unwise exertions by the legislative authority of its lawful powers, even although there be no semblance of warrants in the Constitution for so doing.

"We have not referred to a contention that because certain administrative powers to enforce the act were conferred by the statute upon the Secretary of the Treasury, therefore it was void as unwarrantedly delegating legislative authority, because we think to state the proposition is to answer it. Field *v.* Clark (143 U. S., 649); Buttfield *v.* Stranahan (192 U. S., 470, 496); Oceanic Steam Navigation Co. *v.* Stranahan (214 U. S., 320)."

Affirmed.

Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE—H. R. 391.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a change of reference of the bill H. R. 391, from the Committee on Agriculture to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. What is it about?

Mr. NORTON. It is a bill relating to rural credits.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 391, on rural credits, be taken from the Committee on Agriculture and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] moves that the House adjourn. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 26, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a memorandum by the Chief of Staff, relative to the modification of the legislative provision covering the employment of skilled draftsmen in the office of the Chief of Ordnance of the Army, contained on page 72 of the Book of Estimates for the fiscal year 1917 (H. Doc. No. 614); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Savannah River, at Augusta, Ga., between the upper lines of the city limits of the city of Augusta and the mouth of Butlers Creek (H. Doc. No. 615); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, submitting suggestions for amendment of H. R. 8499, directing the Secretary of War to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy a dredge from the Panama Canal for use at Guam (H. Doc. No. 616); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, submitting an amendment to estimates of appropriations for "Salaries, Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department, 1917" (H. Doc. No. 617); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an item of legislation to enable the department to pay claims reopened and allowed, in suits to recover excise taxes paid under the act of August 5, 1909 (H. Doc. No. 618); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HARDY, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4786) to provide for the appointment of certain assistant inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, at ports where they are actually performing duty, but to which they are at present detailed, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 67), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MONTAGUE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 193) to provide for the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy and to prevent the spread of leprosy in the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 74), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEWIS, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6871) to limit the effect of the regulation of interstate commerce between the States in goods, wares, and merchandise wholly or in part manufactured, mined, or produced by convict labor or in any prison or reformatory, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 75), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES, from the Committee on Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9533) to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 77), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4530) for the relief of Michael F. O'Hare, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 68), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4881) to reimburse the postmaster at Kegg, Pa., for money and stamps taken by burglars, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 69), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8318) for the relief of De Barbieri & Co., of Valparaiso, Chile, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 70), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5835) for the relief of James Stanton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 71), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7248) for the relief of the United States Drainage & Irrigation Co., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 72), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10037) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 76), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. MILLER of Delaware, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2819) for the relief of Francis H. Connelly, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 73), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1436) granting a pension to Francis I. Helm, alias Francis Boyd; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2784) granting a pension to Charles Diesron; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3962) granting an increase of pension to John J. Stanley; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7147) granting an increase of pension to William C. Ramsey; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 10012) regulating shipments of freight to foreign ports and prohibiting discrimination in the receipt and shipment of such freight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 10013) to provide for the licensing of American boys at the age of 19 years; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TAGUE: A bill (H. R. 10014) to grant official recognition to the organizations of employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 10015) for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under joint resolution of July 14, 1870, authorizing the Postmaster General to continue in use in the Postal Service Marcus P. Norton's combined post-marking and stamp-canceling hand-stamp patents or otherwise; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 10016) to amend section 14 of the seamen's act of March 4, 1915; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 10017) to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 10018) to accept the cession by the State of Washington of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mount Rainier National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HEATON: A bill (H. R. 10019) for the remodeling of the United States Federal building at Pottsville, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10020) regulating the compensation of stationary firemen employed in Federal Government buildings in the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10021) to amend section 715 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by act of Congress of March 3, 1905; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREIDER: A bill (H. R. 10022) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lebanon, in the State of Pennsylvania, four bronze cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 10023) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate condemned cannon and cannon balls to the village of Jeffersonville, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10024) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate condemned cannon and cannon balls to the village of Bellbrook, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10025) to create an athletic commission and to legalize boxing in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 10026) to amend sections 2, 13, and 14 of an act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen," etc., approved March 4, 1915; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 10028) to amend section 1 of the act to regulate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 10029) to repeal an act entitled "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHEELER. A bill (H. R. 10030) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 10031) authorizing and directing the managers of the soldiers' homes to designate and set aside one of the homes for the exclusive use of the widows of soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10032) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River from a point on its banks, in the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., at or near the locality known as Woods Run, to a point on the opposite shore of said river within the borough of McKees Rocks, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 10033) to amend an act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenues for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10034) to amend an act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenues for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10035) to amend an act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenues for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 10036) to construct a public building for a post office in the city of Sylacauga, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 10038) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the pensions of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War," approved April 19, 1908; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: Resolution (H. Res. 104) asking for the appointment of five Members to investigate the Yucatan Sisal Trust; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 118) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 119) directing the Attorney General of the United States to submit to the Supreme Court all information available bearing upon the validity of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 12) providing for the printing of 10,000 copies of the report of the medico-military aspects of the European war; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10037) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 10039) granting a pension to William B. Hampshire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10040) granting an increase of pension to Hepsiba Fisk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 10041) granting an increase of pension to Fredrick F. Pflaff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10042) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Stebbins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10043) granting a pension to Hugh G. Smelcer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10044) granting a pension to Robert G. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 10045) granting an increase of pension to Alfred S. Gates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 10046) granting a pension to Thomas J. Reynolds; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10047) granting a pension to Ortha A. Glanville; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10048) granting an increase of pension to Prudie Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 10049) for the relief of Capt. Harvey H. Young; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 10050) granting a pension to John H. Yount; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10051) granting a pension to Miner Howard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10052) to reimburse J. T. Nance; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 10053) granting a pension to William A. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 10054) for the relief of the estate of R. W. Elsom; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 10055) granting a pension to Franklin R. Albert; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10056) granting an increase of pension to Ansel T. Ware; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10057) granting a pension to Carolina Dollen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10058) to increase the provisions of an act granting lands to aid in the construction of certain railroads and telegraph lines in the State of California, approved July 25, 1866, and its amendments; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 10059) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Volkman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10060) granting a pension to Edith V. Bowman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 10061) granting a pension to Schuyler Van Tassell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10062) granting a pension to Joseph F. Mattson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 10063) to satisfy the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of Annie M. Bradshaw, Beulah B. Dingle, Clara Belle Bergeron, and George William Bradshaw, heirs of William H. Bradshaw, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 10064) granting a pension to J. E. Haws; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MEEKER: A bill (H. R. 10065) granting a pension to George C. Emmert; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10066) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 10067) for the relief of Mrs. Thomas S. Ferral; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OAKEY: A bill (H. R. 10068) granting an increase of pension to Julia Rosenthal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 10069) for the relief of Mary Ella Fales; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10070) granting a pension to Henry Matteson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10071) granting a pension to Mary Matteson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 10072) granting a pension to Frederick M. Hohmann; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10073) granting a pension to J. George Mehringer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10074) granting a pension to Henry Jordan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10075) granting a pension to Bradford S. Donahugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 10076) granting a pension to Peter Dell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10077) granting an increase of pension to Azariah Rankin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 10078) granting a pension to Harry A. Leonard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10079) granting a pension to Charles H. Avery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 10080) granting an increase of pension to James Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10081) granting a pension to Thomas E. Rector; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 10082) granting an increase of pension to George S. Griffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 10083) for the relief of the members of the American section of the International Waterways Commission; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 10084) for the relief of Sarah Jane Thornton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 10085) for the relief of James Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 10086) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Hess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 10087) granting an increase of pension to Aaron A. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10088) granting an increase of pension to Satulford R. Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10089) granting an increase of pension to Stephen F. Cassaday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10090) granting an increase of pension to John S. Tanner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10091) granting an increase of pension to Helen Dannat; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10092) granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10093) granting an increase of pension to George T. Talley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10094) granting a pension to Sallie F. Oates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10095) granting a pension to Belle Shannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10096) granting a pension to Nannie Z. Penrod; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10097) granting a pension to Eugene Wootten; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10098) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Whalin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 10099) granting an increase of pension to Frances C. McDonough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 10100) granting an increase of pension to Andrew G. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 10101) granting an increase of pension to Louisa J. Puckett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10102) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Kenison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10103) granting an increase of pension to Elias Culbreth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10104) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. McMullen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10105) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Shoemaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10106) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Yarborough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10107) granting an increase of pension to Judy A. Turley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 6489, for relief of Melchior Weiler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: Petitions of citizens of Rose Hill and Wellington, Kans., protesting against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of Salisbury Worsted Mills, of Camden, N. J., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petitions of depositors in the banks of Kansas, protesting against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Milwaukee Division, No. 46, Order of Railway Conductors, favoring printing report of Industrial Relations Commission; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of Wisconsin Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, protesting against House bill 743, for building for Department of Justice; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of John Cook and many other citizens of the State of Florida, asking the passage of legislation similar to that provided in House bill 5308 in the Sixty-third Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of Buffalo (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to urging Board of Engineers of the United States Army to report in favor of making a survey of the entrance of the Buffalo River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Hedwig A. F. Kosbob, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring passage of the Workmen's compensation act, H. R. 476; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of B. Niccoll & Co., of New York City, relative to exemption from compulsory State pilotage of barges operated in inland waterways in tow of steam tugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Stockton Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway-mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Merchants Association of New York, relative to development of really important waterways of New York City and State; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petitions of Business Men of the thirty-ninth congressional district of New York, favoring a tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DARROW: Petition of Gen. Hirry C. Egbert Camp, No. 42, United Spanish War Veterans of Germantown, Philadelphia, favoring pensions for widows and minor children of Spanish War Veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petitions of John R. Marlin Council, No. 20, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Fred. M. Wagner Council, No. 185, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia, and State Council of Pennsylvania, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petitions of Fred Schofield, Henry Clark, and William H. Marnes, of New Jersey, favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Petitions of Captain M. M. Marvin Camp, No. 95, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, of Walton, N. Y.; General Joe Wheeler Camp, No. 12, United Spanish War Veterans; William H. Hubbell Camp, No. 4, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring pensions for widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petitions of Warner D. Crouch Camp, No. 77, United Spanish War Veterans, McLeansboro, Ill.; S. A. Valentine Camp, No. 31, Department of Michigan, United Spanish War Veterans; Barry E. Brown Camp, No. 11, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring pensions for widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of National Indian War Veterans, favoring pensions equal to soldiers of other wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of City Council of Rock Island, Ill., favoring passage of House bill No. 54, for pensions for widows of Spanish War Veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELSTON: Memorial of Stockton (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway-mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Stockton Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway-mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Fred A. Bean and 28 others of Toma and G. E. Fox and 28 others of Wonewoc, Wis., favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of the Public Forum of the Church of the Ascension, of New York, favoring the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of A. K. Gleason, of New York, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Stockton (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Cigarmakers' Union, No. 149, relative to motion to convene a congress of neutral nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FREEMAN: Memorial of Stratford (Conn.) Woman Suffrage Association, favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of the Mystic Manufacturing Co., of Mystic; Somerville Manufacturing Co., of Somerville; Gardiner Hall, jr., Co., of South Willington; Blissville Mills, of Norwich, all in the State of Connecticut, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of Ottawa, Ill., favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Stockton Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Illinois Society of the Revolution, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARNER: Petitions of business men of Scheetz, Tex., favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Webb County, Tex., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOOD: Petitions of business men of the fifth congressional district of Iowa, favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of Whitney Blake Co., of New Haven, Conn., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINDS: Petition of Forest Mills, of Bridgton, Me., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IGOE: Memorial of L. K. Robbins, of St. Louis, Mo., on national preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: Memorial of Civic Convention of Hawaii, favoring the construction of a breakwater at Nawiliwili and an appropriation by Congress to cover cost of same; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, favoring the establishment of military-training camps in all States and Territorial possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, favoring the creation of a body of experts to study and make a scientific report on their finding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLEY: Petition of Gov. W. N. Ferris, of Michigan, and others, indorsing the plan for the prevention and real cause of international wars, prepared by Homer L. Boyle, of Lansing, Mich.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Wilkins Manufacturing Co., of Woonsocket, R. I., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Anchor Webbing Co., of Woonsocket, R. I., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Evidence in support of House bill 8148, for the relief of Ola Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 9087, for the relief of Henry Fleisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 1723, for the relief of Richard Van Dusen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of Stockton Chamber of Commerce, relative to efficiency and equitableness of mail rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LEWIS: Petition by Santiago Inglesias, president of the Free Federation of Workingmen of Porto Rico, on behalf of the federation, asking for an investigation of industrial conditions on the island of Porto Rico; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial by Sandy Spring monthly meeting of Friends, opposing any increase of armament by the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of L. R. Simpson, of Bay City, Mich., protesting against Federal censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Petition against the exportation of arms and ammunition from this country to any nation of Europe now at war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: Petition of Hartley Silk Manufacturing Co., of Towanda, Pa., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petitions of seven citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of veterans of the Indian wars, favoring passage of bill to pension the few Indian war veterans the same as other war veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of 71 members of First Infantry, National Guard of Missouri, all of St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of the militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Grand Lodge Progressive Order, composed of 20,000 members; Young Men's and Ladies' Hebrew Charity Society; Chesed Shel Emith Society, composed of 1,000 members; Rabbi Bernhard A. Moritz, in the name of 60,000 Jews; Nathan Frank Lodge, No. 87; Beth Israel Lodge, No. 228; Jewish National Workers; Alliance Sholom Aleichem, Branch 17; United Jewish Educational and Charitable Associations; Polish Immigration League; Polish National Alliance; Polish Roman Catholic Union; Polish Women's Alliance; Polish Alma Mater; Polish Falcons Alliance; Polish Daily News; Polish National Daily; Polish Alliance Daily; the Polish Nation; and a number of other citizens, all of St. Louis, Mo., urgently protesting against the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Metal Trades Council of St. Louis and vicinity; Mound City Lodge, No. 3, State of Missouri; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union No. 2; Sheet Metal Workers Local Union No. 36; Brewery Engineers Union No. 246; Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, Local Union No. 88, representing a membership of 618, all of St. Louis, Mo., and also a number of other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of City Forestry Union 14851; Painters Local Union No. 137; International Hod Carriers Union No. 240; Stove Mounters International Union No. 86; Boot and Shoe Workers Union; Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers International Union No. 73; Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers, No. 46; the Commercial Telegraphers Union No. 3, all of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of the

Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MILLER of Delaware: Evidence in support of House bill 9004, granting an increase of pension to Julia W. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Herman Held, Max Schneider, Peter Dorsam, and others, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring embargo on munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of D. F. Waters, of Germantown Dye Works, favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORIN: Memorial of Capt. Alfred E. Hunt Camp, No. 1, Department of Pennsylvania, favoring legislation granting relief to widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Traffic Club of New York, urging immediate repeal of the seaman's act; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petitions of James R. Miller and Margaret S. Patton, in favor of the passage of the Keating-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of C. K. S., favoring the Keating-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Papers in support of House bill 9997, relative to Charles P. Morse; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Mr. Harry S. Houghton, of Elmira Heights, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Gard W. Ford, of Hornell, N. Y., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Evidence to accompany bill granting a pension to Harry A. Leonard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of bill granting a pension to Charles H. Avery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWE: Memorial of American Federation of Labor at San Francisco, Cal., protesting against repeal of the seamen's law; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of piano manufacturers of New York City, favoring the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Petition of Frank Cheatham Camp, No. 314, United Confederate Veterans, at Breckinridge, Tex., favoring pensions for Confederate veterans and widows of same; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEDMAN: Petition of employees of Amazon Cotton Mills, of Thomasville, N. C., protesting against child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Memorial of the State Board of Education of California, approving the policy of extending national aid to the various States for the purpose of assisting them in providing opportunities for vocational education to those individuals who anticipate entering or who have already entered the occupations of agriculture, trade, industry, commerce, and home making, and favoring the passage of the measure generally known as the Page bill, and introduced in the Senate of the United States by Senator SMITH of Georgia at the second session of the Sixty-third Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Home Industry League of California, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of F. R. Fancher, of Redondo Beach, Cal., protesting against any bill seeking to establish a Federal censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of Los Angeles County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Commissioner H. J. Skeffington, favoring an appropriation for the building of an immigrant station at the port of Boston; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of sundry firms of the State of Massachusetts, favoring legislation protecting the manufacture of dyestuffs and munitions of war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS: Memorial of District No. 23, United Mine Workers of America, asking publication of full report of Industrial Relations Commission; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, memorial of District No. 23, United Mine Workers of America, protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *January 26, 1916.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we know that Thou hast so constituted human life as that good may be brought out of every ill. Where sin has abounded grace hath much more abounded. Amid the conflict, the chaos, and the strife of the world which afflict our ears every day, telling the story of suffering and oppression, we pray that at least we may by our generous response and our hearty brotherhood gain the friendship of those who are distressed and gain for ourselves the sweet satisfaction of a blessed service.

We pray Thy blessing upon the generous offerings of this people poured upon the altar of humanity, that they may have the approval and the blessing of the Divine One upon them all, and through our service may we learn where honor is, the honor of a great nation like ours. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EDITORIAL ON MEXICAN SITUATION.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I have here an editorial from the Evening Express, of Santa Barbara, Cal., on the Mexican situation. It is a very temperate and dispassionate statement of the conditions, and as it is both interesting and instructive I should like to have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not hear the request of the Senator from California. What is the paper?

Mr. WORKS. I request to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Santa Barbara Express on the Mexican situation.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I gave notice some time ago that I thought the time had arrived when editorials from newspapers on matters of this kind should be kept out of the RECORD. I do not know whether this is the time I should insist upon that course, but I want to say to the Senator that I am having figured up the amount of pages in the RECORD taken up by newspaper and magazine articles to show the percentage of the pages of the RECORD of such items. I will know in a day or two what that percentage is up to date; but I am quite certain the RECORD contains at least half of matter that has never been read or uttered in either House of Congress. I think the practice is being abused greatly, and if the Senator does not really think that the printing of this editorial in the RECORD is necessary, I should like very much to have him withdraw the request.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I have received a great many articles from newspapers that ought not to go into the RECORD at all. It was because of the nature of this particular editorial, which is very temperate in character and which I think would be instructive, that I have asked it may be printed in the RECORD. It is not one calculated to arouse the passion of the country. I think it is quite unwise to put in matters of that kind.

I would be glad if the Senator from Utah would look at it and see if he will not change his opinion as to printing it at the present time. If the Senator, or any other Senator, has serious objection after reading the editorial, of course I shall not ask to have it printed.

Mr. SMOOT. With that understanding, I shall not object. I want to see what it is.

Mr. STONE. Does it go in?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is what the Chair wants to know, whether it goes in the RECORD or is left to the Senator from Utah to determine.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I am entirely in sympathy with what the Senator from Utah has stated and with his declared purpose to object. I do not think we ought to have a mass of newspaper editorials and matters of that kind put into the RECORD. No one ever reads them, or very few. It is not very informing and it is expensive. It simply gives to such a paper the right of the franking privilege. If the Senator from Utah does not object, I shall myself, in pursuance of the notice I gave some time ago.

Mr. SMOOT. I object at this time to printing the article in the RECORD.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. WORKS. I reserve the right to use it at some other time, and I withdraw the request for the present.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was about to remark, if the Senator will permit me, that the objection will hold until the Senator who offered it or some other Senator will read it to the Senate, and then it will go into the RECORD. That is about all an objection amounts to.

ESTIMATES OF DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Attorney General submitting an urgent estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for printing and binding, Court of Claims, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, $5,000 (S. Doc. No. 258), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture submitting an urgent estimate of appropriation for destruction of predatory animals for suppression of rabies, $75,000 (S. Doc. No. 257), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture submitting an urgent estimate of appropriation for cooperative investigations for eradication of white-pine blister rust, $20,000 (S. Doc. No. 259), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that in order to promote agriculture, afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm products, and encourage the development of a general system of improved highways, the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads which may be used in the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, or postal matter, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of Eugene L. Aldrich, of Keene, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the memorial of A. Sharpe, of Wolfeboro, N. H., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petition of Albert D. Carter, of Tilton, N. H., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of James L. McConanghy, of Hanover, N. H., praying that increased appropriations be made for the maintenance of the Bureau of Education, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CUMMINS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Waverly, Dubuque, Durango, and Dows, all in the State of Iowa, praying for the placing of an embargo on the exportation of munitions of war, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NORRIS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Nebraska, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McCUMBER presented a memorial of the American-Norwegian Chamber of Commerce, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the interference with trade between Norway and the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of 240 citizens of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation to fix a standard price for patented and trade-marked articles, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented memorials of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of Center and of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of Burleigh County, in the State of North Dakota, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of the American-Norwegian Chamber of Commerce, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the interruption of commerce between the United States and Norway by the British Government, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Plattsburg, N. Y., praying for the creation of a tariff commission, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Real Estate Board of Trade of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against an extension of the so-called emergency war-revenue law as applied to real estate, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of Dr. John T. Nagle, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the automatic citizenship of expatriated natives, of naturalized Americans, and those who have enlisted in the service of foreign Governments being restored to American citizenship without naturalization, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ASHURST. I present a petition signed by a number of citizens of the town of Nogales, Ariz. I ask that the body of the petition, together with the first signature, be printed in the RECORD, and that the petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOGALES, ARIZ., *January 17, 1916.*

To Senator HENRY F. ASHURST, *Washington, D. C.:*

We, the undersigned, members of the Chamber of Commerce and citizens of the town of Nogales, Ariz., desire to express our sincere sorrow for the relatives and friends of the victims of the dastardly outrage committed by Mexican outlaws and bandits, whoever they may be, at Santa Isabel, Chihuahua, on Monday, January 10, 1916, and our heartfelt sympathy for them in their hour of great grief and sorrow.

Realizing as we do the deep gravity of the situation which now on all sides confronts the American people and the grave responsibility which is placed upon President Wilson and the administration at Washington, we hereby desire to express our full confidence in the President and those in authority with him, and as American citizens to assure him and them of our loyal support and assistance in arriving at a correct and just solution of the difficult problems with which they find themselves confronted.

And we condemn, with all the vehemence of which we are capable, and repudiate the rash, unnecessary, ill-timed, uncalled-for and insulting resolutions prepared and adopted by a committee purporting to represent the Nogales Chamber of Commerce, as published in a Nogales newspaper; and we most emphatically deny that these resolutions express the sentiment of the people of Nogales or that the persons responsible for them represent the populace of this border community.

We believe that at such a time as the present it is the duty of every loyal American to refrain from giving rise to any act, or expression to any thought, which may in any manner or to any degree cause embarrassment to those in authority; and when, as now, the administration and the Congress of the United States are giving the benefit of their united wisdom, coupled with their years of experience, to the solution of the problems on hand, and when every word spoken by them is guarded in the interest of true Americanism, we regret the indiscretion which prompted the resolution of such committee.

ALLEN T. BIRD,
(And 37 other names).

Mr. PHELAN. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of California, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assembly joint resolution 2 (by Mr. H. W. Wright, of sixty-ninth district) relating to Federal aid for indigent persons afflicted with tuberculosis in State or other institutions when such persons are nonresidents of the State in which such institutions are located.

Whereas the State of California has made such provision as its resources allow for the proper care in public institutions of patients afflicted with tuberculosis of the lungs; and

Whereas many thousands of patients afflicted with tuberculosis come to this State from other States, many of whom become a charge on State and municipal funds; and

Whereas there has been introduced in Congress a bill providing Federal aid for indigent nonresident tuberculosis patients cared for in hospitals which conform to the hygienic standard established by the United States Treasury Department; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That we consider the proposed measure to be of the greatest importance to this State and to the whole Nation, and express the hope that it may become law at the present session of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to use all honorable means to expedite and secure the passage of said bill; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit a certified copy of these resolutions to the President and Speaker, respectively, of the Senate and House of Representatives and to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

C. C. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
L. B. MALLORY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Received by the governor this 10th day of January, A. D. 1916.
ALEXANDER McCABE,
Private Secretary to the Governor.

Witness my signature and the seal of this office at Sacramento this 10th day of January, A. D. 1916.
[SEAL.] FRANK C. JORDAN,
Secretary of State.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Loomis, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to exploit the water power of the country, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 3872) for the relief of John Horgan, which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey presented a petition of the Society of the Sons of the American Revolution of New Jersey, praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the State Federation of Women's Clubs of East Orange, N. J., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. DU PONT presented a petition of the German-American Alliance of Wilmington, Del., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit American citizens from taking passage on vessels of a belligerent country, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jackson, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. WORKS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the imposition of a prohibitive tax on intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Church Federation of Sacramento, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to make the national parks available as playgrounds, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the City Council of Los Angeles, Cal., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a dam north of Los Angeles Harbor, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Pedro, Cal., praying that an appropriation be made for the control of the floods in the harbor of Los Angeles, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the Merchants' Association of Fresno; the California Development Board, of San Francisco; and the Merchants' Association of Colton, all in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to protect the rights of oil producers and consumers, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Clayton antitrust law so as to permit directors of national banks to also be directors in State banks, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of J. M. Garland, of Springfield, Ill., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on express, telegrams, and notes, and remonstrating against the imposition of a stamp tax on bank checks, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WEEKS presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 3346) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to adjudicate the claims of the State of Massachusetts, which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS.

Mr. GRONNA, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1326) for the relief of Vilhelm Torkildsen, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 68) thereon.

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 640) for the relief of Ellen B. Monahan, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 69) thereon.

Mr. CATRON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 142) for the relief of Mrs. George A. Miller, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 70) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 3949) to increase the limit of cost of the construction of a Federal building at Long Island City, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey:

A bill (S. 3950) governing the hours of work and mileage of railway postal clerks (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3951) to establish national cooperative rural banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 3952) making appropriation for investigation and promotion of rural education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 3953) requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to investigate and report as to the advisability of erecting public buildings in certain towns and cities in Texas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUGHES:

A bill (S. 3954) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce,"' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission," approved March 4, 1915; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BORAH. On behalf of my colleague, who is absent on account of illness, I introduce a number of bills, and ask that they be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. BORAH (for Mr. BRADY):

A bill (S. 3955) for the relief of Aaron Kibler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3956) for the relief of John Boyd (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3957) authorizing the submission to the Court of Claims of the claims of sundry citizens of Idaho for damages sustained by reason of the overflow of their lands in connection with the construction of the reservoir to irrigate lands belonging to the Indians on the Fort Hall Reservation, in Idaho;

A bill (S. 3958) for the relief of Peter W. Anderson;

A bill (S. 3959) for the relief of Fred Larsen; and

A bill (S. 3960) for the relief of Mary Van Deventer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 3961) to correct the military record of Robert Kee, alias Robert Adams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3962) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Henry H. Sibley, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3963) granting an increase of pension to Nellie S. Nanson;

A bill (S. 3964) granting an increase of pension to Max A. Pietsch;

A bill (S. 3965) granting an increase of pension to Halvor Anderson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3966) granting an increase of pension to James A. McConkey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3967) to survey and locate a military and post road from St. Louis, Mo., to Olympia, Wash.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3968) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Sager (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3969) granting an increase of pension to John R. Randall (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 3970) providing for the construction and equipment of a storehouse at Benicia Arsenal, State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 3971) granting a pension to Mary A. Newman (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 3972) to provide for selection by the Omaha Indians and the setting apart of reservation lands for tribal cemetery purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 3973) for the relief of Clyde R. Altman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROUSSARD:

A bill (S. 3974) relating to certain employees under the Civil Service; to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 3975) granting an increase of pension to Harry Colpus; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 3976) to limit the effect of the regulation of interstate commerce between the States in goods, wares, and merchandise wholly or in part manufactured, mined, or produced by convict labor or in any prison or reformatory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 3977) to authorize the Shamokin, Sunbury & Lewisburg Railroad Co., its lessees, successors, and assigns, to con-

struct a railroad bridge across the Susquehanna River from the borough of Sunbury, Northumberland County, Pa., to Monroe Township, Snyder County, Pa.; and

A bill (S. 3978) to authorize the Catawissa Railroad Co., its lessees, successors, and assigns, to construct a railroad bridge across the west branch of the Susquehanna River from the borough of Milton, Northumberland County, Pa., to the borough of West Milton, Union County, Pa.; to the Committee on Commerce.

(By request.) A bill (S. 3979) for the relief of Clyde R. Altman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3980) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Jenkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 3981) for the relief of S. Hodge (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 3982) to establish the Mount Baker National Park in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3983) authorizing the President to appoint Charles F. Smith a first lieutenant of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BORAH (for Mr. BRADY):

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 87) for the relief of N. B. Pettibone; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

THE JUDICIAL CODE.

Mr. SHIELDS submitted four amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1412) further to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

STATUE OF HENRY MOWER RICE.

Mr. NELSON. I submit a resolution, which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Minnesota will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 80), as follows:

Resolved, That exercises appropriate to the reception and acceptance from the State of Minnesota of the statue of Henry Mower Rice, erected in Statuary Hall in the Capitol, be made the special order for Saturday, February 19, 1916, after the conclusion of the routine morning business.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to say in explanation of the resolution that the statue of Mr. Rice, who was the first Senator from Minnesota, is soon to be placed in Statuary Hall in the Capitol, and that this resolution follows the precedent which has been established in such cases.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CLERK.

Mr. McCUMBER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 81), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard be authorized to employ an additional clerk, at a salary of $100 per month, for the balance of the present fiscal year, the same to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERK.

Mr. CHILTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 82), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Census be authorized to employ an assistant clerk at the rate of $120 per month, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate for a period not exceeding two months.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following communication, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., January 25, 1916.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is to inform you that I desire to be relieved from further service on the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

Very truly, yours, HARRY LANE.

Mr. KERN. I send to the desk my resignation as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, which I ask may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: I hereby resign my membership on the Committee on the District of Columbia.

JOHN W. KERN.

Mr. KERN. I move the adoption of the following order.

The order was read and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That Hon. JAMES D. PHELAN, junior Senator from the State of California, be appointed as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Senator KERN.

ADDRESS BY J. F. CALLBEEATH.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I present an address by J. F. Callbreath, secretary of the American Mining Congress, delivered January 4, 1916, before the second Pan American Scientific Congress in Washington, District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that it be made a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. I am of the opinion that that address has already been printed as a public document in connection with the other addresses which were delivered before that congress.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If that is true, I do not care to press the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It had better go to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will withhold it.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it go to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so referred.

NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a public document the second report of the committee on the duty of courts to refuse to execute statutes in contravention of the fundamental law, adopted by the New York State Bar Association.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that paper may go to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. O'GORMAN. We printed the first report and this is the second one.

Mr. SMOOT. I will look it over and see about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The matter will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

ADDRESS BY HON. A. C. GORDON (S. DOC. NO. 256).

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, on the 4th day of March, 1911, Congress made an appropriation for the erection of a suitable monument over the grave of ex-President John Tyler. The monument, in accordance with the act of Congress, was erected by the War Department, and it was dedicated on the 12th day of October, 1915. In the meanstime a committee of the two Houses had been appointed to represent Congress at the dedication.

On the occasion of the dedication a very able and interesting address was delivered by Mr. A. C. Gordon, a distinguished author and lawyer in my State. The address is such a very able and philosophic discussion of the period of President Tyler that I ask it may be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator if the address was delivered in connection with the dedication of the monument?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It was. The monument was erected under an act of Congress, and a delegation from Congress was present to represent Congress at the dedication. I ask that the address may be printed as a document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TARIFF COMMISSION.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from President Nicholas Murray Butler, of Columbia University, in favor of establishing a permanent tariff commission; also a letter from Prof. Hadley, of Yale University, on the same subject; also a letter from Hon. E. A. Filene, of Boston, favoring the establishment of such a commission.

I ask to have read to the Senate a letter from Hon. Howard H. Gross, of Chicago, president of the Tariff Commission League.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know how long these letters are.

Mr. GORE. I ask for the reading of only one of the letters. It is not very lengthy. The others I ask to have printed in the RECORD without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read the letter referred to.

The Secretary read as follows:

JANUARY 25, 1916.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am very glad to reply to your inquiry and say why, in my opinion, a nonpolitical tariff commission should at once be created and permanently maintained. As president of the Tariff Commission League, I have for more than a year, aided by a number of able field assistants, made a careful study of the subject and a thorough canvass of more than 30 States to feel out public sentiment. The following summary is conservative as to conditions and how it is best to meet them.

We are facing a future of great uncertainty and perhaps of peril. Our revenues must be largely increased and the tariff should be readjusted with that in view. Since the Underwood-Simmons Tariff Act

was passed conditions have greatly changed and are still changing. No one can approximate what the situation will be in six months or a year. We are sure that, with over fifty billions of wealth already destroyed and half a continent laid waste by war, that when peace comes and ten to twenty millions of men, now in trenches, go back to the industries we will, in common with all other countries, face an unparalled situation that will call for a world-wide readjustment.

If it were conceded that the present tariff laws were the best ever enacted, it does not now and can not under the changed conditions meet the requirements. The data upon which it was based has in a large measure become obsolete. There seems but one thing to do: Make at once such changes as will increase the revenue to the amount required and at the same time create a nonpolitical tariff commission, equally balanced between the majority and minority parties, and give its members a long tenure of office, with broad powers and an ample appropriation, so that it may take up and fully and fairly investigate the whole subject of tariff, both revenue and protective, gather all the facts that can be had, and then analyze, arrange, classify, and index them with such explanations as will make them readily understood and available.

This commission should be responsive to Congress and it should be broadly representative of all the people and all the great industries, including agriculture and labor along with manufactures, commerce, and general business. Given a commission of high personnel and its reports and conclusions would be accepted by the people. If, however, the same work were done by a bureau responsive to a Cabinet officer, the result would be regarded as ex parte and open to question.

The demand for a nonpolitical tariff commission is widespread and insistent and comes from all classes of people from various parts of the country. The American Federation of Labor at its late convention in San Francisco went on record strongly for it, and instructed its legislative committee to work for the passage of an act to create such a commission upon which both agriculture and labor should be represented. The National Grange and other agricultural organizations are actively supporting it. Practically the entire agricultural and labor press are urging the plan. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, by a referendum vote of 715 to 9, are in favor of such a commission. The records of our league are comprehensive and have been carefully kept. They show that more than 90 per cent of the organizations, associations, and publications, representating all political parties and all forms of activity, strongly approve the plan. Where six months ago occasional paragraphs appeared upon the subject, now columns are being printed. I never have known a movement having a more vigorous or spontaneous growth. The people with practically one voice declare that the tariff must be put upon an economic rather than a political basis. Is it a vain hope that when all the facts are fully, fairly, clearly, and impartially brought out and put before the people in understandable form that they will speedily declare for a tariff policy and adhere to it as other countries have done? The people think straight. Give them all the facts and turn on the light. The people should keep clearly before them that the tariff commission is not to decide upon tariff policies. That is the people's job. The commission can not make rates. Congress must do that. In tariff enactments, however, an able and efficient tariff commission can render invaluable service to the congressional committees, prevent them from being imposed upon by an unscrupulous lobby, and, with all the facts at hand, it can aid in a wise adjustment of the tariff rates as may become necessary. For generations we have tried making tariffs upon insufficient data plus guesswork and inspiration, and we have failed to satisfy the people. Within 23 years we have had five tariff revisions, and every time business has been upset, losses have taken the place of profits with hundreds of thousands of idle men. If the aggregate loss could be totaled the sum would be appalling. One of the first steps in a sane program of preparedness is to increase the revenue and get ready to adjust ourselves to coming conditions. We must prepare for peace as well as for war. Anyone who would tinker the tariff for political ends under existing conditions should be regarded a public enemy.

Very truly, yours,

HOWARD H. GROSS,
President of the Tariff Commission League.

To the Hon. THOMAS PRYOR GORE,
United States Senate.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1916.

Mr. H. H. GROSS,
Congress Hall Hotel, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The American Federation of Labor at its recent convention, held in San Francisco, November 8 to 22, 1915, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas periods of industrial depression are of frequent occurrence and cause loss of employment to thousands of wage earners throughout the country; and

"Whereas these industrial depressions are often prolonged and made more acute by the political methods that have been followed in dealing with the question of tariff schedules; and

"Whereas an agitation is now in progress throughout the country in favor of taking the tariff out of politics, through the creation by Congress of a permanent nonpartisan tariff commission: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Federation of Labor indorses the idea of a nonpartisan tariff commission, and directs the executive council to instruct the incoming legislative committee to work for the passage of a bill creating a tariff commisison on which all interest, including agriculture and labor, shall be directly represented."

This action of the convention expresses the attitude of the organized labor movement of America toward the creation of a permanent nonpartisan tariff commission, a movement in which you are greatly interested. As I thought this action of the convention might be of considerable use to you, I am officially notifying you.

Very truly, yours,

SAM GOMPERS,
President American Federation of Labor.

The additional letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
New York, November 15, 1915.

Hon. T. P. GORE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In reply to your kind inquiry for suggestions in regard to Senate bill 7190, being a bill to create an international trade and tariff board, introduced by you at the third session of the Sixty-third Congress on January 8, 1915, and referred to the Committee on Finance, I beg to say—

1. That I am very much in favor of the creation of a tariff board or commission, with as large powers as may be found permissible under the Constitution, not only to inquire into matters of cost, production, labor conditions, and the like, but actually to formulate proposals and recommendations for the consideration of the Congress. The commission should have this power on its own initiative without being specifically asked to exercise it by the Congress. If the men appointed to the tariff board or commission were really disinterested and intelligent men, public opinion would do the rest.

2. That, in my judgment, the tariff policy of the United States should, in addition to providing revenue, be used to organize and to develop the national industries and resources and to conserve them, as well as to round out groups of industries and to make the United States industrially independent, at least in certain of the major lines of manufactured goods. For example, the experiences growing out of the European war show clearly that we must build up in this country a whole series of chemical industries, including particularly the dyestuffs, as to which we have heretofore been almost entirely dependent on other countries, especially Germany.

3. That the composition of the tariff board or commission should be without any regard to politics whatever, and that there should be no provision in the bill for dividing the commission between two or more political parties or for representing political parties thereon. If the tariff commission starts as a political body, it will end as a worthless one.

4. That care should be taken not to duplicate or in any way to overlap the functions and jurisdiction of the existing Trade Commission. The law establishing that commission is very defective, but a good seed has been sown from which later on important fruit may be gathered.

Without more study I could not express any opinion as to whether or not there exists in the present Government administrative service any body which might be transformed into an international tariff or trade commission without involving us in the steadily increasing expense which always attaches to a new administrative unit. What we sorely need in Washington is administrative reorganization and simplification, in order that the people's business may be transacted as efficiently and as economically as is the business of the stockholders of a first-rate railway or manufacturing corporation.

It will interest me very much to follow the public consideration and discussion of this bill.

Faithfully yours,

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER.

YALE UNIVERSITY,
New Haven, Conn, November 22, 1915.

Hon. T. P. GORE,

MY DEAR SIR: Your bill creating an international trade and tariff board appears to me to be a wise one and to be drawn on the right general lines. I do not feel that I am in sufficiently close touch with the administrative problems that such a board would have to take up to be able to say more than this or to offer detailed suggestions as to the possible improvement of the proposed measure.

Very sincerely,

ARTHUR T. HADLEY.

BOSTON, *November 15, 1915.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have read the draft of the tariff board bill which you introduced in the last Congress with much interest, and I am writing to you because I want you to know that I am strongly in favor of your recommendation that the board shall consist of three Republicans and three Democrats. I feel that there will be a great advantage in such a make-up, and that its chance of being passed at the next session of Congress will be largely increased thereby. * * *

The name of the bill, I think, was stronger in the old form—"International Trade and Tariff Board"—than it will be if you introduce the word "efficiency." However, it seems to me that it might be further strengthened by substituting, as a suggestion, the word "taxation" in the place of the word "tariff." In this way you will cover the whole ground of taxation and not be limited to the tariff. This, it seems to me, would be a very wise substitution, because the task of dealing with the entire subject of taxation is one which will naturally develop from a scientific study of the tariff situation. When it comes to efficiency, however, it is another matter, and the word itself has been so misapplied, and the results of this misapplication have so antagonized many manufacturers and business men, that it seems to me it will arouse more opposition than will be wise for us to incur.

You have asked whether I consider that $7,500 would be an adequate compensation. Frankly, I do not. I think that the members of this commission should certainly be of at least as high grade as the members of the Federal Reserve Board, and I do not believe that such men can be obtained for less than $10,000 salaries. An appropriation of $250,000, I should say, would, therefore, be much nearer the figure than $100,000.

Now, as to section 7, I am of the opinion that this commission should sit continuously through at least eight months of the year; and it would seem to me wise that the Secretaries of Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor and representatives of commercial organizations should meet with the tariff board on stated occasions to consider special questions likely to affect, or be affected by, their several departments. The precedent for this has already been set, I should think, by the fact that the Secretary of Commerce meets often the representatives of business organizations in order to promote the same good feeling for which it seems to be the purpose of your section to provide. With the other provisions of this section and of the bill I find myself practically in agreement. I hope that, as your letter seems to suggest, your purpose is to push it, if possible, to passage at the next session. * * *

With kindest regards, believe me, sincerely yours,

EDWARD A. FILENE.

NOVEMBER 21, 1915.

I have held this letter to again think it over carefully. I find, after studying the matter once more, that this letter expresses my best judgment, except that I now find that I am doubtful whether the change suggested as to including "taxation" in the title is good advice.

E. A. F.

Hon. T. P. GORE,
Senator from Oklahoma, Washington, D. C.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 7617. An act to provide that in order to promote agriculture, afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm products, and encourage the development of a general system of improved highways, the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall in certain cases aid the States in the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads which may be used in the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, or postal matter was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

INTERFERENCE WITH FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Friday next, the 28th instant, at the conclusion of the routine morning business, I shall address the Senate on the subject of interference with our foreign relations.

ELECTION OF SENATORS.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, when the Senate had under consideration Senate bill No. 2860, providing a temporary method of conducting the nomination and election of Senators of the United States, in February, 1914, Senator Bacon, of Georgia, moved to amend by striking out the provisions of section 2 of the bill, regulating the nomination of candidates for Senator, the objection to these being that while Congress had the power, under Article I, section 4, of the Constitution, to make or alter the regulations provided by the States concerning the time and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, it had no power to regulate the nomination of candidates by political parties for these offices; and in this position he was supported by a number of Senators. I was one of the number in favor of the amendment, upon the grounds stated, and presented a number of adjudged cases which I then believed and now believe upheld the position that nominating devices of political parties were no part of an election and the control of them was not within the power and jurisdiction of the Congress. The adjudged cases upon which I relied were from the courts of last resort of a number of the States, but did not include any from the Federal courts. Since that time the question has been presented in the case of C. P. Elliott *v.* R. L. Thompson et al., lately pending in the United States district court for the western division of the western district of the State of Missouri, and determined in all things as contended by Senator Bacon and those agreeing with him. The opinion in the case was delivered by Hon. Wilbur F. Booth, one of the district judges of the United States and a jurist of great learning and ability.

The question involved in the amendment of Senator Bacon was considered one of great importance by many Senators, as they regarded the provision for controlling the nomination of Members of Congress an insidious and gross encroachment upon and violation of the rights of the sovereign States to control their local affairs, and is not yet settled in favor of the legislation. It may come up again in Congress, and I desire, in support of the views of those who supported the amendment, to have the opinion of Judge Booth printed in the RECORD, and ask unanimous consent that it be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The opinion referred to is as follows:

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DIVISION OF THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, AT KANSAS CITY.

C. P. ELLIOTT, PLAINTIFF, *v.* R. L. THOMPSON, BENJAMIN RAPP, MAX C. ENGLEHARDT, PAT MURPHY, H. M. SMITH, J. C. BAIRD, R. H. FOSTER, H. C. HILL, WM. S. BEEBE, LEWIS SCHAFFER, WM. CONLIN, C. H. HERSEY, PETER KLINK, ET AL., DEFENDANTS.

This is an application by plaintiff for a dedimus potestatem to take depositions, as provided by section 866, Revised Statutes of the United States.

The application is opposed by defendants on the ground that the court has not jurisdiction of the action; on the further ground that the complaint does not state a cause of action; and on the further ground that the application should not be granted, because the granting of it would be contrary to the provisions of the constitution and statutes of the State of Missouri.

The action is brought by a citizen of the State of Missouri against defendants, who are also citizens of the State of Missouri, for damages alleged to have been sustained by reason of a conspiracy on the part of all of the defendants, and by reason, pursuant thereto, of the refusal by several of the defendants acting as judges and clerks of a certain primary election held in the city of Kansas City, State of Missouri, on the 4th day of August, 1914, to count the vote of the plaintiff as cast by him for WILLIAM P. BORLAND for Member of Congress.

Judisdiction by this court is claimed to exist on the ground that the action is one arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States; the plaintiff alleging, "that said defendants herein did procure and cause the plaintiff to be deprived of a right and privilege secured to him by the Constitution and laws of the United States of voting for a Member of Congress for the fifth congressional district."

The right of suffrage in general is not a right that is based upon the Constitution and laws of the United States, nor conferred by Congress upon anyone, but is conferred by the several States. (Minor *v.* Happersett, 21 Wall., 162; United States *v.* Reese, 92 U. S., 214; United States *v.* Cruikshank, 92 U. S., 544.)

The right to vote for Members of Congress, however, is based upon the Constitution and laws of the United States, and Congress may pass laws to protect this right. (Ex parte Yarbrough, 110 U. S., 651; United States *v.* Moseley, 237 U. S.)

In the exercise of its power to protect this right Congress may adopt and has adopted many of the State laws relating to elections, and has provided punishment for a violation thereof, so far as such violations occur in elections where Representatives in Congress are being elected. That the officers of election wherein Representatives in Congress are elected, though appointed by the State, yet owe a duty to the United States, is also settled. (Ex parte Siebold, 100 U. S., 371; Ex parte Clark, 100 U. S., 401; In re Coy, 127 U. S., 731; United States *v.* Aczel, 219 Fed., 917.)

Furthermore, in cases of contested elections for Representatives in Congress the Federal courts have power to issue subpœnas to obtain evidence, and may authorize the taking of evidence before commissioners. (In re Howell, 119 Fed., 465.)

Even where the State constitution and laws, as in Arkansas, provide for sealing up the ballots and forbid their being opened, except in cases of contested election, it has been held that such ballots can be ordered produced before Federal grand jury in an investigation for violation of the Federal election laws. (In re Massey, 45 Fed., 629.)

Furthermore, wrongful interference with the right to vote at an election for a Representative in Congress gives rise to a cause of action against the wrongdoer, and such cause of action is one arising under the constitution and laws of the United States. (Wiley *v.* Sinkler 179 U. S., 58; Swafford *v.* Templeton, 185 U. S., 491; Knight *v.* Shelton, 134 Fed., 423; Brickhouse *v.* Brooks, 165 Fed., 543.)

But, though the foregoing principles appear to be well established, it does not necessarily follow therefrom that the right to participate in a State primary election is a right arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States, even though Representatives in Congress may be nominated at such primary election. And the crucial question in this case is whether, conceding the right to vote at said primary election existed in the plaintiff, and conceding that this right was violated by the defendants, this state of facts gives rise to a cause of action which can be said to be a case arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

A State primary election is not an election within the meaning of that term as used in the State constitutions and laws. This is the view of the courts in the great majority of the decisions, although there are decisions to the contrary. (State ex rel. Taylor, 220 M. O., 619; State *v.* Nichols, 50 Wash., 508; Lodgerwood *v.* Pitts, 122 Tenn., 570; State *v.* Johnson, 87 Minn., 152; State *v.* Erickson, 119 Minn., 152; Brown *v.* Smallwood (Minn.), 153 N. W., 953; Montgomery *v.* Chelf, 118 Ky., 766; Gray *v.* Seitz, 162 Ind., 1.)

In State *v.* Johnson, supra, the court said:

"The primary election law simply adopts a general method by which all parties and organizations shall, in the interests of public order upon a certain day, within certain regulations, meet and select their various nominees to go upon the ballot for the ensuing election."

And again, in State *v.* Erickson, supra, the court said:

"Our primary election, which is purely of statutory origin, is the selection, by qualified voters, of candidates for the respective offices to be filled, while an election, which has its origin in the Constitution, is the selection by such voters of officers to discharge the duties of the respective offices."

The rights of candidates and voters at primary elections are widely different from the rights of candidates and voters at an election proper. Legislation on various points may be passed with reference to rights and procedure under a primary election which would be unconstitutional if applied to an election proper. The right at a primary is not a right to vote to elect, but a right to vote to nominate. In other words, the primary is a mere nominating device. See authorities supra.

It is claimed, however, that Congress has recognized primary elections, and attention is called to the act of August, 1911, chapter 32, being United States Compiled Statutes 1913, section 195.

But in my opinion, it does not follow that because Congress has recognized State primary elections for certain purposes that it has adopted all the State laws touching the preliminary machinery of the State primaries, so that such laws become, as to the election of Representatives in Congress, laws of the United States.

The case of Anthony *v.* Burrow (129 Fed., 783), in some respects analogous to the instant case, is instructive. Judge Pollock, after reviewing the cases of ex parte Yarborough, Wiley *v.* Sinkler, and Swafford *v.* Templeton, supra, used the following language:

"From this it will be seen the claim made by solicitors for complainant, that the above and kindred cases hold the election machinery employed by the State in the selection of candidates for the office of Representative in Congress, becomes when so employed a part of the Federal law, and the construction of the same raises a Federal question, is claiming too much for such cases."

In the case at bar, not even the construction of the State law is involved, but it is contended that the violation of plaintiff's rights under said law constitutes a violation of the plaintiff's rights under the United States Constitution to vote for a Representative in Congress, because of a necessary connection between the right under the State law and the right under the United States Constitution. The claim is plausible, but, in my opinion, is not sound. As above stated, the great weight of authority is to the effect that a primary election is not an election within the meaning of the term as used generally in the State constitutions, and the same reasoning leads to the conclusion that a primary election is not an election within the meaning of that term as used in the Constitution of the United States in reference to the election of Representatives in Congress.

Nor is the right to participate in the primary to nominate candidates for Representatives in Congress a necessary part of the right to participate in the election. The primary election, as above shown, is simply a substitute for its predecessor, a convention or a caucus, and it is as stated above, a mere nominating device. It is true that in the interest of economy and practical efficiency in voting, many States have recognized this nominating device and prepare a so-called official ballot in accordance with the result of the primary; but no one is restricted in his vote at the final election to the names on the official ballot. At the election proper a voter may substitute a name of his own choice in place of a name on the ballot; this right can not be refused, and it is frequently exercised. The right therefore to participate in the nomination is not a necessary part of the right to elect, nor is is indispensably connected with it. In State *v.* Johnson, supra, the court said:

"The independence of the elector to cast his vote at the general election for those whom he believes will best represent his political ideas or best conserve public intercourse remains undisturbed."

While it is true that Congress has in the act of August, 1911, recognized for some purposes the primary election, it has also equally recognized nominating conventions. Would it be contended that if plaintiff had been voting for a precinct delegate to a county convention, which in turn should elect delegates to the congressional convention, which in turn should make nominations for Representatives in Congress, and the precinct judges had refused to count the plaintiff's vote as cast that a right of action in his favor would have arisen under the Constitution or laws of the United States? I think not. Yet his vote in the precinct would be a step taken toward the election of a Representative in Congress.

The weakness of the plaintiff's contention lies in the assumption that a nominating convention or a primary election is a necessary step in the election of a Representative in Congress. It is a very common step, but not a necessary step.

A primary election not being a necessary step in the election of a Representative in Congress, can not be held to be included by fair implication in the meaning of the term "election" as used in the Constitution of the United States touching the election of Representatives in Congress.

Whether it might be desirable for Congress to fully recognize and adopt the States' primary elections and the laws relating thereto so far as they relate to the nominations of Representatives in Congress and to provide for the protection and enforcement of the rights of voters at such primary elections is a question which the courts are not called upon to decide. It is sufficient to say that as yet Congress has not specifically done so, and, in my opinion, it has not done so by implication.

Before the court can grant the present application of the plaintiff it must decide that it has jurisdiction of the case on the ground that the action is one arising under the Constitution or laws of the United States. In my opinion the action does not so arise, either directly or by fair implication. Therefore I am constrained to hold that this court has not jurisdiction of the action, and it necessarily follows that the present application must be denied.

In view of the foregoing, it becomes unnecessary to decide or to discuss the other questions involved in the application.

Dated October 2, 1915.

WILBUR F. BOOTH, *Judge.*

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business—the Philippines government bill.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Nebraska is not debatable.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to ask unanimous consent to say a few words.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from Nevada saying a few words? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I hope the motion made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] will be defeated, because the regular order is the consideration of the calendar. When the calendar was last before the Senate we were in the consideration of the joint resolution providing for the appointment of a joint committee of the two Houses of Congress to inquire into interstate commerce. That matter has been dragging along for two or three days, but it will take only half an hour, or three-quarters of an hour, to conclude it, according to my present advices. I hope, therefore, that the regular order will be pursued.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 381.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I offered the amendment which is now before the Senate as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas. Various amendments have been proposed to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. That Senator himself has had printed a different amendment, which, as I understand, he desires to substitute for his original amendment. Under the parliamentary procedure of the Senate none of these amendments are in order until the substitute which I have offered shall have been disposed of. I have, however, no disposition to prevent the consideration of these various amendments, and it may be that upon their presentation and consideration the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas may be so modified that it will meet with my approval. I therefore feel constrained at the present time to withdraw my amendment, with the statement that later on I may reintroduce it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I had intended to give my views regarding this bill at some length. It is a most inviting field for discussion, but it has been considered from every viewpoint, and I shall not take much of the time of the Senate. In view of the votes I am going to cast, however, I deem a word of explanation proper.

I have no serious objections to the bill itself. Practically everybody in the Philippines seems to think some legislation of this character should be enacted now. I would be glad to vote for it standing alone.

I am unalterably opposed, however, to the preamble which pledges us to give the Filipinos their independence when we think it will be for their permanent benefit. While I believe it would be well for us when the Philippines shall be established as an absolutely independent nation, the time for that is not now. The preamble admits this fact, and those who know the situation know this to be a fact. The interests of the Filipinos should not alone determine the time for their separation from us. Our interests are at least of equal importance, and should not be disregarded, as they are in this pledge.

This problem is to be solved in the future, and future legislators should not be hampered or embarrassed by unnecessary action on our part. Let us solve the problems that confront us and leave them to solve their problems in their own way. No declaration with reference to independence is necessary now. It should not be made. It can only do harm. Wisdom, justice, and patriotism will not die with us. Future legislators will be just as wise and just as patriotic as we are. The conditions that will confront those who must deal definitely and directly with the question of independence may be entirely different from those which now confront us.

We have a striking illustration now of how quickly a change may be wrought in our public affairs and in our opinions and judgments. On December 8, 1914, a little over a year ago, the President of the United States was telling us in clear, classic, but emphatic language, not to get excited over war preparation, and that there was no need of changing the policy which we had been pursuing, while now, according to press reports, he is going to start out on a campaign of education to convince the people of the country that we are in danger from attack, that we lack adequate military preparation, and that immediate war preparation should be made. That message of December 8, 1914, was very unwise, if he is right now, and can only be a source of embarrassment.

These propositions regarding independence, in my judgment, Mr. President, would not be presented now except for the partisan declarations that have been made in political platforms heretofore framed in political conventions to meet what were thought to be existing partisan conditions, and largely through the influence of that gentleman who is now apparently considerably discredited within the ranks of his own party. They are here not in response to a sentiment from the Philippines, but because of these political platform promises. Let us not make the same mistake concerning the Philippines that the President made regarding preparedness. Let us not embarrass future legislative bodies or executive officers by unnecessary legislative compacts or unwise declarations regarding future action. I shall vote against the whole measure if the preamble is kept in or if any promise with reference to future independence is included in the bill.

I shall vote against any amendment looking to the neutralization of the islands through agreements with foreign countries. At first I was favorably impressed with this suggestion, but reflection has convinced me that it is fraught with the greatest of danger to us. This is a most inopportune time to attempt such negotiations. To suggest such treaties is to show our suspicion and distrust, and might, with some reason, be taken by certain countries as a national affront, and especially by the nation against which we are unwisely almost daily voicing our fear and suspicion.

Even if other nations were willing to enter into such a treaty, it would only mean trouble and danger for us to become a party to it. We want no entangling alliances about the Philippines. We should keep control of them until we are satisfied they are ready for independence, and then, if we want to withdraw our sovereignty, we should do so without any strings attached to our action. The only wise course for us to pursue is to continue the good work that we have been doing in the discharge of an unsought duty and maintain our sovereignty there until we believe it is for their best interests and ours that they be freed from our sovereignty, and then give them that freedom. Let them then take their place among the free and independent sovereignties of the world and work out their own destiny in their own way and without any obligations whatever upon our

part to protect or defend them. I can not conceive of any relation more unwise or more dangerous for us than the maintenance of a protectorate over the Philippine Islands. It would impose upon us the burdens and dangers of sovereignty without the power or opportunity of avoiding or preparing to meet them.

We have done a marvelous work in the Philippines. No nation in the world's history can point to a similar achievement. We freed them from the bondage of Spain. We took their multitude of tribes, some savage and some semisavage, speaking many different dialects, and are making of them a homogeneous people. Savagery is being eradicated, order is maintained, the principles of free government are being applied, and self-government established. Splendid roads have been constructed, a splendid public-school system established, sanitary measures perfected, agricultural development encouraged, and everything is being done to give these people self-government, and not only fit them for self-government but for independence. Let us not endanger this good work by prophetic declarations that can only hamper and embarrass future partiotic Congresses and lead to dissension, disorder, and insurrection in the islands and dangerous complications with other nations.

Mr. President, I find on my desk this morning an amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. A hasty reading of it leads me to look upon it as the best proposition that has been submitted thus far, if this Congress proposes to take any action at all with reference to the independence of the Philippine Islands. That amendment does provide for a certain and definite course.

If Congress is satisfied that the Philippines are ready for independence and that they want independence, then, I would say, let us give it to them and establish them as a separate government and withdraw entirely from the islands. My position is that we ought to stay there as long as it is necessary for us to stay there, in our interest and theirs, and in the discharge of the duty which I think rests upon us, and then, when we get out, get out entirely, leaving them to take their place among the nations of the earth to work out their own destiny as best they can. I do not think that time has come. They are not ready or fitted for independence. Our duty is not fully discharged.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, as I understand, the pending question is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. Am I correct about that?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, let us clear up that matter. I understand that several substitutes or amendments to the amendment which I proposed have been offered; among others, one by the Senator from Iowa. Of course I have no preference as to the order in which the several propositions shall be considered. I do not know which one is before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed by the Secretary that they have been printed and are on the table, but have not been formally offered.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I take it for granted that the last amendment I offered is formally before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The substituted amendment of the Senator from Arkansas is formally before the Senate, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] having withdrawn the amendment submitted by him.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Let me inquire if it is a fact that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] has offered a substitute?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not offered it. The Senator from Iowa has had it printed, but has not offered it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then I am correct in saying that the pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Chair so informs me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is the substituted amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I desire to say a word or two with reference to the amendment, and incidentally with reference to some other matters that are under discussion in connection with the Philippine bill.

I am one of those who have always believed that from the point of view of the United States it is unfortunate that we have the responsibility for the Philippine Islands upon our hands. But a nation, like an individual, sometimes has a responsibility which is unfortunate, which constitutes a great burden, but of which the nation, like the individual, can not decently rid itself.

Mr. President, we engaged in war with Spain upon the theory that she was unfit to govern in Cuba. As a necessary part of the prosecution of that war our fleet under Commodore, now Admiral, Dewey went to Manila, and there sank and destroyed the Spanish fleet. The destruction of the Spanish fleet, and the subsequent taking over of the city of Manila, practically put an end to the Spanish government there. It put an end to the only responsible government in the Philippine Islands. There were Americans there—few in number at that time, it is true. There were citizens of the various countries of Europe who had settled in the Philippine Islands and engaged in business; and in addition to our responsibility with reference to the natives of the islands we had certain very clear duties to perform with reference to these foreign citizens.

That being so, it became obligatory upon us to set up a government in the Philippine Islands, which we did. I have said that I think it was unfortunate that we were obliged to do that; but if we will look at the situation for a moment we must all admit that it was an absolute necessity.

What were the courses open to the United States at that time? First, we could have turned the islands back to Spain when we concluded the treaty of peace with that Government. Second, we could have turned the islands over to some other country than Spain. Third, we could have permitted the people of the islands to set up an independent government of their own, and ourselves have withdrawn. And, fourth, we could retain possession and set up a responsible government of our own.

It is perfectly apparent that the first course was entirely unthinkable. We had engaged in a war with Spain upon the theory that she was unfit to govern in Cuba. Surely, if she was unfit to govern in Cuba she was unfit to govern in the Philippines. So that that alternative was at once dismissed as entirely out of the question.

Second, we could have turned the islands, as I have said, over to some other country. I have no doubt that at that time England would have been glad to take them; Japan would have been glad to take them; almost any other country would have been glad to take them over. But for us to have taken that course would have been to invite friction and trouble and quarrels among those countries.

Third, we could have turned the islands over to the people themselves, but everybody who was familiar with the situation agreed that the people of the Philippine Islands were utterly incapable of carrying on a government of their own. So we accepted the fourth alternative, not as being a thing that it was pleasing for us to do but as being, under the circumstances, the only thing that we could do.

We have been in possession of the Philippine Islands for 17 years. On the whole, I think that no nation, no people in the history of the world has ever performed for a dependent people a greater service, a more altruistic service, than the people of the United States have performed for the people of the Philippine Islands. I think, on the whole, we have been there for their good. They are in far better condition to-day than they ever have been before, and in far better condition, I confidently believe, than they possibly could have been under any other disposition of the islands.

I am not going to recount the story. We have built schoolhouses, we have been educating the children, we have built good roads, we have extended to the people of the Philippine Islands just as rapidly as it was possible and safe to do so the principles and the opportunities of self-government; and the question now arises, What is the wise thing to do for the future?

And, Mr. President, it is not only a question as to what is the wise thing to do, but it is a question as to what is the righteous thing to do under all the circumstances. A nation, like an individual, may be obliged to carry a burden for the sake of righteousness. Responsibilities comes to nations as they come to individuals. Every individual who is strong and self-reliant is obliged to take upon himself burdens which he would be glad to get rid of if he could do so consistently with the performance of duty; and so we must consider that phase of the subject in dealing with the Philippine Islands.

If we turn them over to the people themselves, we can not escape moral responsibility for our act any more than the Levite could escape by passing by on the other side. We are there, and if we withdraw from those people the strength of this Government, the upholding hand of this Government, and disaster follows, we are morally responsible for it.

I do not know when the Philippine Islands will be ready for self-government; but I feel quite sure that they never will be ready for independence until they are ready for self-government. Independence without the ability to carry on an orderly government would be a mockery.

What has been the situation? What is the situation to-day? There are three races of people settled in these islands, speak-

ing different languages and dialects. I do not know how many there are. I do not know that anybody knows how many different languages are spoken in the islands. The people range from a degree of barbarism and savagery up to a very high degree of civilization. Among the Tagalogs, of course, there are men of intelligence, who are capable of carrying on the affairs of a government; but they have to deal with all these other people, millions of people who are utterly incapable of discharging the duties of citizenship.

If, under these circumstances, we withdraw from the islands and allow the people to set up an independent government of their own, it seems to me perfectly obvious that it will be only a matter of a year or two, perhaps a month or two, until they will be at each other's throats. They are not only of different races and of different languages but they are of different religions. There are the people in the south part of the archipelago who are Mohammedans, and the people in the northern part who call themselves Christians. For centuries those people have been in strife with one another. The people of the south have been fitting out expeditions and going up into the north and making war. To me it is perfectly evident that the moment the authority and power of the United States is withdrawn that condition will reassert itself; and the final result will be, without multiplying words about it, that a condition of anarchy will prevail throughout the islands. The situation will be that the Philippine government will constitute an international nuisance that some strong nation or some strong nations will feel obliged to suppress; and the final result will be that some strong nation will take possession of the islands, and the last lot of the Filipinos will be far worse than their first.

This preamble that has been incorporated in the proposed law recites that—

Whereas it is desirable to place in the hands of the people of the Philippines such an increasing control of their domestic affairs as can be given them without in the meantime impairing the sovereignty of the United States, in order that, by the use and exercise of popular franchise and governmental powers, they may be better prepared to fully assume the responsibilities and enjoy all the privileges of complete independence—

Then follows—

which it is the purpose of the United States to grant.

What is meant by "the United States"? Does it mean the people of the United States? If so, the statement is not true. The people of the United States never have signified their purpose or desire to grant independence to the Philippine Islands. On the contrary, whenever they have spoken—and they have spoken upon three or four separate and distinct occasions—they have declared exactly the contrary. Our friends on the other side of the Chamber declared in favor of Philippine independence in 1900, and we joined issue with them and went before the people of the country upon that issue. Mr. Bryan called it the paramount issue of the campaign, and it was so regarded by a great many people who participated in the campaign. At any rate, whether it was the paramount issue or not, it was one of the leading issues of the campaign; and the people of the United States intelligently passed upon it, and if their votes meant anything they meant that they repudiated the Democratic suggestion that we should withdraw from the Philippine Islands.

The same followed in 1904 and 1908. In 1912 a majority of the people did not speak in support of the Democratic platform, or any part of it. A minority of them—a trifle over 40 per cent—voted to put the Democratic Party into power, and therefore may be said to have approved the Democratic platform. Whenever the people of the country have spoken through a majority in favor of one party or the other they always have repudiated this idea of withdrawing from the Philippine Islands. So it is inaccurate to say that it is the purpose of the United States to do this thing, if we mean, by "the United States," the people of the United States.

But the preamble proceeds—

which it is the purpose of the United States to grant when, in the judgment of the United States, it will be to the permanent interest of the people of the Philippine Islands.

What do we mean by that? In the first place, who is to judge of that condition? I suppose that in that connection the words "the United States" mean the Congress of the United States, because that is the only agency of the United States which has the power to speak. It seems to me that such a declaration as that is absolutely certain to invite trouble. I can not conceive of a more mischievous declaration, because, as we all know, in a very short time the people of the islands who desire independence will be declaring that it is for the permanent interest of the people to have independence, and, if Congress is not prepared to agree with them, that means disappointment, ill feeling, and, very likely, insurrection. It means trouble, in any event, and serious trouble.

The declaration is objectionable from another point of view. It is a maxim of law and it is a rule of common sense that the expression of one thing is the exclusion of all other things. We assert here that it is our purpose to grant independence when it will be to the permanent interest of the people of the Philippine Islands. That is equivalent to saying that it is not our purpose to grant independence under any other circumstances or conditions. No matter what may transpire hereafter, no matter how extreme the necessity of getting rid of the islands from the point of view of the United States alone may be, if we are to keep our pledge, we have tied our hands against parting with the Philippines except upon the single condition which is expressed.

So, Mr. President, if the opportunity presents itself, I shall vote to strike out from the bill the preamble as being mischievous and dangerous.

Mr. LIPPITT. Will the Senator from Utah permit me?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly.

Mr. LIPPITT. I am very glad indeed to have the Senator from Utah call attention to that feature of the preamble which seems to deprive the United States from having the power to grant independence to those islands on any other ground except the fact that it may be for the permanent interest of the Philippine Islands. I am not a lawyer myself, and I am very glad indeed to have the Senator from Utah, who is a very eminent lawyer, give his approval to that interpretation of it, because it does seem a very vital thing, in connection with this whole subject, that the United States is depriving itself of acting for its own advantage if it should be necessary at any subsequent time. I only want to express my approval of that view.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Of course, pledges of that kind can be disregarded hereafter; but I have no doubt in my own mind that that is the proper interpretation of it. So if we can conceive of a case arising hereafter where the people of the Philippine Islands will conclude that it is not to their advantage to separate from the United States, we are bound to remain there if we keep this pledge, no matter how onerous or burdensome it may become for us to do so.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to suggest to the Senator that it is not at all impossible that, as the years go by and the interests of the two countries become more closely united, instead of there being a party in the Philippine Islands crying for independence, there will be one there urging us not to abandon them, and they would then have the right to come back upon this preamble and say in substance that we had promised that we would not do it until it was for the benefit of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the people of the Philippine Islands consider the question intelligently and dispassionately, they are bound to come to the conclusion that it is far better for them to remain under the control of the United States Government than it is for them to undertake to carry on a government of their own. I do not know how long it will take to educate the people of the Philippine Islands to the point where independence can safely be intrusted to them. I do not go quite as far as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] did the other day. I do not believe it is a matter of a century; I doubt whether it is a matter of 50 years; but I think it is a matter of at least another generation. Until the new generation has grown up, until they have been educated in the schools which we have established, until the English language has become the predominant language in the islands, I do not believe it is safe to intrust independence to those people.

Some things have been said here with reference to imposing upon those people the English language. To my mind, the greatest blessing that we could confer upon them is to educate them in the English language. It is the language of Anglo-Saxon liberty, the language in which the highest ideals of government have been written, and no people can study and understand that language without understanding to some extent the literature of the language and making a part of themselves those high ideals of government which my reading of history teaches me are the greatest and best that the world has ever seen.

Only 10 per cent of those people to-day are capable, or even measurably capable, of carrying on the operations of self-government. As was said here the other day in the discussion of the Senator from Idaho, if we could imagine a situation where 10 per cent of the people of those islands were educated Americans, even they would be incapable of carrying on a free government with 90 per cent of the people illiterate and many of them barbarians. If it would be impossible for a population of which

10 per cent were Americans to carry on the government, how much more clear is the impossibility of a population consisting of only 10 per cent of educated and capable literate Filipinos doing the same thing?

The thing that keeps the people of those islands together, the thing that makes orderly government possible, and the only thing that does it, is the strong arm of the United States, and I think it is a wicked thing to suggest at this time the idea of withdrawing our strength from those people and leaving them to their own helplessness.

Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] has offered an amendment which, with all due deference to him, I think is a little worse than this preamble. The Senator from Arkansas proposes to authorize and direct the President to withdraw our sovereignty from the islands in not less than two years nor more than four years. If he would stop there, simply making a hard and fast rule that we should get out of the islands and leave them alone, while I should not be in favor of it, I should regard it as preferable to the provisions of this preamble, but he goes further and inserts a proviso which reads:

That if the President, at the expiration of the said period of four years, shall find that the condition of the internal or external affairs of said Philippines in respect to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government thereof is such as to warrant him in so doing, he is hereby further authorized, by proclamation duly made and published, to extend the said time to and including the date of the final adjournment of the session of Congress which shall convene next after the date of the expiration of the said period of four years.

So we do not cut ourselves loose from the Philippine Islands. We authorize the President within two or four years, if he thinks it is the wise thing to do, to withdraw, but it is left entirely in his hands, so far as that part of it is concerned. If at the expiration of four years he concludes—and if he investigates the situation over there in the meantime as thoroughly as he ought to investigate it, in my judgment, he must conclude—that the condition of the internal and the external affairs of the Philippines in respect to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government is not such as to justify immediate independence—if he concludes that, as I say I think he must conclude, then we have simply made an offer of independence to those people with a string to it, which we have pulled back at the end of that time, and the result will be a mischievous situation, quite as bad, and perhaps worse, than that which is invited by the language of the preamble.

In the meantime the Republican Party will come into power again. We know what the view of that party has been. We know what is likely to be the view of the nominee of that party, who will be elected by the people. Suppose he concludes that the situation is such as to demand action under this proviso. Then we shall have invited revolution, insurrection, and bloodshed.

The wise thing to do is to leave them alone, to go on as we have been doing, to keep adding to the schools in the country, to proceed with our education of the people, to keep teaching them the lessons of good government, to extend further and further the principles and opportunities of Anglo-Saxon self-government, to say nothing about independence, but to wait until in God's good time, 30 years hence, 40 years hence, 50 years hence, whenever it may be, that everybody will recognize the fitness of the people for self-government and independence, and then, and not till then, withdraw and let them set up a government of their own, but in the meantime leave the subject of independence alone.

Mr. President, to my mind that is not the most mischievous part of this proposed amendment. It provides further that—

Immediately upon the passage of the act the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located, in the form of a treaty or other character of binding agreement, whereby the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines—

And further—

and also to mutually obligate themselves, equally and not one primarily nor to any greater extent than another, to maintain as against external force the sovereignty of said Philippines.

In other words, we are to invite the other nations of the world, or such of them as may join with us to maintain a protectorate over those islands, to maintain them as against external force from any other country or people. If that can not be done, then the amendment further provides that the United States is to undertake that burden alone.

Now, what does that mean? It means that we are to withdraw from the islands. It means that we are to have no Army there, of course. It means that we are to leave them to their own devices, to carry on their own affairs in their own way, and then if trouble results between them and Japan or between them and Germany or any other country, no matter what the cause of the trouble may be, we must take upon ourselves the burden of defending a country thousands of miles away from our shores against any force that may be exerted by any other country.

In other words, it proposes to extend the Monroe doctrine into Asia. Some of us are looking ahead with more or less apprehension to being obliged some day to defend the Monroe doctrine upon this hemisphere. I believe in maintaining that doctrine upon this hemisphere at all hazards, but I do not believe it is wise to extend it into the Orient and to pledge ourselves to do with reference to the Philippine Islands what I think we would be bound to do with reference to one of the countries in Central or South America. Yet that is the situation in which this proposed amendment will leave us.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does not the Senator think that we are invading the Monroe doctrine in the Orient now in the possession of the Philippines?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No, Mr. President, I do not. We are there in our own right. It is the Government of the United States which is in the Philippine Islands. We are in the Philippine Islands, not by quite as strong a tie but by as clear a right and as great a power as we are in Hawaii.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As we are in Guam and as we are in Porto Rico.

Mr. GALLINGER. Or Alaska.

Mr. CUMMINS. Suppose Japan would take possession of Mexico and say, "We are there by virtue of our power," I assume the Senator from Utah would think that the Monroe doctrine had been somewhat infringed upon.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Undoubtedly.

Mr. CUMMINS. Why can not Japan say the same thing to us about the Philippines?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The difference is quite obvious. We would invoke the Monroe doctrine while Japan was undertaking to do that. We would not invoke it after Japan has established herself and set up a government there. We do not invoke the Monroe doctrine against the English Government in Canada, because they are there; but if the English Government should undertake to invade one of the independent Republics in Central or South America, then there would arise an occasion for invoking the Monroe doctrine. But, as I have said, we are in the Philippines by the same title and the same power that we are in Guam or Porto Rico. It is not a question of maintaining the Monroe doctrine; it is a question of maintaining our sovereignty in the Philippines.

Mr. CUMMINS. I agree that we are there with the same power.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Precisely the same power.

Mr. CUMMINS. The power of conquest. The territory that the United States has, with the exception of Hawaii and Alaska, is the result of conquest.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Undoubtedly. It was the result of war in many cases followed by a treaty which the other people to the treaty were more or less coerced into making.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator speaks of war and conquest. What about the Louisiana Purchase and others of that character?

Mr. CUMMINS. We have the Louisiana territory by the technical title of France. France had no more title to the Louisiana territory than she had to the golden streets of the New Jerusalem, and we had to conquer the territory in order to hold it.

Mr. WARREN. The assertion was made that all our possessions were acquired by us by conquest.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator from Wyoming is undoubtedly correct. I was speaking of other possessions of the United States. We have acquired territory by purchase. We acquired Alaska, of course, by very peaceful methods.

Mr. GALLINGER. And the Gadsden Purchase.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. And the Gadsden Purchase. That is quite true; but we are in the Philippines in our own right, and what we are maintaining is not the Monroe doctrine, but our own sovereignty. But if we withdraw from the Philippines and permit them to set up an independent government, then if we undertake to defend them against force from an outside power we are not doing it by virtue of our sovereignty, but we are doing it by virtue of having extending a protectorate over them, and by virtue of having extended something in the nature of the Monroe doctrine into Asia.

Mr. President, I think that is a very dangerous burden for us to take upon ourselves; I think it is a very unnecessary burden. Suppose that a condition should arise in the Philippine Islands such as I indicated a moment ago, that there should be domestic

disturbances resulting in revolution. Whatever others may think about it, in my judgment that will be the result. If Mexico can not carry on a government of its own, if revolution is the normal condition of affairs there, surely a people who are, if anything, less capable of self-government, must bring themselves to the same unhappy pass. There is bound to be revolution; there is bound to be bloody revolution in the Philippine Islands whenever we withdraw our power and our protecting arm from them; it is inevitable, as I view the situation. Suppose that condition arises and Japan, a near neighbor, says, "We can not tolerate that condition; we can not permit the Philippine Islands to make an international nuisance of themselves, to be disturbing the international peace, and we will put an end to it." No matter how strong the excuse might be for the intervention of Japan or of any other country, we shall have bound ourselves by this solemn agreement to engage in a bloody and costly war. It is the same condition that might exist if some European country had agreed to maintain Mexico against the intervention of any other country. In such an event, no matter how much violence multiplied in Mexico, we would be powerless to intervene, except at the cost of a war with the power that had guaranteed to protect them. Do we want to put ourselves in that position in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand the Senator from Utah is now addressing himself to the criticism of the proposition that this Government shall guarantee the independence of the Philippine Islands for five years after we have retired from the islands.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That means nine years from the date of the passage of this bill, if it passes.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I understand the amendment as now drafted provides for four years.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Well, add five years to it, and that makes nine years.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; you add two years to it under the provision that the President may extend the time until the end of the following Congress, which might be six years.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator will pardon me just a moment, the amendment provides that "guaranty" shall be given "on behalf of the United States alone for the period of five years from and after the expiration of said period of four years, or any extension thereof."

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; it means a guaranty of five years after we have retired from the islands.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then I am correct in saying it is nine years.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; it is nine years, including the time before we retire and the time we guarantee the independence of the islands.

Mr. President, I understand the party to which the Senator from Utah belongs, while they do not believe in the immediate surrender of our control of the Philippines, have at all times held out to the Filipino people the hope and expectation that when, in the judgment of this Government, they were prepared for self-government this Government would withdraw from the islands. I take it that the Senator believes that policy should be pursued.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is my own judgment about it.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is the Senator's own judgment. Now, if the Senator's party should come into the control of the Government hereafter—and I hope that time may be long in the future—and should decide that the time had arrived to set the Filipino people free, would the Senator from Utah insist that this Government had no obligation to extend to them some protection for any period of time whatever?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator from Utah insists absolutely upon that.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me ask the Senator, before he answers that——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let me finish my reply to the Senator. So long as we are there, we are under the gravest responsibility to protect those people against outside force; to give them a good government; to give them the very best government of which we are capable; but when they are ready for independence and we are ready to get out, then my position is that we have no further obligation; we shall recognize them as a sovereign nation, equal in the eyes of international law to the greatest nation in the world, and we shall not owe them the duty of protecting them after having recognized a status of that character.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then, let me suggest to the Senator from Utah, would it not lead to this situation: During this period of preparation for self-government the Philippine Islands would be under the control and dominion of the United States; the Filipinos would have no powers or functions of government that we did not see fit to accord to them; it would be our Government; it would be our control. When they are turned loose and our control ceases, would they not find themselves without an army, without a navy, without a regularly established government of their own; and during the period when they were organizing and getting ready for defense in case of invasion, would we not leave them, carrying out the policies of the Senator's own party, in a very pitiable and helpless condition? Does not the Senator from Utah think that ordinary generosity, ordinary fair treatment, and justice to those people, would appeal to us to stand sponsor for their independence; to stand between them and external invasion until at least they could prepare themselves measurably for defending their own rights and their own territory?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, my position is that the Philippine Islands——

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator please, if we should withdraw to-day from the Philippine Islands, would we not leave them absolutely helpless, absolutely unable to defend themselves, because they have had no control, they have had no opportunity to organize for defense, either by way of providing a navy or providing an army? They have neither, and they can not have either, until we have withdrawn and given them an opportunity to provide them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, what I have been insisting on all the time is that we ought not to withdraw from the Philippine Islands until the Filipinos are capable; that we ought not to take that step.

Mr. SIMMONS. They might be capable of self-government, if the Senator will pardon me; you may hold them until they are capable, if they ever can qualify themselves, and then turn them loose, and with all their capacity they would still be helpless, because until the moment of our surrender of American control they would have had no opportunity to provide for their protection.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the capacity for self-government is not the only thing that is required. I would not leave them until they were not only able to govern themselves from the standpoint of intelligence and ability, but not until by having set up under our guidance their self-governing institutions and prepared for their own defense they were able to care for themselves. I would not leave them until they were in that situation. But my point is that whenever the time comes that we are ready to withdraw upon the theory that they are to be recognized as an independent and sovereign nation, the time has come to get rid of all our responsibility, and we should be responsible after that time for the Philippine Islands in no greater or different sense than we are responsible for China or any other country with which we have never heretofore had the relations that we have had with the Philippine Islands.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Utah probably knows, and I think the Senator from North Carolina knows but has overlooked the fact, that we are preparing them now. We have in the Philippines an army of scouts who are being educated for war, and they amount now to many thousands, including those now in the service and those who have been discharged from time to time from the service after having received the military education and training afforded. There is also a competent and powerful constabulary force in the islands; and in addition we are fortifying the islands. We are fortifying them very thoroughly and heavily; we are putting in the same kind of defenses—in fact, I might say superior defenses to those we are installing in our own or mother country. I might also say that we have gone so far amongst the communities of the south which have been referred to, the Moros for instance, as to form companies, and almost regiments, of native scouts, which are to-day defending the southern part of the archipelago. The island of Mindanao has no white troops now, but is defended by native troops.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I so understand the situation.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator from Utah will pardon me. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Wyoming if the

constabulary and scouts are not merely a police force? We are not organizing the Filipinos into an army for the purpose of defense against external invasion.

Mr. WARREN. As to the constabulary, yes; as to the scouts, no. The scouts are an army. I wish to say, if the Senator from Utah will permit me——

Mr. SIMMONS. But, if the Senator will pardon me, before he turns his attention to the Senator from Utah, as he in part addressed his remarks to me, are we providing them with any navy?

Mr. WARREN. Not so far.

Mr. SIMMONS. Is not a navy the chief reliance the island people would require in case of invasion? Are they not situated very much like the British Isles are situated? Their defense is dependent entirely upon the size and strength of their navy, and they have recognized that fact in their traditional policy. Are not the people in the Philippine Islands in the same situation and would it do any good to turn the islands over to them, so far as their protection is concerned, even if they did have a small army, if they had no navy?

Mr. WARREN. A navy is largely an attacking force. We are already providing in the Philippines, as I have said, harbor defenses of a character that can be no more than equaled in any other country; certainly they are not surpassed. We have not built them a navy; in fact, we have not built our own beyond a defensive strength and hardly up to that. The Philippines must depend always, as we do, largely upon fortifications.

If the Senator from Utah will allow me, I should like to say a few words now, because I have to leave the Chamber soon in connection with duties as a member of a subcommittee engaged in important work. I intended to cover some of the ground which the Senator from Utah is so well covering. I suggest we had better think and plan a little further whether we have the Army and the Navy to make good our guaranty, if made as proposed in the Clarke amendment. Now, according to that, we propose to withdraw the Army and Navy from the Philippine Islands and then to be held in suspense for a certain number of years to respond when called upon to make our guaranty good. We are now there with a very considerable Army and some portion of the Navy. We are bound to have an Army and a Navy. The difference in expense is in supporting it there and here. It is a matter of nominal additional expense to support the force that we now have there during the time that the islands are in our charge, but when we leave the Philippines, leave them alone and independent, and then are called upon to make good the guaranty, what kind of a figure will we cut with Japan or some distant foreign country that may propose to annex the Philippines or to overrun them?

That is a matter to be thought of. Our Army now is confessedly too small, but no matter how large we may make it, no matter how far we may go along the path of preparedness, we do not expect to have an army of occupation in a country seven thousand or more miles away, as it would be essential to have if we undertook to requite the wrongs of that nation if attacked by another country.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator is quite right in his observations, and I entirely agree with him.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I want to remark, in reply to what the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] has said, that, as I understand the proposition of the Senator from North Carolina, we would be under some moral obligation to the Filipino people to protect them internationally until they had organized and established an army and a navy sufficient for their own protection, or at least to give them a reasonable time to do so; and he suggested that would be five years, or that the five-year period mentioned in this bill would enable them to do that. I think, if the Senator from North Carolina will reflect for a moment upon the actual conditions, that he will not entertain any such idea. It is perfectly obvious, it seems to me, that the Filipino people never will be able in any length of time to establish an army or a navy that could make any respectable showing whatever in any international conflict that they might have with any of the great military powers which we have in view as parties to the agreement that is proposed here. Against Japan or Germany or Great Britain the Filipino people would never be able to protect themselves.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I hope the Senator from North Carolina will be brief, because I wish to conclude.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will be brief. I do not think the Senator from Washington could have possibly understood me to mean in anything I have said that I thought the Filipino people would be able in many, many years after they are set free to provide an army and a navy sufficient to protect them against such a power as Great Britain or Germany or Japan. The thought I had in mind, and what I intended to suggest, was that the Filipino people before we went into the islands had been for a long period of time under the control of Spain. Since we have been there they have been under our control, and they will remain under our control until we leave there. When we do leave there they will have no government of their own; they will have to organize and establish one; they will have no army; they will have no navy; and it does seem to me that it would be rather a hard measure for us to take those people, who have never had an opportunity to establish a government or provide for defense, and after having held them suddenly to turn them loose so as to be the prey of the nations without any capacity or opportunity to prepare for their own defense. That was the only thought that I desired to emphasize.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina has demonstrated conclusively what a wicked thing it is to adopt this provision and to undertake to put the people of the Philippine Islands upon their own responsibility. He pictures them as a helpless people, incapable of defending themselves against other nations, which is all quite true. The people of the Philippine Islands ought not to be permitted to set up an independent government of their own and take their place in the family of nations until they have reached the point where we do not need to extend a protectorate over them. The very fact that you admit that we have got to defend them, look after them, and keep them in leading strings after they have obtained independence demonstrates that those people are not fit for independence now and will not be fit for independence in four years.

Mr. President, suppose the people of the Philippine Islands get into a quarrel with Japan, are we to go over there and engage side by side with them in a war on that country, no matter what the circumstances may be, whether Japan be right or wrong? Suppose that the conditions of the Philippine Islands, with respect to the treatment of the citizens of Japan, in six or seven years from now shall be as deplorable as the conditions in Mexico are with reference to our citizens, and Japan, as a great civilized power, believes that her national honor demands that she shall intervene for the protection of her own people and for the sake of civilization, the Senator from North Carolina would still have us intervene, go 7,000 miles across the sea with our Army and our Navy, and sacrifice the lives of our citizens in a cause, however bad it might turn out to be. I am not in favor of such a course.

Mr. President, just a word or two more and I am through. A good deal has been said from time to time about the Philippines being a source of weakness to us. I think in a sense that is true; but I think the danger to be apprehended has been greatly exaggerated. I do not think, for example, there is 1 chance in 100, so long as we maintain our place in the Philippine Islands, of Japan undertaking to take the Philippines from us.

In the first place, the Japanese expansion does not lie in that direction. I am informed, and I think credibly informed, that they have no idea of colonizing their people in that direction at all. In addition to that, I suspect that any attempt upon the part of Japan to invade the Philippine Islands would be very vigorously objected to by Great Britain, because to-day the feeling in Australia against Japanese settlement is quite as intense as it is upon the Pacific coast. The Australian people do not want Japanese immigration any more than the people of the Pacific coast desire it. With that feeling upon the part of that great English colony, I should imagine that it would be the desire of Great Britain to keep the Philippine Islands in the condition they now are, where, to some degree, they constitute a buffer between Japan and the English possessions.

So I do not think we are running any great risk in the future, any more than we have run in the past, by retaining the Philippines. That they never will become a source of great profit to us, I am quite willing to agree. That they will always be a burden upon us, I think is a good deal more than likely. Nevertheless, I believe it to be the duty of this great country, having once set its hand to the plow, to hold it there until the furrow has been plowed to the end.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I quite agree with the Senator with relation to the feeling of Japan in regard to the Philippine Islands at the present time; but I believe that that feeling toward the United States has become friendly by reason of the fact that

it has been repeatedly affirmed that our intention was not to hold the Philippine Islands permanently. Japan has a policy toward the Orient just exactly as we have toward the Western Hemisphere. Any aggression upon the part of any Government in the Orient is repugnant to her, as much so as the acquisition of any territory on this hemisphere is to the United States.

I have not any doubt that 15 or 16 years ago, when we first acquired the Philippine Islands, Japan thought it was an act of aggression on our part; but since that time, having been assured by the repeated declarations of Governors General of the islands that it was not our intention to hold them permanently, I believe their conduct has been in the direction of friendship toward us.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I quite understand that feeling on the part of Japan, and am able to sympathize with it. I can quite understand the feeling of resentment that a great power like Japan would have if they should regard our operations in the Philippines as an intrusion into the affairs of the Orient, just as we would regard a similar act on the part of Japan over here as an intrusion upon our domain.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But, Mr. President, I will say to the Senator, that if it were manifest to Japan that we intended to hold the Philippine Islands forever, or for any great period of time, that would indicate that we never intended to give them up, I believe that that hostile feeling would again arise in the minds of the Japanese people.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I am not in favor of holding the Philippine Islands forever, and I do not think the great majority of the American people are in favor of doing it, but I am in favor of leaving that subject alone, because the discussion of it and a declaration upon the subject is a mischief-making thing. The difference between the attitude of the Senator from Colorado and my attitude about it is that we are both in favor, when the proper time comes, of letting the Philippine Islands go, but the Senator wants to make a declaration about it. When he declares to the people of the Philippine Islands that they will be permitted to set up an independent government when they are ready for it he immediately invites them to say they are ready for it now or ready for it in a year, and that brings on a contest. Let the whole subject alone until the condition has arrived, and act, but make no promises in advance.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The difficulty with the situation, with respect to the Filipinos, is their desire to become independent immediately. If we make an indefinite declaration, or no promise at all, it will make a feeling of unrest right now, because they fear that there is an intention upon the part of the United States to hold them forever, or for an indefinite term; hence we would get more discord, more conflict, more antagonistic feeling, and perhaps insurrection, if we should deny to them a promise of their independence.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; and the Senator's party is responsible for that condition. If the Senator's party had been self-contained and had not been making these declarations in years past, the people of the Philippine Islands would not have felt as they do feel about it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, Mr. President, what has been responsible for this feeling is an instrument that was written 139 years ago, which declared that in order to attain the ends of the inalienable rights of man governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Every time a Filipino reads that declaration there comes the feeling upon his part that he should have a right to govern himself according to our own standard.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh, Mr. President, I have read that declaration many times and I have heard it thundered in many forums, but, after all, the question of self-government is a good deal more a matter of ability than it is of right. In a certain sense every human being has the right of self-government, but for the sake of those with whom he is obliged to associate it ought not to be accorded to him until he is capable of exercising the powers of self-government.

Why, Mr. President, the Declaration of Independence extended over the Indians in this country; and yet we kept them, hundreds of thousands of them, in subjection for a good many generations, because we thought that while in some remote sense they had a right to self-government, they were not capable of governing themselves. The two things must coexist—the right of self-government and the ability as well.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTING in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Just for a question. I want to finish, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I will not interrupt the Senator, then.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; if the Senator wishes to ask a question I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I was just going to suggest to the Senator, in answer to what was said by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], that I do not believe the Declaration of Independence had reference to the Indians. I do not think it had reference to any race in America except the Caucasians. The man who wrote that declaration was a slaveholder.

With reference to the Filipinos, however, the Senator will recall the fact that three-quarters of a century ago, or quite half a century before the Spanish fleet was sunk in Manila Bay, before the Americans had anything to do with the islands, there were revolutions in the Philippine Islands, and some of the utterances by their leader indicated a very profound sense of right and accurate idea as to government.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator let me interrupt him right there to ask him a question?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Yes, sir; I will.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator, I think, had very high regard for the ability of Booker Washington and some others of his race who had reached a high degree of intelligence. Does the Senator think that makes the negro race capable of self-government?

Mr. VARDAMAN. As a matter of fact, you know, it was not the negro race in Booker Washington that gave him the capacity to understand any sort of a government. As John J. Ingalls, of Kansas, said of Fred Douglass, it was the Anglo-Saxon reinforcement that gave him his mentality.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator does not answer my question. Does he think the negro race are capable of self-government?

Mr. VARDAMAN. From the standpoint of a white man, absolutely I do not. The negro has never anywhere shown sustained power for self-development or self-government. His present civilization in America is due to white domination, and the continuation of his civilization in America will depend upon the white man's control.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; notwithstanding the fact that there are among them many men who are very intelligent.

Mr. VARDAMAN. That is true; but I would be very much opposed to the United States going into Haiti, or any other country that belonged to the negro race, and taking their government away from them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is not the question.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If they could participate in the government of the United States without absolutely destroying the civilization of the white man, I should not be so much against it here. But we have tried it, and we find that the negro can live and prosper under the white man's government, whereas under the negro government, or even with the negro sharing it with the white man, the white man can not live.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But the Senator thinks, because José Rizal was a great patriot and a very intelligent man, who knew something about the affairs of government, and because a small percentage of the other people of the islands were of that character, that the Moros and the savages and the head-hunters are capable of self-government? Or does he want to set up an autocracy over there? Does he want to have a few of the Tagalogs governing the remainder of the people who are themselves incapable of self-government?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I will answer the Senator. I do not think they are capable of self-government as we understand it and practice it in America. Very few races in all the world's history have shown the power or capacity to govern themselves as the Americans and English do; but I do think they are capable of maintaining a government good enough for them. While I admit that the government of the Filipino by the American would not materially injure the Filipino, it would necessarily injure the American. It would injure any free government or republic that exercised that arbitrary, usurped power which we exercise in the Philippine Islands. I am in favor of "safety first." I want to get out more for the good of this Republic than I do for the good of the Filipinos. We are not going to share with the Filipino our Constitution, and we should not; but to withhold the Constitution from the Filipino while we hold him as a subject will surely do violence to our Constitution. I repeat, I am very much more interested in taking care of our own country, Government, and people than playing the rôle of guardian for the outside world.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, no country and no people ever will be injured by discharging a duty in the spirt in which

the American people have discharged their duty to the Filipinos.

I have finished what I desire to say, Mr. President, except that I want to speak just a word with reference to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. That is a straightforward, understandable proposition. I do not agree with it, because, as I have already said, I am in favor of retaining our place in the Philippines for a good many years yet to come without making any declaration at all upon the subject. But if we are going to get rid of them at all, we ought to get rid of them in the way proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, which is simply a straightforward declaration that we shall recognize them as an independent nation after we have submitted the question to a vote of their people and they have determined that they want to occupy that status; when that has been done, that we shall withdraw not only our Army and our Navy but all responsibility for their future, and let them take care of themselves. If we are to withdraw, that is the way to do it. But so long as we bear the responsibility of their defense we should maintain our effective control.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I have already spoken at considerable length on the original bill. As an excuse for asking the indulgence of the Senate now I simply wish to say that I feel deeply the importance and the seriousness of the questions involved in these proposed amendments. I hope I do not take the subject too seriously, nor myself too seriously, in this matter. I think of the latter I have never yet been accused. I recall that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] last evening said that it was a most serious and important question, and that it should have the very careful attention of every Senator here.

I confess, Mr. President, that after the discussion so far, and after hearing certain statements made by Senators on this side of the Chamber, I feel almost like one who is engaged with those who are leading a forlorn hope in opposition to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. I am convinced, however, that either in the original bill or in this proposed amendment, if enacted into law, we are making a great national mistake.

We sit here, it seems to me, taking counsel day after day, not of our courage, not of our confidence in the rectitude of our intentions toward the Philippines, not, it seems to me sometimes, with the high sense of duty that we ought to feel, but, rather, taking counsel of our fears and of our misgivings and of a somewhat worn-out pledge in a party platform, which had its inception, to begin with, in the necessity for a campaign issue 16 years ago.

And thus influenced we are forgetting many and most important considerations. We are forgetting the success of this Nation in the past in its acquisition and government of insular territory, its unqualified success down to the present time. We are forgetting that.

Furthermore, Mr. President, we are forgetting another thing. We are forgetting, as I believe, the tremendous material, commercial, and trade advantages that are to result by our retention of the Philippines until at least the Filipinos are capable of self-government. We are forgetting that.

Third, Mr. President, we are forgetting what is more important, to my mind, than every other consideration, and that is our responsibility, our moral obligation, toward the 8,000,000 inhabitants of the Philippine Islands.

As I hear this discussion go on and see so many Members of this body ready to cut loose from the Philippines and send them adrift it would seem that we have forgotten altogether that old principle of chivalry, noblesse oblige, nobility compels. We are now, in our anxiety to get rid of the Philippine Islands, forgetting that great principle, and to my mind, Mr. President, it is a principle that should appeal to our sense of duty as a great Nation toward a weak, and I may say on the whole and in the mass an illiterate people, that through the fortunes of war came into our possession and under our control 17 years ago, and in this view it ought to appeal to our Americanism—our patriotism.

Mr. President, I wish briefly to refer to some of the advantages arising out of our possession and retention of the Philippines. It has been urged on this floor that we should get rid of the Philippines, not simply out of consideration for the Filipinos but that we should get rid of them for the good of the American people. I think I can demonstrate otherwise, and that it will not be for the material benefit, at least of the American people, to be rid of these islands.

In the first place, Mr. President, the expense of the Philippine Islands to us has been greatly exaggerated. The chairman of the committee having the bill in charge and other Senators speaking for the bill have been unable to give definite statistics as to the annual expense of the Philippines to the United States Government; it varies all the way from $7,000,000 to $25,000,000 a year. With the administration of the civil government of the Philippines, carried on by and through revenues derived from the Philippines themselves, my judgment is that the lower number—$7,000,000—comes nearer the truth as to the actual expense of the Philippines to the United States.

Mr. President, there is another consideration with reference to that actual expense, whatever it is. Most of that, of course, is for the maintenance of an army of about 12,000 men in the Philippine Islands, but who can say what portion of that army of 12,000 men, if they were not in the Philippines, would not be in the service of the United States Government somewhere else than in the islands? So it is not fair and you can not consistently and truly charge the expense of the army in the Philippines to the holding and retention of the Philippine Islands.

Again, it has been said here on the floor of this Chamber that there is the expense of the Navy; but who can say and who has said that a single ship has been built for service in Philippine waters or because of our retention of the Philippines? I know, so far as the Army is concerned, there has been no time within the last three years when it would not have been said that we should have here on the continent, in addition to what we have, the number of soldiers now in the Philippine Islands. Had they been here they would have been in the service of the Government and would have formed, without being in the Philippine Islands, a part of the Regular Army of the United States with their thousand or more dollars a year of expense per man to the Government. So it is evident this matter of expense of the Philippine Islands, confined principally to military affairs and to our military establishment there, as it is, has been greatly exaggerated.

Let me speak for a moment of the commercial advantages. Admitting that there might be yet an expense for the maintenance of a military establishment in the Philippines, the participation in the commerce of the Philippine Islands on the part of American citizens, American manufacturers, American exporters will more than compensate the people of the United States for the expense caused by such military establishment. As showing the advantages of the Philippine Islands from a commercial standpoint, I wish to read the editorial heading to an article entitled "Getting into the Philippines," by Patrick Gallagher, editor of the Far Eastern Bureau, found in the Philippine Monthly for September, 1915:

"GETTING INTO THE PHILIPPINES."

[By Patrick Gallagher, editor of the Far Eastern Bureau.]

(Mr. Gallagher, well known to all Manila old-timers as the founder and first editor of the Philippine Free Press, was the guest of the New York Rotary Club at the Hofbrau House on the eve of "Occupation Day." His address, which was reported very fully in most of the newspapers throughout the United States, has evoked much favorable editorial comment. The Boston Transcript said on August 17: "Regarding the Philippines, which we now have possessed during 17 years, the popular mind has been like a child's mind, which peoples the silence and vivifies the night with goblins. 'Wish we were out of the Philippines,' is an expression confined to no one school of partisan political thought, and it is refreshing to find a happy rejoinder coming from the editor of the Far Eastern Bureau, that rejoinder being, 'But we are not yet in the islands.' Americans have found difficulty in projecting their understanding over the leagues of sea, and opinion is swayed by imaginings rather than by a realizing grasp of things as they are. Commercially we have 'barely scratched the foreshore' of the hithermost Philippine land. 'We ought to see,' remarks this critic, 'that our famous open-door policy in the East is useless to us if we fail to utilize that doorstep to the open door, the Philippines.' * * * 'Manila,' he points out, 'should serve as the base mart for serving millions of customers throughout the Orient.' Yet this doorstep of the open door grows mossy and we spend our time worrying lest some one else will want to put foot on it and use it. Militarily the position is about the same. We are neither in nor out of the Philippines, as, for example, we are positively and defensively in Panama."—Editor the Philippine Monthly.)

Yet, Mr. President, notwithstanding the surface has been barely scratched, as this writer says, our trade with the Philippine Islands grew from $120,000 or a little over in 1898 to $27,000,000 in 1914, and at that rate the years, I think, will be but few—10, 15, 20 years—until we can count upon our trade as being valued in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

Mr. STERLING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. Did the Senator give that as our export trade or the combined trade of the islands both in imports and exports?

Mr. STERLING. It is the export trade.

Mr. McCUMBER. And it has increased how much?

Mr. STERLING. From one hundred and twenty thousand and more dollars in 1898 to $27,000,000 in 1914.

Mr. McCUMBER. And what amount have the imports from the islands increased?

Mr. STERLING. The imports have been just about the same as the exports.

Mr. McCUMBER. They have increased in the same ratio?

Mr. STERLING. Increasing in about the same ratio, as I remember. If the Senator will excuse me, I think there is a difference of only a million or two dollars, and there has been only about that amount of difference for the last several years between the imports and the exports.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me ask the Senator if a great deal of the imports did not consist of sugar, tobacco, etc., and operated because of our taking the main duty off those products from the Philippines? In other words, we unprotected ourselves in order to obtain a very much greater supply from these foreign islands. Has not the greater portion of the increase in our exports been of beers, liquors, and other things connected with and for the use of Americans there?

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I will not say as to how much the duties or the want of duty on imports has affected the Philippine trade. It undoubtedly has affected it somewhat, but yet, Mr. President, I have no complaint to make with reference to that method of dealing with the Philippines and the Philippine trade.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me ask the Senator another question, if the Senator will be kind enough to answer it.

Mr. STERLING. Very well.

Mr. McCUMBER. If we would put the products of Great Britain upon the free list, we could probably increase the trade from Great Britain to this country 300 or 400 per cent very quickly, could we not?

Mr. STERLING. Yes; but that is a different situation, a different condition of things. These are our own possessions, in whose advancement and development we are so much interested, and if we can encourage the development of their resources by giving them favors in the matter of import duties, I think it is the part of wisdom to do so.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to call attention to another thought, and that is Manila's importance to our far eastern trade. This is from an article by Mr. S. S. Knabenshue, former American consul general at Tientsin, China. I quote a short extract or two from that article. He says:

British commercial interests at once went to work to develop the new port of Hongkong. At that time the only settlement on the island was a village of Chinese, half pirates, half fishermen, with less than 2,000 inhabitants. In less than three-quarters of a century this has grown into the city of Victoria, with a population of 215,000—of which only some 10,000 are whites, the remainder consisting chiefly of Chinese. It was Great Britain's first commercial outpost in the Far East, and is now the most important port in that quarter of the world. It is a vast emporium of trade, handling the products of China and the Indies, which are sent by its merchants to Great Britain and Europe; and in return all kinds of western merchandise are distributed to the ports of the East. It concentrates about 30 per cent of the total foreign commerce of China, and is a most important financial and shipping center for the entire Far East.

Much else he says here is of interest and importance, but I forbear taking the time to read it.

So, Mr. President, I can not help but think that from the material, the commercial standpoint we shall find very soon that the Philippine Islands are no burden to the people of the United States. On the contrary, they will prove to be of immense benefit.

I now allude briefly to the question of capacity for self-government. I agree almost entirely with what the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] had to say in his very able speech the other day upon this particular proposition. In corroboration of what he said, and to emphasize, too, what I have heretofore said upon this subject, I call attention to the very able article entitled "Self-government in the Tropics; an analysis," by Samuel L. Parrish, which is a reprint from the Journal of the National Institute of Social Sciences. He has this to say, among other things:

In an examination of governmental conditions which from time immemorial have existed in the Tropics I can find no instance of an orderly self-government, with representative institutions, evolved from the people themselves. Nor, on the other hand, have the efforts made by England in recent times to introduce responsible self-government in her tropical dependencies given any encouragement that the issue of such experiments will prove successful. The mental, moral, and economic factors are all at variance with the conditions required for an orderly self-governing community. Of the millions of men who now occupy and of the untold millions who since recorded time have been the indigenous inhabitants of the Tropics, I think it may safely be said that no one commanding figure, judged by world standards, has ever emerged from the mass to challenge the admiration of the world as a benefactor of mankind.

Going on, he says:

The fourth and last proposition which I have undertaken to develop is: That controlling economic conditions, external and internal, no less than moral obligation will increasingly compel the United States, as potentially, if not actually, the most powerful of the civilized nations, to bear its full share in the system of dependent tropical government and supervision now recognized as an international factor of unquestioned and growing importance. Of this question it may be said that since our Civil War none more vital has confronted the American people, and in the course of its solution may well be found practically most of the future danger points which must ever beset a progressive nation in the conduct of its political relations with the other nations of the world.

In considering broadly the development of interracial relations between the dominant and inferior races during the past century one can not but be impressed by the fact that the current has been distinctly in the direction of altruism, so far at least as Great Britain and the United States are concerned, and that, too, notwithstanding the recent outbreak of savage war among the dominant races who themselves inhabit the Temperate Zone.

Slavery has been abolished throughout Christendom, and oppression, injustice, and internecine strife have more and more been giving place to orderly government throughout the tropical dependencies ruled from the Temperate Zone.

Warren Hastings would be an anachronism in the India of to-day, while venal Spanish colonial governors in Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines already seem to belong to a bygone age.

So, Mr. President, so far as there is any danger of the oppression of the Filipinos as long as they remain a part of the United States, I think it is the last thing to enter the mind of an intelligent American to-day and the last thing to merit discussion here. Further, this writer says:

Powerful as was the factor of self-protection in our late war with Spain, a sense of moral obligation alone made that war popular.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President——

Mr. STERLING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LANE. I notice the remark made by the Senator that so long as the Philippines remain in the possession of this Government they will not be liable to an attack upon their country. My opinion is just the opposite. I believe that so long as they are a part of this Nation, lying 7,000 miles from the nearest coast of this country, as they do, they are the most vulnerable and open to attack, and would be the first part of it which would be attacked by any nation at war with us in order to compel us to defend that part of our property which is the hardest for us to defend. I believe they would, by reason of their geographical position, call for an enormous increase in our Army and Navy, and that when the attack came upon us we would lose them. In addition to having to defend them from our enemies at sea, the Filipino, who resent our occupancy of their country, would attack us from the rear, and we would have to fight not only with them but with the other nation at which we were at war.

There is an element of great weakness, as I see it, in our possession of the Philippines. I do not see how the Senator, if he considers the matter carefully and from any viewpoint which a nation should take in attempting to defend itself, can view it otherwise than that the possession of the Philippine Islands is a burden upon this country.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I take quite a different view than the Senator from Oregon on that proposition. I think our retention of the Philippine Islands will not make them the subject of attack necessarily, although that seems to be always assumed. Further, there will be the necessary fortifications on the Philippine Islands to repel attack. We already have in the island of Corregidor, in Manila Bay, a second Gibraltar. If we have a naval base and coal-supply stations, it will be necessary to have them fortified as well.

Further, Mr. President, there is this consideration, which goes beyond them all, that by our surrender of the Philippines we will not be able to stem the tide of trade and of commerce with those islands. We will not be able to prevent commercial rivalry and contest between nations by our surrender of the islands, or contests as to their respective fields or spheres of influence in the islands. A situation like that would be more likely to bring complications and breed trouble than will our retention of the islands, with the acknowledgment of our rights which would necessarily flow therefrom. To be considered, too, is the maintenance there of reasonably necessary fortifications for the islands, and these are largely there already.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, every ton of munitions of war, every troop of soldiers, and every war vessel must be conveyed across the sea 7,000 miles before reaching its destination. It is therefore the most open to attack, with the fact in addition, as I stated before, that the natives themselves would revolt against us. The Philippines will be the first point of attack. Next comes the Sandwich Islands and then the Pacific coast. The retention of the Philippine Islands may in the future lead to the loss of the Pacific coast to this country.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask the Senator if he is in favor of the proposition to guarantee the independence of the Philippine Islands?

Mr. LANE. No; I am not so enthusiastic or enamored with that proposal as are some other Members of the Senate.

Mr. STERLING. That is the proposition involved in this bill.

Mr. LANE. That part of it I do not care much for, but I would gladly see this country get out of there, and go kindly

with well wishes for the Filipinos, wishing them success in their independence and apologizing to them for the time that we have occupied the islands.

Mr. STERLING. While the Senator says he is not enthusiastic over the amendment which provides for a guaranty for five years, I should like to ask him if he proposes to vote for that amendment?

Mr. LANE. If it is the best I can secure toward freeing them, making them independent, and getting out of their country and away from it, allowing them to carry on their own government as they see fit and as we do ours, I will vote for it. If I can get something better, something going further, then I will vote for that.

Mr. STERLING. Yet the Senator realizes, does he not, that the guaranty may involve the very possibility of which he speaks—that of having a fleet in the Philippine Islands to maintain the guaranty?

Mr. LANE. But it is for a limited period. It is a pledge to get out as soon as some of the gentlemen think we can do so; but I would get out as soon as I could, without any guaranty and with many good wishes nicely expressed to the people of that country. However, I am going to take the best I can get.

Mr. STERLING. I say to the Senator simply this, that I go back to the original proposition that with the surrender of the Philippines now the complications that will likely arise because of disputes in regard to trade and commerce, coupled, perhaps, with unsettled conditions in the islands thereafter, would be more likely to involve us in trouble with a foreign nation having interests or seeking interests there than would the continued ownership and retention of the Philippines.

I will read one or two other excerpts from this paper:

But in considering the moral we must not forget the economic side of the question.

That is a question that I first ventured briefly to discuss.

As we note the progress of society through its various stages of evolution, there is nothing more striking than the constantly increasing importance, during the past 50 years, of the economic phase of international relations.

But the source of this superabundant energy and resultant accomplishment has been in the temperate zone, and now, as never before, it seeks outlets in the farthest corners of the earth. With the vast increase in the wealth of the dominant races, an ever-increasing demand is being made upon every heretofore outlying tropical province of the world to furnish whatever it can best produce, and receive in return therefor such products of the temperate zone as may be suited to its requirements.

And if for any reason this production and consumption are retarded by internal disorder, or conditions that science or skill can remedy, then these northern cormorants for economic results insist upon furnishing the remedy. The recent disturbance in the sisal-hemp district of Yucatan which threatened the binding-twine industry of the United States, and therefore the American farmer, would seem to have stirred the present administration to greater activity—if we except the incident of the failure to salute the flag—than anything else that has happened in Mexico for the past two years.

To bring order out of chaos for the purpose of permitting the normal economic development of a tropical island at our very doors was at least one of the avowed objects of our late War with Spain.

In the train of that war followed, in natural sequence, our occupation of the Philippine Islands, for in the redistribution of territory and spheres of influence, since the beginning of the decay of Spain's colonial empire, both in the temperate and tropic zones, the United States has been continuously, since the foundation of our Government, Spain's actual and logical heir. Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines are but corallaries of Florida and the original Spanish North American territory which came to us by forced cession after the Mexican War.

To what lengths the combination of economic necessity and moral obligation may yet compel the United States to go, no one may with safety predict, but I submit that we can not stand still. With the completion of the Isthmian Canal and the resultant increase in tropical trade, new problems arise.

So, Mr. President, although the Spanish-American War may have been the occasion of our ownership of the Philippines, we are Spain's "natural and logical heir." After Cuba and Porto Rico, the growing demands and needs of our eastern trade might easily without war lead us to the hope of dominating or acquiring the Philippines, and would have led us there eventually, to satisfy the demands of an ever-expanding trade.

Let me quote our former distinguished British Ambassador Bryce. At the beginning of his essay entitled "The Roman Empire and the British Empire in India," found in his "Studies in History and Jurisprudence," he institutes a comparison between these two great empires as conquering and ruling powers, acquiring and administering dominions outside the original dwelling place of their peoples, and impressing upon those dominions their own type of civilization; and he has this to say, which, I think, very pertinent to the broad issues here under discussion:

This comparison derives a special interest from a consideration of the position in which the world finds itself at the beginning of the twentieth century. The great civilized nations have spread themselves out so widely, and that with increasing rapidity during the last 50 years, as to have brought under their dominion or control nearly all the barbarous or semi-civilized races. Europe—that is to say, the five or six races which we call the European branch of mankind—has annexed the rest of the earth, extinguishing some races, absorbing others, ruling others as subjects, and spreading over their native customs and beliefs a layer of European ideas which will sink deeper and deeper till the old native life dies out. Thus, while the face of the earth is being changed by the application of European science, so it seems likely that within a measurable time European forms of thought and ways of life will come to prevail everywhere, except possibly in China, whose vast population may enable her to resist these solvent influences for several generations, perhaps for several centuries. In this process, whose agencies are migration, conquest, and commerce, England has led the way and has achieved the most. Russia, however, as well as France and Germany, have annexed vast areas inhabited by backward races. Even the United States has, by occupying the Hawaiian and the Philippine Islands, entered, somewhat to her own surprise, on the same path. Thus a new sort of unity is being created among mankind. This unity is seen in the bringing of every part of the globe into close relations, both commercial and political, with every other part. It is seen in the establishment of a few "world languages" as vehicles of communication between many peoples, vehicles which carry to them the treasures of literature and science which the four or five leading nations have gathered. It is seen in the diffusion of a civilization which is everywhere the same in its material aspects and is tolerably uniform even on its intellectual side, since it teaches men to think on similar lines and to apply similar methods of scientific inquiry. The process has been going on for some centuries. In our own day it advances so swiftly that we can almost foresee the time when it will be complete. It is one of the great events in the history of the world.

Mr. President, it is a world movement, then, so to speak—a civilized world movement—and we of America are within the sweep of that movement. Should we back down and out of the Philippines now we can not in the future escape the impulse or influence of this movement. In these times government itself and the establishment of governments wait on economic needs and on the demands of commerce, and the energy of this movement will not be stayed by this or by any other legislation that we may enact; it is a process not determined by written law.

So, as stated before, in answer to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE], obeying this law, and having behind us the impetus already received from our 17 years of occupancy, we will be in the Philippine Islands. If they are an independent nation, we shall be there for the purpose of exercising our influence and extending the sphere of our influence in competition with the other striving commercial nations of the world, and therein will lie greater danger of friction and of conflict than if we had retained the Philippines.

Mr. President, under all the evidence we have—the evidence of economists, of scientists, of the men who have studied races and their habits in connection with the climate in which they live—we know that the Filipinos will not be fit for independent sovereign government wthin 5 years or 10 years or 20 years, perhaps a century; we are well aware of that, and yet, forgetting our sacred obligations to protect, to lead, to educate them, we propose to make them a sovereign, independent nation within the short period of four years—so short a time in the life and growth of a nation. At the same time we propose to guarantee their independence for the period of five years, in conjunction with other nations, or, if they do not agree to unite with us, then alone. In those guaranties themselves we shall have the entangling alliances against which we have been warned from the beginning of our Government to the present time.

There are alliances and alliances—those that may entangle and those that can not entangle. In the extension of our commerce, in the acquisition of the Philippine Islands themselves, we have had, as it were, the virtual alliance, the countenance, and hearty support of that other greatest colonizing nation in history or on the face of the earth—Great Britain herself. We acquired the Philippines knowing we had at least her moral support, and we were glad to have that support. There would be no rupture with England because of their relinquishment, but her opinion of us, considering all our relations and common ideals, is a matter not irrelevant to this issue. I do not believe that she would willingly enter into an agrement with us, so important and vital are her interests, to guarantee with us the independence of the Philippines for five years or for any other period. I do not believe she would enter into any such agreement. Our action would be a disappointment to her.

Why, Mr. President, think of what is involved in securing the consent of any other nation to such an agreement, giving the Filipinos independence, and for five years guaranteeing their sovereignty and independence; of what is involved in securing the consent of the statesmen and leaders of other nations who would be asked to join in this guaranty, cognizant as they will be of the facts of history. The idea as it appears to me is altogether fanciful.

Will they guarantee the independence of 8,000,000 people of different races and different dialects, with the great mass of them untutored and knowing nothing of the first principles of government? Will they guarantee the independence of those islands against the disaster and the more than possible overthrow of government that would follow the dissension and the revolution of which there would be danger should we grant them

independence? No, Mr. President; it seems that we are making, as I said in the outstart—and I can not help but feel it most deeply and seriously—a grave national mistake. We are taking a step against which the achievements of the past and our success in the government of dependencies protest; we are taking a step in disregard of the material advantage we may derive from the retention of the islands and in which advantage the Filipinos themselves will share; it is a step against which the Filipino people themselves, as well as the whole American people, will in time protest; and, again, Mr. President, we are taking a step in which we ignore the sacred moral obligation to "bear the white man's burden" until the Filipinos are fit for independence and self-government. No Senator on this floor will hazard the statement that within the time provided by this bill or by these proposed guaranties the Filipino people will be fit for independent self-government.

Just a word in conclusion. I would retain the Philippines for an indefinite time without making the time of their independence the football of party politics during the years, without holding out, as we do when we follow that course, false hopes, which have the effect simply of encouraging what I may grant are the aspirations of a few brilliant politicians and agitators in the Philippine Islands, who do not reflect the feelings or the sentiments of the great body of the people. That agitation, both here and there, has been the Pandora's box from which has come many of the difficulties with which we have had to contend in the islands and some of the evils of our own party political life at home. So I would retain the Philippines without mention of the time when we would grant independence. Meanwhile I would govern them as a free, enlightened Nation can govern; I would see that they have the equal protection of the laws; I would extend as rapidly as possible to them the benefits of education, and with that education I would carry, too, experience and training in the principles of government; I would extend to them gradually that measure of self-government of which they shall be capable; I would await the time patiently until they are capable at least of autonomous government under our authority; and then I would leave it to them to say whether they would be independent or whether they would be—what they are likely to want to be—a part of imperial America.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	Martin, Va.	Smoot
Beckham	Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Stone
Brandegee	Harding	Nelson	Sutherland
Broussard	Hardwick	Newlands	Swanson
Bryan	Hitchcock	Norris	Thomas
Catron	Hughes	O'Gorman	Thompson
Chamberlain	Husting	Overman	Tillman
Chilton	James	Page	Townsend
Clapp	Jones	Pittman	Underwood
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Poindexter	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Cummins	Lane	Robinson	Walsh
Dillingham	Lea, Tenn.	Shafroth	Warren
du Pont	Lewis	Sheppard	Works
Fletcher	Lippitt	Smith, Ariz.	
Gallinger	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand on all votes to-day.

Mr. CATRON. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. FALL] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is detained on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. CHILTON. I ask leave to announce that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I understand now that the Clarke amendment is before the Senate. To bring the matter to an issue upon the divergent thought of the Senate, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the pending amendment. I ask that the proposed substitute be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the amendment proposed by Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas, it is proposed to insert the following:

The President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to indicate to the great powers of the world the desire of this Government to extend to the Philippine Islands and the Philippine people full and complete independence whenever it shall be warranted in the belief that such independence will be permanent and be respected by the other powers of the world. The President is further authorized and requested to secure from such other powers such agreements as will insure the independence of said islands in perpetuity, and when such agreements have been made he shall forthwith direct a convention to be held in such islands for the purpose of adopting a constitution providing for a republican form of government, and as soon as such constitution has been adopted and officers have been elected and a government inaugurated thereunder he shall, by proclamation, declare such islands and the people thereof to be a free and independent state, with all the powers of complete sovereignty.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have been laboring for some time under the impression that in conformity with the platform of the Democratic Party it was their intention to introduce and pass a bill the effect of which would be the independence of those islands from this Government. I confess that as amendments are being offered and coming from that side my faith in the intention of the other side of the Chamber to carry out that platform pledge has been somewhat shaken. I find an amendment offered here the purpose of which seems to me to be that of delay—to put the matter off at least for another administration to deal with, if not for several years. I can find nothing in the amendment or in the original bill which promises to grant independence or which establishes a rule under which such independence would naturally follow.

We are confronted here with two very distinct theories of our national duty. I should like the attention of the Senator from Arkansas at this point. The theory of a great many on this side of the Chamber is that we should not at this time even promise or suggest independence, backed by the belief of a great many on this side of the Chamber that we should continue to hold those islands for an indefinite time. I had supposed that the prevailing thought on the other side of the Chamber was that we should take definite steps toward securing Philippine independence, and that independence meant full independence from us without any strings attached to it.

Personally, I can not conceive of granting the Filipinos independence from us with a guaranty upon our part that we will protect their independence. That guaranty must necessarily carry with it the right of interference. The right of interference must to a certain degree deprive these people of the right of complete independence. Not only that, Mr. President, but the result of such a condition would be that while we release all power over the control of the islands and their internal relations, while we have no power to enforce their conduct toward the other nations of the world, we are forced to guarantee that they will not be punished for such misconduct by invasion by any other nation of the world.

I possibly stand midway between the two sides upon that question. I believe that we ought not to attempt to hold that Asiatic territory, either for our benefit or for their benefit. I believe that they do not want our protection. They are not asking for it. We are gaining nothing in affording it. There is no moral duty for us to reach over into Asia and impose our method of civilization upon them; and there being a constant responsibility, measured more than in mere millions of dollars, I think that our first duty is to get rid of those Asiatic possessions, and get rid of any Monroe doctrine that we would have to carry 7,000 miles from our shores. We have all of that doctrine we can properly attend to on this side of the earth.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to inquire of the Senator about the words "in perpetuity" in line 10. I feel very friendly toward the Senator's amendment, but I do not believe we ought to try to get anybody else to agree to something we do not agree to ourselves.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, just let me say right there that the provision in the Clarke amendment was for temporary protection, and therefore to draw the line of distinction between this amendment and those that had already been offered, whereby we were to guarantee a temporary independence, I used the words, not to guarantee anything, but to secure an agreement that the independence of the Philippines should be recognized in perpetuity. That does not mean that other nations should agree with us that forever and ever they would keep their hands off of the Philippines, but that they would enter into an agreement that the islands should be free and independent indefinitely, or at least that they would not interfere with their independence.

Mr. NORRIS. Does not the Senator think that the words he has used mean more than that? The amendment says, "insure the independence of said islands in perpetuity."

Mr. McCUMBER. It says that the President should secure such an agreement as would insure their independence. Now, I think "perpetuity" goes a little further than I would insist on going.

Mr. NORRIS. It is a good while.

Mr. McCUMBER. If we just drop out the words "in perpetuity," and leave it so that it would mean indefinitely, we would obtain the same result.

Mr. NORRIS. If those words were out, I should be glad to vote for the Senator's amendment.

Mr. McCUMBER. I should be perfectly willing to have the words stricken out.

Now, I wish to address myself again to the author of the amendment. This amendment seeks to obtain a guaranty of other nations. I think the Senator introducing it could have little hope that we would be able to secure such a guaranty after the islands had become wholly independent of our sovereignty or control; and therefore he provides that if other nations will not guarantee their independence or territorial integrity for a number of years, this Nation shall be bound to do so for that definite time.

Let me put the same question that I did yesterday. The Senator was not present at the time. Suppose we present this question to Germany, for instance, after we have released the Philippine Islands, and they are just as independent of us as any other part of the world, and we ask Germany to enter into an agreement with us that she will assist us in guaranteeing the independence of those islands. The very first question that Germany probably would ask us would be: "What consideration is there for me to enter into an agreement of that kind at this time? That agreement means war. That agreement means that I shall become your ally. That agreement means that if you get into war with Japan, and Japan seizes those islands, then, under the guaranty which I make, it becomes my duty to join with you in a quarrel against Japan for the purpose of securing the abandonment of the islands by Japan."

Suppose we put the same proposition up to Great Britain. Would not her answer naturally be the same? "It is not a matter for me now to determine. Conditions might arise in which I might wish to join you in protecting those islands; but a protectorate, a guaranty, means that that guaranty must be backed with power, and backed with power means backed with the war power. I will not enter into an agreement beforehand that if you and Japan get into a quarrel in which I have no interest, and she attacks your outlying possessions, which naturally would be the very first place at which Japan would strike, I must enter into that war with you, take up a quarrel that does not belong to me and in which I am not interested, and assist you to drive the Japanese out of the islands, in order to protect their integrity."

I believe the only conclusion is that we never could secure an agreement of that kind, and to me it would seem as though we were a bit impertinent in asking the other countries of the world, after we have lost all control over the islands, to enter into an agreement with us concerning an entirely independent nation.

While I do not think we ever would secure the guaranty, I should have no objection to voting for the amendment that is proposed by the Senator if it provided in the very beginning that before we should release our control over those islands we should secure that guaranty, because I will never believe for a moment that we can secure it after we have released our control.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas and Mr. SHAFROTH addressed the Chair.

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to either one or both the Senators.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, would not the Senator's attitude be, then, that he would leave the independence of the Philippine Islands solely to the will of some foreign power? If you are going to make that a condition precedent to granting them independence, and say that these nations must join in a neutrality agreement, it would be in their power to prevent the independence of the Philippines.

I concur with the Senator in some respects in regard to the difficulty of getting foreign nations to agree to this; but I take it that according to the CLARKE amendment, while the President may not be able to obtain the consent of the nations of the world to guarantee by force of arms the sovereignty and independence of the Philippine Islands, yet he can do what has been done time and again, and was done with relation to the Hawaiian Islands, and that is that each nation would agree not to take possession of or control the islands in any manner. That would involve no obligation except their own obligation. If you would get the leading nations of the world to say, "We will not attempt to establish a suzerainty or any control whatever over the Philippines," it would have the same effect as if there had been an agreement as to sustaining the sovereignty of the islands with armed force.

Mr. McCUMBER. The point I am attempting to make, however, is that it would be impossible to secure such an agreement. There are relations between Japan and Great Britain, treaties of common interest, treaties between the other nations of the Old World, of such a character and demanding the dependence of one upon the other, that it would be impossible, in my opinion, to get other nations to agree to guarantee their independence. Now, if you put it just upon this ground—to get them to agree, upon their part, not to interfere with the independence of the Philippines—that is a different proposition. That they can do. That is a negative proposition. But here you are asking them to enter into a positive agreement which it will require all of their armed force to carry into effect, and which might require them to do the very thing that they do not wish to do at the time.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But the Senator seems to attach to his amendment the idea that nothing with relation to the independence of the islands shall proceed unless that agreement is obtained. I take it that under the Clarke amendment the President would have a perfect right, if nations refused to enter into an agreement of the kind he states, to get them to say, "We will agree to withhold any effort upon our part to acquire any of the territory of those islands"; and, it seems to me, that would be right in line with the amendment. The lesser is included in the greater power, and if he can not obtain one he can obtain the other.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I do not understand that the amendment is such that the President or anyone else can hold it up indefinitely. If I am in error in that, I am willing to be corrected. My understanding is that if this agreement is not secured within a certain time, then for a definite time we will guarantee the independence of the Philippine Islands, and then they shall become independent, with our guaranty for a specific time. That is my understanding of the amendment—not that the President has power, nor any succession of Presidents, to continue their dependence just as long as his judgment should dictate.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no; I do not understand that that exists under the Clarke amendment; but I think the Senator agrees that if the nations of the world would unanimously guarantee the independence of the islands it would unquestionably be a good thing.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, yes.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Now, if it can not be done, the President evidently has the power to do the next best thing, and that is to have each one agree that they will not trespass upon the territory of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, but there is no such proposition in the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. If that proposition were in it—that if the President can not secure the one, he at least might secure their agreement to refrain from interference upon their part, as a condition precedent to the granting of independence—I certainly should support it. But I want to say to the Senator that there is a line of difference between our ideas of what should be done with the Philippine Islands. While I take the ground that we are under no moral obligation to continue to educate the Filipino people indefinitely; that we are under no moral obligation to stand guardian over an Asiatic people seven or eight thousand miles away from our nearest border, I do concede that, having taken possession of them, having made them our foster child for a period of 16 or 17 years, our relation toward them has been changed in some respects, and that changed relation imposes a duty upon our part. My conviction is that if we now release our control over them, we should see to it that no other great nation shall proceed to take possession of them. I think we owe it to them and to ourselves, if we grant them independence, that we shall know beforehand that that independence is going to be respected by the great nations of the world.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The trouble with the position of the Senator is that he wants that as a condition precedent. I think the most important thing is the independence of the Philippines. If they are willing to take the independence without this guaranty—and it seems that they are, as they say that no nation that ever obtained independence ever asked for a protectorate—we ought not to hold back and make it a condition that "it is necessary to obtain an international agreement before we will give them independence." We ought not to make such a condition.

I do not consider that the danger of outside interference is of such great moment. I do not believe that there is going to be any such interference. Many of the nations of the world are

small, and yet have maintained their independence for many years. I believe that there is more danger to the Philippine people of a change of policy of some kind upon our part, as in the exercise of an iron hand upon them, and that they would have more ground for fearing that than they would of any other nation attempting to take control of them.

For that reason I put first, as the most important thing in this bill, the independence of the islands; and second, such guaranties of nations as we are able to get to maintain their independence.

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President; the most important thing is not the temporary independence of the islands. The most important thing is the permanent independence of the islands. The most important thing to the islanders themselves is not that they shall be granted a temporary independence that may last two or three or five years, and which they may lose the moment that any of the countries get into a conflict over there, and either one or the other may consider that it is for its interest that it should seize and hold the islands. I think we owe them a further duty than merely saying, "Now, get out and take care of yourselves." The reason why I insist upon the condition precedent is that I feel positive we will not get any condition subsequent; certainly not a condition that amounts to a guaranty of their independence.

I am not frightened by the specter that is held up by my good neighbor here from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] that the moment we cease our control over those islands there will be scenes of riot, insurrection, and bloodshed. I believe the evidence establishes that the great majority of those people are rather docile. I am more inclined to think that the great majority will be imposed upon, and that the government will be controlled by a very few than there will be danger of insurrection after insurrection. Probably not more than one out of fifty of the inhabitants of those islands is fitted for self-government, and the probabilities are that that one out of fifty in each instance will do the governing. They may govern fairly well; but what I want to secure, before I dare let go of those islands, is the assurance that no other nation will immediately seize them. We would not want to send our child out from us where we knew or felt that there was danger of his being destroyed by any force; nor do I feel that we ought to send the Philippine Islands out of our control without some understanding on the part of the other nations of the world that if we are generous enough to grant them their independence other nations shall at least be generous enough to leave them alone.

I am fearful that they are not all governed by the same ideals that I hope govern this country. I never have known of an instance in history where any great nation, as powerful as ours, has taken possession, through conquest or otherwise, of another smaller country and has withdrawn of its own accord; has given the people of the subject nation education and shown it the pathway of popular government—"We will now release you from our control and send you on your way with our blessing." I am suspicious that the world is not educated up to that idea as yet, and that you can not trust it implicitly. Because of my suspicion, I do hope that before we adopt a policy that says that the Philippine Islands shall no longer be subject to this country we shall feel reasonably sure that they shall not be subject to any other country in the world.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] has discussed the value of the Philippine Islands to us from a financial standpoint. I said the other day, and I think I could corroborate the statement by figures if I desired to take the time, that where we have received $1 of benefit we have paid more than $100 of expense. Wherever we have increased the trade of the Filipino people with the United States we have done so at the expense of the people of the United States in giving them free markets for their sugar and tobacco, and so forth, that compete with our own home industries. From a commercial standpoint we have benefited them, without any possible question, and if they have received any benefit from us we have taxed ourselves to pay for that benefit ten times over.

But we can not measure our responsibilities in mere dollars and cents. There is another obligation that we have imposed upon us. We are now to enter upon a new phase of American life—the creation of a mighty Army and Navy. We are now to compete with Great Britain and Germany and Japan in the building of dreadnaughts. I admit that so long as we hold the Philippine Islands we shall have to have more dreadnaughts than either Germany or Japan. We shall have to be able to defend the islands. As has been suggested by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE], those islands are the one great vulnerable point in our American defenses, and we must meet that vulnerability.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. McCUMBER. With pleasure.

Mr. STERLING. I merely wish to ask the Senator if that consideration has governed us up to this day in the matter of building dreadnaughts? Can the Senator say that we have increased our Navy or built dreadnaughts for the purpose of defending the Philippine Islands?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes, Mr. President; it has governed us. I remember very well when we were first asked to increase our yearly appropriation for two battleships a year to four. It was based entirely upon the assumption that there was danger from the Asiatic side, not from the European side, at that time; and it meant that we must have an ever-increasing navy to be able to meet the conditions on that side of the ocean. I will say frankly to-day that if I vote for added dreadnaughts, and so forth, I shall be governed more by the necessity of defending the Philippine Islands than by any other single factor.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota a further question—whether, irrespective of the Philippine Islands, he thinks our Navy is too large?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; Mr. President, I answer the Senator frankly. We may need a good, strong Navy. I do not think we need as great a Navy as Great Britain, if that is included in your question, for the reason that Great Britain has vulnerable points even beyond that which we have, and so close to us where we can strike her so quickly and so effectively that there is no danger of war with that country, unless we were the one to force the war ourselves.

Mr. STERLING. I quite agree with the Senator from North Dakota, that we do not need nor should it be our ambition to have as great a Navy as Great Britain; but my question simply related to whether or not, irrespective of our ownership or retention of the Philippines, our Navy as it exists is too large.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I am not saying that our Navy as it exists is too large. As the other nations grow in naval power and as we have considerable commerce with the outside world, we shall have to keep somewhat apace with their growth, but it does not mean, as in this instance, that we shall not only keep at a general pace but keep ourselves so much ahead that we are able to cross the ocean 7,000 miles and defend our outlying possessions. It needs a very much larger Navy, and a very much larger standing Army to be transported to this weakest point than it would require if we were not under obligation to protect them.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, we are then coming back to my original proposition exactly, that we have no greater Navy now than we reasonably need. The Senator has said that we were induced to build a Navy because of the Philippines, and that that was the argument used at the time of the appropriation for the increase of the Navy.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, no; the Senator misunderstands me. That certainly was not my intended statement.

Mr. STERLING. I so understood the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. I say the growth has been influenced more or less by the fact that we have had the Philippines, and that has been used heretofore as an argument to double the number yearly of our dreadnaught type of battleships, because of the danger from the Asiatic side.

Mr. STERLING. Then, Mr. President, all I have to say is that if our Navy is no greater than we need, the influence of the Philippines in causing the building of a greater Navy was a good and wholesome influence.

Mr. McCUMBER. The influence did not operate to build the extra two, however. The influence was not sufficiently strong. We voted only our two battleships yearly, just the same as we had done the year previous; but the pressure was extraordinarily strong that we should proceed immediately to provide for four battleships a year, and to-day there are administration orators traveling over the country proclaiming the necessity of not only doubling but trebling or many-times-over increasing our armament and battleships.

The question comes right back to us, why? What particular danger looms up in the horizon to-day which demands that we should so greatly increase our naval and military power? We know that the great nations of Europe must necessarily be nearly exhausted before they get through with this war. We know that they will not be in a condition to immediately enter into an aggressive war against us. We know that if there were dangers pending that, with our present preparedness, we could further prepare more rapidly than they could, with their depleted war chests and their destroyed resources. We could fit ourselves ready for war more quickly than any of these Governments could fit themselves to make war against us. Then why

this wonderful haste toward suddenly building up a mighty war fleet and increasing our standing army without giving us the slightest idea as to where the danger is to come from?

Because of our attitude toward people of a certain color, who are proud and strong and believe that they ought not to be legislated against, I can naturally see that there is constant danger of friction and that we can never tell when that danger may break out into open hostility, and we must be prepared to meet it. But it is one thing to be prepared to meet and overcome a hostile fleet seven or eight thousand miles from our own shores and quite another to merely defend our own coasts or our necessary commerce. With submarines and torpedo boats and mines we can defend our own shores. We would not require half as much of a navy in the one instance as in the other.

That, Mr. President, is one of the principal reasons why I would like to get rid of the Philippine Islands and withdraw our Monroe doctrine from Asiatic waters. We will have enough to do to take care of our Monroe doctrine right here at home without attempting to enforce it all over the world. The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas forces our Monroe doctrine into Asia.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I may agree with the Senator from North Dakota in regard to objections to the administration defense program—I am not quite ready to say what my position will be in that regard—but I think he must concede that in his general view of the European war now that is the great stimulus for this immense defense program, and not the Philippine Islands.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am very thankful to the Senator that he has given me the reason. In other words, he says we are nervous of war; that war is going on around us and it makes us nervous.

Now, the time to be sane is when everyone else is crazy. The time for us to keep our mental balance is when all the rest are at war attempting to destroy each other.

I am not discussing at present the general matter of an increased Army and Navy. I am willing to join in doing what is necessary and proper for national defense or preparedness, but I should like to have some good reasons stated why it is necessary to double and treble our Army and our Navy unless we are all looking toward that one weak spot away off in the Pacific—and the sooner we get rid of that, in my opinion, the better for this country.

Mr. President, in closing this short debate I assume that Senators on the other side are already agreed as to what they are going to do in the matter of amendments. I am not so fearful now of your Filipino bill becoming an effective law that will really bring on the independence of the Filipinos. You put the matter off for several years. You establish no definite policy, except a policy to get something that I am certain you will never succeed in getting, a guaranty. Another Congress two or three Congresses ahead will undoubtedly deal with that question. But feeling as I do that we ought to get out of Asia, feeling as I do that we owe a duty to the Philippine Islands because we have held them and that duty is to assure the independence which we may grant to them, I have drafted this simple amendment. If we can not secure from these Governments an agreement that they will respect the independence of the islands toward which we show this kindly interest and this great national spirit of justice, if they will not agree to allow them to remain independent, then I say frankly I want to hold them until they do agree to do so.

Mr. STERLING. If the Senator will permit me a question before he takes his seat; I refer to the first part of the Senator's amendment which authorizes the President of the United States "to indicate to the great powers of the world the desire of this Government to extend to the Philippine Islands and the Philippine people full and complete independence whenever it shall be warranted in the belief that such independence will be permanent and be respected by the other powers of the world." I suppose the meaning is whenever the Government of the United States shall be warranted in the belief.

Mr. McCUMBER. Surely; the pronoun "it" refers to the Government.

Mr. STERLING. I would like to have the Senator explain in what way we would have an expression of that belief on the part of the Government. It would be by act of Congress?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; by entering into diplomatic relations with each of the great Governments that would be at all liable to interfere with the independence of those islands, and an agreement or a treaty, because it would be in effect a treaty, that they would refrain from interfering with the independence of the islands.

Mr. STERLING. Yes; but before there is any diplomatic correspondence with other powers, Mr. President, the amendment implies that the Government of the United States shall be first warranted in the belief that such independence will be permanent and be respected by the other powers of the world.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not think the Senator reads it correctly—

> The President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to indicate to the great powers of the world the desire of this Government to extend to the Philippine Islands and the Filipino people full and complete independence whenever it shall be warranted in the belief that such independence will be permanent—

And so forth.

That is, that the Government will indicate the desire of this Government to extend to the Philippine people independence when this Government is assured that the independence will be permanent. There can be but one meaning to that.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, just one further question. Of course the Senator realizes to what extent the question of independence in the Philippine Islands has been made the subject of party politics from the time of our acquisition of the islands. Does not the Senator think that even with his amendment it would still be made a partisan matter?

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President; I hope that that would not be the case. I am dealing with the matter certainly from a nonpartisan standpoint, and I hope Senators on the other side will do exactly the same thing, and will show their good faith in the intent to give to these people independence. Giving them independence from us is not where we want to stop. We want to know that they are going to be independent after they have left our control.

Mr. President, I will strike out of my amendment the words "in perpetuity," in line 10. I do not think they are necessary.

Mr. CLAPP. Before the Senator takes his seat will he pardon an interruption?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. I certainly do not want to be captious about the amendment; I am in sympathy with a good deal that the Senator has said; but it does seem to me that this leaves the matter in a very vague and indefinite way. After first providing that the President is "authorized and requested to indicate to the great powers of the world the desire of this Government to extend to the Philippine Islands and the Filipino people full and complete independence whenever it shall be warranted in the belief that such independence will be permanent and be respected by the other powers of the world"——

Mr. McCUMBER. That is, it is our desire to do so only when we are assured that it will be respected. That is the meaning of the phrase.

Mr. CLAPP. Now:

> And when such agreements have been made.

There are no designated governments that we are to deal with. The administration which is in power might feel that an agreement with one or two nations would do, while Congress might feel that the nations which might most likely be inclined to make trouble thereafter were not included. There would then the issue arise as to whether or not the great powers of the world had joined in this agreement.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, we have dealt so long with the phrase "the great powers of the world" that I think we have all come to recognize what is meant by it. It is impossible to designate every nation in the world or to designate just where the line might be drawn. I should think it a little mischievous to designate particular nations. I would rather leave it to the President to act when he thinks that we have a sufficient number to justify it. Remember the matter will always be before Congress until it is completed. I certainly would want Great Britain, Germany, France, Austria, Russia, Italy, Japan, and Spain to be included. The President might think it was not necessary to include Italy or not necessary to include Spain, possibly not, but I think in all probability he would include those which we recognize as the principal powers of Europe and Asia.

Mr. CLAPP. My objection to it is that it really does not settle anything. It does seem to me that we ought to do one of two things—either quit talking about the independence of the Philippine Islands or take specific steps that more or less automatically would lead to our acknowledgment of their independence.

I do not want to be captious every time a Senator offers an amendment here; I realize that it is much easier to find fault with amendments than it is to draw them; but it does seem to me that at this time we ought to do one of two things—either quit talking about it or take steps to acknowledge their independence.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me ask the Senator a question, since he has asked me one. Even though the Senator may believe in the independence of the Philippine Islands, does he believe that

we ought to grant them independence without any understanding with any power on the face of the earth that that independence shall be recognized or respected? Would he be willing to turn them loose without any understanding with any other power in the world?

Mr. CLAPP. That is just what I am in favor of, so much so that I find it difficult, even as a step toward their independence, to support any of these amendments. I am opposed to any string being tied to it, and I certainly am opposed to any entangling engagements with other nations or any entangling engagements between the Filipinos when they become a nation and this Nation. If on the day when our fleet sailed into the harbor of Manila there was no obligation resting on us to wrest the Filipinos from foreign dominion, there certainly is no obligation resting upon us to-day to guarantee their independence, unless in the 17 years we have rendered them less capable, perhaps, to take care of themselves than they were before.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, there is no obligation on my part to take a poor child out of the street and take him into my family for 17 years, but if I do so I feel that I have a little greater obligation at the end of those 17 years to look after the interest of that child. That is the difference between the Senator and myself.

Mr. CLAPP. When I surrender that child he may be less able and less capable to meet whatever surroundings there might be in front of him. If I had taken the child and led him by the hand for 17 years and guided him and protected him and guarded him, I am under no obligation to continue that burden unless my relations to that child had rendered the child less capable than he was when I first took him under my tutelage and guardianship.

Mr. McCUMBER. Possibly, Mr. President, there would be no real obligation except the obligation of your own heart and conscience. Interest grows toward your ward, an interest which demands of you that you should do something more for that child than you would if he had never been under your control.

Mr. CLAPP. Undoubtedly in the 17 years with that kind of a relationship there would grow up in me an affection for that boy, but I am speaking now of one race dealing with an alien race, where the sentiment of affection cuts no figure and can not cut any figure. We took those islands. We were under no obligation that morning to relieve them from the dominion of Spain. After 17 years, teaching them the lesson of liberty, teaching them the intelligence that comes from common schools, if to-day we are under an obligation to do something that we were not before we sailed there in 1898 it is because the relation which has existed has rendered them less capable and less competent to go on with their own affairs.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I feel that there is more of an obligation than there was upon us when we first took the Philippine Islands, but that is a difference between the Senator and myself.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. In just one moment I will yield. The Senator says this amendment does not get anywhere. I do not want it to get anywhere until I know that these people are going to have independence, until we get an understanding. I believe that all the nations of the world would be glad to have us release the Philippine Islands and not project ourselves into Asiatic matters, unless possibly it would be Great Britain alone. I feel that there would be no difficulty while they are in our possession for us to get an arrangement, because there is a consideration. While they are ours, the consideration is that we will let go of them, and I believe all the great Governments would be highly pleased to have us do so. But beyond that, if we once let go of them, then I can not see any consideration that we can offer to other nations for entering into a guaranty obligation.

Mr. CLAPP. I quite agree that there is nothing in the guaranty obligation, and if I vote for that amendment it will be solely on the ground that it is the only apparent avenue toward a conclusion of some sort in this matter. But my objection to this is that after this experiment of getting the agreement with those nations has been tried out, one group will say to this country we have now placed this matter where independence is permanently guaranteed and another group will say we have not got this nation or that nation into the agreement, and we still leave it a matter to be beaten back and forth between two political parties.

Mr. McCUMBER. There may be some dangers, Mr. President, from certain directions where there would be no danger from other directions. I think we could trust the President and Congress to determine which were the dangerous directions and to meet them.

Obtaining this agreement will be the first step. Then all we have to do is to call a convention and agree upon a republican form of government in the Philippine Islands, allow them to elect their officers, and then a proclamation by the President frees them forever from our control, under the amendment which I offer.

Mr. CLAPP. That part is easy. When the various contending factions and interests in this country, if they ever should, under this amendment, agree that a sufficient guaranty has been obtained, the balance of it is automatic. That is a part of the amendment that I am in sympathy with, and to that extent I prefer it to the other amendment. But that does not relieve us of the situation that at any time there will still be a difference of opinion. There are those who believe that the suggestion of the Philippine Islands being attacked by some foreign nation is a dream. The only reality it has in history is the fact that we took them when we got into the war with Spain.

Mr. McCUMBER. If we had not been in the war with Spain, we never would have taken them.

Mr. CLAPP. We never would have touched them.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is absolutely correct. I yield now to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to direct the Senator's attention to line 6 of his amendment. I suggest to him that there might be, it seems to me, a possible misunderstanding there in the way it reads. If the Government of the United States "shall be warranted in the belief that such independence will be permanent and be respected by the other powers," and so forth. It seems to me that the words "permanent" and "be" ought to be stricken out, so that it will read that the President shall indicate to those powers that this Government desires "to extend to the Philippine Islands and the Philippine people full and complete independence whenever it shall be warranted in the belief that such independence will be respected by the other powers of the world."

If it is left just as it is it will be for this Government first to determine whether it is of the belief that the independence will be permanent, and after it has determined that, then, whether such independence will be respected by the other powers of the world.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator does not get the right construction of the sentence. The sentence means that we indicate our desire to grant independence on the condition that we believe such independence will be permanent.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, when is that going to be? Who is going to decide that?

Mr. McCUMBER. It is simply declaring our sentiment that we do not wish to indicate that we would give them independence independent of the fact that it shall be recognized by others. We want that first.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, does not the Senator think it will take some further legislation? Suppose the President would say, "I am of the opinion myself, and I am representing the Government of the United States, that independence would not be permanent?"

Mr. McCUMBER. No; the President simply indicates not his desire, but that it is the desire of this Government to grant independence to those islands upon assurances that such independence will be permanent. It does not desire to grant independence unless it is assured.

Mr. NORRIS. By the other governments?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what I thought the Senator wanted it to mean, and that is what I should like to have it mean, but it seems to me that as he has it drawn it does not quite mean that. The President could really say, "The Government of the United States has not yet determined the first feature." It says, "The President of the United States is authorized and requested to indicate to the great powers of the world the desire of this Government to extend to the Philippine Islands and the Philippine people full and complete independence whenever it shall be warranted in the belief that such independence will be permanent and be respected by the other powers of the world."

Now, somebody must determine for this Government. We do not determine it by this act, if we leave it that way. Somebody must determine for the Government whether we believe it is going to be permanent, and after we have determined that then we want an additional assurance that it will be respected by the other powers.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, that is not the idea I seek to convey at all. That section relates only to the expression of the desire of this Government.

Mr. NORRIS. I think I understand.

Mr. McCUMBER. It has nothing whatever to do with the act of the President, except that the President shall indicate

that it is not the desire of this Government—putting it in the negative way—to give independence to the Philippine people unless it feels at the time that such independence will be respected and be permanent.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator and myself are in perfect accord as to what we want to do, but it does seem to me that he has not expressed that idea, and that it would be completely expressed by striking out the words "permanent and be." Then it would read:

The President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to indicate to the great powers of the world the desire of this Government to extend to the Philippine Islands and the Philippine people full and complete independence whenever it shall be warranted in the belief that such independence will be respected by the other powers of the world.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, Mr. President, it would mean exactly the same thing, in my opinion; but, as the Senator thinks that it will not, I will amend it by striking out the words "permanent and be" in line 6 and will offer the amendment in that form.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then, the question is on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota as modified to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, is that amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; that is the purpose.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. While I am on my feet, Mr. President, I wish to say that the Senator from North Dakota is not entirely accurate in his statement or assumption that the Senators on this side of the Chamber have agreed upon any particular amendment to this bill. The bill has been discussed for the most part on the other side of the Chamber. I think it is growing rather late to-day, but to-morrow it will probably receive some discussion on this side of the Chamber, especially by the Senator who is the author of the amendment.

I want to say for myself that the amendment as proposed by the Senator from Arkansas is not satisfactory and that I shall take occasion to point out what I consider objections to it, or to parts of it; but I did not like to have the statement of the Senator from North Dakota pass without comment and leave the assumption that there has been any agreement upon the amendment.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, on to-morrow at 2 o'clock I shall ask the Senate to hear me briefly in support of the amendments I have from time to time offered. I think I can join the Senator from Nebraska in the statement that the amendment in its present form is not so satisfactory to me as it might be. I have been induced to modify it from time to time until I am now in a frame of mind to say that it barely satisfies me. I would be glad to see more prompt, effective, and definite action taken in connection with this subject, but legislation is a matter of compromise; it involves the process of harmonizing conflicting views, and it frequently turns out that a legislator is compelled to accept very much less than he would demand if he had the power to supply his own wishes. So I will address the Senate briefly on to-morrow, if I have the opportunity, at 2 o'clock.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I could not hear the suggestion made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. Whenever the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] is complete, I have an amendment which I propose to offer as a substitute for it, after the other amendments already proposed are voted upon. I could not hear what the Senator from Nebraska suggested with respect to the procedure. Will he restate it?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I made no suggestion as to the procedure. I understand that the vote will first come upon the substitute offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], and, so far as I am concerned, I am ready to take that vote now. After that has been acted upon it will then be for the Senate to decide what further action to take. The Senator from Arkansas desires not to speak to-day. I had hoped that he would address the Senate to-day, and that the amendment might come to a vote to-day; but to-morrow I shall urge that we reach a final vote upon the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas and all substitutes or amendments to it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understood the Senator from Arkansas to suggest that he desired to discuss his amendment to-morrow at 2 o'clock; but do I understand from the Senator from Nebraska that the present amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas is to be withdrawn and another offered in its stead?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No, sir; the Senator did not understand the Senator from Nebraska to say that, because there is nothing less likely to occur than that. It may be amended, and probably needs amendment, but I think I can say with certainty that it will not be withdrawn.

Mr. CUMMINS. I thought that a different amendment had been agreed upon on the other side.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No, Mr. President. I was correcting a statement made by the Senator from North Dakota to the effect that he assumed that this side had agreed upon some particular amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. I beg pardon. I entirely misunderstood the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I am glad if I have been misinformed.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, we have not adhered very closely to the rules in the consideration of these various amendments. As a matter of fact, there are three so-called Clarke amendments pending; that is to say, there are three that have been introduced. The Senator from Iowa need not defer until to-morrow any remarks that it is his purpose to submit, for his amendment has been offered; it will be reached in regular order, and there is no reason why he should not proceed with his remarks this afternoon if he sees proper to do so.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am quite ready to go on at any moment when it is in order to do so. I desire, as soon as the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota is disposed of, to offer an amendment, and when I have offered it I intend to debate it.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. It will be only an amendment in the second degree if the Senator should offer his amendment now. That is in order, and he may debate that at this time.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the ordinary rule of the Senate is that an amendment should be perfected before any other amendment is offered as a substitute; and as the Senator wishes to defer his discussion and, possibly, to perfect his own amendment, I would rather not press mine for a vote this afternoon, but wait until I know just exactly what the Senator is going to propose. Possibly his amendment might be such that I would not want to offer mine as an amendment to it.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I have no purpose at this time of offering any further modifications of the amendment; but I was attempting to make way for the Senator from Iowa to proceed with his remarks this afternoon. The amendment offered by myself is the main question. The Senator from North Dakota has offered a substitute. The Senator from Iowa may offer his amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota, and proceed at this time, if he so elects.

Mr. CUMMINS. I prefer, if it will not inconvenience anybody, to offer mine as a substitute for the amendment presented by the Senator from Arkansas, after the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota shall have been disposed of in some way.

Mr. McCUMBER. And, Mr. President, I would prefer to defer action on my amendment until the Senator from Arkansas, who has not spoken upon his amendment at all, has had an opportunity to do so. He might change my opinion altogether.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I think that is an entirely reasonable request, and I am sure the Senate will not insist upon a course in contravention of it.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, if there is nothing more now to be said, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 27, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 26, 1916.

SURVEYOR GENERAL.

Frank P. Trott, Phoenix, Ariz., to be surveyor general of Arizona.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

Camille Bringle, Wilson.

DELAWARE.

John T. Ratledge, Elsmere.

MASSACHUSETTS.

John Adams, Provincetown.

NEW YORK.

Sylvester Curry, Richmond.
Thomas J. Gallagher, Geneva.
C. B. L'Amoreaux, Schoharie.
John P. Purcell, New Dorp.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

William H. Coleman, Columbia.

WASHINGTON.

Edward W. Ferris, Mount Vernon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *January 26, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

"O Thou Eternal One, whose presence bright all space doth occupy," mindful of our dependence upon Thee for all that we are and all that we can hope to be, we most fervently pray that Thou wilt continue to uphold, sustain, and guide us as individuals and as a people; deliver us from egotism and bigotry, that with minds and hearts open to conviction we may march on to larger life, to greater victories, under the leadership of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

FRANCES M. HAMMOND—LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. DALE of New York, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Frances M. Hammond, House bill 21013, Sixty-third Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

The Clerk called the Committee on Labor.

CHILD LABOR.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday the bill (H. R. 8234) to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes, was called, but by unanimous consent consideration of that bill was deferred until to-day.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, would it not be well to have some agreement as to the time for general debate?

Mr. LEWIS. Under the amended rule, the general debate is limited to two hours.

Mr. MANN. Unless the House by unanimous consent extends the time.

Mr. LEWIS. In the absence of any agreement, I presume that an hour will be given to each side, and I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole——

The SPEAKER. That motion is not necessary. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 8234, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] will take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 8234, to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. LEWIS. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that half of the two hours of general debate be put under the control of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. MANN. It does not require unanimous consent. The committee can not give more time. The gentleman will have an hour.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maryland made a request for unanimous consent, which, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], seems to have been waived. Reserving the right to object for a moment, I want to ask the gentleman from Maryland whether the two hours' general debate is to be confined to the bill?

Mr. MANN. The rule requires that.

Mr. LEWIS. That is my understanding.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That there shall be no outside discussion, then, during the two hours?

The CHAIRMAN. The rule provides that the discussion shall be confined to the bill. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, two questions are presented by the report of the committee on this bill. The first is a question of policy, the second is a question of constitutional power.

I submit that the question of policy has been settled by the legislative decisions of nearly all the States. According to those decisions it is necessary that limitations be placed upon the contractual powers of the parent and the employer with reference to the age when the minor may be employed. Another branch of the question of policy is this: Should those restrictions be imposed by 48 governing authorities, bound in the nature of things to differ, and to introduce uncertainty and complexity in the operations of the rule, or where there is practical unanimity as to the necessity and wisdom of the rule, should it be prescribed by a single authority, insuring uniformity in application and effect? So far as I am concerned, sir, I consider definite rules of limitation upon the ages when children may be employed as of an importance equal to that which actuated the Congress in passing a uniform bankruptcy law. I see no more objection on institutional or moral grounds to applying a uniform rule to the subject of labor of children than I see to applying it to the subject of the rules that shall govern insolvent debtors and their creditors. No appeal on the ground of sectionalism, no attack on the ground that some particular State is delinquent, makes any appeal to me. I plant myself firmly on the ground that the child's life, the importance of a good rule and a uniform rule with regard to the employment of children, are of a dignity that ranks as high as the business considerations which have inspired us to pass a uniform bankruptcy law.

That leaves open, then, only, so far as I am concerned, the question of constitutional power. With regard to that, sir, I must say that, as a lawyer, I have been surprised by the discussions that have taken place before this committee, discussions of a character upon constitutional law that rank as high as any discussions I have ever heard in my experience of 20 years as a lawyer before the courts of my State, to find that clearly and lucidly the power to deal with this subject, the power to deal with any subject relating to the interstate-commerce laws, is one very much more plenary, very much wider in character, than I had ever supposed.

The result of those discussions, sustained by the courts stated in the form of a conclusion, is this: The power to regulate interstate commerce and foreign commerce is without any implied limitations whatever. The only limitations that exist upon the exercise of that power must be limitations expressed in the Constitution itself. Now, it can not be disputed that this bill constitutes a regulation of interstate commerce, because it provides that articles may not be shipped in interstate commerce under certain circumstances. It is therefore a regulation of interstate commerce because it qualifies the exercise of the privilege of participating in interstate commerce. The question arises as to the consideration which moves the Congress to impose that regulation, the regulation itself being beyond question as a fact. What considerations may Congress have in mind in undertaking regulations of interstate commerce? The answer to that gentlemen will find is this: That Congress may move on any consideration, that Congress may move for the accomplishment of any object that is not prohibited by other sections of the Federal Constitution.

The interstate power reposed in Congress is the historical successor of the power that the colonies had as independent nations or sovereignties to do what they pleased in relation to foreign or intercolonial commerce; to do anything they pleased, with reason or without reason, in determining what commerce should move from State to State. The Federal Government in this respect succeeded to their power, to their full and complete and unlimited power. It was shifted from the colonies to the Federal Government, and the only restraint upon the exercise of that power by the Federal Government is what is known as the fifth amendment, corresponding in its effect upon the Federal legislative power to the fourteenth amendment on the State power, namely, that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

Here are three great substantive subjects of legislation—life, liberty, property. This bill does not involve life, it does not involve the right to property, but it does involve the question of contractual liberty as interpreted by the decisions of our court; liberty, in the sense of the power of the employer to make contracts with the parents of children for their employment below certain minima described in the bill.

Now, let us ask directly, what contractual rights the employer has that are beyond the reach of the State or Federal legislation in the employment of children? The question answers itself in the experience of every layman and every lawyer on this floor. No court has ever held that an employer has a right to make such contracts a right beyond the regulative power of the legislative functions of the government.

The restrictions in this bill are 14 years, 16 years, and then again some about employment during the midnight hours. I challenge anyone here to mention a statute containing any restriction of that character that has ever been held violative of "liberty" as State legislation. These clauses, of course, mean the same in the fifth amendment and the fourteenth amendment. One has its application to State legislative functions and the other its application to the Federal. Their meaning is identical in both cases. If the employer has no invulnerable right to make contracts, if there is no invulnerable liberty in that respect, in relation to employment under State legislation, then in the nature of things he can not have it under the same clause, applied to the same subject by Federal legislative power.

We are not without direct light on this subject from the great tribunal that sits between the two branches of this Congress. In the lottery case, identical with this in principle and character, the Supreme Court held that Congress could use a regulation of interstate commerce, namely, a prohibition of the movement of certain commodities, in order to accomplish a moral object within the State of Louisiana. That moral object was the prevention of the evil of gambling through the lottery enterprises then conducted. If it can use a regulation of interstate commerce to stop lotteries, surely it can not be denied the power to use the same regulation with the object of stopping the employment of children and women under certain deleterious and forbidden circumstances.

They say that the child is not hurt by its employment up to 14. They might refer to my own personal experience, for I went into the mines of Pennsylvania when I was 9 years of age. But I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that every child taken away from the opportunities of education, the opportunities provided at great expense for them by our institutions, before he arrives at the age of 14 years, is a child who is seriously wronged and injured. [Applause.]

I do not care to hear from the doctors on this subject. It is enough to know that as a representative of conditions sought to be remedied by this bill that I was deprived of the priceless privilege of an education in my youth and that other children ought not to be deprived of it in our time, when the art of the inventor, when the achievements of the great masters of industry, and the progress of this world have made it easy for men without such children to win sufficient bread and raiment for the support of their families. What is our civilization worth if we still have to employ such children of this country in manufacturing enterprises?

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB].

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I have given the provisions of this bill careful consideration, and, in my judgment, they merit the most serious consideration by this Congress. It brings before us, in boldest form, the constitutional question of State rights, in all its seriousness and importance; and along with it an equally serious question of public policy. I desire to discuss the bill from these two angles.

The first section of the bill prohibits the shipment in interstate commerce, by any producer, manufacturer, or dealer, of the product of any mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment in the United States which has been produced, in whole or in part, by the labor of persons under the age of 14 years, or by the labor of persons between the ages of 14 years and 16 years, who work more than eight hours in any one day or more than six days in any one week, or after the hour of 7 o'clock in the evening, or before the hour of 7 o'clock in the morning.

The first question that would suggest itself to the average mind upon a full reading of this bill is why the peculiar wording of the bill, "prohibiting shipment in interstate commerce."

I hope to show later in my argument that this phraseology furnishes only a flimsy pretext under which such legislation could bear any semblance to a valid law.

While this bill by its title pretends to deal with interstate commerce, a careful reading will disclose that this is but a subterfuge through which stealthily to rob the several States of their reserved constitutional right to regulate their purely internal affairs. It deals with the age and hours of labor of persons and not with rules and regulations for interstate commerce. This impression of the measure is entirely borne out by a reading of the report from the Committee on Labor, which recommends its passage.

In the outset of their report, in stating the design of the bill, they say:

> It attacks the national evil of child labor.

And, again, I read in the report:

> As it will be observed, the minimum penalties fixed under the act are comparatively small as contrasted with the character of the injury done to the State by the lawbreaker in fostering the national evil which it is the aim of this bill to abolish.

Under the second subdivision of the report, entitled "Necessity for Federal relief," not a word is said about any needed or wholesome regulation of the agencies of commerce, but five and one-half pages are consumed in dealing with the necessity for such police regulations which by law belong to the States and a complaint that the States have not done so efficiently.

We read in Upshur on the Federal Government, 98 and post, the following:

> Congress has no right to employ for one purpose means ostensibly provided for another. To do so would be a positive fraud and a manifest usurpation; for if the purpose be lawful, it may be accomplished by its own appropriate means, and if it is unlawful it should not be accomplished at all. Without this check it is obvious that Congress may by indirection accomplish almost any forbidden object.

It is difficult to follow the line of reasoning adopted by the committee which brings them to the conclusion that Federal relief only is competent to cure it, for on page 12 of their report they show that 44 States have already legislated upon this subject.

If 44 States of this Union have already undertaken the task of dealing with this problem, including all the great manufacturing States, we may well ask ourselves the question why should the Congress of the United States undertake it, and especially since it involves setting a dangerous precedent by violating the Constitution.

That the laws in the several States differ in their provisions is but the greater reason why they should be let alone. Each State is attempting to meet the requirements peculiar to the condition and needs of its own people.

Is it not fair to presume that the legislatures of the several States, elected by the voters of those States and directly responsible to them, are more competent to judge of the needs of that State than is Congress, far removed from the people to be affected, and with only a few Members who have any first-hand information of their peculiar needs?

Is it possible that those who advocate this measure think that they have "received the coal from off the altar" of ultimate truth? Do they ascribe to themselves that wisdom which, they hold, has been denied to the State legislatures, by which they are justified in fixing this absolute rule for the government of the citizens of all the States?

It is absolutely certain, as seen from the instrument itself, as well as from the writings of that day, that the great minds who framed our Constitution never accredited us as Congressmen with such wisdom.

The sovereign States only delegated to Congress certain powers, and among these is the right to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States. All other powers not delegated were reserved to the States.

There was a deep-seated conviction among the framers of our Federal Constitution that a Federal Government composed of several States, each retaining large jurisdiction, was far preferable to a strong central government.

One whose writings inspired much of the thought of the day was Rousseau; his Contrat Social became a standard textbook for the makers of government of those days. In this work, Rousseau says:

> As nature has set limits to the stature of a properly formed man, outside which it produces only giants and dwarfs; so likewise, with regard to the best constitution of a state, there are limits to its possible extent, so that it may be neither too great to enable it to be well governed nor too small to enable it to maintain itself single-handed. There is in every body politic a maximum of force which it can not exceed and which is often diminished as the state is aggrandized. The more the social bond is extended, the more it is weakened; and, in general, a small state is proportionally stronger than a large one.
>
> A thousand reasons demonstrate the truth of this maxim. In the first place, administration becomes more difficult at great distances, as a weight becomes heavier at the end of a long lever. * * * The same laws can not be suited to so many different provinces, which have different customs and different climates, and can not tolerate the same form of government. * * * The chiefs, overwhelmed with business, see nothing themselves; clerks rule the state. In a word, the measures that must be taken to maintain the general authority, which so many officers at a distance wish to evade or impose upon, absorb all the public attention; no regard for the welfare of the people remains, and scarcely any for their defense in time of need; and thus a body too huge for its constitution sinks and perishes, crushed by its own weight.

Mr. Jefferson, in his first inaugural address, summarized what he termed "the essential principles of our Government," and among the first of these he placed—

The support of the State governments in all their rights as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies.

It would be a very difficult task for each Member of Congress to so inform himself of the peculiar local conditions prevailing in the numerous manufacturing industries of each separate State, so that he could wisely determine what regulations were best for each. It would be necessary for him to take into consideration the different classes of people that he would have to regulate, the variations of climate, the economic condition of the working people, the different burdens incident to the manufacture of the various products of different manufacturing industries; in short, the different environments and requirements of each industrial plant in each State. This is not practical, and without it it would be unsafe to attempt it.

It would be as unreasonable for Congress to fix an absolute rule to govern the employees in every manufacturing plant in this Union, without regard to the different conditions that surround each, as to prescribe the minimum age below which a girl should not marry, to effect alike the tropical possessions of this country, and our most northern possessions. All will agree that, if Congress possessed this power, it would be necessary to take into consideration this different environment.

A different rule should apply as to age and hours of labor, both as to children and adults, in a bleak New England city, with its severe climate, where the employees of a cotton mill, mostly foreigners, live huddled together in overcrowded and poorly ventilated houses for nine months in the year, where the mill hand hurries from the mill to his home to escape the cold, from that which should apply in a rural village in the balmy Southland, where everyone moves slower, where the houses are far apart and well ventilated, and where there is abundant opportunity for fresh air and balmy sunshine while on duty, and where there is abundant opportunity for play and recreation in the open air when not on duty.

A different age and different hours of labor should prevail for a child who is engaged at a machine that requires a constant mental or physical strain from the time it enters the mill until the working day is over from those that should apply to a doffer in a fine yarn spinning mill in the South, where the work done during the day does not require constant work, and when not employed he is permitted to amuse himself as he pleases, with the one restriction that he must be within calling distance of the foreman, so that when the spools run empty he can be called to take them off and put another set on. As explained in the hearings had on this bill, this is in the main the work required of the younger help in a southern cotton mill.

Notwithstanding my high regard for the wisdom of the Representative from Colorado who makes the report on this bill for the Committee on Labor, who comes from a State that hardly knows what a cotton mill looks like, I can not think that he knows better the needs of the cotton-mill employees in North Carolina than does that splendid body of sincere, humane, and broad-minded men from every county of the State that compose our State legislature. The same observation is true of any other Member of this House who is not familiar with the difficulties, needs, and environments surrounding this growing industry in my State.

But you Members from the New England States who are not familiar with conditions in the South, and you who come from agricultural States who know nothing at first hand of cotton-mill industry, wonder why all this sentiment and prejudice has been created against the southern cotton mills.

The ninth congressional district in North Carolina, which I have the honor to represent, contains a number of well-equipped cotton mills. The men employed in them constitute a very considerable part of the population in at least 6 of the 10 counties in my district. I know them, and when I am down in the district I go among them, speak to them, and am very happy to claim them as my friends.

The industry is not an old one. I have watched its development almost from its beginning. The war left our people too poor to build such costly enterprises, but by the hardest work, by men, women, and children, without too great a care as to the number of hours they worked, and the closest economy, our people restocked their farms and reclaimed their waste lands. We had plenty of water power, and after a time, by the combined efforts of our people, enough money was gotten together to build a few small mills. There were no high-salaried men among them; the manager usually worked harder than the employees. Those who came to work in the mill were, in the main, the less fortunate in the community, who did not own land and had to depend upon making a living by renting land; they were, however, the mill owner's old neighbors and friends with whom he grew up, who called him by his first name, visited him and his family on Sundays and in sickness, and received, in turn, the same kindly attention from him.

It is not necessary for me to tell you that there was a strong bond of friendship between them. The help went from the farm because they could better their condition; they stayed at the mill because they were satisfied. These small ventures proved successful and others were built; other families from the country found employment with them, and thus the industry has grown from this unpretentious beginning.

In the infancy of the industry the mills were not so well equipped, the homes for the employees were not so comfortable, and the same care was not taken of the help. Too often a kind-hearted superintendent yielded to the appeal of some widow with a house full of children, whose only hope to get on the pay roll was through her young children.

As these industries passed the experiment stage, the managers began to realize that their success depended largely upon efficient help and that it was the best policy to guard their health and comfort. I feel safe in asserting that the mills that have been built in my district during the last 10 years are as modern and sanitary in every particular as you can find in any district represented on the floor of the House, with every protection and comfort that has come into general use.

The employees are comfortably housed in healthy buildings. Usually the mill furnishes a large and comfortable hall that serves as a place of worship or for public entertainment. The mill owners were the pioneers in advocating compulsory education. This has nowhere been so effective as among the children in mill villages, for with them they can not now get in the mill until they have attended school for the required length of time each year. The mill owners are anxious that their help be educated and use every means to foster and promote education, in many cases to the extent of largely supplementing the funds provided for public schools.

With all these advantages that are not always accorded the child on the farm, who lives his secluded life, you will not be surprised to learn that the problem of the landowner in my district is to get enough help to run his farm.

But we have always had the agitator; we have, perhaps, not paid enough attention to him. My people are a practical people, and whether you credit them with doing it for the sake of humanity or because they found it a good policy for their business, they have, from year to year, steadily improved the conditions prevailing in the mill village until it is marvelous to me that there are still credulous people with maudlin sentiment enough to contribute their salaries to keep the agitator at his work. We know that as long as the salary is forthcoming the paid agitator will keep on agitating.

We know him and his methods as well as we know the cheap itinerant sewing machine agent. With a few cheap pictures taken of God's unfortunates somewhere and a sensational and slanderous report of awful conditions as he found them, he is fully armed to go forth and battle for humanity, knowing well that the moment he reports that conditions have changed he is out of a job and without the very desirable pay envelope.

Prof. Richard Karl Walker, in his publication, "The problem of the southern cotton mill," pays his respects to the representatives of the national child labor committee in the following language:

Of all those attacking the southern cotton manufacturer, the representatives of the national child labor committee are deserving of the severest censure. Their methods are vicious; their practices are pernicious; the work of their hands is in every sense destructive. With the grin of a sneak and a leer at the manufacturer, the paid agents of this organization turn to the public with a tale of woe and oppression, and, under cover of profuse protestations of interest in the welfare of the operative, they deliver an assassin's thrust at the builder and business of the South's greatest industry.

I know there are men on the national child labor committee who are honest and sincere; there are a lot of people outside of this committee also who believe they are serving God and humanity by fostering the paid agitators on the South. Against all these I have no harsh word to utter.

Did you ever hear of any of these organizations attempting to relieve suffering or in any way relieve against the dire want and poverty that they picture in the reports of conditions that prevail? Is it not strange that their sentiment, if not their judgment, has not suggested to them that they could help in other ways than by an agitation that would merely produce legislation? Did you ever hear of one of these paid agents who has the proof that laws of the States have been violated, in the form of a picture that bore no date to show its age or to indicate how long it had already done service, and nothing to indicate where it purports to have been taken, or who makes a

gruesome report of how the lifeblood is being sapped from the child, but fails to name the mill, the parent of the child, or in any way specify so that his falsehood could be exposed, going to the prosecuting officer of the district where such conditions exist, or, if need be, going before a grand jury of that jurisdiction and exposing the violations of law and ask the punishment?

Cotton manufacturing in North Carolina is mainly limited to certain sections. The larger part of the State is almost wholly agricultural. The judges who try such offenders come from the various judicial districts and are independent of any local influences. The vast majority composing the legislature of the State come from sections not affected by any local sentiment of the mills. All of these have the same burning desire to correct evils of every kind that burns in the heart of the sentimentalist. When these act officially, it is not heralded abroad by an agitator; when they do not act, it is because no sufficient evidence has been found to warrant action.

The cotton-mill industry mainly exists in the New England States and in the South, mainly North and South Carolina. The New England States already have labor laws that are held up to us as standards, and it is unreasonable to suppose that this legislation is aimed at them. It is fair to conclude, it seems to me, from a reading of the report and the hearings before the committee and from a review of the situation, that this bill is aimed largely at the South.

It is generally believed and freely talked among millmen and legislators of the South that much of the agitation against the southern cotton manufacturer is carried on at the instance of and with the support of some of the New England States. Why all this demand for a uniform law regulating labor unless it is simply the pretext by which they hope to foist upon the mills of the South the same labor laws and troubles that they experience in New England and thereby lessen competition with them.

On behalf of one of the noblest aggregations of good, plain, honest, and humane business men that ever graced a common enterprise in a State—to whom just credit will some day be given for the noble part they have played in the rebuilding of the South—the pioneer mill builders of the South, I want to thank the Committee on Labor for the scant compliment, which we feel must have been intended for us, when they stated that—

> The evidence from cotton manufacturers indicate a gratifying attention to the welfare of their employees in other respects.

I can not but regret that the committee did not find the time to accept the offer of the southern millmen and go to the South at the expense of the millmen and get full and first-hand information for themselves. The southern millmen offered, in perfect good faith, to charter a car and give the committee every opportunity of knowing the truth. They realize that until they can dissipate the cloud that has been produced to obscure your vision they can hardly hope that you will have a clear understanding of the situation.

Since this bill has been pending in Congress I have received petitions from 1,780 employees fron the mills in my district who oppose this legislation. All of these petitions were introduced by me and referred to the Committee on Labor. I regret that the committee brushed aside these petitions without giving them due consideration or weight.

The bill permits persons between 14 and 16 years to work during the daytime for only eight hours per day. Our people of all ages on farms and public works, in mills, stores, and offices have found it practical to work longer hours than this. If this bill passes, it will not be practical to utilize this privilege between the ages of 14 and 16 in cotton mills. The work of each machine in a well-equipped mill is so timed that if you stop any part of the machinery you cut off the material to be run through the next process, and if part of the help only works eight hours this measures the output of the mill. This would eliminate the work of children between the ages of 14 and 16 at any regular employment in the mills. This result has been demonstrated by the operation of such a law in the State of Kentucky, as shown by Mr. Clark in the hearings before the committee.

There is a bond of friendship between the managers and the help, and they work in harmony because each respects the rights of the other. The mill employees in my district are all white people, and are an independent class who can take care of themselves and would not be easily imposed upon by the managers of the mills.

It is to be regretted that there should ever be a dire necessity to labor, and especially by children, but this condition sometimes exists, and unfortunately those back of this bill have not suggested a remedy for it.

I believe there is a virtue to be derived from honest toil aside from the money return, that could never be developed through idleness. There is no position in a cotton mill that requires an employee to sit fixed in one position under a mental or physical strain during the working day. I have already spoken of the lighter work and freedom accorded the younger employees in the mill. Did a paid agitator ever show you a group picture of the doffer boys, on the river bank stripped for a swim, during the time they were not needed in the performance of their daily work? Or a group of these boys and girls sitting out in the grove enjoying the open air and sunshine until they were again needed? These are familiar sights which might be photographed almost any summer day at a rural mill. What better place could be suggested for them than to permit them to go with their parent into the mill where they would receive oversight and care? Place yourself in the position of the father of a boy, who works in a mill, and tell me what he is to do with this boy between the ages of 12 and 16, when the school term is out. There is nothing else for him to do. He is far better off for having done light work with his father than to have loafed around the mill village learning bad habits and getting into mischief. A boy or girl that never acquires the habit of honest toil before they reach the age of 16, enters live under a serious handicap.

Our mill employees are against this bill because it prescribes an unreasonable restriction upon their inherent right to labor and because it would deprive them of the right to teach their children industry and have them help in a reasonable way to contribute toward the family expense.

Section 4, which provides for the agents and detectives, is not only unnecessary, but it is an unwarranted reflection upon the law-abiding mill men everywhere. The main thing that it would accomplish, in so far as the cotton mill of the South is concerned, would be to furnish employment for some self-styled moral censor, and an army of inquisitors, always spying and prying into these industries which give honest employment to thousands of needy people.

Section 2 of the bill is so harsh and unreasonable that I find it difficult to seriously discuss it. It provides: "Section 2. Proof of employment within 60 days prior to shipment of such product therefrom," of a child under the prohibitions of section 1, "shall be prima facie evidence that such product has been produced in whole or in part by the labor of such a child." This must be considered in connection with section 8, which says:

> That in prosecutions under this act each shipment or delivery for shipment shall constitute a separate offense.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the southern cotton mills sell a part of their product in the markets of the State. In the manufacture of this there would be no law prohibiting the labor of a child of 12 years, while there was no term of their school, and yet his mere employment in the mill would be sufficient to make out a prima facie case, not for one shipment, but for every shipment in interstate commerce for more than two months thereafter. Ordinarily, we presume a person innocent until the State or Government proves him guilty, but in this case it is reversed and he is presumed guilty for perhaps a hundred different offenses, if he should happen to have made that number of shipments in interstate commerce within the following 60 days. The managers of a large mill would be absolutely unable to know whether they had a good defense or not if they attempted to live up to the privileges granted under the State law, and which were forbidden by the act of Congress. The enforcement of this bill would effectively destroy all rights on the part of the State to prescribe rules bearing upon the subject.

He would not be prosecuted in his local courts but must be dragged away to a Federal court for trial.

This rule of evidence would furnish a vigilant sneak an opportunity of harrassing a manufacturer past endurance, whether innocent or guilty, and invites the vengeance of any enemy it might have.

The fact that this law also applies to a "dealer" would give it the practical effect of requiring a guaranty to accompany every package sent out by the mill, whether sent within the State or beyond, for should it ever become the subject of interstate commerce the dealer who delivered it for shipment might then be convicted under the drastic provisions of this bill, and the only way he could feel safe would be to have the protection the guaranty would afford.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE MEASURE.

I now come to a discussion of what seems to me to be the most serious matter involved—whether such legislation can be justified by any power granted to Congress by the Constitution.

If this power exists in Congress it must be found in what is known as the commerce clause of the Constitution, which confers upon Congress the right to regulate commerce with foreign nations, between the States, and with the Indian tribes. If it is not so delegated to Congress, then it is clear that by the

tenth amendment to the Federal Constitution it is reserved to the States.

It seems to me unfortunate that the Committee on Labor did not give greater consideration to the constitutionality of the measure before so earnestly and strongly recommending its passage. It is true that they concluded that the measure was within the power of Congress to enact, but this question seems, however, not to have received the grave consideration that a question of this importance should demand. I say this because of the attitude shown toward this question in the report. On page 13 they say they invited a full discussion of this phase of the proposed legislation, but following this they add:

Needless to say, however, your committee did this, not with a view to arrogate to themselves the duty of passing judgment upon a problem of constitutional law but rather with a view of provoking discussion and of informing themselves and Congress as to the general attitude upon this problem of experts familiar with the authorities and the trend of judicial thought.

In asking the House to seriously consider its constitutionality I am but asking you to follow the precedent set by your predecessors. This same constitutional question confronted the Members of the Fifty-ninth Congress. So zealous were they in the discharge of their sworn duty that, before they were willing to take up and consider the expediency of such legislation, they referred a resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary, asking them to advise the House as to the constitutionality of the measure. On that committee there were able lawyers, and through its chairman, Judge Jenkins, it unanimously reported to the House that—

The committee is of the opinion that Congress has no jurisdiction or authority over the subject of woman and child labor and has no authority to suppress any abuses of such labor or ameliorate conditions surrounding the employment of such labor.

This report reviews the authorities bearing upon the question and sets out very clearly the reasons that led the committee to its conclusion.

After carefully reviewing the authorities cited by Mr. KEATING and by Judge Jenkins and the recent decisions of the courts bearing upon the question, I have clearly reached the conclusion that the power to enact legislation here proposed is not conferred upon Congress by the Federal Constitution, but is reserved to the several States, and that it would be dangerous and unwise to attempt to give to the Constitution such a strained construction.

Chief Justice Fuller, in writing the opinion for the Supreme Court in the case of United States against E. C. Knight Co. (156 U. S., I), says:

It is vital that the independence of the commercial power and of the police power and the delimitation between them, however sometimes perplexing, should always be recognized and observed, for while the one furnishes the strongest bond of union the other is essential to the preservation of the autonomy of the States as required by our dual form of Government; and acknowledged evils, however grave and urgent they may appear to be, had better be borne than the risk be run, in the effort to suppress them, of more serious consequences by resort to expedients of even doubtful constitutionality.

If our dual form of government is to last, it is necessary that we set a limit to what Mr. KEATING, in his report on the pending bill, calls "the broadening view of the power of Congress under the interstate-commerce clause."

In this day of world war we can read in almost any daily paper of how our very existence as a Nation is threatened by a fancied attack from some foreign enemy. Such a thing is awful to contemplate. We can console ourselves that such may never come. But unless we can adopt a safe limit, beyond which the power of the Federal Government, by strained construction of the commerce clause of the Constitution can not go, we shall have our dual form of government destroyed. Against it there is no consolation that a better Government may be formed.

We, as Members of Congress, are all inclined to stretch a power needed to accomplish what we strive for and desire, and especially when we feel we are doing it in behalf of a righteous cause, but by reaching out a little further each time we are gradually appropriating to ourselves the reserved power which originally and still belongs to the States. And when this absorption of power has become complete, this Government will no longer be a Nation made up of sovereign States but a Nation composed of taxing districts, which will inevitably fall.

By encroachment, we would throw away what Tocqueville considered "a great discovery in modern political science," and destroy the distinguishing feature of our Constitution, which Gladstone described as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

If the Constitution had not prescribed the limits to our congressional power, it seems that such encroachment still would not be a wise policy to pursue. Thomas Jefferson says, in his autobiography:

Were not this great country already divided into States, that division must be made, that each might do for itself what concerns itself directly, and which it can so much better do than a distant authority.

Mr. Lincoln said in his first inaugural address:

It is my duty and my oath to maintain inviolate the right of the States to order and control under the Constitution their own affairs by their own judgment exclusively. Such maintenance is essential for a preservation of that balance of power on which our institutions rest.

Senator Edmunds said in a debate in the Senate:

I believe that the safety of the Republic as a Nation—one people, one hope, one destiny—depends more largely upon the preservation of what are called the rights of the States than upon any one thing.

Senator Elihu Root, in his Princeton lectures upon the Constitution, delivered last year, declares that:

On the other hand, if the power of the Nation would override that of the States and usurp their functions, we should have this vast country, with its great population, inhabiting widely separated regions, differing in climate, in production, in industrial and social interests and ideas, governed in all its local affairs by one all-powerful central Government at Washington, imposing upon the home life and behavior of each community the opinions and ideas of propriety of distant majorities. Not only would this be intolerable and alien to the idea of free self-government, but it would be beyond the power of a central Government to do directly. Decentralization would be made necessary by the mass of Government business to be transacted, and so our separate localities would come to be governed by delegated authorities, by proconsuls authorized from Washington to execute the will of the great majority of the whole people. No one can doubt that this also would lead by its different routes to the separation of our Union. Preservation of our dual system of government, carefully restrained in each of its parts by the limitations of the Constitution, has made possible our growth in local self-government and national power in the past, and, so far as we can see, it is essential to the continuance of that Government in the future.

If Senator Root had sought to illustrate to the Princeton students just what he meant in this abstract discourse upon our Government, its dangers or tendencies, he could not have found one that so well illustrates the necessity of preserving to the States the powers that have been reserved to them by the Constitution, than the provisions of this bill we are now considering.

My contention is that the sole purpose of this bill is to regulate manufacture by prescribing the age and hours of labor of persons who are to be permitted to work in mines or factories, and that it bears within its terms and provisions evidence of its real purpose, and that a court can see, as can every Member of this House, that it is not for the purpose of regulating commerce between the States at all.

Mr. Justice Lamar said, in Kidd *v.* Pierson (126 U. S., p. 1):

No distinction is more popular to the common mind or more clearly expressed in economic and political literature than that between manufacture and commerce. Manufacture is transformation—the fashioning of raw materials into a change of form for use. The functions of commerce are different. The buying and selling and the transportation incident thereto constitute commerce; and the regulation of commerce in the constitutional sense embraces the regulation at least of such transportation. * * * If it be held that the term includes the regulation of all such manufactures as are intended to be the subject of commercial transactions in the future, it is impossible to deny that it would also include all productive industries that contemplate the same thing. The result would be that Congress would be invested, to the exclusion of the States, with the power to regulate, not only manufactures, but also agriculture, horticulture, stock raising, domestic fisheries, mining—in short, every branch of human industry. For is there one of them that does not contemplate, more or less clearly, an interstate or foreign market? Does not the wheat grower of the Northwest and the cotton planter of the South plant, cultivate, and harvest his crop with an eye on the prices at Liverpool, New York, and Chicago? The power being vested in Congress and denied to the States, it would follow as an inevitable result that the duty would devolve on Congress to regulate all of these delicate, multiform, and vital interests—interests which in their nature are and must be local in all the details of their successful management.

It is not necessary to enlarge on, but also to suggest the impracticability of such a scheme, when we regard the multitudinous affairs involved and the almost infinite variety of their minute details. * * * * * * Any movement toward the establishment of rules of production in this vast country, with its many different climates and opportunities, could only be at the sacrifice of the peculiar advantages of a large part of the localities in it, if not of every one of them. On the other hand, any movement toward the local, detailed, and incongruous legislation required by such interpretation would be about the widest possible departure from the declared object of the clause in question. Nor this alone. Even in the exercise of the power contended for, Congress would be confined to the regulation, not of certain branches of industry, however numerous, but to those instances in each and every branch where the producer contemplated an interstate market. These instances would be almost infinite, as we have seen; but still there would always remain the possibility, and often it would be the case, that the producer contemplated a domestic market. In that case the supervisory power must be executed by the State; and the interminable trouble would be presented, that whether the one power or the other should exercise the authority in question would be determined not by any general or intelligent rule but by the secret and changeable intention of the producer in each and every act of production. A situation more paralyzing to the State governments and more productive of conflicts between the General Government and the States and less likely to have been what the framers of the Constitution intended it would be difficult to imagine. * * *

This court has already decided that the fact that an article was manufactured for export to another State does not of itself make it an article of interstate commerce within the meaning of section 8,

article 1, of the Constitution, and that the intent of the manufacturer does not determine the time when the article or product passes from the control of the State and belongs to commerce.

So we see that the decision of the United States Supreme Court, upholding the right of the State and denying this right to Congress, is a direct authority upon the question presented in this bill.

The case of Adair against the United States (208 U. S., 161) passes upon the right of Congress to make it a crime for a carrier engaged in interstate commerce to discharge an employee simply because of his membership in a labor organization. Mr. Justice Harlan, in delivering the opinion of the court, denying this right to Congress, said:

The general right to make a contract in relation to his business is part of the liberty of the individual protected by the fourteenth amendment of the Federal Constitution. (Allgeyer *v.* Louisiana, 165 U. S., 578.) Under that provision no State can deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. The right to purchase or sell labor is part of the liberty protected by this amendment unless there are circumstances which exclude the right.

The opinion, then, recognizes the right of the State, through its police power to regulate these rights by fair, reasonable, and appropriate laws. This same opinion says:

Manifestly, any rule prescribed for the conduct of interstate commerce, in order to be within the competency of Congress under its power to regulate commerce among the States, must have some real or substantial relation to or connection with the commerce regulated. But what possible legal or logical connection is there between an employee's membership in a labor organization and the carrying on of interstate commerce? Such relation to a labor organization can not have, in itself and in the eye of the law, any bearing upon the commerce with which the employee is connected by his labor and services. * * * If such a power exists in Congress, it is difficult to perceive why it might not, by absolute regulation, require interstate carriers, under penalties, to employ in the conduct of its interstate business only members of labor organizations or only those who are not members of such organizations—a power which could not be recognized as existing under the Constitution of the United States. No such rule of criminal liability as that to which we have referred can be regarded as, in any just sense, a regulation of interstate commerce. We need scarcely repeat what this court has more than once said, that the power to regulate interstate commerce, great and paramount as that power is, can not be exerted in violation of any fundamental right secured by other provisions of the Constitution. (Gibbons *v.* Ogden, 9 Wheat., 1, 196; Lottery Case, 188 U. S., 321, 353.)

It results, on the whole case, that the provision of the statute under which the defendant was convicted must be held to be repugnant to the fifth amendment and is not embraced by nor within the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce, but under the guise of regulating interstate commerce and as applied to this case it arbitrarily sanctions an illegal invasion of the personal liberty as well as the right of property of the defendant Adair.

There is much more reason to contend that Congress can prescribe the qualifications of a man to be employed in handling interstate commerce, the very agency employed in the traffic, than there is to say that Congress can say who shall be employed in a mill or mine that makes a product that may find its way into interstate commerce.

Mr. Justice Bradley, delivering the opinion of the court in the case of Coe against Errol (116 U. S., 517, 525), says:

There must be a point of time when they (logs cut and hauled to a river town to be transported, interstate) cease to be governed by the domestic law and begin to be governed and protected by the national law of commercial regulation, and that moment seems to us to be a legitimate one for this purpose in which they commence their final movement from the State of their origin to that of their destination.

This appeals to our common sense, and if it be good law, then the earliest moment an act of Congress could get hold of and regulate a product from a mill or mine would be when that product has been delivered at the depot of the common carrier for transportation beyond the State. All right to say that the general health of the employees required that they be not allowed to work in a given enterprise before they reached a certain age, or before a certain hour of the day, would have nothing to do with commerce, and Congress could not regulate these. The last opinion quoted from continues:

It can not be denied that the power of a State to protect the lives, health, and property of its citizens, and to preserve good order and the public morals, "the power to govern men and things within the limits of its dominion," is a power originally and always belonging to the States, not surrendered by them to the General Government nor directly restrained by the Constitution of the United States, and essentially exclusive.

To the same effect is the decision of The Daniel Ball, Tenth Wallace, 557, 565:

Whenever a commodity has begun to move as an article of trade from one State to another, commerce in that commodity between the States has commenced.

We are referred to certain cases in which the Supreme Court has upheld the law, which are regarded by the advocates of this bill as some authority for upholding the provisions of this bill. In all of these we can find a distinguishing feature that completely differentiates them from the provision of the one under consideration.

Every article that has been excluded from commerce by an act of Congress has been an article that was bad in itself, immoral, or fraudulent. Such articles are spoken of in some of the opinions as outlawed. Justice Harlan described it in the lottery case as the kind of traffic which no one can be entitled to pursue as a mattery of right.

In the case of lottery tickets it required interstate commerce to complete the gambling contract, and in this way commerce became a potent factor in promoting the gambling contracts.

In the pure-food cases the thing prohibited was bad, dangerous, and fraudulent; in the white-slave traffic act the subject of the traffic which was forbidden was the person of the woman for immoral purposes; but in the case presented here there is nothing inherently dangerous or bad in cotton yarn or cloth made by a person under the age limit prescribed or in violation of the hour limit named. It can have no harmful effect upon those to whom it is shipped. Mr. Justice Peckham, in Schollenberger *v.* Pennsylvania (171 U. S., p. 12), says:

The general rule to be deducted from the decisions of this court is that a lawful article can not be wholly excluded from importation into a State from another State where it was manufactured or grown.

Eminent authorities have, however, discussed the very question raised in this bill—the question as to whether Congress could prohibit the shipment in interstate commerce of goods made by child labor. Upon this subject ex-President Taft, in his work on Popular Government, has this to say:

Bills have been urged upon Congress to forbid interstate commerce in goods made by child labor. Such proposed legislation has failed chiefly because it was thought beyond the Federal power. The distinction between the power exercised in enacting the pure food and that which would have been necessary in the case of the child labor is that Congress in the former is only preventing interstate commerce from being a vehicle for conveyance of something which would be injurious to people at its destination, and it might properly decline to permit the use of interstate commerce for that detrimental result. In the latter case Congress would be using its regulative power of interstate commerce not to effect any result of interstate commerce. Articles made by child labor are presumably as good and useful as articles made by adults. The proposed law is to be enforced to discourage the making of articles by child labor in the State from which the articles were shipped. In other words, it seeks indirectly and by duress to compel the States to pass a certain kind of legislation that is completely within their discretion to enact or not. Child labor in the State of shipment has no legitimate or germane relation to the interstate commerce of which the goods thus made are to form a part, to its character, or to its effect. Such an attempt of Congress to use its power of regulating such commerce to suppress the use of child labor in the State of shipment would be a clear usurpation of that State's rights.

In Watson on the Constitution the subject is treated under the title, "Articles made by women and children, and transportation thereof," as follows:

Closely akin to the question of regulating manufacturing is the question whether Congress can forbid the hauling of a commodity, by a carrier of interstate commerce, which was manufactured in a State, for instance, by women or children under a certain age as has been recently maintained. This question is of far-reaching effect, and if such power exists in Congress it would result in the most complete invasion of the sovereignty of the States by the General Government which has ever been accomplished under the Federal Constitution.

The author then reviews at length the decision in Kidd against Pearson, United States against Knight Co., the Lottery Case, and a number of others, and finally concludes:

There is no power in Congress to control the manufacture of goods in the States destined for interstate or foreign commerce, and consequently Congress is unable to control the labor of persons engaged in manufacturing products in the States which are intended for interstate or foreign business. Such regulations are left to the State. The power to make such regulations resided there before the Constitution was adopted or the Union was formed and it was not surrendered by the States to the General Government.

But why multiply authorities, all to the same effect? It has been boldly asserted that the report of the Committee on Labor, which recommends the passage of this bill, cites no precedent in the annals of Congress itself nor any authoritative deliverance from any judicial tribunal to sustain it.

Is it possible that this House will not take counsel of the great constitutional lawyers and statesmen of the past or present; that it will not be guided by the official and authoritative utterances of our highest judicial tribunal, whose duty it is to give the last and final interpretation to our Constitution?

If there are those in this House who do not feel a binding force in the limitations of power contained in the Constitution, I desire to call to their attention the words of Judge Cooley:

Legislators have their authority measured by the Constitution. They are chosen to do what it permits and nothing more, and they take solemn oath to obey and support it. When they disregard its provisions they usurp authority, abuse their trust, and violate the promise they have confirmed by an oath. To pass an act when they are in doubt whether it is not violating the Constitution is to treat as of no force the most imperative obligations any person can assume. A business agent who would deal in that manner with his principal's business would be treated as untrustworthy; a witness in court who would treat his oath thus lightly and affirm things concerning which he was in doubt would be held a criminal. Indeed, it is because the legislature has applied the judgment of its members to the question of its authority to pass the proposed law, and has only passed it after being satisfied of the authority, that the judiciary waive their own doubts and give it their support.

Section 4 of the bill, which provides for inspection of mills and mines if they ever produce articles for interstate commerce, is indefensible from the standpoint of its constitutionality. It does not even pretend to limit the inspection to the goods produced for interstate shipment; and, indeed, it would be impossible to distinguish between those for intrastate and those for interstate shipment during the course of their production. It attempts to override all the reserved rights of the States and to draw under its full inspection all such enterprises. What has already been said as to the unconstitutionality of the main feature of the bill applies with even greater force to this section.

I close by quoting the strong language used by Judge Jenkins in his report to the Fifty-ninth Congress, already referred to:

In fact, it is not a debatable question. It would be a reflection upon the intelligence of Congress to so legislate. It would be casting an unwelcome burden upon the Supreme Court to so legislate. The agitation of such legislation produces an uneasy feeling among the people and confuses the average mind as to the power of Congress and the power of the States. The lives, health, and property of the women and children engaged in labor is exclusively within the power of the States, originally and always belong to the States, not surrendered by them to Congress. Such is the emphatic language of the Supreme Court. If a question of good order or morals, it is the same. The argument has long since been made by others, and the committee can not add to it. The assertion of such power by Congress would destroy every vestige of State authority, obliterate State lines, nullify the great work of the framers of the Constitution, and leave the State governments mere matters of form, devoid of power, and ought to more than satisfy the fondest dreams of those favoring centralization of power.

I regard such attempted legislation by Congress as bad, considered from the standpoint of public policy, and when looked at from the standpoint of its constitutionality as a dangerous usurpation. Manufacture is no part of commerce. Then, how can the control of commerce by Congress give Congress control over manufacture.

The bill, in my opinion, is clearly unconstitutional, and I should regret to see the House pass such a void measure and thus set such a dangerous precedent.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Labor I yield some time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COPLEY].

Mr. COPLEY. Mr. Chairman, on June 17, 1913, I introduced the following bill:

A bill (H. R. 6146) to further regulate interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting interstate transportation of the products of certain forms of child labor, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the labor of children in certain industries and under certain conditions hereinafter described is hereby defined as antisocial child labor, and that this act shall be known, referred to, and cited as the Federal child-labor act.

SEC. 2. That the employment of a child under 14 years of age in any mill, factory, cannery, workshop, manufacturing or mechanical establishment, or of a child under 16 years of age in any coal mine, coal breaker, coke oven, quarry, or in any establishment where poisonous or dangerous acids, gases, or dyes are used, manufactured, or packed, or in any establishment wherein the work done or materials or equipment handled are dangerous to the life and limb or injurious to the health or morals of such a child is hereby designated and defined as antisocial child labor and as detrimental to the general welfare and debasing to commerce.

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of Labor, within six months after the passage of this act, to classify and make public a list of such businesses or industries as are included within those described in section 2 of this act, together with a list of the products of such businesses or industries; and it shall be the duty of the Secretary of Labor to revise from time to time said public list as the changing character of industrial establishments or additional information received by the Secretary of Labor shall warrant and require.

SEC. 4. That any person, firm, or corporation which owns or operates a business or establishment designated in section 2 of this act and included within those businesses or industries listed by the Secretary of Labor as herein required, may make or cause to be made by his duly authorized agent an affidavit to the effect that no antisocial child labor is employed in his business or establishment, and that the products thereof are not produced with the aid of antisocial child labor. When such an affidavit in the form duly approved by the Secretary of Labor is filed with the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Labor shall issue a certificate to the maker of the said affidavit, or to the person, firm, or corporation in whose behalf said affidavit is made, giving authority to said person, firm, or corporation to stamp or label the goods and products of such business or establishment in the following manner: "Registered under the Federal child-labor act, Serial No. ——." The serial number certified by the Secretary of Labor shall be the number given to the affidavit on file by virtue of which said certificate is made as herein provided.

SEC. 5. That six months from and after the passage of this act no carrier of interstate commerce shall knowingly accept for initial interstate transportation or knowingly transport initially in interstate commerce the goods or products of any business or establishment described in section 2 of this act and included within those businesses or industries listed by the Secretary of Labor as herein provided which have been made with the aid of antisocial child labor or have been made in any business or establishment in which antisocial child labor is employed; and no jobber, wholesaler, manufacturer, producer, or other dealer in such goods and products shall knowingly make initial shipment or knowingly offer for initial shipment in interstate commerce any such goods or products so made: *Provided, however,* That in case any such goods or products the interstate transportation whereof is hereby prohibited shall be presented for transportation and transported, stamped and labeled "Registered under the Federal child-labor act, Serial No. ——," as provided in section 4 of this act, the carrier, jobber, wholesaler, or other dealer in such goods or products, excepting the manufacturer or producer thereof, responsible for such interstate transportation shall be presumed to have been ignorant of the fact that such goods or products were of the character prohibited by this act.

SEC. 6. That within six months from and after passage of this act the Secretary of Labor shall examine the laws of the several States relating to the employment of child labor and give public notice and certify to the governor of each of the several States whether or not, in the opinion of the Secretary of Labor, the law of each particular State substantially prohibits and effectively prevents antisocial child labor as herein defined; and the Secretary of Labor shall from time to time make such revision of his certificate regarding the laws of the several States as the changes therein, or additional information by him received, shall warrant or require; and for the purposes of this act the judgment and decision of the Secretary of Labor as to whether the laws of a particular State substantially prohibit and effectively prevent antisocial child labor as herein defined shall be final. The provisions of this act prohibiting interstate transportation of the products of antisocial child labor as herein defined shall not apply either to the carrier of interstate commerce or to the manufacturer, producer, jobber, wholesaler, or other dealer offering for interstate transportation, or accepting for or transporting in interstate transportation, any initial shipment from a State certified by the Secretary of Labor as prohibiting and preventing antisocial child labor into any other State or Territory.

SEC. 7. That any officer or agent of any carrier of interstate commerce, or of any person, firm, corporation, or any other person who knowingly is a party to any violation of this act, or who knowingly violates any provision of this act, shall be punished for each offense by fine of not more than $5,000 nor less than $100, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both said fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court. Any person making affidavit to the Secretary of Labor, as provided in section 3, and making a false statement in such affidavit, or any person stamping or labeling goods or products in the manner provided in section 4 of this act, without authority from the Secretary of Labor as provided in said section, shall be punished by fine not exceeding $5,000 nor less than $100, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both said fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 8. That any person required, for the protection of a carrier of interstate commerce, to make a written statement as to whether or not goods or products are offered for initial shipment as herein defined, or have been produced with the aid of antisocial child labor, who knowingly makes a false statement in writing in response to such inquiry, shall be fined not exceeding $5,000 nor less than $100; and any carrier of interstate commerce is hereby empowered and permitted to refuse to accept for interstate transportation any goods or products regarding which the shipper refuses to make such written statement upon demand of said carrier.

SEC. 9. That the term "interstate transportation" as used in this act is hereby defined as all transportation which is a part of interstate commerce comprised within the term "commerce among the several States" as used in the Constitution of the United States. The term "business or establishment" as used in this act is hereby defined as any place where work is done for compensation of any sort. The word "person" as used in this act is hereby defined to include any individual, male or female, any partnership or other unincorporated or incorporated organization, or any municipality, public or private institution or organization. The masculine pronoun wherever used in this act shall include other genders, and the singular number shall include the plural. The term "goods or products" shall include any substance, article, or chattel of any kind made or produced or upon which or in connection with which any kind of work is done in any business or establishment as defined in this act. The term "initial shipment" or "initial transportation" or similar term as used in this act is hereby defined as the first shipment or transportation of goods or products in interstate transportation subsequent to their production or manufacture.

This was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. No hearings were ever held and it slept peacefully until the expiration by limitation of the Sixty-third Congress, when it carried this child-labor bill into oblivion.

On January 26, 1914, seven months and nine days after I introduced House bill 6146, Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer, a Democratic member of the Sixty-third Congress, introduced a bill of similar import (H. R. 12292). This bill was referred to the Committee on Labor; was reported out on August 13, 1914 (H. Rept. 1400); passed the House on February 15, 1915; was put on the Senate Calendar March 1, 1915; and it, too, died a peaceful death at the expiration by limitation of the Sixty-third Congress.

Mr. Palmer was a candidate for the United States Senate from the State of Pennsylvania when he introduced his bill, and it must be perfectly clear to every Member of Congress why his bill was reported out of the committee and mine was not. The Democratic managers thought it might help gain a Senator from Pennsylvania.

On December 6, 1915, the opening day of the Sixty-fourth Congress, I reintroduced the same bill, which was known as H. R. 6146 in the Sixty-third Congress. This time it was known as H. R. 666. This bill was again referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

On January 7, 1916, one month and one day later, Mr. EDWARD KEATING, a Democratic Member from Colorado, introduced a bill of similar import, H. R. 8234, which was referred to the Committee on Labor. Again this committee took the bill under consideration and reported it to this House, with amendments, on January 17, 1916.

Again, it must be apparent to every student of practical politics why the bill which I introduced has not been taken up and the bill introduced by a Democratic Member, who will undoubtedly need help in the next election, was substituted for consideration, although it was introduced 32 days later.

But this question is of too great moment to the welfare of the people of this country to allow personal wishes to interfere with its progress. I am as heartily and as sincerely for this bill as though it were the exact measure which I introduced.

I am not going to appeal to your humanity. That has been done for more than a generation, and if the heart of any Member of Congress has not already been touched there is little hope that mere words will accomplish anything at this last moment. If the heartstrings are not already attuned, they probably never will be. I shall, therefore, address myself to two entirely different phases of the question; that is, to justice and to economics. We founded our great democracy on the principle that all men are created free and equal, but there is another self-evident truth which goes with it, viz, that all men should have an equal opportunity under our laws. Every man owes it to his fellow men banded together into organized society to work, to do something of value in life; and organized society is equally interested with himself that his strength shall be so conserved that his earning power at the end of life shall represent the maximum of possible achievement. Organized society presents most of the opportunities and is entitled to a considerable part of the wealth created by each individual. Wealth is not a bad thing in itself. Why, my old teacher in political economy, in describing the beginning of wealth, used this figure: "It probably had its origin when the ape hunting for his breakfast found two coconuts and could only eat one. With an instinct born of countless generations of experience he remembered that some morning he had been unable to find a coconut, so he ate one and hid the other against some future morning when he again might be hungry and again be unable to find anything to eat."

This was the beginning of wealth, and from that time until the present the fundamental idea of wealth has been that it is something that stands between humanity and want—between humanity and suffering. Following out this fundamental idea, it is one of the greatest blessings the world has ever known, and on this, as a foundation, the splendid and complex organization of society has been gradually builded as century after century has rolled around.

Wealth has never done any wrong. It is only when men have used it for purposes of oppression—for purposes of self-aggrandizement—that wealth has ever been anything but a blessing to the humblest member of organized society. The man who creates it is entitled to a large proportion of it, and its very creation presents an added bulwark between humanity and suffering, and so we are all interested in seeing that every man has a fair chance to produce the maximum amount during his lifetime.

The maximum earning power of a man is the largest amount which can be determined by multiplying the number of years of his usefulness by the product he can turn out per year, and that is a problem in which each individual is interested, and also in which organized society is interested.

Every Member here who represents a farming constituency feels instinctively that every farmer in his district knows that he must not put a harness on a colt until it has arrived at a certain point in its physical development—feels instinctively that if he does he impairs the general usefulness and value of the colt to himself, and the farmer who violates this simple rule is considered a downright idiot by his neighbors. If this is true with our domestic animals, how much more is it true of our future citizens. There are plenty of good men and women in this country who have spent their lives in making experts of themselves on this particular problem. They know that the child can not develop into its full strength and usefulness when put to work too early, and the ages of limitation of all these bills to which I have referred are practically developed from exactly the same source—the consensus of opinion of the great experts of this country who have spent their lives studying this one particular question.

I wonder if it has ever occurred to you what the real value of a child is to this country. Why, the wealth of the country is increasing at a rate of seven or eight billions of dollars a year. This has all been created—and future wealth will be created—by the natural resources of this country, combined with the work of our men and women, and so the mere dollars and cents value to organized society—to this country—of every child born, if he lives the natural course of life, will amount to several thousand dollars.

Why, in one part of our country, when labor was involuntary and men were chattels, they used to bring several hundred dollars apiece, simply representing what they could earn for the man who had the right to direct their labor and to take unto himself the fruits thereof, after paying for their keep. In those days men knew enough to treat the children of slaves well because of the economic loss in their possible earning power if they were set to work so early; that the total earning of their lifetime would be diminished.

In fact, it was left for our free institutions, developed along individual lines and by a large number of different units, to violate this physical law when applied to free humans, which was then so obvious with slavery and is now so universally patent when applied to domestic animals.

Every soul has a "right to a place in the sun." Industry owes every man his life and his health. It can not guarantee it in specific terms, but from the standpoint of self-interest we must all see to it that we come as near as possible in guaranteeing to each individual not only his life and his health but his maximum earning power as well.

Most of the objections to this bill have come from people who say they believe in the principle but want the various States to exercise this particular function, each as best suits its own conditions. Why, you can not have uniformity with 48 different States legislating. We have not the same kind of laws for inheritance or the same kind of laws for marriage or divorce. We have not the same sort of laws governing aggregations of wealth banded together into corporations; and just as every incorporation seeks the States that are most liberal in their charters to corporations, so industry of certain kinds would naturally seek the States in which there is least trouble with laws governing child and female labor. A manufacturer in one State having enlightened laws on this subject could not compete with another in a State which is willing to weave the life-blood of children and women into its products. There can be no successful and intelligent regulation of child labor until the effort is nationalized in its scope and each State stands exactly on the same basis.

With the national law it would cost the manufacturers of one State just as much as it would those located in another State, and competition between them would be reduced to one of intelligence, application, industry—to the survival of the fittest. Then if we find our industries are going to suffer from foreign competition, where, perhaps, they are not as advanced in the conservation of children as we are, it is a very easy matter to preserve, at any rate, our own markets by assessing a tax in the form of an import duty against such products; but, as a matter of fact, we shall suffer no inconvenience of this sort, because every civilized nation on earth—and they are the only ones who could compete with us—is further advanced in this, the most important item of all schemes of conservation, than we are ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of this bill will mark the greatest stride toward real democracy that this country has ever taken since the first landing in Jamestown, and I hope the bill prevails and that it soon becomes a law of our land. It will insure a race of better producers. This means added wealth, better distributed, and more comfort and happiness for our people.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE].

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, when this bill reaches the five-minute rule I propose to offer amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for this bill to prevent interstate shipment of the products of child labor because I believe it helps to insure American youth in its inalienable right to health and education.

Education is the foundation of all real reform. The argument has been made that some of the social-betterment legislation, designed to protect children, must disturb the natural order of living. Some children, it is said, must work to keep themselves alive. It is a commentary upon the present order of things, however, that complete provision has not been made for all such cases.

The trouble with the old system, wherein employers were free to carry on their business by employing children, was to be found in the fact that the employment of the children frequently deprived their own adult male relatives of work. Because it was cheaper to employ the children, the fathers and adult brothers of the family sometimes found it difficult to procure employment.

I maintain that in passing laws to prevent the youth of America from being impaired, physically and mentally, we are merely providing aids to nature's own laws. This is not a radical movement, but on the contrary, it is sound and conservative. This reform should go a long ways toward correcting evils at their very root, preserving the health and insuring the education of future generations, which, by reason of these constructive laws, will give the United States a higher standard of general intelligence, greater national vigor, and greater prosperity.

Forty-five State and territorial legislatures and the Congress of the United States in the year 1915 passed laws affecting

children. Even Alaska has forbidden the employment of boys under 16 years of age underground in mines. What we need now, however, is a uniform law which will do away with the inequalities, which will straighten out the situation wherein the canners of one State may employ children, where the canners of another, under the State law, can not. The fact that the manufacturers working under humane laws must compete with those still employing little children marks an inequality that places a premium upon social reaction.

Of all the States that have passed laws affecting children, Pennsylvania was the leader in 1915. We now have on our statute books the most advanced child-labor law in the Nation—a law which makes certain the education of such children as must work in order that they shall live.

In no other State will there be found a more advanced, yet practical, law for the protection of children. Our Pennsylvania law limits the employment of children between the ages of 14 and 16 to 51 hours a week, no child to be employed for more than 9 hours in any one day. The law provides that 8 of the 51 hours must be allowed for the education of the child so employed, and vocational schools are being provided for the education of these children who, unfortunately, must work to live.

This humane and practical law, giving the maximum of benefit to the child, was made possible by the experience and ability of the governor of Pennsylvania, Martin G. Brumbaugh, who had devoted 25 years of his life to the development and education of children. As superintendent of schools in Philadelphia, and previously in other eminent educational positions—for a time as the organizer of the school system of Porto Rico, to which task he was set by President McKinley—Dr. Brumbaugh studied the problem of conserving and developing the youth of the country, and when he became governor he went to work on a model child-labor law, which he finally induced the legislature to pass against the will of some of the prominent leaders of his own party.

The bill we are considering to-day should nationalize the movement for the conservation of the health of children and their education. It adopts the only possible method for putting the Government's veto upon the employment of children of tender age in mills, canneries, workshops, factories, and manufacturing establishments. It will prevent the employment of children under 14 years of age and limit the hours of children between 14 and 16 to eight hours a day and six days a week. This is as little as the Government can afford to do. My only regret is that Pennsylvania's new system of vocational education can not be worked into this law for the conservation of children; but I believe we are making a distinct movement forward, and my vote will be cast for the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. South Carolina is one of the States referred to in the report of the majority as being without what is therein described as "standard provisions" in its labor laws. Under the child-labor law in the State of South Carolina, the employment of any child under the age of 12 is prohibited absolutely. In the employment of any child between the ages of 12 and 14, the owner or superintendent of a manufacturing establishment must require of the parent or guardian of the child a sworn statement as to the age and birthplace of the child seeking employment, which statement must be forwarded to the commissioner of commerce and industries, who is thereupon authorized to issue a permit of employment. The furnishing of a false statement as to the age of a child is made a misdemeanor, punishable by fine or imprisonment.

The employment of any child under the age of 16 between the hours of 8 p. m. and 6 a. m. in any factory is prohibited. There is also a prohibition against the employment of children in any factory in the various occupations set forth in the statute as being dangerous. Under the law permitting the employment of children between the ages of 12 and 15, where permission is secured from the commissioner of labor, there were employed in the cotton mills in South Carolina, according to a census taken by the factory inspectors in August, 1915, 2,562 children, which number is less than the number employed the previous year. Whatever may have been the attitude of mill owners in the past, it is undoubtedly true to-day that a great majority of them are of the opinion that the employment of children under 14 years of age, instead of being advantageous, is in fact injurious to the success of the mill.

I wish to discuss this measure, first, with reference to its constitutionality; second, as to the wisdom of enacting such legislation, even if it is constitutional; and, third, as to the necessity for such legislation by the National Legislature. I believe it is unconstitutional, unwise, and unnecessary.

I know that it has been argued that inasmuch as the ultimate decision as to the constitutionality of a measure must rest with the Supreme Court; that it is unnecessary for Congress to decide beyond all doubt that the measure is unconstitutional. But as has been very ably stated in the report of the minority, a Member of Congress is the first judge before whom such law is presented, and before he can act he must decide that he has a right to do what is proposed.

It was well said by Mr. Cooley in General Principles of Constitutional Law, second edition, page 160:

> Legislators have their authority measured by the Constitution. They are chosen to do what it permits and nothing more, and they take solemn oaths to obey and support it. When they disregard its provisions they usurp authority, abuse their trust, and violate their promise they have confirmed by oath. To pass an act when they are in doubt whether they are not violating the Constitution is to treat as of no force the most imperative obligations any person can assume. A business agent who would deal in that manner with his principal's business would be treated as untrustworthy; a witness in court who would treat his oath thus lightly and affirm things concerning which he was in doubt would be held a criminal. Indeed, it is because the legislature has applied the judgment of its members to the question of its authority to pass the proposed law, and has only passed it after being satisfied of the authority, that the judiciary waive their own doubts and give it their support.

If a legislator decides to shirk his duty and refrain from considering the constitutionality of any law presented for his consideration, he can easily rid himself of a great responsibility, but his neglect is bound to result in injury to the public. The inevitable result of Congress enacting laws without giving careful consideration to their constitutionality would be to throw upon the Supreme Court the burden of declaring those laws unconstitutional, and inasmuch as the public would have a right to presume Members of Congress had discharged their solemn duty to consider the constitutionality of the laws enacted by them, they will soon come to regard the Supreme Court as an obstruction to all real progress and an enemy to the people, and give comfort and strength to those who have argued in favor of the recall of judges. I do not believe that any Member of this House, who, after giving to a measure the consideration he ought to give it, reaches the conclusion that it is unconstitutional, can excuse his voting for it.

I do not claim any superior knowledge as to the provisions of the Constitution nor any superior ability to interpret it, but from a most careful study of this question I am convinced that there is in the Constitution no power under which Congress can enact this bill into law, and I am, therefore, opposed to it. No matter what title may be placed on a bill, its purpose is to be ascertained from its provisions, and there is not one among the proponents of this bill who would dare to assert that it has any purpose other than to regulate the hours and ages of employees engaged in the manufacturing industries of the country. There is not one of them who will assert that Congress has any right to enact a bill directly regulating the hours of labor and the ages of employees, but this they seek to accomplish by prohibiting the shipment in interstate commerce of commodities manufactured under conditions of which they do not approve, basing their authority for this legislation upon the commerce clause of the Constitution. No advocate of this bill has ever been able to cite a single decision of the Supreme Court justifying the construction they place upon the commerce clause of the Constitution. In an effort to sustain their contention the majority of the committee reporting this bill referred to an argument by an attorney who cites in support of this legislation the decisions of the Supreme Court in the Lottery cases, Pure Food cases, and White Slave cases.

In the Pure Food cases Congress exercises the power of regulating commerce on the ground that the articles are injurious within themselves. Under the same principle diseased meat is excluded from commerce because it is not a legitimate article of commerce. Again, in the case of Plumley *v.* Massachusetts (155 Mass., 461), where the State of Massachusetts forbade the introduction of misbranded oleomargarine, Mr. Justice Harlan said:

> No; that is fraud; that is the use of interstate commerce to perpetuate a fraud, and no man has a right to sell a thing under the pretense of its being something else, because it is not a merchantable commodity, obviously.

In the Lottery case, which is relied upon by the proponents of this bill to sustain their contention as to its constitutionality, you had a gambling contract, evil within itself, and which it was necessary to transport in interstate commerce in order to complete the contract. In the State from which the ticket was issued, gambling may be prohibited by law, but no law can prohibit a man from placing a ticket into the hands of an express company for shipment in interstate commerce into another State. The State is powerless to prevent that which is necessary to complete the contract, namely, the delivery of the ticket, and therefore it is powerless to prohibit the evil. But

it was necessary to use the facilities of interstate commerce to complete the transaction. An entire different question is presented here. The evil which this legislation seeks to correct is the employment of children in the production of goods in violation of what they believe to be the proper conditions under which children shall work. The evil, if it be an evil, is completed when the goods are completed by the children and has ceased to exist before the goods are offered for transportation and become a subject of interstate commerce.

In the White Slave case, the other case upon which the proponents particularly rely upon to support their contention, it is argued by them that the decision was based upon the right Congress has to enforce what it believes to be the proper standard of public morals by regulating interstate commerce. In the White Slave case the person was transported in interstate commerce for the purpose of engaging in immoral practices in another State, and the agency of interstate commerce was used for the purpose of inflicting immorality upon the people of another State. But surely there is a distinction between the right to deny the instrumentalities of interstate commerce to one who seeks to transport a woman into another State for immoral purposes, and the denial of the facilities of interstate commerce to cotton goods, innocent within themselves and incapable of doing injury to the health or the morals of the people in the State into which they go, solely because of some condition surrounding their production before they were offered for transportation.

As against the cases cited by the proponents of this bill there are many decisions of the Supreme Court specifically declaring that Congress can only exercise jurisdiction over articles after they become the subject of interstate commerce, and that any effort to control them or their production prior to that time is unconstitutional.

In the case of In re Greene (52 Fed., 113), the court stated:

When the commerce begins is determined not by the character of the commodity, nor by the intention of the owner to transfer it to another State for sale, nor by his preparation of it for transportation, but by its actual delivery to a common carrier for transportation or the actual commencement of its transfer to another State. At that time the power and regulating authority of the State ceases and that of Congress attaches. * * * Neither the production or manufacture of articles or commodities which constitute subjects of commerce and which are intended for trade and traffic with citizens of other States, nor the preparation for their transportation from the State where produced or manufactured prior to the commencement of the actual transfer or transmission thereof to another State, constitutes that interstate commerce which comes within the regulating power of Congress.

In the case of Kidd v. Pierson (128 U. S., p. 1), Justice Lamar said:

No distinction is more popular to the common mind or more clearly expressed in economic and political literature than that between manufacture and commerce. Manufacture is transformation—the fashioning of raw material into a change of form for use. The functions of commerce are different.

In the celebrated Knight case the Supreme Court made the statement:

Commerce begins where manufacture ends.

Quoting again from Kidd v. Pierson:

The functions of commerce are different. The buying and selling and transportation incident thereto constitute commerce, and the regulation of commerce in the constitutional sense embraces regulation at least of such transportation. If it be held that the term includes the regulation of all such manufactures as are intended to be subject to commercial transactions in the future, it is impossible to deny that it would also include all productive industries and contemplate the same thing. The result would be that Congress would be invested, to the exclusion of the State, with the power to regulate not only manufactures, but also agriculture, horticulture, stock raising, domestic fisheries, mining—in short, every kind of human industry. For is there one of them that does not contemplate more or less clearly an interstate or foreign market? Does not the wheat grower of the Northwest or the cotton planter of the South plant, cultivate, and harvest his crop with his eye on the prices at Liverpool, New York, and Chicago? The power being invested in Congress and denied to the State, it would follow as an inevitable result that the duty would devolve upon Congress to regulate all of these delicate, multiform, and vital interests—interests which in their nature are and must be local in all the details of their successful management. The demands of such supervision would require not only uniform legislation generally applicable throughout the United States, but a swarm of statutes only locally applicable and utterly inconsistent. Any movement toward the establishment of rules of production in this vast country, with its many different climates and opportunities, would only be at the sacrifice of the peculiar advantages of the large part of the localities in it, if not of every one of them. On the other hand, any movement toward local detailed and incongruous legislation required by such interpretation would be about the widest possible departure from the declared objects of the clause in question.

A study of the cases decided by the Supreme Court construing the commerce clause of the Constitution will show that the Supreme Court has never sustained the right to exclude from interstate commerce a merchantable and pure commodity. That this power has always been exercised to exclude from interstate commerce articles injurious within themselves or injurious to those who receive them through the facilities of interstate commerce.

This view has always been entertained by this Congress. In 1907, when a bill similar to this was introduced by Senator Beveridge, a resolution was adopted by this House instructing the Judiciary Committee to investigate and report as to the authority of Congress to legislate over the subject of child labor. The chief law committee of the House, after careful consideration of the subject thus submitted to it, made a unanimous report, in which it was said:

The jurisdiction and authority of woman and child labor certainly falls under the police power of the States, and not under the commercial power of Congress. The suggestion contained in the resolution shows how rapidly we are drifting in thought from our constitutional moorings. Undoubtedly it is the earnest wish of all who desire the prosperity of the Nation that the proper line should always be drawn between the power of the States and the power of the Nation. Certainly there is no warrant in the Constitution for the thought or suggestion that Congress can exercise jurisdiction and authority over the subject of woman and child labor. If those performing such labor are abused and conditions are such that the same should be improved it rests for the State to act. The failure of the States to act will not justify unconstitutional action by Congress.

Unquestionably Congress has the power to investigate conditions, ascertain facts, and report upon any subject. In the opinion of your committee, there is no question as to the entire want of power on the part of Congress to exercise jurisdiction and authority over the subject of woman and child labor.

In fact, it is not a debatable question. It would be a reflection upon the intelligence of Congress to so legislate. It would be casting an unwelcome burden upon the Supreme Court to legislate. The agitation of such legislation produces an uneasy feeling among the people and confuses the average mind as to the power of Congress and as to the power of the States. "The lives, health, and property of the women and children engaged in labor is exclusively within the power of the States, originally and always belonging to the States, not surrendered by them to Congress." Such is the emphatic language of the Supreme Court. If a question of good order and morals, it is the same. The argument has long since been made by others, and the committee can not add to it. The assertion of such power by Congress would destroy every vestige of State authority, obliterate State lines, nullify the great work of the framers of the Constitution, and leave the State governments mere matters of form, devoid of power, and ought to more than satisfy the fondest dreams of those favoring centralization of power.

It is said that the provisions of this proposed law are copied from the labor laws of Massachusetts. The Republicans of Massachusetts believe in the national child-labor law, and so declared in the platform adopted by them in their State convention last fall. But though Massachusetts has never been charged with being overzealous as to the maintenance of the rights of a State, and the Republican Party has not boasted of this as one of its principles, yet we find that in their platform they express their realization of the fact that Congress has no power under the Constitution as it now exists to enact a law regulating either the hours of labor or employment of women and children, and they therefore solemnly declared in their platform:

We believe the Federal Constitution should be amended and necessary legislation enacted to secure a national corporation law, national regulation of the hours of labor and the employment of women and children, and national divorce laws. Employers of other States should accord the same privileges and protection to their employees and assume the same duties as their competing employers in Massachusetts.

Upon that platform former Representative McCall was elected governor; and, from what I know of him as a legislator, I do not believe that he would have approved of a platform that declared for national legislation on the subjects mentioned without first amending the Constitution. In view of their solemn declaration in favor of the amendment of the Constitution in order to secure this law, I am anxious to know what attitude the Republican Members of the House from the State of Massachusetts, elected upon this platform, will assume toward this legislation.

In this connection it is seen that in Massachusetts it is realized that Congress has no more right to regulate labor conditions in the States than it has to regulate the divorce laws of the States. The divorce evil is a national one; and if Congress has the power to regulate the evil of child labor within the States, it also has the right to regulate the divorce evil within the States. South Carolina is the only State in the Union having no divorce law. Because of the existence of this national evil, has Congress the power to say, for the protection of the people of South Carolina, who do not believe in the granting of divorces, that no person can be transported in interstate commerce who has been divorced or who has been divorced upon some ground not recognized as legal in the majority of the States of the Union?

Having quoted from the Republican platform of Massachusetts, may I not quote from the platform of the last national convention of the Democratic Party the following:

We denounce as usurpation the efforts of our opponents to deprive the States of any of the rights reserved to them and to enlarge and to magnify by indirection the power of the Federal Government.

But even it be admitted that this bill is constitutional, is it wise to establish this precedent? Will it not open the door for legislation seeking to establish uniform conditions in all the industries of the country? In fact, one of the arguments made in favor of this bill is that the manufacturing industries of one State should not be allowed to use the labor of children under

14 because it is cheaper, and therefore unfair competition. If this logic is to be accepted, it means that Congress is to endeavor to establish uniform conditions in the production of goods, something that is absolutely impossible because of the varying conditions existing in the different sections of the country. But if Congress is to attempt it, it would not stop merely at the labor of children, for there its work would but commence. It would go on and do that which is argued in the Republican platform in Massachusetts, namely, provide uniform hours of labor for all the industries of the country; a minimum wage for all workers in like occupations in the country; regulate the freight rates so as to equalize them in all sections, and, to make it entirely uniform, provide also for uniform climatic conditions. If Congress can deny cotton goods the facilities of commerce because of some conditions surrounding their production, then it can regulate all. Congress could say that goods can not be shipped in interstate commerce if in the mill in which they are manufactured there is any segregation of the races or discrimination against any race.

Again, will we not have in the next Congress an effort to amend it so as to cause it to apply to the cultivation as well as to the manufacture of products? That this is not farfetched is evident from the hearings before the committee in the last Congress when Miss Lathrop, the head of the Children's Bureau, informed the committee that children were exploited upon the farms of the South as well as in the mills.

If you believe the bill constitutional and believe also that it would establish no dangerous precedent, can you yet say that the evil is one demanding Federal legislation? The majority report shows the great progress made during the last 10 years by all the States in the improvement of labor laws regulating the employment of children. Is it not wiser to allow the States to continue their progress instead of taking from them this right they have always exercised of regulating labor conditions?

Legislation is of value only in proportion to the information of conditions upon which it is based and the intelligence applied to those conditions in framing legislation. What does the Representative from Maine or Minnesota know of the labor conditions in South Carolina? The enactment of this law would make it necessary for every Member to acquaint himself with conditions in every State in the country if he is to intelligently legislate as to local matters in other States.

I am not in favor of the oppression of children. In my own State, in the only speech I have made on the subject, I declared my belief that South Carolina should increase the age limit from 12 to 14, and in the legislature now in session such a bill is pending. If it is not passed at this session, it will be at some future session. I do not favor, however, the adoption even by the State legislature of the provision limiting the hours of labor of children between 14 and 16 to 8 hours a day, because I know that the mills could not work part of their force 8 hours and another part for 10 hours a day, and the result would be that every child under 16 would be put out of a job. This may mean nothing to gentlemen who have never known poverty, but to the widow whose son of 15 is her only support, the fact that that son loses his means of making a support for himself and for her is quite a serious matter. Why, if that provision had extended to law offices when I was a boy of 15 I would have been prevented from working, because I worked not 8 but often 10 and 12 hours a day, and my employment was absolutely necessary. I believe the progress in this matter should be gradual and there should be no immediate increase from 12 to 16 years.

From whom does the demand for this legislation come? Though I know the great majority of the operatives in the cotton mills in my county I have never had one of them urge me to support it. I have received a petition against its passage and seen many petitions from cotton-mill operatives in the State. There is no such thing as coercing our cotton-mill operatives into opposing something they want. If any boss attempted to influence the operatives in my county in a matter of that kind, they would not hesitate to tell me about it. The truth is that in South Carolina the operatives constitute 38 per cent of the voting population and hold the balance of power in the State. Whenever they want a change in the child-labor law and so inform the Legislature of South Carolina, the legislature will grant it because of their political power. They know their power, and I believe their lack of interest in this legislation is due to the fact that they are unwilling to transfer the right to regulate labor from the State legislature, whose membership is acquainted with local conditions, to Congress, whose membership know nothing of local conditions.

If I believed this legislation was to the best interest of the cotton-mill operatives of the South, I would vote for it, because they have always been my friends. But I believe it against their interest. I believe it will cause many boys of 15 to be thrown out of employment and, in the absence of any law compelling them to go to school, force them to loaf upon the streets and grow up in ignorance of any trade and with no education other than the undesirable one received by the average boy who becomes a loafer. And the worst feature of it is that the Government that assumes this power to legislate in such manner as will, in my opinion, force a boy of 15 out of employment can and will make no provision for his education or for the support of a mother or younger brothers and sisters in cases where they are dependent upon the boy's labor for support.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, how do we stand in the matter of time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado has 36 minutes and the opposition has 35 minutes.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BRITT].

Mr. BRITT. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to vote against this bill, and yet I have anxiously sought to bring myself to its support, for I am the friend of every man and woman and child that toils, and all my life long have I made common battle with them for higher wages, shorter hours, safer working berths, more sanitary surroundings, and better general conditions. But in all reform legislation two things are fundamentally necessary—first, the power to act; and, second, the pursuit of a wise policy.

In my sincere judgment, this bill is not only utterly without constitutional warrant, but I believe it would signally fail of any helpful results to the working children of the country. I have pondered every line of it over and over again, with the result that I always come back to the two same irresistible conclusions, namely, that this Congress is without constitutional authority to pass it, and that the purposes of its distinguished author, high and patriotic as I know them to be, can only be lawfully accomplished by the proper exercise of legislative powers reserved by the Constitution to the several States. It is our duty here to take into account the constitutional validity of legislation, and not recklessly pass bills of doubtful authority and refer them to the courts for decision. For myself, if I should vote for this bill, with my oath of office still warm on my lips, I should not only do violence to my conscience, but I should recklessly disregard what I understand to be the limitations which the Constitution has imposed upon this Congress.

I am not the special guardian of State rights. I am not only a Republican, I am a good deal of a Hamiltonian. And yet, with all my liberal views toward the Federal powers, I am constrained to say that if a horde of United States officers, armed with unlimited authority, on the Government pay rolls, can go into the heart of my State, enter one of our factories, take charge of its products, and, possessed of every power of inquiry, demand to know by whom these products were made, how old were the makers, whether they were male or female, and arbitrarily say whether such articles should or should not be removed, then the States will have disappeared overnight, and all hope of preserving the historical balance between the States and the Nation will have vanished like an evanescent dream. [Applause.]

But, pray, do not misunderstand me. I heartily favor just and proper child-labor laws. But the States are the only competent authority to make them. The conditions are strikingly diverse in the several States and even in different parts of the same State. No general law can possibly be made to apply to all the various conditions. The kinds of work are different, the customs of the people are unlike, the situation is always a local one, and it is the peculiar province of the States to provide for it.

In my district there are nearly a score of great cotton mills in which thousands of men, women, and children are employed. These mills are owned and operated by big-hearted and generous men, and the relations between them and their employees are excellent, and hundreds of these workers have petitioned me to vote against this bill. Here the employers have provided for their employees free Young Men's Christian Association halls, assembly rooms, music bands, and, in some instances, schools for their children, and our State laws prohibit the employment of children so as not to prevent them from attending the public schools.

The law of life for the child is combined work, study, and play, and the chief of these is work, for, if rightly planned and properly conducted, it can be made to combine the other two. And, too, the surroundings should be clean, moral, and sanitary. But no child is ever injured by reasonable work, under proper conditions. Work is the first law of our being. The child should be taught to know it, to respect it, to do it.

I thank God that I was compelled to go to work when I was but 9 years old. It was rather tough on the boy, but it was the lot of thousands of our southern boys whose early childhood marked the period when the South was emerging from the wreck and desolation of the great war. That experience I prize as my best life lesson, for it, more than anything else, has enabled me to see and to know and to feel the rights and duties of both myself and others.

Mr. Chairman, with all my heart and with all my soul I favor conserving, protecting, and safe-guarding the child, but once more let me say that it ought to be done by the States, for they and they only can do it effectually and without disturbing that happy balance between the States and the Nation upon which our Government with all its untold blessings has rested for more than six score years. [Applause.]

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to myself six minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HARRISON). The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for six minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the pending legislation strikes at a great evil—the employment of children in mines, quarries, factories, mills, and canneries—and it seeks to exclude such products from the channels of interstate commerce.

If this bill is passed, the effect will be to make the Federal Government say to the various States, "If you see fit, within your own borders you may tolerate this immoral, this pestilential thing, child labor; but you shall not spread the contagion." [Applause.]

Gentlemen tell you that we are trying to regulate the method of production within the States. No such thing is sought by this bill. North Carolina may continue, if it sees fit, to weave the bodies and souls of its children into the cloth produced in its cotton mills, but it can not exchange that cloth for the gold of citizens in other States that have more consideration for their little ones. [Applause.]

North Carolina does not want this legislation. The supporters of child labor, the men who are profiting from child labor, do not want this legislation. Why? Because it will be effective legislation. They do not want this bill, because they realize that this bill has teeth in it, and that when it is placed on the statute books child labor will end in North Carolina and every other State of the Union.

I want to congratulate my friend from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, that he has swept aside that false pretense that this bill is aimed at the South. We have had Members talking that way for weeks, saying that we were striking at the industries of the South. We are not. We are striking at every man in the United States who seeks to make money out of the employment of child labor. [Applause.]

But, my friends, there is a particular reason why North Carolina is opposed to this bill. During the hearings had before the Committee on Labor and the child-labor subcommittee the cotton-mill manufacturers placed a number of witnesses on the stand, and their star witness was Mr. David Clark, editor of the Southern Textile Bulletin, of Charlotte, N. C. We asked him if they had any factory inspection in North Carolina, and he said they had not. We asked him why they had no factory inspection, and Mr. Clark, the spokesman of these cotton manufacturers, their star witness, said:

> The gentlemen here to-day, the cotton-mill owners, do not favor it. Some people favor Government inspection and some do not. Personally I do not, because it is largely a grafting proposition.

Mr. LONDON, the gentleman from New York, then asked him—

> What do you mean by a grafting proposition?
>
> Mr. CLARK. I am not prepared to give you the facts, but my understanding is that if you pay you get a clean bill of health.
>
> Mr. LONDON. You believe your mill owners would resort to corruption in order to escape a fair inspection?
>
> Mr. CLARK. Not more than any others; not more than was necessary.

That is why they are opposed to this. They may be able to dodge State inspection. They may be able to prevent the enactment of State inspection. But they know, gentlemen, that if this bill is placed on the statute books there will be Federal inspection, and that the little children will come out of the mills in North Carolina and out of every other manufacturing establishment in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I only wish I had the time to continue, but so many Members on the floor are anxious to discuss this bill that I shall not take up further time, but will ask the consent of the House to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WATSON] is recognized.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, to my mind the saddest tragedy connected with the human race is poverty. It is one of the most universal things that we come in contact with in human life. It is as widespread as humanity, and it will last, if we believe Holy Writ, as long as time lasts. And yet one of the things growing out of poverty that has been, in my judgment, of the greatest value to the human race is the absolute necessity of toil.

I have been impressed this morning in listening to gentlemen discussing this question, with the remarks of the chairman of the committee reporting this bill, Mr. LEWIS, of Maryland, in advocating the legislation that is contained in it. He stood in this presence and made the declaration that he—robust in body, robust in intellect beyond the average of men—began his life of toil in a mine when 9 years of age.

I am not here to defend the working of small children. I am not here to say that I favor the placing of onerous burdens upon the weak and the young. But I am here representing in part a State in this Union that has not seen fit to place a premium upon idleness by passing laws that would prohibit from performing labor all children under 14 years of age. I do not say that I personally would not favor—and I do favor and I have advocated in my own State—legislation that would make the minimum age for labor in certain employments 14 years, as is provided by this bill. But I undertake to say that no State in the Union, however drastic may be the law against child labor, but makes provision in that law for unusual and exceptional cases. This legislation is as hard and fast and as fixed as the laws of the Medes and Persians. If applied in the District of Columbia half of the newsboys would be deprived of earning the small sum that bridges the gulf between hunger and misery and a full stomach and happiness, coupled with the hope of future independence. In one county of my congressional district there are hundreds of small, portable canneries utilizing the blackberry crop, in most instances, if not universally, operated by the mother of the family and her children, bringing to the family revenue in each individual case an amount small of itself but in the aggregate thousands of dollars. The proponents of this legislation would deprive the family of the services of the 12-year-old boy or the 13-year-old girl, and deprive them of the opportunity to contribute their mite to the betterment of the family or deny them the market for their product outside the State. These are, unquestionably, canneries within the meaning of the bill.

I am not a lawyer. I am not here to argue the questions of law involved in this bill. I leave that to gentlemen who are learned in the law. But I do make bold to make the declaration that if any man, lawyer or layman, who possesses a knowledge of the English language and the construction of the courts in the past, will take the able minority report that has been filed by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Judge WATSON, and his colleagues and read it this bill would be defeated by an overwhelming majority in this House. Being a layman I have some respect for the opinion of courts and great lawyers, believing with Judge Cooley that—

> Legislators have their authority measured by the Constitution. They are chosen to do what it permits, and nothing more, and they take solemn oaths to obey and support it. When they disregard its provisions they usurp authority, abuse their trust, and violate the promise they have confirmed by an oath. To pass an act when they are in doubt whether it is not violating the Constitution is to treat as of no force the most imperative obligations any person can assume. A business agent who would deal in that manner with his principal's business would be treated as untrustworthy; a witness in court who would treat his oath thus lightly and affirm things concerning which he was in doubt would be held a criminal. Indeed, it is because the legislature has applied the judgment of its members to the question of its authority to pass the proposed law, and has only passed it after being satisfied of the authority, that the judiciary waive their own doubts and give it their support.

Having regard for my oath of office, I prefer the opinion of the 18 eminent lawyers who composed the Judiciary Committee of this House during the Fifty-ninth Congress, to whom this precise question was submitted by resolution of the House. This committee, composed of great lawyers, after reviewing all the authorities upon this, a question of law, said:

> The jurisdiction and authority over the subject of woman and child labor certainly falls under the police power of the States and not under the commercial power of Congress. The suggestion contained in the resolution shows how rapidly we are drifting in thought from our constitutional moorings. Undoubtedly it is the earnest wish of all who desire the prosperity of the Nation that the proper line should

always be drawn between the power of the States and the power of the Nation. Certainly there is no warrant in the Constitution for the thought or suggestion that Congress can exercise jurisdiction and authority over the subject of woman and child labor. If those performing such labor are abused, and conditions are such that the same should be improved, it rests for the State to act. The failure of the States to act will not justify unconstitutional action by Congress.

Unquestionably Congress has the power to investigate conditions, ascertain facts, and report upon any subject. In the opinion of your committee there is no question as to the entire want of power on the part of Congress to exercise jurisdiction and authority over the subject of woman and child labor.

In fact, it is not a debatable question. It would be a reflection upon the intelligence of Congress to so legislate. It would be casting an unwelcome burden upon the Supreme Court to so legislate. The agitation of such legislation produces an uneasy feeling among the people and confuses the average mind as to the power of Congress and the power of the States. "The lives, health, and property of the women and children engaged in labor is exclusively within the power of the States, originally and always belonging to the States, not surrendered by them to Congress." Such is the emphatic language of the Supreme Court. If a question of good order and morals, it is the same. The argument has long since been made by others, and the committee can not add to it. The assertion of such power by Congress would destroy every vestige of State authority, obliterate State lines, nullify the great work of the framers of the Constitution, and leave the State governments mere matters of form, devoid of power, and ought to more than satisfy the fondest dreams of those favoring centralization of power.

I prefer to follow the judgment of such men as John J. Jenkins, then chairman of the Judiciary Committee; RICHARD WAYNE PARKER, still a distinguished Member of this body; Charles E. Littlefield; David A. De Armond; William G. Brantley; and the others who made the above report, than that of the members of the Committee on Labor of the present Congress, who reported and are urging the passage of the bill now under consideration.

I prefer to accept the opinion of that eminent jurist, ex-President William Howard Taft, who in a recent law lecture said:

> Bills have been urged upon Congress to forbid interstate commerce in goods made by child labor. Such proposed legislation has failed chiefly because it was thought beyond the Federal power. The distinction between the power exercised in enacting the pure-food bill and that which would have been necessary in the case of the child-labor bill is that Congress in the former is only preventing interstate commerce from being a vehicle for conveyance of something which would be injurious to people at its destination, and it might properly decline to permit the use of interstate commerce for that detrimental result. In the latter case Congress would be using its regulative power of interstate commerce not to effect any result of interstate commerce. Articles made by child labor are presumably as good and useful as articles made by adults. The proposed law is to be enforced to discourage the making of articles by child labor in the State from which the articles were shipped. In other words, it seeks indirectly and by duress to compel the States to pass a certain kind of legislation that is completely within their discretion to enact or not. Child labor in the State of the shipment has no legitimate or germane relation to the interstate commerce of which the goods thus made are to form a part, to its character, or to its effect. Such an attempt of Congress to use its power of regulating such commerce to suppress the use of child labor in the State of shipment would be a clear usurpation of that State's rights. (Popular Government, pp. 142, 143.)

The great trouble in legislating and in passing legislation here—one of the great troubles of which we are all, I will not say guilty, but forced to yield to by circumstances—is our engagement with matters specially committed to us. We do not have time to investigate everything, and we therefore follow the committees. Without any reflection upon anybody, I assert that because of lack of time probably not one-fifth of the membership have taken the time to investigate the legal questions that are involved in this legislation.

Gentlemen, we have gone far in a very few years in the direction of State socialism. As my colleague [Mr. WEBB] stated here this morning, only eight years ago this question was submitted to the Judiciary Committee of this House, which brought in a unanimous report—and there are gentlemen who are still Members of this House who participated in the making of that report—in which they denied the right of Congress to regulate the hours of labor and the age of laborers within a State. We are going at a very rapid rate. My mind goes back to the past. In the section of country in which I lived in my childhood, just after the Civil War, the poverty was very much greater than it is now and the necessity for labor was greater. I know the conditions that existed then. As my mind runs back I am amazed that this country of ours should have spent its millions of gold and its thousands of human lives in a devastating war, from which the section of our country from which I come has taken half a century to begin to recover. I am amazed that it should have settled the question of slavery by blood, by war, and by death, when, if this legislation is within the power of the Congress of the United States, a simple legislative act, merely saying that no product produced by slave labor should enter into interstate commerce, would have settled the question and have freed every slave in America. Not a drop of blood need have been shed if this legislation is possible to-day under our laws.

Mr. Chairman, this is the culmination of an agitation that has gone on for a number of years. I venture the assertion that in all the spasm of muckraking and misrepresentation that has been carried on by sundry organizations and publications during the past 10 years, no greater slanders or misrepresentations have been made of any people on earth, with the possible exception of the population of the southern mountain section, than of the cotton-mill operatives of the South, particularly of those in the States of North and South Carolina. These false and misleading statements have been in some instances made by people who never saw a southern cotton mill, and therefore knew absolutely nothing about it, or by paid emissaries whose salary depended upon making a case. We have had lobby investigations relating to other legislation that has been pending in Congress and investigations as to the means that were used by the paid representatives of interested parties to bring about certain results. I do not charge that these influences have reached any men upon this floor, but I do say that there are gentlemen within the sound of my voice who, if this legislation should become a law, would have to go back to the earning of an honest living, and at a very much less wage than they are getting out of this agitation, or receive appointment from the Department of Labor as an inspector to enforce its provisions. It is that agitation which has brought this before the American Congress. My friend the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] stands here and speaks of my State weaving into its cloth the lives and blood and morals of its children. I say to him and I say to the membership of this House that there is no higher standard of morals or Americanism on this continent than there is in North Carolina. [Applause.] I invite him or any other Member of this House to go to the village in which I live, where there is a cotton mill operating—I ask him to go and view those conditions, the conditions of those children who by compulsion are in the schools nine months in the year, and to view the condition of sanitation——

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. No; I have not the time. I invite gentlemen to view the conditions of labor and every other condition contributing to the making of men and women out of these children, and compare those conditions with those which exist at any place in his own State, and I will stand the comparison, even by his own judgment.

Mr. Chairman, there is more sentimentality than there is sense in the proposition to legislate in this way. [Applause.] I repeat again that if the membership of this House, distinguished gentlemen as all of them are, with their hearts in the proper place—and the great trouble is that their hearts have been appealed to until their judgment in many instances is biased—if they will take the facts as they can see them at first hand, they will be convinced of the correctness of what I say. This great committee was invited to go into the cotton-mill districts of the South, not at their own expense or at the expense of the contingent fund of the House, but at the expense of gentlemen who wanted to teach them something—they were invited to go and see for themselves whether or not we were weaving into the cloth made in our State the blood and the morals and the lives of little children, and they did not go. They seem not to want to know the truth. If they had gone, they would have been personally convinced. If we are ready to embark upon State socialism, then pass this legislation. If you are ready, gentlemen on that side and on this side, that the strong arm of the Federal Government may take over the activities of all the people in your States and to disband your State legislatures and your own internal governments, then you have the opportunity, by voting for this bill. To escape the sentence pronounced upon the first offending couple: "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread," the race has labored for 6,000 years. Few have escaped, and upon the mass of men the curse (?) will rest until the end of time. To escape it entirely would be destructive, for it is still true that "an idle brain is the devil's workshop," to which might be appropriately added, "and idle hands are his instruments of evil." The danger of degeneracy, mental, moral, and physical, comes from the idle and not from those who toil.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the eulogy pronounced on labor by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] appeals to us all, but he fails to make the sharp distinction between working and being worked. [Applause.] We do not object to children working, but we do object to their being worked. We object not to the discipline of work, but we do object to its profit when at the expense of the country's childhood. This bill is trying to take care of the childhood of the country; and if there is any element that should win legislation here of a favorable character, it is that which relates to our children. Legislation should not be confined, as I see it, to the material ele-

ments of the Nation, but it should extend to the very soul of its greatest treasure, the source of the real greatness of the land, namely, the childhood of the country. I shall vote for the measure, and hope it will pass. [Applause.]

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, how much time is there remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado has 29 minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WATSON] has 19 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE].

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I have listened very attentively to the several speeches that have been made for and against this bill. In the brief time that I have been a Member of this House, I have listened to very eloquent speeches on affairs of interest to this great country of ours. We have been treated to speeches on preparedness. We have been told how to raise armies and build navies for the defense of our Nation; but to-day, sir, we are being treated to speeches on the real preparedness of our Nation—the education, the health, and the upbuilding of our children. [Applause.] That to my mind is the real question before this body. The opponents of this bill are discussing the constitutionality of this bill. Mr. Chairman, the question is shall we allow one State or another to do as it pleases with child labor? No, Mr. Chairman, this question is too important to permit even one State, no matter how great it may be, to assume any such responsibility. This is a bill that to my mind treats entirely with the question of the conservation of the health of our children, the future men and women who are to be the rulers of this Nation. [Applause.] Talk about children 12 years of age going into a mill and working 12 and 14 hours a day, and then tell us that they are fit for future citizenship! With their health broken and without education, you opponents know that this is impossible!

Mr. Chairman, I represent, in part, a State, the grand old State of Massachusetts, wherein are more mercantile and manufacturing establishments than in almost any other State of the Union. And we, Mr. Chairman, in the progress of making good laws for the protection of child and woman labor have been met with the same voice that meets you to-day—unscrupulous capitalists trying to commercialize in the blood of innocent children. [Applause.] That, Mr. Chairman, is the issue. It is not so much whether the products of one State with unfair child-labor laws shall be shipped with another State with adequate child-labor laws in another part of the country, but it is whether or not this Nation of ours wants to go on record of permitting any State, no matter where it is, to do the things that are unfair to the rest of the Nation.

The law to protect the labor of children between the ages of 14 and 16, no matter what State it is, has worked equally in the interest of the capitalist as it does for the laborer, because it is giving to him the labor of strong, virile young men and women. It is not right that the conditions that confront us in some of our States in this country to-day should continue.

Let me state to you, if you will, what the real conditions of many of those who have been obliged to work in mills and factories of this Nation in their young days are to-day. Pending before this Congress is a bill for the building of a sanitarium for taking care of the unfortunate people of these United States who are afflicted with that dreaded and terrible disease—tuberculosis. It is known, and the statistics prove it, that there is no people in the land where this disease has been increasing more rapidly than among the people in the factories and mills where children and mothers have been compelled to work 12 hours a day. I do not believe that there is a Member of this body, I care not from what State he comes, who, if he will discuss this bill on its real merits, on the merits that appeal to every man and every Member of this body who has the welfare of the children of our country at heart, but who will say that the United States, through its Congress, will turn a deaf ear to the mothers and children of this Union who are crying out at this moment for relief from this great Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the question of the constitutionality is but a byplay. This opposition, Mr. Chairman, does not come, I contend, from the hearts of the Members of this body who are speaking against it, because if they do know the real conditions they can not defend their position on the idle argument of constitutionality. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, investigations that have taken place throughout this country on the condition of child labor have shown that stringent laws should be put into effect to discontinue the working in the mills and factories of young children unfitted by health, education, and age to do the laborious work that is exacted from them. State after State, realizing that the future of our country must of necessity depend on the health of the children, have passed laws regulating not only the condition as applied to their labor but also to their education. In States where these laws are put into effect they have been met with the strong opposition of the capitalists and mill owners, who believed that we were destroying their rights in labor. Great insistence was placed by the opposition upon the alleged effect that under the law the children can not get the benefit of our eight-hour day but would be discharged entirely. The result would be, said the manufacturers, that the children would spend their time in dangerous and unprofitable idleness and be worse off than when at work 10 hours a day, and that the wholesale hardships among families would be far greater than public relief or private charity could alleviate. The law, nevertheless, has been put into effect and has been successful to the extent that nearly all children who were at work when these laws were enacted are to-day working in the same occupations, and there has been no perceptible increase in family hardships.

In my own State, where this law has been in effect for some years past, we have noticed the rapid advance in the health and education of the children employed in mills, and the law has proven beneficial not only to those employed but to the manufacturers and mill agents themselves, who are to-day the first to come to the defense of laws of this nature.

Investigations of committees throughout this country have disclosed the absolute necessity of the passage of this bill.

Investigation has also clearly shown that in many cases children under the age of 16 and mothers of children were really unfit to perform the arduous work in the mills when compelled to toil 10 hours or more in order to get a mere sustenance to keep life and body together. It was shown in many cases that with the unhealthy condition of many of them made them susceptible to sickness and disease.

It became absolutely necessary that something should be done to immediately assist employees of the mills to bring about a more healthy and beneficial condition, and if we can do nothing else by the passage of this bill but to help in a measure to bring about these conditions it will bring untold blessings and benefits to our Nation.

It is for this reason that I raise my voice in behalf of this bill, for I believe it is the duty of all States to protect the health of their people, and that when they neglect to do so, it is time for the Nation to speak. State laws are good when States are enlightened enough to make them, but when it comes to a pass in this country that States will consider commercialism against the human lives of our men and women, then the Nation must speak through Congress.

Let us further behold that commercial greed and selfish capitalists who would deign to make their riches by the sweat and blood of innocent children shall yield to righteousness in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly hope that this bill will become a law without a dissenting voice, so that we can say to the entire world that this Union made free by the shedding of the blood of our forefathers still remains as they intended it should and that that blood was not shed in vain. Let us realize that a nation is only as strong as the health of the people, and let us bring to the minds of our children that the laws of this land are what they were intended to be—the protector of all her people.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. NICHOLLS].

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended at this session to take up any time of the House, for the reason that I know that there are a great many Members more able and competent to discuss the general proposition than I am. But with reference to the bill before us, I believe that I am in a position to know as much, if not more, about what legislation is necessary than possibly any man within the sound of my voice. For, gentlemen, I have not only seen the operation of the cotton mills from the standpoint of the financier, but it has been my pleasure and my experience to work myself in a cotton mill at the age that you are now trying to exclude. When I was a mere boy at the age of 14 I went into a cotton mill in my native county. That county now has more mills within its borders than any county in the United States, with the exception of one in the State of Massachusetts. I therefore say that I know personally what it means to labor in a cotton mill at the age of 14 years.

But, to go further with this bill, it seems to me that we ought to ask the question: Who wants and who needs this legislation? You say the man who runs the mill, and I say the men and women and children who labor in the mill do not want it. Why do I make that statement? I have in my office, Mr. Chairman, numerous petitions signed by 6,716 persons, operatives who work from day to day in these cotton mills, petitioning their

Congressmen to vote against the passage of such a measure. I am not here representing the men who own the mills in this matter. Any one of my colleagues from my State knows that the men who own the mill endeavored to keep me from coming here, but the people who actually work in the mill sent me here as their representative.

I assure you that if, for an instant, any legislation could be passed benefiting the men who actually labor I would be hand in hand with you in such legislation.

What is their objection? Gentlemen, you who do not know the situation can not imagine, but the objection is simply this: In the State of South Carolina when I was a Member of the House of Representatives from that State we had no child-labor law, but we passed a law limiting the age to 12 years. Later on we passed a law limiting the age to 14 years, with the proviso that a man who really needed the labor of his child could make an affidavit that he needed it, and the child was allowed to work between the ages of 12 and 14. I am not in favor of that legislation, because invariably such an affidavit was made. I am in favor and would vote for your bill if I was a member of the South Carolina Legislature and your bill was before that body, if you would make it that no child under 14 years of age could work in a cotton mill. But when you get above that age you have this to confront you. The mill operatives in the South are not like those in the East or the North. You have a large foreign element who have nothing to live up to, but only come here for the specific purpose of making a living. In the South what have we? The people who build the cotton mills in the South come from the surrounding country where the mills are located, and the men who labor in the mills come from the States of Tennessee, North Carolina, and from the farms in South Carolina. They are absolutely dependent on their daily wage for the support of their families. They have more things to live for than the average foreigner, who comes here and who does not care if he and his family are all crowded in one room; they are true Americans and come from the same flesh and blood that you come from and I come from, and have the same independence of character that we have, and they can not afford to live as a great many of the mill people in Massachusetts and other States live, crowded in tenement houses. As it is, the struggle which they make to support themselves is an honorable, though hard one, and I therefore pray of you that you do not pass any law which would cut down their wages, as this law would. Some of the manufacturers of North Carolina invited the honorable Committee on Labor to inspect mills in the South at the expense of the cotton mills and not at their own, and I am satisfied that if they had taken advantage of this opportunity to visit our mills they would have come back to Washington and reported that conditions are not nearly so bad as they are pictured by some of the leagues over the country, who are behind and who are advocating this bill. I believe that the Members of the House who are pushing it are absolutely conscientious and sincere in the matter. But does it not seem to some of us that some people who are spending their time making reports about the bad conditions in Southern cotton mills would be in a position, if this bill passed, where they would find out that they knew about as little of "real man labor" as they do about "child labor." The State which I have the honor to represent is doing everything in its power, under the circumstances, to make conditions better for the children in its border.

We have a compulsory education law which sends a boy to school from the time he is 7 years old until he is 14. After he reaches that age, Mr. Chairman, the rest of his family actually need his help, actually need his wage, to help support the younger children coming up under him. If a boy is sent to school from the time he is 7 until he is 14, he has a sufficient education, unless he wants to take a profession.

A great many Members of the House have never had seven years' education, and yet, I do not think that any of them would contend that they were not fully qualified to represent the people of their respective districts and to formulate laws for the government of this great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, if this act should pass and become a law, where would we stop? Is there any reason on earth why a bill of a similar nature could not be introduced and passed, requiring that no child in any walk of life should be allowed to work until it was 16 years of age? The law which we are now discussing really does not apply to the negroes of the South, because none of them work in the cotton mills. An experiment was made along this line in Charleston, S. C., but after six months' trial the mill was closed down, moved to Georgia, and white help secured. It has been said that the reason that negroes could not work successfully in the cotton mill was because the hum of the machinery put them to sleep. I can not vouch for this; however, I do know a great majority of the cotton picked in the Southern States is picked by children, both white and black, under the age of 16. If this law should be made to include all classes of children, it would be absolutely impossible to gather this great commodity from the fields in our country.

Mr. Chairman, I have not touched on what seems to me the main objection to the pending bill. I fail to see how any lawyer, who has seen the authorities, could take the position consistently that the bill if passed is constitutional. It is the same old question of State rights, in which I have always believed and in which I shall always believe, regardless of the action of Congress on this measure. It is the same question which confronted Congress before the outbreak of the Civil War, and if able men and able lawyers like President Lincoln and other men of his type, at that time at the head of the Government, had taken the position that Congress had a right to pass a law controlling the State on the question of slavery they would never have engulfed this country in the most horrible struggle that it has ever known. No, indeed, if they had ever entertained the remotest idea that such an act would have been constitutional and if the courts should have held it so this great struggle could have been avoided.

This bill is not at all in the same class as the pure food, the white-slave law, and the lottery measure, which have been passed upon and held constitutional by our Supreme Court. The Supreme Court upheld the passage of the bills above named because the article which was delivered from one State into another was deleterious and after being delivered did great harm, and based their opinion upon the ground that any shipment of a commodity which would hurt the morals of the community could not be carried from one State and placed upon the people of another. In no case has the long and often tortuous line of demarcation between State and Federal control been more clearly drawn than in the celebrated case of Kidd *v.* Pearson (128 U. S.) wherein the court said:

No distinction is more popular to the common mind or more clearly expressed in economic and political literature than that between manufacturers and commerce. Manufacture is transformation—the fashioning of raw materials into a change of form for use. The functions of commerce are different. The buying and selling and the transportation incidental thereto constitute commerce, and the regulation of commerce in the constitutional sense embraces the regulation at least of such transportation. The legal definition of the term as given by this court in County of Mobile *v.* Kimball (102 U. S., 691, 702) is as follows:

"Commerce with foreign countries and among the States, strictly considered, consists in intercourse and traffic, including in these terms navigation and the transportation and transit of persons and property as well as the purchase, sale, and exchange of commodities."

If it be held that the term includes the regulation of all such manufactures as are intended to be the subject of commercial transactions in the future, it is impossible to deny that it would also include all productive industries that contemplate the same thing. The result would be that Congress would be invested, to the exclusion of the States, with the power to regulate not only manufactures but also agriculture, horticulture, stock raising, domestic fisheries, mining—in short, every branch of human industry. For is there one of them that does not contemplate more or less clearly an interstate or foreign market? Does not the wheat grower of the Northwest and the cotton planter of the South plant, cultivate, and harvest his crop with an eye on the prices at Liverpool, New York, and Chicago? The power being vested in Congress and denied to the States, it would follow as an inevitable result that the duty would devolve on Congress to regulate all of these delicate, multiform, and vital interests—interests which in their nature are and must be local in all the details of their successful management.

It is not necessary to enlarge on, but only to suggest the impracticability of such a scheme when we read the multitudinous affairs involved and the almost infinite variety of their minute details.

It was said by Chief Justice Marshall that it is a matter of public history that the object of vesting in Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States was to insure uniformity of regulation against conflicting and discriminating State legislation. See also County of Mobile *v.* Kimball (supra, p. 697).

This being true, how can it further that object so to interpret the constitutional provision as to place upon Congress the obligation to exercise the supervisory powers just indicated? The demands of such a supervision would require not uniform legislation generally applicable throughout the United States, but a swarm of statutes only locally applicable and utterly inconsistent. Any movement toward the establishment of rules of production in this vast country, with its many different climates and opportunities, could only be at the sacrifice of the peculiar advantages of a large part of the localities in it, if not of every one of them. On the other hand, any movement toward the local, detailed, and incongruous legislation required by such interpretation would be about the widest possible departure from the declared object of the clause in question. Nor this alone. Even in the exercise of the power contended for Congress would be confined to the regulation, not of certain branches of industry, however numerous, but to those instances in each and every branch where the producer contemplated an interstate market.

These instances would be almost infinite, as we have seen, but still there would always remain the possibility and often it would be the case that the producer contemplated a domestic market. In that case the supervisory power must be executed by the State, and the interminable trouble would be presented that whether the one power or the other should exercise the authority in question would be determined, not by any general or intelligible rule, but by the secret and changeable intention of the producer in each and every act of production. A situation more paralyzing to the State governments and more provocative of conflicts between the General Government and the States and less likely

to have been what the framers of the Constitution intended it would be difficult to imagine.

There are numerous other authorities which might be cited sustaining this same principle.

In the "Lottery case," which I have referred to, Judge Harlan in his opinion said in substance that traffic which could be limited in interstate commerce from one State to another was the kind of traffic which one could not pursue as a matter of right, the idea being that when the lottery ticket went from one State to another, at the time it reached its destination would cause the violation of morals and other things in that case.

Now, let us take the bill before us. There is not a man on the floor of the House who would for one instant contend that a bale of cotton goods was in any way injurious or could in any way do anyone any harm, and yet we go back to the actual manufacturing of the commodity and try to take hold of that.

You say that you do not punish the manufacturers, but that you punish the common carriers. This is merely a way of doing indirectly what you know you have no right to do directly. It is unquestionably a violation of that clause of the Constitution which guarantees that no citizen can be deprived of his property without due process of law. But you say you are not depriving him of his property; that is the very thing you are doing, because of what value would cotton goods be to the manufacturer or to the purchaser who had purchased them for the purpose of selling them if he had absolutely no way to dispose of them? In other words, while you do not actually propose to take from him his property without due process of law, you do propose, without due process of law, to put him in such a position that his property is absolutely worthless to him because he has no way of selling and delivering same. In the case of People against Hawkins, One hundred and fifty-seventh New York, the court speaks in this language:

> The citizen can not be deprived of his property without due process of law. Any law which annihilates its value, restricts its use, or takes away any of its essential attributes comes within the purview of this limitation or its power.

This is not the first time that the question as to whether or not Congress had a right to legislate against child labor has arisen before this body. A few years ago the Judiciary Committee of this House was asked to make a thorough investigation and research into the law and report back to this House whether or not Congress had that right. The opinion of this able committee was unanimous that this right did not exist and that it was a question for the States to determine.

There are numerous and sundry opinions of the court sustaining this proposition, and some of the most learned lawyers of our country have gone into it to a great extent. Ex-President Taft, who is also an ex-judge and who is considered to be one of our ablest lawyers, has said in his book on Popular Government, pages 142 and 143:

> Bills have been urged upon Congress to forbid interstate commerce in goods made by child labor. Such proposed legislation has failed chiefly because it was thought beyond the Federal power. The distinction between the power exercised in enacting the pure-food bill and that which would have been necessary in the case of the child-labor bill is that Congress in the former is only preventing interstate commerce from being a vehicle for conveyance of something which would be injurious to people at its destination, and it might properly decline to permit the use of interstate commerce for that detrimental result. In the latter case Congress would be using its regulative power of interstate commerce not to effect any result of interstate commerce. Articles made by child labor are presumably as good and useful as articles made by adults. The proposed law is to be enforced to discourage the making of articles by child labor in the State from which the articles were shipped. In other words, it seeks indirectly and by duress to compel the States to pass a certain kind of legislation that is completely within their discretion to enact or not. Child labor in the State of the shipment has no legitimate or germane relation to the interstate commerce of which the goods thus made are to form a part, to its character, or to its effect. Such an attempt of Congress to use its power of regulating such commerce to supress the use of child labor in the State of shipment would be a clear usurpation of that State's rights. (Popular Government, pp. 142–143.)

I would like to talk to you at great length upon this subject, but I realize that there are numbers of other gentlemen here who are very deeply interested in this bill. I believe as time progresses and conditions in the South are improved that each of our States will do everything in their power, as they have done in the past, to relieve the children from working in the mills, but I tell you frankly that if you pass this law and if the Supreme Court of the United States sustains your action, you will take bread out of the mouths of numbers of helpless children who are now depending largely upon their "big brother" or "big sister" to feed them. As I have said before, if this bill was before the South Carolina Legislature—the only body, in my judgment, which has the right to pass it, governing South Carolina—and I were a member of that body, I would vote for its passage, provided that the age limit was 14 years instead of 16. If you decide to pass this bill, I implore you to vote for an amendment which will be introduced making the minimum wage scale in manufacturing plants called for by this bill $2 per day, because if you deprive the families in the mills of the South from the aid now given them by their children from 14 to 16, you should at least place the adult members of these families in a position where they could earn a wage on which their families could live. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, this measure is not any great bugaboo, as the cotton and woolen mill districts and mining districts seem to indicate here. The Constitution of the United States is not going to be trampled under foot. It is just a question of whether you are going to conserve the young boys and girls of the country or put them into these mines and factories, and grind their sweat and blood into dollars. The issue is clearly drawn. Where is the man who wants the little boy or little girl under 14 years of age to be confined in the cotton mills of his country, where they will inhale and absorb into their lungs all of the lint and dust and all of the conditions of immorality that surround them and cause them finally to degenerate into a race of pigmies, physically and mentally?

Mr. GORDON rose.

Mr. QUIN. I have not the time to yield. The question is whether or not we want to make a strong virile race of men and women in this country. You can not do it by putting little children into factories and mines at hard labor. You can not bring up that race that the American people have been so proud of in the past, if we are going to take them when they are little boys and girls and put them to work in mines beneath the earth to inhale dust and gases, and in cotton and wool factories to inhale dust and lint. We can not change nature. We know that in the tender years of life the child should have its schooling, it should have its outdoor exercise in God's pure air and sunshine. If we want to make a race of strong men and women we must have conditions that will protect them. [Applause.] I believe this Congress ought to conserve the manhood and womanhood of this Republic, and it is our duty under the oath taken here to look out for the human race instead of piling up dollars for the men who own the factories and the mines. [Applause.] We know that that class of men have been in all the States endeavoring to keep the respective legislators from passing wholesome laws to protect the children, and when we come to the Federal Congress we see that the same influence is at work here. They never stop; they work all of the time.

The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina talked about a lobby. I hope to God there is a set of people in this Republic who are so interested that they will voluntarily give up their time to come to the city of Washington and try to get a law passed that will save the little boys and girls from being made mental and physical dwarfs and their beauty and health from being undermined by being ground into almighty dollars by the capitalists of this country. [Applause.]

Some of the gentlemen who have just spoken seem to be very solicitous about the success of the factories of our country. I am just as good a wisher for the success and prosperity of the factories as any other man in this Congress, but I shall never cast my vote against the poor laboring people of my district, State, and Nation. I know that the poor people are bound to work for a living, but I do not propose to sit idly by and see these poor little boys and girls worked in these factories and mines when they should be attending public schools to fit them for citizenship and a fair chance in life.

As Representatives of the people we should endeavor to give every boy and girl in this great Republic an opportunity to make good in the world. Does any man on this floor believe the factory and mine owners are as much interested in the little children in their factories and mines as they are in the profits they can make out of this class of labor?

It is our duty to protect the poor children instead of allowing them to be the profit makers for the capitalists of this country.

The gentlemen who are so afraid that capital will be driven out of the manufacturing and mining business are unduly excited. It is my observation that capital can always take care of itself. This bill puts all of the factories and mines in all of the States of the Union on an equal footing. Why should any of them complain?

I contend no child under 16 years of age should be allowed to work in the factories and mines of our country. The child can not help itself. Then it is the duty of the lawmakers of this Government to make it impossible for the children to be worked

in those places at a low, measly rate of wages which shuts the door of opportunity in their faces the remainder of their lives.

The gentleman from North Carolina said this child-labor bill is founded on sentiment, and that seems to be one of his reasons for opposing the measure. Blessed be the people if they are fortunate enough to have this noble sentiment enacted into the law of this land.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the fact that sentiment has found its way into the legislative halls of this Nation to force the lawmakers to recognize the poor children of the United States and enact this wholesome law for their welfare. God bless the sentiment which takes the poor, unfortunate children of the laboring people out of the toils of the captains of industry and places them in the schools to train them for the duties of citizenship. The glory of this Republic depends upon its citizenry. If these little girls spend 8 or 10 hours every day except Sunday at work in factories, what kind of mothers would they make after they are grown women? A large percentage of them would have their health undermined in their youth. They could not have the advantages of schools. They would enter woman's estate with heavy handicaps. Each succeeding generation would become weaker.

Who doubts nature's law of heredity? What prospect for the future has the boy who spends his tender years working in cotton or woolen factories or in the bowels of the earth mining coal or anything else?

Every sensible man knows that boy is loaded down with a heavy weight.

Who says protect the poor children from these hardships and handicaps? Motherhood, humanity, sentiment, and God.

Who says kill this bill? The American capitalist; in order that he might further increase his profits and fortune.

One distinguished speaker on this floor says this bill ought to be killed because it is State socialism.

Mr. Chairman, it is my observation that every bill for the real benefit of the people has to run the gauntlet of its opponents, who claim it either unconstitutional or socialistic.

We all take the oath to support the Constitution. I do not think I ever voted for any measure that violated the Constitution. From my own intellect and conscience I interpret the Constitution as touching the bill now under discussion. The corporations of this country shall never interpret the Constitution for me, and I know they can never get my conscience.

All of this hurrah about State socialism has no terrors for me. I am for this bill in soul, heart, and mind, and hope it will pass this House before the sun sets this day. [Applause.]

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, it is very easy for a man from the State of Massachusetts to be in favor of this bill. I do not rise for the purpose of saying that I am in favor of it. Of course I am in favor of it. I claim no especial virtue for my views. We prohibit child labor in Massachusetts and so it is clearly to our interest to prohibit child labor in States which compete with us. The majority report, I think, gives too much credit to former Senator Beveridge. To be sure he was one of those who followed President Roosevelt's lead, but, if I recollect rightly, one year earlier Congressman William S. McNary, of my own State of Massachusetts, was the first Member of Congress to introduce a measure looking to the ultimate elimination of child labor throughout the land. At that time Congressman McNary and I, each of us, introduced bills to make effective President Roosevelt's recommendation contained in his message to Congress on December 6, 1904.

The President expressed a belief that the States themselves must ultimately settle the question, and called for an investigation. At that time it is probable that the courts would have held this present proposed law to be unconstitutional.

Along in January, 1907, Senator Beveridge offered his amendment seeking to destroy child labor by legislation, which, as he claimed, was constitutional under the "commerce clause" of the Constitution. At the time the trend of the decisions of the Supreme Court had been such as to make it quite apparent to good lawyers that the Beveridge amendment would not be upheld. Since that day the trend of decisions has changed and I feel little apprehension that this proposed measure should be declared unconstitutional. I am heartily in favor of this child-labor bill. I believe that it will go far to prohibiting child labor, and I believe that the courts will find it constitutional; therefore I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY].

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I can get started in three minutes. I want to say a few things, however, that occurred to me with reference to this bill, and I have not had time to look through it, either. As I understand, it provides that the products from factories using a certain character of labor shall not be transported across State lines. My objection to that is that I believe in the people of the different localities of this country controlling, in matters of local concern, their own affairs. I have as much confidence in the people of South Carolina doing justice to their children and rightly determining what they ought to have in their factories as I have in the people of Colorado. I am perfectly willing for Colorado to determine what character of labor her factories shall have. I would not say one word nationally with reference to it. I am perfectly willing for the State of Massachusetts to determine what character of labor she will use in her factories, but I have just as much confidence in the intelligence and integrity and in the humanity of the people of Georgia as I have in the people of Arizona or the people of California. I do not think that we ought to tear down every principle of democracy which relegates to the people the right to determine for themselves the things they have the power to overlook. If I did not believe in the ability of the people to control their own affairs and to govern themselves, I would then say we here in Washington should determine it for them, but believing in the ability of the people to control their own local affairs, to pass their own local laws relative to their factories and their own children, I know that they are better able to do that the closer you bring it home to them. Believing in their ability to do that, and knowing the closer you bring the subject to them the more able they are to deal with it intelligently, and having the same confidence in the people of one State that I have in the people of another, I can not from the city of Washington say to the people of Georgia what they shall do, nor to the people of South Carolina, nor to the people of Alabama, and I do not want them to say to the people of my State, and I do not believe that it is the province of a democratic representative government for the Congress sitting in Washington to determine for every State in the Union what it shall do in respect to its local affairs. [Applause.]

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, the only debatable question, in my judgment, before the committee is the constitutionality of this measure. Now, I, of course, could not in the space of eight minutes hope to discuss with any satisfaction either to myself or to the committee the question of its constitutionality. And I will therefore not attempt to do any more than merely to outline the grounds upon which I believe it is within our constitutional power to enact. I am surprised that the opponents of this legislation, as they have gone on with their debate this morning, have not seen the proposition that is really before the House. It is simply this: We have the power under the Constitution to regulate interstate commerce. Now, is there any limit to our power? Is our power arbitrary? I am frank to say I do not believe it is.

It is, I believe, limited and measured in exactly the same degree that the police power of a State is measured and limited with reference to its own legislation. So, then, coming down to the particular proposition, the question arises, Would the State of South Carolina or the State of Virginia or Georgia, or any State, have the power to enact this legislation controlling these commodities and these manufactures within their own State for their own purpose? Not one of the opponents of this bill will deny that the States have that power; and, if they have it, then we have the same power, to the same extent, to apply the same principles and for the same purposes in so far as interstate commerce is concerned. And that is all that is attempted. Now, the minority have presented a very able brief, and it should, because of the distinguished ability of the men who sign it, command the careful attention of the House; but I want to say, and without any criticism upon those gentlemen, that anyone who reads this minority report must conclude that they are appearing here as advocates of the opponents of this legislation rather than in a judicial frame of mind to ascertain what the law is.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I have not the time to yield. And if you will read this minority report you will find that in practically every case they have cited they go back to the early days of this Republic. The cases they have cited are found in Howard, in Peters, and in Wheaton, and in other of the earlier reports, where it is admitted that the construction of the Constitution then was not as broad as it is to-day. In connection with that I desire to quote to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WATSON] and commend to his consideration some of the language that he used only last year upon the construction of the Constitution. In a speech that he made upon the floor he re-

ferred to some of the earlier decisions of the Supreme Court that had been later modified, and then he went on to say:

But everything changes, Mr. Speaker, in the course of time, and even so conservative a body as the Supreme Court seems to be cognizant of the changes of opinion which take place in the country. Somebody has said of that court, in a spirit of adverse criticism, that the window to its chamber looked out upon the great body of the American people, and it sometimes took judicial cognizance of changes going on among them. I do not subscribe to the criticism in the sense in which it was uttered; but, as a matter of fact, judicial opinions change, and in regard to this subject the mind of the Supreme Court has changed in recent years.

And so it can be said with reference to the minority report. You will observe in this minority report that no comment is made upon the decision in Hoke against the United States, which is the decision in the White Slave cases. No reference is made to the pure-food-act decisions and only passing comment upon the decision in the Lottery cases, and I undertake to say that if we apply the reasoning that was applied in those cases we must conclude that the earlier decisions they have quoted here are substantially modified. Now, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, a little while ago made the statement upon the floor that our power under the interstate-commerce clause related only to goods and merchandise and commodities that were harmful and deleterious in themselves.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will pardon me, I said that was the distinction the Supreme Court had made so far in its line of demarcation.

Mr. LENROOT. And then when the gentleman's attention was called to the pure-food act he escaped from that just as rapidly as possible, because misbranded goods are neither necessarily deleterious nor harmful, and yet they are absolutely shut out of interstate commerce. The gentleman then said the reason that was done was because they perpetrated a fraud upon the public. Granted; and when you get that far, sir, you admit the constitutionality of this bill. And why? Because if it is within our power to prohibit interstate commerce for the purpose of preventing frauds upon the public, we have the same power to prohibit interstate commerce that may produce unfair competition in the public.

The gentleman's own committee reported a bill, which passed this House and is now the law, with reference to unfair competition. Will the gentleman say when a vast majority of the States of this Union have rigid child-labor laws and a few States of the South permit little children, 8, 9, or 10 years old, to work in their factories, that that is fair competition with these Northern States, where they are not permitted to employ children under 14 years old? Is not that as clearly within our power as the power to prevent frauds in the misbranding of goods?

But this is not the only ground upon which the constitutionality of this bill can be sustained. No one has any inherent right to employ child labor in the production of any commodity. On the contrary, the employment of child labor in factories and hazardous occupations is almost universally condemned as wrong. Nearly all of the States have rigid laws prohibiting the employment of child labor in such cases. The right to so prohibit is grounded upon the fact that such employment is detrimental to the public health, the public morals, and the public welfare. That being true, there can be no inherent right to employ the channels of interstate commerce wherever such employment would be detrimental to the public health, public morals, or public welfare. Does it need any argument to support the proposition that to permit manufacturers in a State having no child-labor laws to use the channels of interstate commerce, thus affording a facility for further exploiting child labor, is detrimental to the public health, the public morals, and public welfare? If it is in any degree so detrimental, then our power to close the channels of interstate commerce to any commodity produced under such conditions can not be doubted.

In Hoke *v.* United States (227 U. S., 523) the court said:

It is misleading to say that men and women have rights. Their rights can not fortify or sanction their wrongs; and if they employ interstate transportation as a facility of their wrongs, it may be forbidden to them to the extent of the act of July 25, 1910, and we need go no further in the present case.

All enlightened public opinion condemns the employment of child labor, in the cases enumerated in this bill, as wrong, and all that the bill seeks to do is to forbid producers of commodities in the cases mentioned in the bill from employing any such transportation as a "facility of their wrongs."

Another thing, Mr. Chairman, the House will remember that last year this House passed a cotton-warehouse bill, a bill that was clearly unconstitutional on the face of it, and not one lawyer on either side of this House dared to get up and argue its constitutionality. Every one of those gentlemen who have argued this morning that this bill is unconstitutional, with one exception—and he was not then a Member—voted for that bill on the ground that we had the right to pass that bill under the public-welfare clause of the Constitution. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WATSON], who signed this minority report, was one who voted for that bill. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. WEBB] voted for it, and the others I have mentioned, and it was not then pretended that that power which was exercised in that bill was exercised under the authority of the interstate-commerce clause or any other clause of the Constitution. [Applause.]

Nearly all of these gentlemen who are now so vehement in insisting upon a strict construction of the Constitution did not exhibit any such attitude at that time. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, whom we all respect and esteem, had charge of the cotton-warehouse bill that I have referred to, when neither he nor any one of its supporters even attempted to show that the provisions of that bill came within our constitutional power. He said:

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that when there is great general good to be accomplished by legislation I am not so squeamish about the Constitution. I believe that when a thing is to be done, when an object is to be accomplished, it should be reached in the quickest and most direct way.

If the gentleman and his associates could go so far on the cotton-warehouse bill as to support it when no argument could be advanced for its constitutionality, is it too much to ask of them that they cease their opposition to this bill, the enactment of which rests upon an express power granted in the Constitution and "when there is a great general good to be accomplished"?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill because it seems to me to tell directly for the welfare of the child all over the country, not in any particular section of the country, but in every State and every city and town of the United States. I think it tells for the welfare of the child physically and mentally and morally. We all know that where there is an opportunity for the child to be employed under a given age—14 or 16, as the case may be—it impairs and restrains his full physical development. In the first place, it keeps him employed for long hours and perhaps in the midst of insanitary conditions. Oftentimes the air of the mill or the factory where he is employed is laden with lint or is otherwise foul or impure. Oftentimes, too, he will be the sufferer physically by reason of accidents. The very elaborate report of the commission investigating the conditions of woman and child labor throughout the United States, which was completed only a year or two ago, shows that children of tender years are much more liable to physical injuries caused by the machinery in the midst of which they are employed than are those of more mature years.

In the second place, the mental retardation of children who go to work too early necessarily follows. I have not the precise figures in mind, but in States where there are very rigid child-labor laws the children who go to school between the ages of 10 and 14 number about 95 per cent of all children between those ages, whereas in the States where the child-labor laws are less rigid, or where they are less strictly enforced, the percentage of children between the ages of 10 and 14 who are in school range only from about 70 per cent to about 75 per cent. Now, we all know that that difference of 20 or 25 per cent in school attendance of children between the ages of 10 and 14, the formative period of a child's intellectual career, reflects a very dangerous and unfortunate situation.

The percentage of illiteracy in States where child-labor laws are lax is vastly higher than in those where the child-labor laws are very strictly applied and enforced. I have not those figures fully in mind, but my recollection is that in some backward States the percentage of illiteracy is from 14 to 18 times as high as in the States of the other type, which are noteworthy on account of their enforcement of child-labor legislation.

Speaking of the third point—the question of the morals of the children—Dr. Neil, in his report on the moral conditions affecting child labor, has pointed out that there is a direct causal connection between the moral welfare of children and their em-

ployment at an early age. He has shown by elaborate tables that the records of the police courts and the delinquency courts show an enormously greater percentage of immorality and delinquency in the case of children who are employed too young than is the case where children are allowed to gain more moral stamina before they go to work for the first time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WATSON] is recognized for 11 minutes.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the bill under discussion—commonly known as the child-labor bill—has been in Congress in one form or another for the past 10 years. In substance it makes it a crime to work boys and girls under the age of 14 years in any mill, workshop, cannery, factory, or manufacturing establishment of any kind; or under the age of 16 years in any mine or quarry; or between those ages more than eight hours a day or at all during the hours of night—a crime for which the shipper of goods in interstate commerce, made in whole or in part by such labor, is punishable by fine and imprisonment. To carry out its provisions an extensive system of visit, search, and inspection by the Federal Government is authorized.

It can not be questioned that in recent years a widespread and, in some localities, an almost overwhelming public sentiment has grown up in favor of legislation of this character. Philanthropic and charitable associations have given it the benefit of their support, and organized labor in many sections of the country has freely contributed its very considerable aid.

In the face of such public demand I have not the vanity to suppose for one moment that anything which I can say would affect in any material way the fate of this measure, the passage of which through this body is a foregone conclusion. On the contrary, it were much easier to yield to the amiable impulses of the hour and allow a proposal originating in such kindly motives and introduced under so favorable auspices to pass without comment.

But, Mr. Chairman, though the evil sought to be reached by this law be conceded, and the motives which animate its proposals be ever so commendable, if the remedy proposed is unwise and revolutionary in itself, and beyond the constitutional power of Congress to grant, should not the Representative, charged with the solemn duty of upholding the Constitution and the laws made in pursuance thereof, be willing to lift his voice against the consummation of such a measure and warn his countrymen against the consequences which he thinks must ensue?

It has seemed to me not only that he should be willing but that it is his bounden duty to do so.

NO DIFFERENCE OF OPINION AS TO THE EVIL.

There is no difference of opinion between the advocates and opponents of this bill as to the evil of child labor in any of its moral or physical aspects. As far as law can offer a remedy, I take it that no humane man would be willing to see a single American child condemned to use the spring and seed time of life in consuming physical labor. But that much of the evil in question is beyond the reach of law, is inherent in our nature, and inseparable from our present imperfect condition must be obvious to every thoughtful man. No legislation yet has ever been wise enough to abolish poverty and necessity; and as long as man's needs and wants remain, there will be some, both adult and adolescent, who shall have to toil for daily bread despite the laws of the most enlightened States. It is the duty of the laws to make easy as possible the conditions under which man performs his labor and to see that he is not unjustly deprived of its reward; but beyond that the laws may not go, and he is under God's providence left to work out his own destiny.

THE EXTENT OF THE EVIL TO BE REACHED AND THE PRACTICAL EFFECT OF THE BILL.

Of the countless thousands of young people in the country under the age of 16 years who are compelled to labor of some sort it is not believed that more than 1 in 15 are engaged in the industries affected by this measure. For the myriads of the young who toil upon the farm, in the forests, on the plains, in the counting room, and in all the vast avenues of domestic trade, who ply the streets of great cities in the news and messenger service of a modern civilization, no relief is provided or has even been considered by this bill. Its boon extends only to the factory and the mine.

According to the last census, of the total number of persons in the United States employed in manufactures and mines, aggregating over seven and one-half millions, only 169,644 were under the age of 16 years, and of this latter number fewer than 45,000 reside in States which have not already by local law prescribed the same requirements as to age and night work provided in the bill now before us. North and South Carolina, New Mexico, and Wyoming are now the only States in the Union in which a child under 14 years, unless under special exemption, can be legally admitted to factory work, and in those States, according to the latest returns, only 10,533 under that age were engaged in manufacturing and mechanical occupations.

The bulk of those, therefore, affected by the age and night-hour clauses of the bill are in the textile industries of a few Southern States. The eight-hour provision of the bill would embrace of course a larger number scattered over a much wider area, but however desirable this may be thought of as an ultimate standard, it can not yet claim the sanction of more than half the American States, and it is believed to be true that far more than half of our people engaged in the various professions, trades, and industries of the country still find it necessary to work more than eight hours per day.

It will thus appear that the labor of children of tender years and at night—the subject which has attracted public notice and excited the solicitude of patriotic men and women in all parts of the country—has to-day legal existence in but few American Commonwealths. With the rapid progress of labor laws in all the States, it is confidently hoped that the child labor aimed at here will in a comparatively short period disappear entirely by local legislation. But should we be disappointed in this, economic conditions themselves would eliminate the evil in large measure.

The fact is child labor does not pay; and farsighted business men, albeit moved by no higher motive than gain, are constantly seeking to get rid of it. The committee hearings disclosed that in many instances employers only consent to admit such children to work from motives of humanity to them or their dependent families.

It is not believed that the products of child labor are of such a character or sufficient in volume to make them a serious factor in the economic and commercial life of the country.

To be sure, in some sections just emerging from the social and economic wreck of a great Civil War and entering now upon new industrial life, conditions leave yet much to be desired in the way of educational and vocational advantage; but, considering the means at their disposal, what people anywhere ever advanced so fast and so far against odds so great or face the future now with brighter promise or higher resolve? For years good men and pious women in their midst have devoted their lives with absorbing interest to the solution of this very problem.

These few general observations are submitted not for the purpose of justifying the existence of wrong or injustice in any portion of our common country, much less to defend those, if such there be, who would sacrifice the citizenship of the time to come upon the altar of financial greed, but for the purpose of presenting to your view my own sense of the extent and character of what has been so feelingly described as a "great nation-wide evil."

NO DIFFERENCE IN AIM, BUT IN METHOD.

Conceding, then, the existence of the evil, with the qualifications stated, I yield to no man in the earnest and sincere desire to find a suitable and adequate remedy.

This gentlemen think they have found in the "commerce clause" of the Constitution, and, under its power to regulate commerce among the States, they propose for Congress to exclude from such commerce the products of child labor, and by this method compel the States to enact such laws regulating labor in their midst as will conform to the will of Congress upon this subject. To them it has seemed fit to invoke the aid of the Federal Government upon this question and to rely upon the distant, but very powerful, Legislature of the Nation to deal with its many and, locally, vastly diversified phases.

On the contrary, after diligent search, I have not been able to find in the Constitution any warrant for the remedy proposed; nor, if there were, have I been able to persuade myself that it would be the part of wisdom to employ it. To me and to those who think with me the ages of workmen engaged in manufacturing industries and the hours of labor are in no sense Federal questions, and their regulation can in no proper way be assumed by Congress. To us, therefore, it seems that as far as mere law may be expected to ameliorate our industrial conditions we must look to the wisdom and humanity of the State legislatures, which alone, under our dual form of government, have the power to deal directly with those conditions.

IS THE BILL CONSTITUTIONAL?

The gentlemen who brought this bill from the committee declined any extended discussion of this question in their report, and expressed the opinion it would lead to no "useful result."

Some gentlemen seem amused that such a question should be asked, and others who have taken part in the debate have expressed impatience that their views should be met with "constitutional objections."

All of which means, Mr. Chairman, if it means anything, that a considerable body of public sentiment has been gathering head in the country and now extending to the Congress itself, which is growing impatient with the restraints of a written Constitution, and is disposed to resent the fact that any limit is imposed on the legislative will, however ephemeral the end sought to be attained.

The attitude of some toward the Constitution of their country reminds me very forcibly of a comment made by a distinguished professor of law in the University of Virginia upon the resumption of lectures at that institution at the close of the war. Upon reassembling his classes, he said:

> Young gentlemen, you have now reached the stage in your course in which you will be invited to study what, by common courtesy, is still called "constitutional and international law," but in the light of past and projected events I would not be candid if I did not say to you I look upon the subject in the light of a post-mortem examination.

Is the Constitution really dead? And are the gloomy prophesies of this troubled patriarch of the law, overwhelmed at the time by the misfortune of his country, coming so soon to be realized upon the floor of the American Congress? Does the legislator owe no duty to the Constitution which he is bound to respect and can he cast lightly upon the Supreme Court the sole responsibility of determining his own obligation to the supreme law of the land?

If all great questions could be thus summarily disposed of, then, indeed, would the path of the lawmaker be simple and his task quickly performed. But, fortunately for them and perhaps unfortunately for ourselves, a question affecting the vital interests of a hundred million people can not be thus dismissed without debate before the judgment bar. The legislator is the first judge to whom a proposed law can be submitted; under the solemn sanction of official oath it is not only his right but his sworn duty, before he can act at all, to decide in the affirmative that he has the legal right to do what is proposed. It is because he is supposed to have performed this very duty that the courts, in reviewing his action, when in doubt concerning his power, will determine the doubt in his favor and concede the power.

In this connection it was forcibly said by Judge Cooley:

> Legislators have their authority measured by the Constitution. They are chosen to do what it permits and nothing more, and they take solemn oaths to obey and support it. When they disregard its provisions, they usurp authority, abuse their trust, and violate the promise they have confirmed by an oath. To pass an act when they are in doubt whether it is not violating the Constitution, is to treat as of no force the most imperative obligation any person can assume. A business agent who would deal in that manner with his principal's business would be treated as untrustworthy; a witness in court who would treat his oath thus lightly and affirm things concerning which he was in doubt would be held a criminal.

Assuming, then, notwithstanding the disinclination of some to be bothered by such inquiries, that the question of constitutional power here involved will have the serious and conscientious consideration of this assembly, let us take up the matter for such examination as the occasion will permit.

OPINION OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE IN THE FIFTY-NINTH CONGRESS.

In the Fifty-ninth Congress, in which were pending sundry matters relating to woman and child labor, Mr. Tawney offered the following resolution, which was adopted by the House:

> *Resolved*, That the Judiciary Committee be, and it is hereby, directed to immediately investigate and report to the House at this session the extent of the jurisdiction and authority of Congress over the subject of woman and child labor, and to what extent and by what means Congress has authority to suppress abuses of such labor or to ameliorate conditions surrounding the employment of such laborers.

The Judiciary Committee at the time comprised some very able lawyers in its membership, and was composed as follows:

> John J. Jenkins, Richard Wayne Parker, De Alva S. Alexander, Charles E. Littlefield, Robert M. Nevin, Henry W. Parker, George A. Pearre, James N. Gillett, Charles Q. Tirrell, John A. Sterling, B. P. Birdsall, and John H. Foster (Republicans).
>
> D. A. De Armond, D. H. Smith, Henry D. Clayton, Robert L. Henry, John F. Little, and W. G. Brantley (Democrats).

After careful study and review of the authorities upon the question, the committee submitted, on February 6, 1907, a unanimous report to the House, in which it said, among other things:

> In the opinion of your committee, there is no question as to the entire want of power on the part of Congress to exercise jurisdiction and authority over the subject of woman and child labor. In fact, it is not a debatable question. It would be a reflection upon the intelligence of Congress to so legislate. It would be casting an unwelcome burden upon the Supreme Court to so legislate. (See Rept. No. 7304, 59th Cong., 2d sess.)

This opinion of its chief law committee was respected by the House at the time, and as a question of law for several years the matter was thought to be at rest. I am informed that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary about the same time found to the same effect upon a similar inquiry.

THE BILL IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

Mr. Chairman, in the time allotted it is difficult to discuss with satisfaction a question like this, and I shall have to content myself with an imperfect statement of the reasons which have combined to form my opinion upon this subject.

I submit that this measure is unconstitutional, because—

First. No act of this body in all its legislative history, extending now over a century, can be cited as a precedent for this legislation; and no court of last resort, State or Federal, has ever asserted such a power to reside in Congress.

I do not plead this long record of nonaction and nonassertion as conclusive, of course, but I do present it as powerfully persuasive. In the many vicissitudes through which the country has been called to pass, surely there have been times when the motive for legislation of this kind was not lacking, and the fact that in so long a period such legislation was never attempted or justified beforehand by court deliverance is strong presumptive evidence that the legislative and judicial mind has heretofore discredited the power.

Second. It seeks to do indirectly that which directly it would confessedly be unlawful to attempt.

Will any respectable lawyer upon this floor argue for one moment that it is competent for Congress by direct enactment to fix the hours of labor and the ages of the workmen in the factories and mines within the territorial limits of the States? Yet that is the object and effect of this bill—in fact, its sole object. "So says the bond"; it is express in the exacting clause; the whole context proclaims it. How would such an instrument have answered the constitutional requirements laid down by Judge Marshall in McCulloch *v.* Maryland (4 Wheat., 316)?

> Let the end be legitimate; let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional.

And in ascertaining if the end were legitimate and within the scope of the Constitution, what would Judge Story have said:

> Every act of the legislature must be judged of from its object and intent, as they are embodied in its provisions. (2 Story on Constitution, 37.)

And in this general connection it was finely said by another great lawyer and judge, Abel P. Upshur:

> Congress has no right to employ for one purpose means ostensibly provided for another; to do so would be a positive fraud and a manifest usurpation; for if the purpose be lawful it may be accomplished by its own appropriate means, and if it is unlawful it should not be accomplished at all. Without this check it is obvious that Congress may by indirection accomplish almost any forbidden object. (Upshur on the Federal Government, 98 and post).

Third. It is not a regulation of commerce, but of production.

While nominally purporting to regulate commerce, it in reality regulates the conditions under which goods are made for that commerce; that is, production. The thing aimed at in the bill—child labor—is completed before the thing ostensibly regulated and which alone Congress has power to control—transportation—begins. Commerce is not regulated, but manufacture is. Commerce does not begin until manufacture has ended; and goods are not subject to the commercial regulation of Congress until they have started on their journey into another State.

The legal proposition that the things herein prescribed affect not commerce but conditions anterior, which are amenable to State law alone, I take it as long and well settled by repeated adjudications of the Supreme Court.

Said the court in Coe *v.* Errol:

> There must be a point of time when they (goods) cease to be governed exclusively by domestic law, and begin to be governed and protected by the national law of commercial regulation, and that moment seems to us to be a legitimate one for this purpose in which they commence their final movement from the State of their origin to that of their destination. (116 U. S., 517.)

And again in United States *v.* Knight Co.:

> Commerce succeeds to manufacture and is not a part of it. * * * That which belongs to commerce is within the jurisdiction of the United States; but that which does not belong to commerce is within the jurisdiction of the police power of the States. (157 U. S., 1.)

Fourth. If it be a regulation of manufacture and not of commerce, Congress has no power to make the regulation.

This proposition was already deducible from the court decisions quoted above; but I desire to call especial attention to the celebrated case of Kidd *v.* Pearson (128 U. S., 1), in which the long and often tortuous line of demarcation between State and Federal power is drawn with striking power and skill.

Said the court:

> No distinction is more popular to the common mind or more clearly expressed in economic and political literature than that between manufactures and commerce. Manufacture is transformation—the fash-

tioning of raw materials into a change of form for use. The functions of commerce are different. The buying and selling and the transportation incidental thereto constitute commerce, and the regulation of commerce in the constitutional sense embraces the regulation at least of such transportation. The legal definition of the term, as given by this court in County of Mobile *v.* Kimball (102 U. S., 691, 702), is as follows:

"Commerce with foreign countries and among the States, strictly considered, consists in intercourse and traffic, including in these terms navigation and the transportation and transit of persons and property as well as the purchase, sale, and exchange of commodities."

If it be held that the term includes the regulation of all such manufactures as are intended to be the subject of commercial transactions in the future, it is impossible to deny that it would also include all productive industries that contemplate the same thing. The result would be that Congress would be invested, to the exclusion of the States, with the power to regulate not only manufactures but also agriculture, horticulture, stock raising, domestic fisheries, mining—in short, every branch of human industry. For is there one of them that does not contemplate more or less clearly an interstate or foreign market? Does not the wheat grower of the Northwest and the cotton planter of the South plant, cultivate, and harvest his crop with an eye on the prices at Liverpool, New York, and Chicago? The power being vested in Congress and denied to the States, it would follow as an inevitable result that the duty would devolve on Congress to regulate all of these delicate, multiform, and vital interests—interests which in their nature are and must be local in all the details of their successful management.

It is not necessary to enlarge on but only to suggest the impracticability of such a scheme when we regard the multitudinous affairs involved and the almost infinite variety of their minute details.

It was said by Chief Justice Marshall that it is a matter of public history that the object of vesting in Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States was to insure uniformity of regulation against conflicting and discriminating State legislation. See also County of Mobile *v.* Kimball (supra, at p. 697).

This being true, how can it further that object so as to interpret the constitutional provision as to place upon Congress the obligation to exercise the supervisory powers just indicated? The demands of such a supervision would require, not uniform legislation generally applicable throughout the United States, but a swarm of statutes only locally applicable and utterly inconsistent. Any movement toward the establishment of rules of production in this vast country, with its many different climates and opportunities, could only be at the sacrifice of the peculiar advantages of a large part of the localities in it, if not of every one of them. On the other hand, any movement toward the local, detailed, and incongruous legislation required by such interpretation would be about the widest possible departure from the declared object of the clause in question. Nor this alone. Even in the exercise of the power contended for Congress would be confined to the regulation, not of certain branches of industry, however numerous, but to those instances in each and every branch where the producer contemplated an interstate market.

These instances would be almost infinite, as we have seen, but still there would always remain the possibility, and often it would be the case that the producer contemplated a domestic market. In that case the supervisory power must be executed by the State; and the interminable trouble would be presented that whether the one power or the other should exercise the authority in question would be determined not by any general or intelligible rule but by the secret and changeable intention of the producer in each and every act of production. A situation more paralyzing to the State governments and more provocative of conflicts between the General Government and the States and less likely to have been what the framers of the Constitution intended it would be difficult to imagine.

Fifth. If it be held in fact a regulation of commerce, there is no direct and substantial relation in the provisions of the bill and the commerce assumed to be regulated.

It is difficult to imagine how the requirements of this measure could affect in any direct, practical way the commerce it involves. There is no rule of traffic or transportation laid down by which the facility or safety of commerce is to be promoted; and, as far as can be seen, it would add nothing to and take nothing from the volume of existing commerce. The identical articles sought to be outlawed would continue in the commerce of the future, with the sole difference that an incident of their manufacture will have been changed. Manifestly, then, the regulation proposed can have no effect upon commerce as such. In fact it has no real relation to commerce. It is not intended to have; its effect is entirely retroactive, and is designed to operate upon an ordinary relation of life—that of master and servant engaged in private business—a relation never before now supposed to be subject to any but domestic law.

That Congress has no power to prescribe arbitrarily a rule for commerce having no direct and substantial relation to that commerce has been adjudged by the Supreme Court in many well-considered cases. One of the most interesting of these, perhaps, was that of Adair *v.* United States (208 U. S., 161), decided at the October term, 1907, in which a portion of the act—known as the Erdman Act—was declared to be unconstitutional. It will be remembered that a section of that act forbade railroads engaged in interstate commerce to discharge from their employment an employee because of his membership in any labor organization. Here both employer and employee, while engaged in the business of interstate commerce, were confessedly subject to any reasonable regulation which Congress might prescribe for the conduct of their business. But the court declared that the regulation described above had no real relation to the commerce sought to be regulated, and for that reason it was beyond the power of Congress to prescribe, unconstitutional, and void. Mr. Justice Harlan, the same who had rendered the opinion in the Lottery cases, so much relied upon to uphold this measure, said:

The power to regulate interstate commerce is the power to prescribe rules by which such commerce must be governed. Of course, as has often been said, Congress has a larger discretion in the selection or choice of the means to be employed in the regulation of interstate commerce, and such discretion is not to be interfered with except where that which is done is in plain violation of the Constitution. * * * In this connection we may refer to Johnson *v.* Railroad (196 U. S., 1), relied on in argument, which case arose under the act of March, 1893. That act required carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their cars used in such commerce with automatic couplers and continuous brakes, and their locomotives with driving-wheel brakes. But the act upon its face showed that its object was to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads, and this court sustained its validity upon the ground that it manifestly had reference to interstate commerce and was calculated to subserve the interests of such commerce by affording protection to employees and travelers. It was held that there was a substantial connection between the object sought to be attained by the act and the means provided to accomplish that object. So in regard to the employers' liability cases (207 U. S., 463), decided at the present term. In that case the court sustained the authority of Congress, under its power to regulate commerce, to prescribe the rule of liability as between interstate carriers and their employees in such interstate commerce, in cases of personal injuries received by employees while actually engaged in such commerce. The decision on this point was placed on the ground that a rule of that character would have direct reference to the conduct of interstate commerce and would, therefore, be within the competency of Congress to establish for commerce among the States, but not as to commerce completely internal to a State.

Manifestly, any rule prescribed for the conduct of interstate commerce, in order to be within the competency of Congress under its power to regulate commerce among the States, must have some real or substantial relation to or connection with the commerce regulated. But what possible legal or logical connection is there between an employee's membership in a labor organization and the carrying on of interstate commerce? Such relation to a labor organization can have in itself and in the eye of the law no bearing upon the commerce with which the employee is connected by his labor and services. * * * It results, on the whole case, that the provision of the statute under which the defendant was convicted must be held to be repugnant to the fifth amendment and as not embraced by nor within the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce, but under the guise of regulating interstate commerce and as applied to this case it arbitrarily sanctions an illegal invasion of the personal liberty as well as the right of property of the defendant Adair.

Sixth. It is not a regulation, but an absolute embargo against articles sound and harmless in themselves.

Regulation presupposes the existence of the thing to be regulated; a rule intended to and which does entirely destroy a given commerce can scarcely be deemed in law a reasonable regulation of that commerce.

I do not forget that in legislating upon foods, drugs, explosives, lottery tickets, and, perhaps, other subjects, Congress has so regulated as, in some instances, to proscribe altogether the traffic affected. I am not unmindful of the fact that impure foods have been excluded from interstate commerce; that diseased meats have been denied its instrumentalities; that false and fraudulent branding has been prohibited; that lottery tickets have been excluded from the instrumentalities of interstate commerce; and likewise human beings when transported for immoral purposes. But I would ask any lawyer in this body, aye go further and ask any intelligent laymen, whether or not a single article included in the list has any right of itself to constitute any part of the commerce between the States? The judge who delivered the opinion in the lottery cases paused time and time again to declare that this traffic in gaming was a traffic which no man was entitled to pursue as a matter of right. In those cases Justice Harlan said:

It is a kind of traffic which no one can be entitled to pursue as a matter of right. (Champion *v.* Ames, 188 U. S., 321.)

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the gentleman believe that the traffic or business of dealing in the labor of little children under 14 years of age is a traffic that no man should have the right to pursue?

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. I will try to answer the gentleman at the proper time. Does any man in this Congress believe that a citizen in one State of this Union should have the right to transport to another State a woman for immoral purposes? Does any man here believe that a consignment of tainted meat has a right to be shipped from one State to another? Does the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] believe that an article of goods can be misbranded and a citizen of one State perpetrate a fraud upon the citizen of another State?

I say, gentlemen, without fear of successful contradiction, that in no legislative act of this body from the foundation of the Government has any article, sound in itself, not misbranded, and representing a business which a man had a right to conduct, ever been excluded from interstate commerce.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DILLON. Does the gentleman believe that the National Government should have the right to inspect slaughterhouses to determine the method of construction before the exportation of those meats?

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, that opens a very interesting legal question, which I have not the time to take up at this point. I take pleasure in saying to the gentleman that if I have leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I will try to answer that question.

Mr. DILLON. And one other question. What is the difference between that case and one affecting the welfare of the child?

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. I will try to answer that also.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am endeavoring to demonstrate the further fact that under its power over interstate commerce Congress has never undertaken to exclude from commerce a single, solitary article which the State itself had not the lawful right, under its police power, to exclude, if it had been able to exercise adequate physical control over it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Has not every State the right to prohibit child labor within the State?

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. I think so.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then wherein lies the applicability of the question?

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. The point I am trying to make is that in all those cases in which Congress has heretofore "outlawed" certain articles from commerce it acted not in contravention of State law and against its inalienable police power, but in aid thereof. My view is that in exercising this power Congress can not invade the police power of the State nor curtail the liberty of its citizens under the fifth amendment.

In all these cases the legitimacy of the act is rested by the courts upon the principle that the articles upon which an embargo was laid never had the right to enter commerce or to use its instrumentalities.

Assuming, then, all that these precedents may imply, can Congress arbitrarily deny admission to interstate commerce of a bolt of cotton cloth, for example, sound in itself, not misbranded, of use and value, and incapable of affecting the peace and morals of those to whom it is consigned, because, forsooth, it has been made by a child in North Carolina, let us say, who had attained the age at which he or she was entitled to work under the law of that State?

This question is predicated upon a concrete case, and upon its correct answer, it seems to me, hangs all the law in this controversy.

Before considering it from the standpoint of the inferences which may be drawn from partially analogous cases already adjudicated by the courts, I invite your attention briefly to the history of the "commerce clause" and the way in which it came to find a place in our organic law.

It is well known that after the Revolution the States early became involved in strife among themselves concerning their trade, both foreign and domestic. The dispute between Maryland and Virginia on this subject led to the convention at Annapolis, and it in turn to the convention at Philadelphia which framed the Federal Constitution.

Under the Confederation each State possessed the right to control the commerce of its own citizens and with the outside world. It could prescribe such regulations as it pleased at its boundaries or forbid trade beyond altogether. Under this system vexatious restrictions upon commerce grew up everywhere, and the prosperity and progress of the newly formed Commonwealths were seriously threatened.

I do not, I think, put it too strongly to say that the strongest motive which drove the States into a Federal Union was commercial—the desire to enjoy freedom of trade among themselves, unhampered by local restrictions and embargoes. Thus was it to escape restrictions and embargoes and have free trade among themselves that the States consented to confer upon the Federal Government the power to regulate commerce.

If these things be so, may it not be said as a matter of history that it was never intended that the power given to Congress should be used to prohibit lawful commerce among the States?

In his excellent commentary on the Constitution, discussing this question, the late John Randolph Tucker said:

> Under the Articles of Confederation the States could interdict trade inter se. The grant of power to Congress to regulate commerce was with the purpose not to transfer this power of interdicting interstate trade to Congress, but to leave interstate commerce free, as the Constitution intended, in order to form a more perfect union. Could the Constitution have intended to destroy the freedom of interstate trade by congressional power, when it took it from the States and vested it in Congress in order to prevent such destruction? (2 Tucker on Constitution, 528.)

And again:

> But there is another clause of the Constitution which is clearly a denial of any such power by Congress. It declares that "citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." It will be perceived that this is a declaration of the personal right of every citizen and belongs to him as such. No Federal or State law gives it to him. He holds it by the higher title of the Constitution itself. If, therefore, any regulation of commerce should invade the right conferred by this article, it would be, under Judge Marshall's canon, prohibited to Congress by the Constitution. It is a personal right which neither Congress nor a State can impair. * * *
>
> It is clear, therefore, that this right conferred by the Constitution upon the citizens of each State included free ingress and regress of persons and property and the like, and put them beyond the reach of the power of the States, and, a fortiori, beyond the power of the Federal Government. * * *
>
> Congress may regulate such commerce so as to promote it and secure its safety, but can not forbid it or tax it. * * *
>
> The whole Constitution, in all its parts, looks to the security of free trade in persons and goods between the States of the Union, and by this clause prohibits either Congress or the States to interfere with freedom of intercourse and trade. (Idem, pp. 530, 533, citing 7 How., 413, The Slaughter House cases, the Passenger cases, and Ward v. Maryland, 12 Wall., 410.)

To the same view spoke the Supreme Court in Railroad Co. v. Richmond (19 Wall., 584):

> The power to regulate commerce among the several States was vested in Congress in order to secure equality and freedom in commercial intercourse against discriminating State legislation; * * * designed to remove trammels upon transportation between different States which had previously existed, and to prevent the creation of such trammels in the future.

Further illustrating the view that the "commerce clause" was framed that the people might be the better protected in their commercial rights and privileges, and not that these rights should be curtailed and destroyed, we may consider the opinions expressed by eminent publicists and authors who have written upon the subject.

Watson, in his work on the Constitution, says:

> Clearly akin to the question of regulating manufacturing is the question whether Congress can forbid the hauling of a commodity by a carrier of interstate commerce which was manufactured in a State, for instance, by women and children under a certain age, as has recently been maintained. This question is of far-reaching effect, and if such power exists in Congress it would result in the most complete invasion of the sovereignty of the States by the Federal Government which has ever been accomplished by the Federal Constitution. * * * Has Congress, under the power to regulate commerce, the power arbitrarily to deprive individuals or commercial agencies of the exercise of a privilege which is necessarily inherent in the right of citizenship and the right of transacting business? The Constitution will enforce rights which the citizens of this country are entitled to have, exercise, and enjoy rather than destroy them. * * *
>
> The commerce clause refutes the idea that Congress can prohibit the transportation of an innocuous article by an interstate carrier. The word "regulate" does not mean prohibit. * * * There is no power in Congress to control the manufacture of goods in the States destined for interstate or foreign commerce, and consequently Congress is unable to control the labor of persons engaged in manufacturing products in the States which are intended for interstate or foreign business. Such regulations are left to the State. The power to make such regulations resided there before the Constitution was adopted, or the Union was formed, and it was not surrendered by the States to the General Government. (Vol. 1, pp. 524 and 31.)

Ex-President and ex-Judge Taft says:

> Bills have been urged upon Congress to forbid interstate commerce in goods made by child labor. Such proposed legislation has failed chiefly because it was thought beyond the Federal power. The distinction between the power exercised in enacting the pure-food bill and that which would have been necessary in the case of the child-labor bill is that Congress in the former is only preventing interstate commerce from being a vehicle for conveyance of something which would be injurious to people at its destination, and it might properly decline to permit the use of interstate commerce for that detrimental result. In the latter case Congress would be using its regulative power of interstate commerce not to effect any result of interstate commerce. Articles made by child labor are presumably as good and useful as articles made by adults. The proposed law is to be enforced to discourage the making of articles by child labor in the State from which the articles were shipped. In other words, it seeks indirectly and by duress to compel the States to pass a certain kind of legislation that is completely within their discretion to enact or not. Child labor in the State of the shipment has no legitimate or germane relation to the interstate commerce of which the goods thus made are to form a part, to its character, or to its effect. Such an attempt of Congress to use its power of regulating such commerce to suppress the use of child labor in the State of shipment would be a clear usurpation of that State's rights. (Popular Government, pp. 142, 143.)

In their valuable book on the Commerce Clause of the Federal Constitution (p. 305), Messrs. Prentice and Egan say:

> The right to engage in interstate commerce is one of the rights reserved to the people and one of the privileges and immunities of citizenship. Congress can not lay an embargo upon interstate commerce, nor can it, in national matters, make restrictions of unequal operation among the States. The purpose with which the grant was made—to secure freedom of transportation throughout the country unembarrassed by differing regulations of State lines—measures not only the power of the States but also the power of Congress. (Citing in support thereof the opinion of Mr. Justice McLean in Grove v. Slaughter 15 Peters, 449.)

Mr. Chairman, I trust I have found sufficient answer to this question in the negative from the standpoint of history and of

approved text writers upon the Constitution. I come now to consider how may stand the question when tested by the light of judicial decision. It is, perhaps, entirely safe to say that had such a question arisen at any time prior to the period in which the Lottery case was decided, the judgment of the courts would have been adverse to the power claimed here. It is not so much what was decided in that case, as some of the reasons assigned by the court for its decision, which has made it come to be regarded in some quarters as epoch making and making a change in judicial thought respecting the Constitution.

In discussing the right of Congress to exclude lottery tickets from interstate commerce, the judge rendering opinion for the court in that case did ask:

> Are we prepared to say that a provision which is, in effect, a prohibition of the carriage of such articles from State to State is not a fit or appropriate mode for the regulation of that particular kind of commerce? If lottery traffic, carried on through interstate commerce, is a matter of which Congress may take cognizance and over which its power may be exerted, can it be possible that it must tolerate the traffic and simply regulate the manner in which it may be carried on? Or may not Congress, for the protection of the people of all the States, and under the power to regulate interstate commerce, devise such means, within the scope of the Constitution and not prohibited by it, as will drive that traffic out of commerce among the States? (Champion v. Ames, 188 U. S., 355.)

And, again, he did say:

> As a State may, for the purpose of guarding the morals of its own people, forbid all sales of lottery tickets within its limits, so Congress, for the purpose of guarding the people of the United States against the "widespread pestilence of lotteries" and to protect the commerce which concerns all the States, may prohibit the carrying of lottery tickets from one State to another. (Idem, p. 357.)

Such, by way of inquiry and illustration, is the reasoning by which the learned judges sought to sustain the judgment rendered in this important case. As far as I know, it was the first time in the judicial history of the country when the intimation was dropped from that court that the Federal Government possessed any general police power, and that Congress, like the States, might legislate objectively for the morals of the general public.

Upon the incidental dicta of this opinion which was delivered in 1902, has been since erected a considerable superstructure of constitutional interpretation, to my mind, unjustified by the event and demanding conclusions far in advance of what was contemplated by the court at the time.

Of such, for instance, was the claim made before your committee by a learned professor of the law in a leading university (see Com. Rept., p. 16) that the validity of an act of Congress like this was no longer to be tried by the Constitution, but by a "legislative and sociological test"—whatever that may mean.

But that decision stands for itself, it is a part of our judicial history, and it is our duty to analyze its meaning and ascertain, if we may, from the surrounding circumstances how far its motives and reasonings are likely to be accepted as a rule for future adjudications of kindred questions.

It will not be amiss to state that the decision in the lottery case came only upon the thrice argued cause, and then from a nearly evenly divided court; the distinguished presiding magistrate feeling constrained to join in an earnest dissent.

That the precise point in issue in that case—to wit, the power of Congress to exclude lottery tickets from interstate commerce—differed in, at least, two very material circumstances from the question involved here, can, I think, be plainly displayed.

First. The lottery ticket represented an illegal business; it was the evidence of a gambling contract which could not be enforced by either State or Federal law; its delivery through interstate commerce was necessary to complete such contract.

In discussing the extent of control that might be exercised upon such an article of commerce, the court said:

> In determining whether regulation may not under some circumstances properly take the form or have the effect of prohibition, the nature of the interstate traffic which it was sought by the act of May 2, 1895, to suppress can not be overlooked. * * * It is a kind of traffic which no one can be entitled to pursue as of right. (Idem., pp. 355, 358.)

It can not be contended that the product of child labor, made in accordance with State law, occupies any such category in interstate commerce as this: That it represented any unlawful business, or that its delivery through the channels of interstate trade is necessary to the completion of any part of an illegal contract.

Second. The drawing of lotteries and the sale of lottery tickets had been forbidden by municipal law in perhaps every State of the Union, and therefore the exclusion of such tickets from interstate commerce was not only not in conflict with the inalienable police power of the States, but in direct aid thereof. That this circumstance had material bearing upon the judgment rendered is evidenced by the language of the court:

> In legislating upon the subject of the traffic in lottery tickets as carried on through interstate commerce, Congress only supplemented the action of those States—perhaps all of them—which for the protection of the public morals prohibit the drawing of lotteries as well as the sale or circulation of lottery tickets within their respective limits. It said, in effect, that it would not permit the declared policy of the States, which sought to protect their people against the mischiefs of the lottery business, to be overthrown or disregarded by the agency of interstate commerce. (Idem, p. 357.)

Surely no analogy can be found between the situation of the lottery tickets herein described—outlawed by every State—and that of child-made goods manufactured in accordance with State law and denied sale in no State in the Union. To prohibit the commerce in the former case was to recognize and uphold the authority of the States over their domestic administration; to prohibit it in the latter would be to subvert local self-government and defy State law.

Furthermore, that the decision in this case might not be drawn upon as a precedent in the future for further extension of legislative power, the court was at pains to declare that it meant to decide no question but the precise one in issue:

> We decide nothing more in the present case than that lottery tickets are subjects of traffic among those who choose to sell or buy them; that the carriage of such tickets by independent carriers from one State to another is therefore interstate commerce; that under its power to regulate commerce among the several States Congress—subject to the limitations imposed by the Constitution upon the exercise of the powers granted—has plenary authority over such commerce, and may prohibit the carriage of such tickets from State to State; and that legislation to that end and of that character is not inconsistent with any limitation or restriction imposed upon the exercise of the powers granted to Congress. (Idem, pp. 363–364.)

Likewise, to disarm those who might incline to find in this opinion authority for the exercise of arbitrary and unrestricted control over commerce by Congress, the court said:

> We may, however, repeat, in this connection, what the court has heretofore said, that the power of Congress to regulate commerce among the States, although plenary, can not be deemed arbitrary, since it is subject to such limitations or restrictions as are prescribed in the Constitution. This power therefore may not be exercised so as to infringe rights secured or protected by that instrument. It would not be difficult to imagine legislation that would be justly liable to such an objection as that stated, and be hostile to the objects for the accomplishment of which Congress was invested with the general power to regulate commerce among the several States. (Idem, p. 363.)

So that, Mr. Chairman, after all has been said, it pleases me to believe that the decision in the lottery case, notwithstanding the apparent leaning of its dicta, will work no revolution in judicial thought concerning the Constitution; that the police power of the States—or their authority to regulate the manners, morals, health, and occupation of their people—declared to be inalienable by a long line of decisions from the same court, is substantially unimpaired by that decision; and that an act of Congress not incidentally but objectively nullifying State law will itself be pronounced unconstitutional and void.

CONCEDING IT TO BE CONSTITUTIONAL THE BILL OUGHT NOT TO PASS.

The evil sought to be cured is too limited, both in area and probable duration, to justify the exercise of the immense and sometimes harsh power of the Federal Government.

Besides there is no satisfactory reason for supposing that Congress can deal with it more wisely or effectually than the State legislatures. In fact, the contrary seems much more likely. If it be true that the State is a better guardian for the child than its own natural parents and is ready to make more sacrifices for its welfare, then I would sooner trust the destiny of my child to the wisdom and humanity of the legislature of my own State, familiar with local conditions and able to legislate directly therefor, than to rely upon a distant Congress, unacquainted with local needs, operating through general laws unsuited, it may be, to many localities, and compelled to deal with great social and moral questions, if it deal with them at all, through the doubtful efficacy of indirect and devious commercial regulations.

Indeed, when we consider the vast and conflicting interests of our people—their diversified soil, climate, occupations, and business methods, their inequality of wealth, of educational and industrial development—it is obvious that Congress would possess neither the information nor the means to regulate successfully the domestic affairs of the people upon so large and complicated a field.

Mr. Chairman, to pass this bill now, as was aptly said by another, would be a precedent which would permit "many an error by the same example to creep into the State." It is estimated that over 90 per cent of the products of our manufactures are consumed in States other than those in which they originate, and hence sooner or later find their way into interstate commerce. To permit Congress to prescribe the conditions under which this vast commerce shall be produced is to

give at once power to control by internal regulation the industrial life of the Nation. And will the demand for this sort of law stop with the factory and the mine? Will the legislative lion, having once tested his strength, lie down to rest by the door of the factory and at the mouth of the mine, or will he rise up to extend his conquest to the forest and in the field? The corn of Nebraska, the wheat of Minnesota, the tobacco of Kentucky, the cotton of Arkansas, the cattle of Texas, the lumber of Oregon have all, like the products of the mine and the factory, to find their way to market through the door of interstate commerce. Having fixed the age limit for the factory and the mine, why should not Congress do the same for the farm and the pasture and the lumber camp? And if it fix the age and hours of labor, why should it not prescribe the sex, the language, the educational standard, the task, and the wage of the laborer? Why not? It has twice already prescribed a literacy test for the immigrant seeking a home upon our shores; will it not be ready, if conflicting interests demand, to impose an educational standard upon the domestic workman?

And when it has once had jurisdiction over the vast and complex field of domestic toil—there to regulate the daily lives of the people in the grave social, racial, and economic problems which confront them—what function will there remain for the States to perform in our dual system; what will be left of local self-government—that birthright of our race come down to us all the way from Runnymede to Yorktown?

No; we believe with the Supreme Court in the case of the United States against Knight Co.:

> It is vital that the independence of the commercial power and of the police power, and the delimitation between them, however sometimes perplexing, should always be recognized and observed; for while the one furnishes the strongest bond of union, the other is essential to the preservation of the autonomy of the States as required by our dual form of government; and acknowledged evils, however grave and urgent they may appear to be, had better be borne than the risk to be run in the effort to suppress them of more serious consequences by resort to expedients of even doubtful constitutionality. (156 U. S., 12.)

And with a great Chief Justice, now gathered to his fathers, that—

> The Constitution speaks not only in the same words but with the same meaning and intent with which it spoke when it came from the hands of its framers and was voted on and adopted by the people of the United States. Any other rule of construction would abrogate the judicial character of this court and make it the mere reflex of the popular opinion or passion of the day. (19 How., 393.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the committee's time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] is recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, there is something very amusing about this discussion and the attacks made upon North Carolina. North Carolina is not the only State that sins against the child. You have 2,000,000 children working in the factories and mines of the United States. They are not all in North Carolina. While I favor this bill, I favor it merely as a step forward. When you regulate child labor you regulate a vice. By regulating a vice you retain it. The proper thing for us to do is not to regulate child labor, but to eliminate it by making it impossible; and the time is not far distant when the awakened conscience of the people will make it impossible for any child below the age of 16 to work in any factory or mine.

When gentlemen lack argument they run to the Constitution for protection. They go to the grave and seek for reasons in the graveyard.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman let me ask him a question right at that point?

Mr. LONDON. No; I will not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. LONDON. As if all the wisdom of the human race was buried in 1787, as if we had all the time to go back to 1787 to find what we shall do, and what we shall think, and how we shall legislate on every problem that comes up before the people. [Applause.] The generations that came after 1787 have never abdicated the right to legislate. We of this generation have the right to legislate as time demands.

We are told that the white-slave act is constitutional, but that the child-labor law is unconstitutional. Why, if it was constitutional for Congress to legislate upon a simple moral proposition which involves the violation of the decalogue, I say that by exploiting child labor you violate that canon of the decalogue which says, "Thou shalt not kill." [Applause.] And not only the State of North Carolina, but that glorious State of Massachusetts and the other glorious States are alike guilty of that offense. They are still exploiting child labor, and it is a pleasure to see the Republicans and Democrats falling over each other in expressing their love for the child.

I hope to see the day when we shall not only have a national law which shall make child labor impossible, but when we shall have a national compulsory education law which will make it impossible for some States to have 20 per cent of native illiterates. I hope to see that day.

Do not quarrel with the times. Whether you Republicans or Democratis want it or not, you must march along the broad road of social legislation. We, the socialists, hold a whip over you, and compel you to work in the direction indicated by an awakened national conscience. You will have to legislate for the child. You will have to legislate for the workingman. You will have to legislate for shorter hours of labor. You will have to legislate for better conditions. You can not help it. The socialist movement, representing at this moment, it is true, the extreme view, compels you to march forward.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield for a question now?

Mr. LONDON. Yes, if I have the time.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman has the time. Does he consider himself bound by the Constitution which he swore to support?

Mr. LONDON. Yes; certainly.

Mr. GORDON. Would the gentleman vote for a bill if he knew it was in violation of the Constitution?

Mr. LONDON. Certainly not. I consider myself bound by the Constitution; I took an oath to oppose all enemies, foreign and domestic. I consider a man to be a domestic enemy who is a reactionary, and who refuses to heed the lessons of to-day. [Applause.]

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit the following:

The general debate on the subject was confined to two hours—one hour to the opponents and one hour to the advocates of the bill. With a number of gentlemen desiring to speak on each side, the opportunity for a thorough discussion of the essential principles involved in this legislation is rather limited.

Among the industrial demands of the Socialist Party dealing with the conservation of human resources, there is none more appealing than the demand for the prohibition of the employment of children under 16 years of age. I therefore feel constrained to discuss the subject at some length.

The bill purports to obtain an improvement in the condition of child workers. It prohibits the transportation from one State to the other of the products of a mine or quarry in which children under the age of 16 years are employed, or of a factory, mill, and so forth, in which children under the age of 14 are employed, or in which children under 16 are permitted to work more than eight hours a day or more than six days a week or at night.

The bill provides for national supervision. A number of individual States have higher standards.

In every State whenever legislation is proposed that in any way tends to curtail the power of the employer over the helpless employee, whether it be man, woman, or child, the employers of that particular State argue that competition by employers in other States will ruin their industries in the affected State. The New York manufacturers point at New Jersey and say New Jersey will ruin them. New Jersey points at Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania at Maryland, and all of them at the Southern States. The Southern States, with a great deal of merit, argue that Massachusetts and New York and other States still exploit the child.

Industry knows no State boundaries. Ninety per cent of the products manufactured in each State find their way into other States. At the time the Constitution of the United States was adopted the Colonies put all sorts of difficulties in each other's way. Some collected a tax on incoming goods, some on outgoing goods. It was with the object of providing a free flow of commerce throughout the country that the exclusive power was vested in the National Government "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes."

It is now sought to utilize the power of Congress to regulate commerce between the States in the effort to extend the protection of the National Government over the child in industry.

It is significant that the National Association of Manufacturers has appeared in opposition to the proposed bill. It was the contention of the representative of the National Association of Manufacturers that such legislation was unconstitutional and was within the exclusive province of the States. In State legislatures employers argue that unless the legislation is to be uniform throughout the country industry will be destroyed.

The child bears the brunt of the contest. The child's life is being crushed, while the merry argument goes on. What shall it be, the State or the Nation, that is to save the young from perdition? The answer of the commercial soul is—neither.

In sweatshop and in tenement, in quarry and mine, in factory and mill, North, South, West, and East—everywhere—the child's back is bent as the slave's back was bent in the good old days of chattel slavery.

There is more than one way of utilizing the power now existing in Congress for the benefit of the child. The taxing power of Congress was invoked on behalf of the worker when Congress passed the Esch phosphorous-match law. This law was aimed at and did strike at an industry which was responsible for the horrible disease known as "phossy jaw."

The courts have sustained a law prohibiting the use of the mails for the purpose of sending lottery tickets; the courts have sustained a law prohibiting the transportation of women for immoral purposes from State to State; the courts have sustained the pure food and drugs act, which deals with an ordinary proposition of commercial honesty; dating back to the days when the Prophets called the wrath of Jehovah upon the users of false weights and false measures, every State has been dealing with this problem. Nevertheless the Federal Legislature found it necessary to use the power given to it under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution to prohibit the use of the instrumentalities of commerce to fraudulently branded articles.

Under these circumstances it is hard to see how the courts can refuse to sustain the validity of a law which, in response to the new morality of our age, seeks to save the child from destruction.

The proposed law touches only the surface of the evil. There are 2,000,000 children employed in gainful occupations in the United States. "Gainful occupations" is the euphonious phrase used in statistical reports. How gainful those occupations are one can easily gather when he considers the small earnings of families where father, mother, and children, competing with one another, barely eke out a living. That excessive work stunts the body, stupefies the mind, and prevents the normal growth of a human being can no longer be disputed. In a number of industries, through the persistent efforts of organized labor, adults have obtained the eight-hour day. It seems to be universally conceded that eight hours for work, eight hours for sleep, and eight hours for study, exercise, and recreation should be about the normal division of the day in the life of a civilized man. How cruel it is to class the child of 16 with the adult!

There is no attempt made in the proposed legislation to get at the root of the problem of the exploitation of the child. We legislate in driblets. There is no method about this legislation. It lacks plan and system. Provision should be made to enable the child emancipated from the factory and mine to obtain an education. A helping hand should be extended to the parents who have been forced to send their children to work, so that they may adjust themselves to the change.

There is too much sham, too much hypocrisy, too many crocodile tears about our present child-labor legislation, and entirely too little constructive action. We must eliminate child labor. We must educate the child. We must help the parent in his struggle for existence.

The horrifying details of the underfed condition of children in our large cities are too shocking to be restated here. It is not enough to send a child to school if the child is not to receive sufficient nourishment. According to the report of the United States Commission on Industrial Relations, from 12 to 20 per cent of the school children in our largest cities are noticeably underfed. According to the same report, only one-third of all children in our public schools complete the grammar-school course—and Heaven knows that is not much—and less than 10 per cent graduate from the high schools. Take this in connection with the fact, also brought out by the Commission on Industrial Relations, that in the families of workers 37 per cent of the mothers are at work and unable to give to the children proper attention and you will realize that the problem of the child's welfare is something that can not be left to the philanthropy of the employer, nor to charitable ladies, but that it must be taken up by the people themselves as a fundamental problem. It is a problem of life and death, a problem involving the very safety of this Republic and the very existence of the Nation.

I give here a statistical table showing the latest official figures on child labor from the United States census of occupations, 1910. These include the number of children employed in manufacturing and mechanical industries, in extraction of minerals, in agriculture, and in all other occupations. These figures should be studied carefully. In some States there is no adequate source of information as to the exact number of children employed. Some States fail to provide for the registration of births, and the enumerators must obtain their information as to the age of the child from the employer. In other cases they obtain this information from parents, who, in their distress and in their despair, misrepresent the age of the children.

The latest official figures on child labor.

[Compiled from United States Census of Occupations, 1910.]

	All gainful occupations.	
	10-13 years.	14-15 years.
Alabama	93,594	61,118
Arizona	620	1,053
Arkansas	55,079	37,371
California	1,937	9,314
Colorado	1,817	4,047
Connecticut	679	10,689
Delaware	1,294	2,362
District of Columbia	247	1,098
Florida	13,465	11,459
Georgia	93,098	68,491
Idaho	1,028	1,670
Illinois	10,551	45,959
Indiana	8,954	24,739
Iowa	6,493	17,892
Kansas	6,857	11,873
Kentucky	31,392	33,300
Louisiana	29,943	29,789
Maine	856	4,570
Maryland	7,366	16,801
Massachusetts	1,683	31,062
Michigan	3,690	15,603
Minnesota	5,706	12,658
Mississippi	83,969	54,561
Missouri	18,175	34,527
Montana	524	1,240
Nebraska	4,192	8,112
Nevada	82	204
New Hampshire	317	3,442
New Jersey	2,183	23,609
New Mexico	2,602	3,114
New York	4,852	60,242
North Carolina	84,279	60,353
North Dakota	2,856	4,496
Ohio	8,800	34,046
Oklahoma	24,608	21,503
Oregon	930	2,575
Pennsylvania	14,770	82,125
Rhode Island	334	7,742
South Carolina	69,232	48,020
South Dakota	3,363	4,846
Tennessee	44,535	39,421
Texas	102,064	72,316
Utah	1,130	2,101
Vermont	521	2,044
Virginia	29,234	32,645
Washington	1,285	4,181
West Virginia	10,132	13,670
Wisconsin	4,260	19,638
Wyoming	308	558
Total	895,976	1,094,249

With the genius of man evolving machine after machine, with discovery after discovery making the work of man easier and more productive, with steam and electricity harnessed for the use of man, there is no excuse for the exploitation of the child.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is exhausted. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled——

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. The section has not been read yet.

Mr. SHERLEY. I thought I would get in on the enacting clause. I move to strike out the last word of the enacting clause.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can not make the motion until the section is read.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not sure about that.

Mr. MANN. I am.

Mr. SHERLEY. A motion to strike out the enacting clause would be in order, and if that be true it ought to be equally true that a motion to strike out a part of the enacting clause is in order, without waiting for the first section to be read.

Mr. MANN. The motion to strike out the enacting clause takes precedence after the section is read.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not want to take the time of the committee in a discussion of that question and will wait until the paragraph is read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That no producer, manufacturer, or dealer shall ship or deliver for shipment in interstate commerce the product of any mine or quarry situated in the United States which has been produced, in whole or in part, by the labor of children under the age of 16 years, or the product of any mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment situated in the United States which has been produced, in whole

or in part, by the labor of children under the age of 14 years or by the labor of children between the ages of 14 years and 16 years who work more than eight hours in any one day, or more than six days in any one week, or after the hour of 7 o'clock p. m., or before the hour of 7 o'clock a. m.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It is needless for me to say to this House that I have no sympathy with the idea frequently expressed here to-day by those who in their zeal for this measure say that considerations of constitutional power are not made in good faith, or are to be neglected. For my own part, I believe that it is the duty of every Member to decide the constitutionality of a question, and if in doubt to resolve that doubt against the constitutionality, just as I believe it is the duty of every court in passing upon the constitutionality of a law, if in doubt, to resolve that doubt in favor of the constitutionality. A very brief statement will show the reason for that. The court must assume that the legislative body has tried to keep within the sphere of its legitimate activities, and therefore when in doubt gives the benefit of the doubt in favor of the legitimacy of the action of the legislative body. But that body itself, dealing with a matter, in order to be careful that it does not overstep the limits of its power, must decide its doubts against its power.

I say this as a prelude to what I am now going to say, touching the constitutionality of this act. I have not had the time to give to a renewed study of the matter that I would like; but, perhaps, there is no subject that I have studied as much as I have that relative to the power that is conferred under the commerce clause of the Constitution; and while the decision in the Lottery cases is not in accord with what I formerly conceived to be the power of the Federal Government over interstate commerce; while I believe that originally that power was given to the Federal Government in order to keep commerce free from regulation by the States, and without any idea of it being used to regulate even to the point of prohibiting, just as the power was given to the Federal Government over foreign commerce in order to enable Congress to prohibit it, still I hope I am lawyer enough to recognize the finality of a Supreme Court decision; and after reading, and to-day rereading, the decision of the Supreme Court in the Lottery cases, I am forced to the conclusion that this Congress has power to deal with this matter in the way proposed. [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield for a moment.

Mr. LENROOT. Merely for information, I want to ask the gentleman whether he distinguishes between doubt as to the constitutionality of a proposition and doubt as to what the Supreme Court might hold with reference to it?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, of course, I think a lawyer, or anyone, in considering the constitutionality of a provision must consider it largely in the light of what the court has said the Constitution means. A man who does not do that is more or less lawless, and he has no right to talk about law—and particularly about constitutional law—if he is not willing to accept the law as laid down by the body authorized to decide finally.

Now, coming to the concrete question, the Lottery cases decided, first, that the right to regulate carried with it the right to prohibit. That was the marked forward step taken by the court in that decision. Then, having decided in favor of the right to prohibit, the court held that an intrastate commerce which the States plainly could prohibit as being against morals could be prohibited by the National Government so far as it related to interstate commerce.

Much has been said here on the proposition that the goods themselves are not dangerous or injurious to commerce in any form. That is true; but neither is a lottery ticket. The danger of the lottery tickets to the morals of the people lay in what happened in the State from which the tickets were sent and what might happen in the State to which they were sent; and the Supreme Court held that the Congress had the right to prevent interstate traffic in what it considered an immoral thing.

Now, if you will take the language of Mr. Justice Harlan, found on page 357 of volume 188 of the Supreme Court Reports, and wherever you find the words "lottery tickets" substitute the words "child-made goods," I think you will not have very much doubt that the power exists, if that decision is upheld by the court in the future. Here is what the court said:

As a State may, for the purpose of guarding the morals of its own people, forbid all sales of lottery tickets within its limits, so Congress, for the purpose of guarding the people of the United States against the widespread pestilence of lotteries, and to protect the commerce which concerns all the States, may prohibit the carrying of lottery tickets from one State to another. In legislating upon the subject of the traffic in lottery tickets as carried on through interstate commerce, Congress only supplemented the action of those States, perhaps all of them, which for the protection of the public morals prohibited the drawing of lotteries, as well as the circulation and sale of lottery tickets within their respective limits.

Now, I repeat that wherever you find the words "lottery ticket," strike it out and put "child-made goods," and you will find a plain argument for the constitutionality of this law. It is true that goods made by child labor are not in themselves injurious, but the thing that is being aimed at is the evil that arises from child labor. Your law must not be arbitrary as to the subject matter dealt with. But plainly in this case it is not. Now, as I have said, there was nothing that hurt interstate commerce in the pieces of paper, the lottery tickets themselves, but what hurt the morals of the people lay back of that. In my judgment, the only question, if the Lottery decision is to be followed, is this: Whether Congress in the exercise of this power has exercised it in a reasonable way touching a subject matter clearly involving the morals of the people.

Much has been said about the Adair case. The Adair case said that it was not constitutional for Congress to pass a law making it a criminal offense against the United States for a carrier engaged in interstate commerce to discharge an employee simply because he belonged to a union. It held that law unconstitutional because it violated the fifth amendment, and it interfered with the right of contract. Under that decision the States themselves under their police powers could not have done what there was undertaken. But every State has the power to regulate the employment of child labor. No one questions that, and the very argument made by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WATSON] that such right was the test, when applied here upholds the constitutionality of this law.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. HARDY. Taking the same liberty in the lottery-ticket case, if you strike out the words lottery ticket wherever it occurs and insert in lieu of it the words nonunion-made goods, then you can prohibit——

Mr. SHERLEY. I get the gentleman's question.

Mr. HARDY. Let me finish my question.

Mr. SHERLEY. No; I get the gentleman's question and I will answer it. Congress can not arbitrarily declare that something affects the morals of the people and therefore pass a law prohibiting it. There must be in the subject matter dealt with that which fairly warrants the conclusion that it does affect the morals of the people.

But I say to you that no court of the land, in my judgment, is going to say, when the Congress of the United States declares that the question of child labor is one involving the morals of the people, that it has arbitrarily decided and therefore its action is beyond its power. Therein is the difference between the matter passed on in the Adair case and the question here.

Mr. HARDY. But whenever sentiment gives way——

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman's judgment that sentiment is the controlling thing he is entitled to. I say to you that these things are naturally progressive, and as the world moves it learns that some things are immoral to-day that were not so considered before. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky to disfigure the bill by striking out the last word. Mr. Chairman, all legislation is evolution. That which is suggested to-day may make an impression to-morrow, may receive favorable consideration from many the next day, and may be enacted into legislation the day after—speaking of days as spaces of time. It was only a few days ago that the people commenced to see the grave danger to the race by the employment of young children in large factories. It was a danger which had not existed before, but in the main became one of grave importance. The States have taken the matter up and have legislated in behalf of the children in the States, but the State that refuses to legislate can send the products of its labor into another State which can not refuse to receive it.

There must be power somewhere in our dual form of Government to exercise control of everything which affects us as human beings. That which can not be exercised by the State, in the main, is wisely left so that it can be exercised by the General Government. Where the State itself can not refuse to receive the goods which ought not to be shipped, the power of the General Government, under the common clause of the Constitution, steps in, and we have the power to say, "Your State may make what it pleases, but you can not transmit it across the State line to another State which does not desire to receive it."

This legislation, as I say, is evolution. We have reached the point where it comes before us. We must determine whether we will do our share to preserve the life, the environment, the education, the possibilities of the child, and also the equalities of the States. I believe that the Republicans, in the main, will now, as ever, favor this righteous and humane legislation.

[Applause on the Republican side.] And while on these subjects of grave and great importance there is always a division on the Democratic side, which splits up their party, I hope that we will be true to our traditions, and that the great mass of the Republicans here will stand for these rights and the progressive legislation which can not be enacted without our vote. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "States," insert a comma and the words "or any foreign country."

In line 9, after the word "States," insert the following: "or in any foreign country."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this bill does not relate to foreign commerce, but is expressly and exclusively devoted to American commerce and that the amendment is not germane. This point was ruled upon last year. This is the same bill.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair recollects, the ruling a year ago was on a bill similar to this, applying to local interstate commerce, and the Chair held then that an amendment of this character was not in order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the Chair did hold that with respect to a bill pertaining to goods made by convict labor, but it was suggested in the course of the debate that this amendment would be germane in the consideration of a bill of this kind affecting child labor.

If the Chair will bear with me for a few moments, I would like to speak upon the point of order. For some years efforts have been made in the course of legislation, notably with respect to tariff bills and the convict-labor-made-goods bill, to introduce a provision, which, as there was an effort to protect the labor within the United States, would also protect the labor of the United States from unfair competition from abroad. When the convict-labor bill came up in March, 1914, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] offered an amendment providing that the provisions of the bill as against convict-labor goods shipped between the States should apply also as against foreign child labor. A point of order was made against the amendment by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS]. It was debated for some time, when, after the proponents of the bill had suggested that such an amendment would be proper when a child-labor bill proper came up for consideration, the point of order was held to be well taken. It was only after a quite general discussion that the Chair did sustain the point of order.

Out of the mouths of the gentlemen who advocated the bill to prevent the interstate shipment of convict-made goods, however, came the suggestion that an amendment as to foreign goods should hold over until the then Palmer bill, now the Keating bill, should come up in the House. So I contend, Mr. Chairman, that the conditions are entirely different from what they were then, inasmuch as the gentlemen advocating the passage of the convict-labor bill admitted they were ready to protect the child labor of the United States against unfair labor abroad when the question should come up under a child-labor bill. If the Chair will permit me, I will read from the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN], a member of the committee. He said, and the following discussion ensued:

I hold in my hand a bill introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Palmer] to prevent interstate commerce in products of child labor, and for other purposes. Now, it seems from the remarks that have been made here to-day that we are almost unanimously in favor of protecting the children from being exploited for profit in the manufacturing industries of the country. This bill would be a special act, for the reason that it equalizes the proposition throughout the United States, and to this bill, it would seem to me, the amendment that is being considered here to-day could be applied, and treat the child-labor question alike in this country as well as in foreign countries. It could not be said then that we were discriminating against any country in regard to the matter. And if the feeling is so unanimous here, and we are in favor of legislation of this sort, it seems to me after the Labor Committee gets through with its hearings on this question we could get a measure like this up by unanimous consent and be able to pass it in the near future and not load the present bill down with an amendment the utility of which is questioned.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I do.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman think the Palmer child-labor bill would be effective as between the States, and that we could prohibit the transportation of child-made goods from one State to another?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman that, in my judgment, if he wants my judgment, which probably will not amount to much to the gentleman, as I am not a lawyer, if the Federal Government have such right to legislate in regard to interstate commerce I do not see where the Constitution puts limits on it.

I voted for the amendment of my colleague [Mr. MANN] the other day, and the only objection that I heard to it was that it might be successfully attacked as to its constitutionality. I have advised with lawyers, who say it was constitutional, and I do not agree with those who thought it could be attacked successfully in that way.

Mr. MOORE. If such a law were effective as between the States, barring child-made goods, why would it not be competent to pass a law here barring the importation of goods made by children abroad?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I did not catch that question.

Mr. MOORE. If we are capable of passing a law that would be effective preventing the shipment of child-made products from one State to another, why are we not competent to pass a law to prevent the admission into the United States of child-made products from foreign countries?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I endeavored to make it plain that I was in favor of an amendment of that sort, or an addition of that sort being attached to this child-labor bill of Mr. Palmer's, but do not think it properly applies to the bill under consideration.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS], chairman of the committee, and others entered into the discussion, the trend of which, I think, could be fairly interpreted as telling us to wait with this amendment protecting the labor of the United States against child labor in foreign countries until this child-labor bill came up, and that then it would be in order. In other words, they were favorable to the proposition, but they thought that tacking it on to the convict-labor bill would interfere with its passage. The amendment, therefore, is in order now

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire merely to make one suggestion. The authority of statements made by gentlemen during the course of a discussion I do not think would be sufficient to warrant the Chair in ruling upon this proposition. The rule is very plain with regard to the germaneness of questions, at least as to this. It reads that no proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under amendment. Here we have under the terms of this bill a proposition for the regulating solely of interstate commerce. This is a proposition not in any manner relating to interstate commerce, but a proposition to load down this bill with an endeavor to regulate foreign commerce. These two powers are entirely separate under the Constitution, and certainly are separate here. Under that rule we have this decision that in questions of this kind two subjects are not necessarily germane because they are related, and in Fifth Hinds, page 5841, it was expressly decided that to a bill relating to commerce between the States an amendment relating to commerce within the several States was not germane. Certainly if that be true it can not be considered that the proposition here to regulate foreign commerce can be held germane to a proposition enacted solely for the purpose of the regulation of interstate commerce.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, the most serious question about this measure that confronts the House is not our desire to regulate child labor, for I suppose we all share that in common within certain limits, but the grave question that confronts you and me in the consideration of this bill is the obligation we took when sworn in as Members of the House to support the Constitution of the United States. I do not think there has ever been a bill presented to this body that more clearly, directly, and boldly undertakes to violate the Constitution of the United States and the reserved rights of the various States than this particular measure. I challenge the advocates of the bill to cite one case on all fours with it that has been passed upon during the last 125 years by our Supreme Court which will uphold their contention, to wit, the right of the Federal Government, through an act of Congress, to go inside the individual States and regulate and control their manufactures and method of production.

Will it be argued here that the Federal Congress would have a right to pass a law providing that nobody in the United States under 16 years of age should work, or that they should only work eight hours a day or for not less than $3 a day? The merest tyro would say no; that that could not be done. Then, if that is the case, this whole bill is an attempted legislative fraud on the Constitution in an effort to hang onto the interstate-commerce clause of that instrument the power to regulate manufacture and production wholly within a State. I want you gentlemen from States which have laws on child labor to bear in mind that this bill is not aimed alone at the few remaining States which have not come up to the standard arbitrarily set in the bill. It is aimed at your State as well, and will set aside all your laws and turn over to the Federal authorities the administration of child-labor laws.

I would almost risk my reputation, whatever it may be, as a lawyer in saying that the Supreme Court will not hesitate in declaring this bill void; but should it by any possibility become a law, remember that this law is not aimed at the four States that have not yet brought their laws up to what this committee thinks they ought to do, but it is aimed at every one of the States which has child-labor laws, because the sponsors of this bill say you do not execute your laws properly, and they propose

to take charge and send their agents and spies into every factory in your State to see that this law is executed according to their notion; not according to the laws of your State, because it is my opinion that if this bill passes and becomes a law all of your State statutes are wiped out, and Congress takes charge of the whole subject of child labor and will administer the law exclusively. So do not get the false idea that it is aimed at only four States. If it were aimed at only four States, and it is admitted that those States are making rapid progress, that it is only a question of a few years when they will come up to the standard by this committee, what is the use of Congress undertaking to pass a bill through this House in order to coerce those four remaining States to adopt the standard set by this bill? That is not the only object. It is for the purpose of turning over to a bureau here in Washington your entire domestic child-labor internal affairs, which will employ an army of Federal officers to administer your affairs around your factories and manufacturing plants. I do not defend young child labor in factories or defend girl work under the age of 16. For that matter, I wish no woman or child had to work, but in my country we have a lot of widows who are poor and depend upon the labor of their children 13 years old and over for support and a living.

My experience is that if you let a boy grow up to 16 years of age doing nothing except going to school for four months in a year, he is not of much account after that time, because he has not been taught anything by which he can earn a living. Who is the best judge of conditions surrounding working people? Do you think the Federal Congress—do you think a Federal committee is the best judge of how you should govern your purely internal domestic affairs? Has it not been left to the States under our Constitution for the last 125 years to pass on all of those things? Why, if this bill is constitutional, there is no use hereafter of having any amendments to the Constitution of the United States. You can regulate suffrage; you can provide that no citizen of a State shall ride in interstate commerce if his State does not permit every male, able-bodied citizen over 21 years of age to vote. You can regulate divorce and everything that has heretofore been the subject of domestic concern. Do you think you can regulate marriage, and provide that only persons married in accordance with a Federal standard should ride on an interstate train? I have no doubt but that my friends who are advocating this bill will say yes, and yet the Supreme Court, in the case of Andrews against Andrews, plainly said that Congress has no power over divorce or marriage; that that is a matter exclusively for the States. If this bill is constitutional, then there are no State rights, and State sovereignty is gone forever.

About six or seven years ago we had this very matter before Congress, and it was being pressed by the National Child Labor Committee and others. This question was up before the Committee on Appropriations, on which the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and other Members of this House were serving. They had their doubts about its constitutionality, and, not being lawyers, referred this question to the Committee on the Judiciary, of which Judge Jenkins was then the chairman. At that time such distinguished men as Mr. Birdsall, Mr. Charles E. Littlefield, Judge R. W. Parker, once chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and a Member of this House, Mr. De Armond, Mr. Sterling, of the present House, and others were members of that committee. They reported unanimously on the power of Congress to regulate child labor, and I will give only some excerpts from Judge Jenkins's report. Here is one of them:

> Therefore it plainly follows that Congress can not even exercise any jurisdiction or authority over women and children employed in the manufacture of products for interstate-commerce shipment; and certainly it will not be claimed by the foremost advocate of a centralized government that Congress can exercise jurisdiction or authority over women and children engaged in the manufacture of products for intrastate shipment.

I quote further from that report:

> Certainly there is no warrant in the Constitution for the thought or suggestion that Congress can exercise jurisdiction and authority over the subject of woman and child labor. If those performing such labor are abused and conditions are such that the same should be improved, it rests for the States to act. The failure of the States to act will not justify unconstitutiona action by Congress. * * *
>
> In fact, it is not a debatable question. It would be a reflection upon the intelligence of Congress to so legislate. It would be casting an unwelcome burden upon the Supreme Court to so legislate. The agitation of such legislation produces an uneasy feeling among the people and confuses the average mind as to the power of Congress and the power of the States. The lives, health, and property of the women and children engaged in labor is exclusively within the power of the States, originally and always belonging to the States, not surrendered by them to Congress.

The report was concurred in by every member of that committee.

> The committee is of the opinion, therefore, that Congress has no jurisdiction or authority over the subject of woman and child labor and has no authority to suppress the abuses in such labor or the amelioration of conditions surrounding the employment of such laborers.

Now, ordinarily that would end the matter, and it did end it, as for about seven years it was not agitated again. Judge Jenkins has been gathered to his fathers, Judge D'Armond has passed away, and the other members of that committee have gone, except Messrs. PARKER, STERLING, and HENRY. Now we are again asked to undertake to do the same thing that was undertaken then, when it was unanimously declared unconstitutional by the great law committee of the House.

Gentlemen, this House is asked to attempt to do by indirection what every man in this House will agree can not be done directly. If this bill be constitutional, you can regulate not only the hours of labor of children and men and women but you can regulate their pay. You can regulate the question of whether or not manufactured articles shall be shipped in interstate commerce if they are not made by union labor. You can regulate every internal affair that for 100 years has been left to the States of this Union to regulate and control.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WEBB. Yes, sir.

Mr. ADAMSON. I desire to ask the gentleman if the same rule of reasoning could not prevent boys from raising cotton and working in the fields?

Mr. WEBB. Oh, yes; if this bill is constitutional, Congress can provide that no cotton picked in whole or in part by a child under 14 or 16 years of age shall be shipped in interstate commerce, just as the arbitrary will of Congress may dictate.

Mr. ADAMSON. And on the same line of argument you could prohibit all children from working and make vagabonds of all the coming generation?

Mr. WEBB. Yes. If this bill is constitutional there are no more rights left to the States at all, if Congress wants to take them away. You can regulate everything, and there is no use hereafter in undertaking to have a constitutional amendment for suffrage, divorce, or anything else. As Rousseau says, whenever you arrogate to one central government all the powers concerning the purely domestic and internal affairs of the people, which have always been left and are still left to the States to administer, then our Government will fall of its own weight. There have been other Republics besides ours, but there never has been a Republic balanced like ours with dual State and Federal sovereignty—the sovereignty of the Federal Government within its sphere and the sovereignty of the State governments within their spheres. The sovereignty of the State government has always been recognized to have the control of all conditions which affect the morals and health of the people.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. WEBB. In one moment. It has been decided by the Supreme Court—Adair against United States—that any rule prescribed for the conduct of interstate commerce, in order to be within the competency of Congress, under the power to regulate commerce among the States, must have some real or substantial relation to or connection with the commerce regulated. Commerce does not begin until manufacture ends. Congress attempted a few years ago to say that a railroad company could not dismiss a man because he was a member of a labor union, and the court, in the case of Adair against United States, decided that whether a man did or did not belong to a union had nothing to do with the regulation of commerce at all, and declared the statute void and unconstitutional. So, gentlemen, I submit that the question whether a child is 14 years and 1 day old or 13 years 11 months and 29 days old has nothing to do with the regulation of commerce. No; it is boldly stated by this committee that it is not the purpose of this bill to regulate commerce, but to regulate child labor. Every man in this House knows, whether he be lawyer or layman, that that has always been left to the State and such power can not be usurped by the Federal Government. I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not a fact that the pure food and drug act prohibited shipment in interstate commerce of adulterated and misbranded foods?

Mr. WEBB. I am glad my friend asked that question. The only line of demarcation the Supreme Court has made in the control of Congress over interstate commerce is to give Congress the power to prohibit the shipment of an article that is deleterious or harmful in its nature.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman state how a misbranded article is necessarily deleterious or harmful?

Mr. WEBB. It is fraudulent.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the gentleman recall——

Mr. WEBB. If you would provide that manufacturers should brand all articles they make by child labor, maybe you could do that as a regulation of commerce, but you can not exclude from interstate commerce such clean, healthful articles on the pretense that you have power over commerce, when really you are undertaking to legislate on the hours of labor and ages of the laborer.

Mr. Chairman, the object of this bill, as shown by the report of the committee, is to regulate child labor. The alleged power we have for regulating it is supposed to be the commerce clause of the Constitution. If we have the power to regulate child-labor in the United States under this bill, and if it is immoral to receive goods made by child labor inside the United States, why not let us go further and say that it is immoral for the people of the United States to receive and consume goods made by child labor anywhere. The amendment is certainly germane to the same subject, to wit, the regulation of child labor.

I can not understand why, if it is competent for this Congress, having this question before it, to legislate on child labor, we can not legislate on all child labor, wherever child labor is used, especially if child-labor-made goods come within the confines of the United States from foreign countries. If we refuse to allow American manufacturers to employ child labor in their manufactories, why should foreign child-made goods be allowed to be introduced in this country? "Morals is morals" everywhere.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. WEBB. Yes, sir.

Mr. ADAMSON. A good many foreign countries have less success in raising men and women than we have in the Southern States.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the regulation under which they claim this power is a police regulation looking to the protecting of children. As I understand it, what they are striking at is not the shipment from one State to another, but it is the actual work performed in the factory, cannery, or other establishment, by children under a certain age. Now, why should it be a greater crime to say that an article manufactured under those conditions should not be shipped into another State than if it were shipped out of the United States? It is the manufacturing of the article in which they claim the injury consists, and not the transportation of it. Therefore, if we have the power to regulate the shipment of an article from one State to another, certainly we have the right to regulate the shipment of the article from one State through another State and out of the borders of the United States. What this bill seeks to do, Mr. Chairman, as I stated before, is not to regulate the transportation of the article, but it seeks to regulate the manufacture of the article, and it only aims at the transportation of the article in order to prevent its manufacture. Therefore, as it seems to me, this amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is but going a step further in the regulation of the production of the article, that the Government has the same right, and this bill should be amended to that extent, and if enacted it should govern, if it is the wisdom of this House, just as much the shipment internationally as it should shipments between the States. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will.

Mr. LINTHICUM. If the amendment is inserted, will the gentleman vote for the bill?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I would not vote for the bill with or without it; but I say this, Mr. Chairman, that certainly the United States Government should not put itself up to maintain a high moral position in order to regulate interstate commerce, and then say that the same position on morality should not obtain to international shipments. [Applause.] I say, Mr. Chairman, that if it is wrong for the United States Government to permit the great transportation arteries to be used to transport articles of this character between the States, then it is equally wrong to take the ships that sail the high seas, that are under our flag, under powers that we give them, protected on the seas by our fleets, and transport them to other countries.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Certainly.

Mr. ADAMSON. Would it not be just as immoral to import lottery tickets from abroad as from one State to another?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Absolutely; as my friend, with his usual good judgment, states so pertinently. Mr. Chairman, another thing: It seems to me the United States Government is not seeking to regulate the importation of articles manufactured by children abroad, but we could not in decency attempt to do that, Mr. Chairman, if we permitted our own articles to be exported abroad manufactured under those conditions. If it is a moral question to be controlled by the legal proposition, the position of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is well taken, and it seems to me that there could be no question as to the legality of this amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, the subject matter of this bill is the elimination from the Congress of the United States of goods manufactured by child labor. It is to shut out from all commerce of the United States goods of that character. Now, I respectfully submit that it is germane to this subject, which is the exclusion of a certain kind of goods, for this House to consider an amendment that goods shall not be put in commerce coming from, for instance, Canada, and from inside the United States.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I understand this bill, if enacted into law, prohibits goods made by child labor in one State from being transported to and sold in another State. Some say this is done to preserve the children; others say it is to protect the States that prohibit child labor from competition with the products of child labor in States that do no prohibit the same.

There is nothing in this bill that prohibits States employing child labor from shipping their products to any foreign country in the world, nor is there anything in the bill which prohibits the world from shipping into the United States and selling therein, in competition with goods made in States of the United States where child labor is prohibited, goods made by child labor in such foreign countries.

The proposed legislation is sought to be justified under the Constitution, which provides that "Congress shall have power to regulate commerce among the States and with foreign countries." If the bill is enacted into law, it seems to me that the competition with foreign countries which employ child labor is much more serious than the shipment of the products of the few States which do not prohibit child labor into other States. So that this amendment, in my judgment, is in order. It seems to me that the bill should be amended so as to protect the United States against the child labor of the world.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard for a moment on the point of order, especially on the question which has just been brought up by the last two speakers. The gentleman correctly says one of the great purposes of this bill is to control and prohibit a moral wrong. That moral wrong consists of the production of goods by children under conditions that are deleterious to health and to morals and the peace of society. That moral wrong occurs at the place of production of the goods. There is another equally important element connected with the prohibition of child-made goods, and that is the economic wrong. That economic wrong occurs at the point of consumption or at the point of sale, where really the goods are coming in competition with the labor of adults who are supporting families and who are supposed to have an adequate wage for that purpose and with the goods of manufacturers who are working under conditions of humane organization of their departments.

But the gentlemen have confused the two questions of the moral and economic wrong. This bill can not deal with the moral wrong, if such there be, of child labor in foreign countries. It is not intended for any such purpose. It can, however, put the States of this Union upon an equality, so far as moral conditions are concerned, by providing that goods manufactured under immoral conditions in one State can not be sent to another State, but must be used in the States where they are manufactured. Now, the gentlemen have confused the economic results of the bill with the moral results of the bill, and the point of order is well taken that this particular amendment, seeking to reach moral conditions beyond the jurisdiction of this country, is not germane to the present bill, however desirable it might be to have it effected by legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. It will be understood that the Chair has nothing to do with the merits of the feasibility of extending this act to foreign commerce. His province is to determine whether or not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is germane to the bill now pending. The House is familiar with the principle that to one specific subject another specific sub-

ject is not in order. This has been held in the House time and again. It seems to the Chair that most of the gentlemen who have argued in favor of this proposition have discussed the power of Congress to regulate both interstate and foreign commerce rather than the question of whether a proposition regulating foreign commerce is germane to a bill regulating interstate commerce. Two subjects are not necessarily germane to each other because they are related. The Chair believes that this is a bill to regulate child labor in interstate commerce, and, therefore, that an amendment proposing to extend it to foreign commerce is a different matter, and is not in order. Therefore the point of order is sustained.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 1, line 5, after the word "States," by inserting the words "or imported from any foreign country."

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order on that. I think that can be disposed of without any further argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not care to hear, unless the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants to make an argument.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think this is clearly interstate commerce now. The amendment relates to goods within this country. It does not relate to goods made in any foreign countries, except as they are already in this country. It applies to goods that have arrived here and are going into interstate commerce. We are trying to protect the workmen of the United States against unfair child labor abroad. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS. The gentleman is trying to protect the Republican Party and not the workmen of the United States.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I quote the gentleman last year against the gentleman this year. He was in favor of some such provision as this then.

Mr. LEWIS. I make the point of order, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will observe that the committee has limited this bill to child-labor goods produced in the United States. The child-labor goods produced in foreign countries are another matter. If the gentleman will turn to the RECORD of a year ago, he will find where the Speaker overruled the Committee of the Whole on the same identical proposition. In that case the Speaker held that where the committee had limited the application of the bill to the products of one kind of labor, a proposition to extend it to the products of another kind of labor was not germane. The Chair thinks he ought to follow the ruling of the Speaker where the Speaker was sustained by the House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the Chairman permit an interrogation?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would not the effect of the ruling of the Chair as to previous amendments and also as to this, if the Chair should sustain the point of order, be that the shipment, interstate, of goods made within the United States would be prohibited, while the shipment, interstate, of goods made in foreign countries would not be prohibited?

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is asking the Chair something he could determine for himself. It is the province of the Chair to follow the rules of this House as they have been laid down by precedent. The committee has limited the scope of this bill to the products of one class of labor, namely, child labor, in the United States. The gentleman from Pennsylvania seeks to extend its operation to another class of labor. It is immaterial whether the Chair is or is not in favor of the proposition. The present Speaker of the House ruled on this identical question over a year ago, and the Chair feels constrained to follow the ruling of the Speaker, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania appeals from the decision of the Chair. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the decision of the committee?

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 103, noes 42.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can get the yeas and nays when the bill is in the House.

So the ruling of the Chair was sustained.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I offer an amendment.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 1, line 7, after the word "any" and before the word "mill," by inserting the words "farm, plantation, waterway."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, evidently this is a germane amendment, because the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] has not raised the point of order against it. It is such an amendment as I do not believe I am personally in sympathy with [laughter], although it is an amendment, being germane, which gives me the opportunity to say that, while I respect him highly, as much as I do any man in the House, the rulings made by the Chair a little while ago are clearly in the line of the encouragement of child labor in foreign countries as against the conditions that hold in the United States, where we are passing drastic child-labor laws.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] seems to think there is some politics in this suggestion. There has been some politics in this suggestion for some time, but it has emanated very largely from the other side. This side, so far as I have knowledge, has persistently endeavored to protect the labor of the United States as against unfair foreign conditions. We undertook to do this when a low-tariff law was passed in this House in October, 1913.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not just now. This question was raised when a low-tariff law was passed against our protest, which brought this country, in an industrial sense, to its lowest possible ebb.

We are recovering somewhat from that condition now, due to the unfortunate war in Europe, which gives excuse to gentlemen on the other side to play about as much politics now in wriggling out of the hole into which they got themselves when they passed the low-tariff law, as they are entitled to. They did not permit us to put an antidumping clause in the tariff law, which, I think, they are themselves now about to suggest that we assist them in doing. They did not permit us to put into the tariff law a provision limiting imports from foreign countries where goods were produced under working conditions and hours of labor that must compete with the goods produced in the United States under more favorable conditions. They knocked out the eight-hour provision as against foreign labor which we wanted to insert in the low-tariff law.

Then the convict-labor bill came along, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] suggested what he was going to do for the working people of this country. He favored restrictions on the shipment in interstate commerce of goods made by convicts in the United States, but when we offered a provision proposing that we should extend protection to the people of the United States as against the convict-made goods of Europe the gentleman winced and claimed, as he claims now, that we were playing politics. We were told then to wait for the foreign child-labor question until the child-labor bill came up, but now, when the child-labor bill is up, they do not want us to protect the American end of it. We have asked that the producers of the United States be protected against unfair child labor in Europe, whose products, as we learn from the imports, are coming into the ports of the United States along with other free products to such an extent that the Treasury of the United States is being impoverished for want of revenues. Apparently our friends on the other side are only endeavoring to put a thumbscrew upon some of the Southern States which up to this time have not passed child-labor laws such as some other States of the Union now have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WEBB. Is it in order to move to strike out words in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WEBB. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move——

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard before the Chair makes a ruling along those lines, because the Chair will find a long line of precedents in rulings by Speaker Carlisle and Speaker Reed and several other distinguished Speakers holding that where the effect of striking out words is to change the scope of the bill it is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Upon reflection, the Chair thinks the gentleman from Kentucky is correct. The Chair was in error in making his answer. An amendment is now pending before the House. If no one desires to speak on that amendment——

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss the bill for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I was not in the House during the general discussion on this bill, and therefore I avail myself of this opportunity to say a few words under the five-minute rule. I believe I have always voted in the interest of labor since entering Congress and shall vote for this bill. But before doing so I want to talk to the Members of this House in reference to its effect if we do not increase the tariff duties on cotton, woolen, and knit goods.

This past summer I visited cotton and woolen mills in Japan and China and made a personal investigation. I examined a cotton mill in Kobe, employing 9,000 Japanese girls and boys; a spinning mill between Yokohama and Tokyo, employing 4,500; a woolen mill employing 1,500 at Tokyo. Then I personally inspected a cotton mill at Shanghai, China, and another employing 4,500 Chinese boys at Wuchang, 600 miles in the interior of China, on the Yangste River. I found in Japan they were paying from 8 cents to 15 cents a day for 11 hours' work in cotton, woolen, spinning, and knitting mills, and in China they were paying boys 5 cents a day for 11 hours' work. There are 525,000 Japanese women and girls in the textile mills of Japan alone and 66,000 men and boys.

Now, this bill is going to result in increased cost in the production of cotton, woolen, and knit goods. You will have to admit this. We are going to pass legislation which will result in increasing the cost of producing American cotton, woolen, and knit goods at a time when our tariff on the importation of these same foreign-made goods is lower than ever before in the history of this country.

Now, we sold $30,000,000 of American-made cotton goods in China a few years ago. I think the report of the Secretary of Commerce will show that last year we sold $1,200,000 in China, where we had formerly sold $30,000,000.

Now, the lowest wages paid in the knitting and cotton mills in the district I represent—and there are 2 large cotton plants and 15 knitting mills—is 50 and 60 cents per day for beginners, and when they understand their work their wages are increased to $1 and as high as $1.50 per day. Our mills must compete in the foreign markets with mechanics, with employees, with the same kind of modern, up-to-date machinery, who are working for 5 or 8 or 15 cents a day, as against 50 and 60 cents and $1 and $1.50 a day.

What do our foreign returns show on cotton-goods importations? They show that in 1913 and 1914 there was imported into the United States and into the Philippine and Hawaiian Islands, where our present low-tariff law applies, $105,000,000 of foreign-made cotton goods; $25,000,000 more than we sold abroad, and we produce 60 per cent of all the raw cotton in the world.

This bill is going to injure seriously this great industry in the South, unless Congress increases the tariff duty on imported cotton, woolen, and knit goods.

If we will increase the tariff, well and good; but if not, then look out for a very large increase in the sale of European and Japanese cotton, woolen, and knit goods in the United States, and the closing of many American mills or the reduction of the hours of work or wages in our textile mills.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] offers an amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as I do not intend to support the amendment I have offered, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw it and present another one.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. We have had three or four speeches in favor of this amendment, and I think we ought to be permitted to say something in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a question of unanimous consent pending. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HARDY. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas objects.

Mr. HARDY. I object just in order to be heard myself, Mr. Chairman, not that I have any objection to the withdrawal of his amendment. It appears to me that we see very plainly the purpose of his amendment. If the protectionists could secure the injection of this amendment into this law they would need no more protection, or high tariff, or anything else to secure to the manufacturers of this country a monopoly of the markets of this country. As a matter of fact, if you applied the principle of this bill to goods imported from abroad there would not be an opportunity for the importation of any goods from abroad or the collection of any revenue from the importation of such goods. The gentleman last addressing the House [Mr. AUSTIN] has illustrated how all Japanese goods would be excluded under the provisions of this bill, if it applied to foreign-made goods; and I doubt not that the importation of goods from every country of Europe would be likewise excluded by this bill if extended as proposed by the amendment. The truth is the gentleman from Pennsylvania illustrates very clearly that he is not so much interested in child labor as he is in protection. He is like the merchant of Venice. It is a case of my ducats and my daughter, of protection and child labor; but which he thinks the most of is not hard to tell. In the innermost recesses of my soul I think he cares more for protection, and if he could so amend this bill as to provide that no goods made abroad in the making of which child labor, so called, entered would be admitted into the United States he would exclude all foreign-made goods. And yet this bill offers the anomaly of excluding from the commerce of one State goods made in a sister State, while admitting goods of the same class and character when made abroad. That fact alone ought to condemn this bill.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close at the end of 10 minutes.

Mr. VARE. Reserving the right to object, I have an amendment I should like to offer.

Mr. LEWIS. Is there objection to closing debate in 15 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from Maryland to ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I object.

Mr. HARRISON. I have an amendment I desire to offer.

Mr. MANN. Let us see if it is possible to reach an agreement, because we are going to stay here and pass this bill.

Mr. LEWIS. I will withdraw the application at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina objects, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] knows very well that this is one of the bills that has been introduced into this House for the purpose of injuring the South in its relation to the other States. Already in those matters in which transportation is involved, legislation has been enacted that has struck us very hard blows in the past. To-day, if the people of the South want to transport their raw or manufactured products to another State in the Union, they have lost absolute jurisdiction over any of the railroads transporting that product.

The people of the South to-day may want to transport their products by water into any other State, but, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania well knows, they labor under a disadvantage that has operated against them for years. To-day you can load two ships in the ports of Europe and send one to India and one to South Carolina and reload each one of those ships with cotton. You know that if these ships were not built in the United States the ship that comes from India can take the products from India and sell them in any port of the United States, while the ship that is loaded in South Carolina or at any other southern port can not take an American product and deliver it in any other State in the Union.

The iniquitous system of protection that the Republican Party has foisted on the people of the United States has stifled commerce between the States, and has laid a burden of expense in transportation under which the people of the South have suffered and the flag driven from the seas. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to further legislation that restricts our rights, that puts a further burden upon us, and that interferes with our right to create, to manufacture, and to sell at will in the markets of this country and in the markets of the world that which we produce honestly and sell honestly and to take fair compensation for that which we produce and offer for sale.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "of," strike out "16" and insert in lieu thereof "19"; in line 10, strike out "14" and insert "18"; in line 11, strike out "14" and insert "18"; and, page 2, line 1, strike out "16" and insert "19."

Mr. LEWIS. I make the point of order on the proposed amendment that it does not deal with children. People 19 years of age are not children.

Mr. HARRISON. I should like to ask the gentleman if that is all he has to say in support of his point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, there appears much sentiment among the Members here in behalf of the children of the country. I concede to no Representative on this floor a greater interest in their health and welfare than I have. I think the States of this Union all should pass humane child-labor legislation. The agitation of this question in this country, as you know, grew out of the conditions in the mills and factories and treatment of little children in the towns and cities of the East. Conditions that called for rigid child-labor legislation. There you would find a mill or factory employing little children whose health, intellect, and body were weakened and impaired.

These conditions forced State legislatures to pass appropriate child-labor legislation. The conditions I have briefly referred to do not obtain in the mills and factories of the South.

There are few factories in my State. Only one cotton mill in my district. The operator of that factory is for this legislation. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] knows him well, and that gentleman wrote me on yesterday that he favored this legislation. You will see, therefore, that all these operators are not opposed to this bill. He may be the exception, for he is a splendid man, patriotic and broad minded.

This question, therefore, does not affect me locally. My State legislature knows more about conditions there and is better enabled to pass appropriate legislation to meet those conditions than is the Federal Congress. Conditions in the mills and the factories of the South are splendid. If you should pass through the States of South and North Carolina, you would see these factories and mills erected on hills with ideal sanitation, and beautiful homes, schoolhouses, and churches built far apart.

There is no comparison between the conditions that obtain in the South and the conditions that did obtain in other parts of the Union until recently respecting child labor.

Sirs, I am against the Federal Government exercising this power. It is a dangerous precedent and will, if passed, rise to plague many of you. But if you are sincere in your arguments for this legislation, if you really want to stop by Federal law the employment of children in the mills and factories and mines of the country, then vote for the amendment I have offered. It raises the limit and prevents the transportation of goods from without a State where the labor employed is younger than 19 and 18 years.

Now, vote for this amendment and back up your assertions by your actions.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think the age limit ought to be considerably raised.

Mr. HARRISON. I think the ages I suggest are sufficient.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has made a very eloquent appeal for the protection of children of 18 years in manufacturing establishments and 19 years in mines and quarries. The gentleman is blind to the fact that now in North Carolina children of 13, and maybe younger, are being worked 11 hours a day. He has not a word of condemnation for that; but instead comes in here and, while appealing to this House to assist him to safeguard those who are 18 or 19 years old, joins the enemies of the bill and endeavors to mutilate it.

That is the record the gentleman from Mississippi is making on the floor of this House. I am amazed that he of all men from the South should take such an attitude, because he belongs to the newer generation in the Southern States. Does the gentleman know that the testimony before our committee demonstrated that the children affected by this bill, the children who work in the cotton mills of the South, are Anglo-Saxon? One cotton-mill owner boasted that only white children worked in his mill. Another witness testified that it was a common spectacle to see white children on their way to work in the mill passing black children on their way to school. I submit, as a friend of the South, Mr. Chairman, that there is one section of this country that needs this legislation more than any other section, and that section is south of the Mason and Dixon line. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that debate on the amendment is exhausted.

Mr. HOWARD. I move to strike out the last word of the amendment.

Mr. MANN. That is not in order; there is an amendment pending. The gentleman, like myself, will have to wait until we have a vote.

Mr. HOWARD. I offer to amend by striking out the word "fourteen" and inserting the word "thirteen" in section 1.

Mr. MANN. That amendment is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this is exhausted, and the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia is not in order.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may be allowed to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 1, after the word "year," in line 10, by inserting "except during the periods of regular school vacations, work not to exceed eight hours in any one day."

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that I am heartily in favor of the purposes of this bill. I take it that the prime purpose of the bill is for the protection of the child. I am also interested in the further protection of the child, and I believe in strengthening this measure. If this bill becomes a law as it is, during the school vacation there will be an army of children in this country in enforced idleness. We were told yesterday by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] that in the city of New York there are 750,000 school children. I dare say of that number one-half of them by reason of this bill, if it passes without the amendment I propose, will be idle entirely during school vacation.

If there is any one thing that the children, especially the boys of this country, should be protected in, it is from idleness between the ages of 12 and 16 years. It is during that period that their habits for weal or for woe are made. It is the formative period of their character, and if they are educated along the lines of idleness they will be idlers during their entire lives. As I say, I am in favor of the purposes of this bill. I think it should be strengthened by adding an amendment something like this that I have offered, whereby the children during the period of vacation may find some kind of employment. In Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, and many of the Western States, where we have large canneries that can vegetables, pumpkin, beans, the work is done during the period of vacation, from the latter part of July to the latter part of September. The work is not hard, and these boys from 10 to 16 years of age can find remunerative employment.

I want to say that I expect if we took a vote of the men in this body and at the other end of the Capitol Building we would find that everyone of them found employment during that period and that it did not detract from them, but made them stronger and more useful men. There are many who absolutely need it; there are many poor men who are working hard to sustain their families; and there are many widows who are working hard at the washtub to sustain their families who are in favor of educating their children but want them to find some employment during school vacations to help sustain the family.

This great army of young children in the city of New York can not go into the country, and what exists there exists all over this land.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman know that the laws of New York and of Indiana and Illinois and of other States which the gentleman has mentioned all forbid the employment of children within the ages mentioned in this bill, and those exceptions are not given in the laws of those States?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It would not apply, I know, in the State of Indiana. I know that in Indiana children during the school vacations may work in these factories. I do not know whether it is true in the State of Illinois or not.

Mr. DENISON. Does not the law of Indiana forbid the employment of children of the same ages or within the ages fixed by this bill the whole year around?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; it does not.

Mr. DENISON. I think if the gentleman will refer to those laws he will find that he is mistaken. I have an abstract of the Indiana law in front of me. I am sure I am right about the law in Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana. As I was attempting to say a while ago when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] interrupted me, I presume that when my delegation votes on this measure I will be as lonesome as a martin on a fodder pole. I have heard a good deal said about the South and southern conditions, and they are no worse there than they were everywhere only a few years ago. I have tried to find a single reason why I should vote against this bill. I read all of the hearings and the argument made before the Committee on Labor by the distinguished and able gentleman from North Carolina, Ex-Gov. Kitchin. Then I read the argument of Dr. Parkinson, and after reading both of them my mind was still in doubt as to the constitutionality of this bill. I wavered; I could not arrive at any conclusion definitely as to whether it was constitutional or not. So I decided that I would give the benefit of the doubt as to the constitutionality of the measure to the innocent childhood of my State, and I am going to do it. The law in Georgia is not like the law in the Carolinas. Our age limit is two years higher. We have, as a rule, a lot of broad-minded, humane, and patriotic men engaged in the manufacture of cotton in our State. [Laughter.] The manufacturers of Georgia are not now attempting to wring gold out of the bodies of innocent little children. The strong arm of the State law protects them under the age of 14, and they do not work them under this age lawfully any more.

The astounding thing to me is that there is any necessity for this law anywhere. The mill owners testify themselves that only a very small percentage of their employees are children under 14 years of age. If this is true, the law we are debating will not harm a hair upon their heads. If it is not true, then this bill should unquestionably become a law.

We hear much about the mill owners and the poor widows, but they are not wholly to blame for child-labor conditions. In a great many cases trifling, no-account, drinking daddies are as much to blame for conditions in the South as they are in any other section of this country. They have large families—five, six, and seven children; they are not willing to make a living by the sweat of their faces, and they move their families to a mill town and put their innocent little children in pawn that they may live in idleness and ease, and there is not a man from the South or from any section of the country that does not know that that is true. [Applause.]

The other day the cotton manufacturers from my section came up here and said to the Ways and Means Committee: "We want you to join in with us in giving us protection for aniline dyes, that this particular industry may be conserved to the cotton manufacturers of the country. We need this protection to encourage the manufacture of dyestuffs in America." [Applause on the Republican side.] I say to these gentlemen: "Yes; if I believe the necessity exists for you to have protection upon analine dyes, I will vote for it." [Applause on the Republican side.] But I, in turn, say to those same gentlemen now that I believe that we need protection for the childhood of the South; that they may be granted that privilege which is the sweetest heritage of life—childhood days of play and physical development.

Mr. Chairman, we must protect and conserve their intellects; they must have a chance in life. We must protect them from designing and mercenary men engaged in business. We must protect them from worthless fathers and thoughtless mothers. We must educate them intellectually and morally. The ignorance of our people is our greatest weakness, and our greatest asset is our children—educated in mind, strong in body, clean in morals. Compulsory education, strict child-labor laws, in my humble judgment, are imperative in the making of a nation great. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that another mourner has come forward——

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I think debate on this particular amendment has been exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. No one made the point of order, and the Chair recognized the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KEATING. I make the point of order that debate is exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1, page 2, line 4, by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"It shall be unlawful for any carrier of interstate commerce to transport or accept for transportation in interstate commerce the products of any mine, quarry, mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment offered to it for transportation by any person, firm, or corporation which owns or operates such mine, quarry, mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment, or by any officer, agent, or servant of said person, firm, or corporation, until the president, secretary, or general manager of such corporation, or a member of such firm, or the person owning or operating such mine, quarry, mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment shall file with said carrier an affidavit setting forth that none of the products so offered have been produced, in whole or in part, by the labor of children under the age of 14 years, or by the labor of children between the ages of 14 and 16 years, who work more than eight hours in any one day, or more than six days in any one week, or after the hour of 7 o'clock p. m., or before the hour of 7 o'clock a. m.: *Provided, however,* That in lieu of the affidavit hereinbefore provided the president, secretary, or general manager of any corporation, or the member of any firm, or any person owning or operating any mine, quarry, mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment, as aforesaid, may file with the Secretary of Labor a general affidavit setting forth that for the six months preceding the filing thereof in said mine, quarry, mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment no children under the age of 14 years were employed in any capacity, and that no children between the ages of 14 years and 16 years, who have worked more than eight hours in any one day, or more than six days in one week, or after the hour of 7 o'clock p. m., or before the hour of 7 o'clock a. m., which general affidavit shall be renewed each six months thereafter. The form of said affidavits shall be prescribed by the board composed of the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor, as hereinafter provided."

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say at the beginning that this amendment is offered in good faith; that I am heartily in favor and always have been of legislation to prohibit the labor of children under these ages, and as a member of the legislature of my own State I had more or less to do with securing the enactment of similar legislation. I am firmly convinced, however, that some such amendment is necessary to make this legislation effective and capable of accomplishing the result which most of us really desire.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the trouble with the bill as it has been reported by the committee is not with its constitutionality—and I want to say in passing that I have been surprised to hear Members from the Southern States who yesterday voted for a roads bill appropriating money out of the Federal Treasury for purely local roads and bridges, raise that question against this measure, but the trouble I find with this bill is the difficulty of securing a conviction under its provisions. In the Keating bill, as originally introduced, in order to obtain a conviction the burden was upon the Government to prove not only that a child was found working in a manufacturing establishment under the age of 14 years, but that the labor of that particular child actually entered into the production of a commodity which was the subject of interstate commerce. The committee in its report has sought to meet this difficulty in section 2 of the bill now under discussion by making the fact of the employment of a child under 14 years of age or between 14 and 16 for more than eight hours prima facie evidence of a violation of this act.

The question naturally arises whether the making of an act which in itself may be perfectly innocent prima facie evidence of guilt is constitutional or wise; but assuming that it is constitutional and wise, it is only *prima facie* evidence. Let us suppose an actual case of a complaint under this bill if in its present form it becomes a law. The Government puts an inspector on the witness stand, who testifies that he has found a child working in some factory under 14 years of age, and the Government rests its case. The foreman of the factory then goes on the stand and testifies that the special kinds of goods which that child was working upon were intended for shipment, or were actually being shipped, to points entirely within that State. Then the Government is obliged to go forward and contradict that evidence by proving that those particular goods were intended to be shipped, or were actually being delivered for shipment, in interstate commerce, which it will be almost impossible to do. Now, Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered affords a way in which this bill can be enforced, and enforced practically every time, whether the Government is able to sustain the burden of proof just mentioned or not. It puts the responsibility upon the carrier as well as upon the producer and dealer,

just as Congress has done in the Penal Code in regard to the transportation of immoral and obscene books and papers, in which cases it has placed the responsibility not only upon the shipper but also upon the carrier, and even upon the receiver.

Under the provisions of my amendment every shipment of goods in interstate commerce must be accompanied by an affidavit that the provisions of section 1 of this act have been complied with, and that no child labor has entered into the production of that particular commodity. Now in those States where child-labor legislation like this has been enacted by the State legislatures I have provided a remedy to do away with the inconvenience and burden of filing a separate affidavit with each individual shipment by providing that in place of it a general affidavit may be filed by any manufacturing concern with the Secretary of Labor, renewable every six months, setting forth that in that factory or that manufacturing establishment no child under 14 years of age has been employed in any capacity and that no child in that establishment between 14 and 16 years of age has been employed more than eight hours in any one day or more than six days in any one week, for the six months next preceding. Not only will this general affidavit be universally made use of by concerns in all of those States which have proper labor legislation, but also in the other States. On account of the inconvenience of filing a separate affidavit in the case of each shipment the temptation will be strong to file a general affidavit, and wherever such a general affidavit has been filed you can always get a conviction if the Government inspector finds a child working under 14 years of age or under the conditions forbidden by section 1 of the act, because in every such case the evidence is conclusive that a false affidavit has been filed. In short, if this amendment is adopted, the bill is not harmed. If the Government is able to sustain its heavy burden of proof, it is capable of being enforced.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, if, on the other hand, it is found difficult to obtain a conviction under the remainder of the bill, a conviction can always be obtained where a general affidavit has been filed under the provisions of the paragraph which I have moved to have added to the first section of the bill, by simply offering testimony that a single child has been employed in the factory or other manufacturing establishment under the age of 14 years, or has been employed between the ages of 14 and 16 years, for more than eight hours in any one day or more than six days in any one week, or after the hour of 7 o'clock in the afternoon or before the hour of 7 o'clock in the morning, for the reason that if this amendment is adopted I shall later offer an amendment to the penal provisions of section 6 of the bill imposing the same penalties for the making of a false affidavit as are imposed by that section for the violation of the other provisions of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the permitting by the electorate of this country of the exploitation of child labor for the sake of financial gain, which has been going on to a greater or less extent for a quarter of a century, is in my opinion, next to the permitting for a much longer period of the institution of human slavery, the greatest crime against humanity of which the American Nation has been guilty, and for which some day it will have to answer before the bar of Divine Justice.

I must confess that I have always failed to understand how men calling themselves Christians have been willing to reap profits at the expense of the physical and mental well-being of the childhood of America. The Great Founder of Christianity, when He was upon this earth, was meek and gentle and spent His time going about doing good. He taught throughout His earthly ministry the great principle that love is the fulfilling of the law, and He came to establish upon earth the brotherhood of man. There were times, however, when He spoke in words of no uncertain meaning of the inevitable punishment of those who for selfish greed oppress the innocent and helpless. It was He who said: "Woe unto him who shall offend one of these little ones; it were better for that man if a millstone were hanged about his neck and he were drowned in the depths of the sea."

Mr. Chairman, every consideration of reason and justice demands the passage of this legislation, and it is for the sole purpose of making this legislation effective and of stamping out for all time this blot upon our Christian civilization that I have offered this amendment, and sincerely hope that it will be adopted and that the bill as amended will be enacted into law.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is now nearly 4 o'clock. We have read half of the first section of the bill. There are nine sections of this bill. Under the new rule of the House, which was adopted yesterday and for which most of the Members voted but for which I did not, consideration of this measure will automatically close at a fixed hour. If this bill is delayed this day until it is impossible to keep a quorum, and there is still a number of sections of the bill to be read, the bill will not be passed on next Wednesday in my opinion. The amendment now offered is in good faith, but many of the amendments which have been offered have been offered for the purpose of delay and filibuster. I think the time has nearly arrived when the gentleman in charge of the bill, in order to accommodate the mass of the membership of the House who do not care to be unduly inconvenienced in hearing speeches to which they do not desire to listen, ought to commence to move the bill along to its final disposition. [Applause.]

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Georgia indulge the Chair just a moment?

Mr. ADAMSON. Of course. The gentleman from Georgia will indulge the Chair in anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wants to say that a good many gentlemen have asked to be recognized for the purpose of speaking on the bill, by offering to strike out the last word or for the offering of amendment. The Chair thinks the better rule is to recognize those gentlemen who have amendments which affect the bill and perfect it according to their views, and he will give recognition to those gentlemen in preference to pro forma amendments. [Applause.]

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to cause any delay, nor have I very much to say. I thought it useless for the distinguished and eloquent gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] to announce that his amendment was in good faith, for considering the grotesque bill now before the committee it is not difficult for me to understand that some people can do anything in good faith, and if anything can be worse than the bill it must be the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts. But, Mr. Chairman, I rose for the purpose of corroborating a portion of the speech of my eloquent colleague from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD]. As to the part in which he confessed to having failed while he was solicitor general to convict vagrants I have no dispute with him; as to the part in which he boasted of the broad, high-minded, great, strong, good men and the beautiful and accomplished women in Georgia I proudly concur with him [applause]; but he deplored the degraded, desolate condition of the benighted Carolinas. I admit all the good things he says for Georgia. I believe the output shows on the average that she knows how to raise just as good men and women as Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, or Colorado. Comparisons are always odious, but the gist of this bill being to attend to somebody else's business because they can not attend to it themselves invites comparison.

Conditions of factory life and labor in Georgia are ideal. The factory communities are model villages. They have schools, churches, and libraries, all liquor, gambling, and all vice being strictly and effectively prohibited. We teach the children in Georgia to work, because an "idle brain is the devil's workshop; an idle hand the devil's best instrument." We teach them to work not always because their work is pecuniarily profitable or necessary for support of them or their family but in order to educate them in industry and economy and skill in production fully as important as teaching them languages, rhetoric, or mathematics. I have reason to state that some other States do as well and are unjustly and cruely maligned here.

Therefore I decline to indorse the balance of the speech of my colleague, which I understand to mean that, standing on this exalted pinnacle of self-sufficiency and ability, we deem it necessary to resort to the subterfuge of invoking and perverting the commerce clause of the Constitution to pick up poor benighted North Carolina and help her out of the dumps. I decline, either for Georgia or myself, to join either the Pharisees, who are professing to be "holier and better than thou," or the Shylocks, who propose, as some gentlemen here have openly and shamelessly argued, to equalize the conditions which God Almighty has made unequal throughout the different parts of the country. I want to say to those gentleman that their mistake lies in this, that they think it necessary for everybody to follow the same pursuits and to do the same things in every clime, which is contrary to nature and abnormal. There are

things which men can do, each in his own section and under the peculiar conditions thereof, without trying to do violence to the instrumentalities of commerce in this country and the common sense and the decency and the equal rights of various parts of the country, and without reflecting upon the people of other States and insulting large sections of the country which bid fair by their progress to outstrip the localities and enterprises of the persons interested. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PRICE, Mr. WEBB, and Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] rise?

Mr. LEWIS. I move that debate on this section and all amendments thereto be closed at 15 minutes after 4 o'clock.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Is that motion debatable, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is not debatable. The gentleman from Maryland moves that all debate to this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed at a quarter past 4 o'clock.

Mr. WEBB. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WEBB. That does not cut off the right to offer an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, no. This is simply limiting debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto to quarter after 4 o'clock.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WATSON] may be heard for three minutes on this motion.

Mr. MANN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to the motion of the gentleman from Maryland. I move to amend by striking out the words "quarter past 4."

Mr. LEWIS. I think that is not in order, sir.

Mr. MANN. We will agree to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] moves that the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] be amended by striking out the words "quarter past 4." That would close debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto, but would not at this moment prevent offering amendments ad libitum.

Mr. DYER. Debate would be closed, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will that mean that gentlemen who have amendments to offer will be precluded from offering them?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair just said it would not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will it preclude debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has just said that it would.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I wish to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I renew the amendment.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is recognized.

Mr. HEFLIN. I understood the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] to move that all debate close on the pending amendment at a quarter past 4 o'clock. It is now five minutes of 4. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] moves to strike out "quarter past 4."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] to the motion of the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. MANN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland as amended by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The gentleman from Mississippi will please wait until the Chair states the question.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Chair will allow me, I was on my feet when the Chair announced the vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS].

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 181, noes 10.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina demands tellers. Those in favor of taking the vote by tellers will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Only three gentlemen have arisen—not a sufficient number. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] as amended by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. VARE: Amend section 1 by inserting after the word "years," on line 1, page 2, the following: "who work more than eight hours in any one day or more than six days in any one week, or after the hour of 7 o'clock p. m., or before the hour of 11 o'clock a. m.; and each minor between the age of 14 and 16 years so employed shall, during the period of such employment, attend, for a period or periods equivalent to not less than six hours each week, a public school, during the usual public school term: *Provided*, That the school hours shall not be on Saturdays nor before 8 o'clock a. m. nor after 5 o'clock p. m. of any other day."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the amendment just considered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS: On page 2, lines 2, 3, and 4, after the word "week," in line 2, strike out the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof the following: "or between the hours of 7 o'clock p. m. and 7 o'clock a. m.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out all after the word "years," on page 1, line 10, down to and including the word "antemeridian," in line 4, page 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in line 5, page 1, the words "situated in the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 1, by striking out, in line 5, the words "situated in the United States."

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order to the amendment, and I do it for this purpose: A moment ago in a hurry I made a statement to the House, which the Chair accepted, in which I think I was in error. I made the statement that a motion to strike out words would not be in order

if it would have the effect of giving the bill a scope which could not be given by an affirmative amendment. I think that ought to be so, but in my haste I said just contrary to what was decided by the Speakers to whom I referred. I think I owe it to the House and to myself to make this statement. I will not press the point now, but some day I want to make that point plain.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I move in line 8, after the word "establishment," to strike out the word "situated," and in line 9, at the beginning of the line, the words "in the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 1, lines 8 and 9, by striking out the words "situated in the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 57, noes 69.

Mr. WEBB and Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania demanded tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Tellers are demanded. All those in favor of taking the vote by tellers will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Evidently a sufficient number; and the Chair appoints Mr. WEBB and Mr. KEATING as tellers.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the other side.

Mr. WEBB. Too late, Mr. Chairman. The Chair has already appointed tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is a little too late. The tellers have been appointed.

Mr. MANN. Very well. I am willing to stay a little longer while the gentlemen filibuster.

The CHAIRMAN. The tellers will take their places and gentlemen will pass between the tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 57, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1 by adding at the end of said section the following: "That no producer, manufacturer, or dealer shall ship or deliver for shipment in interstate commerce the product of any mine, quarry, mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment in the United States which has been produced in whole or in part by persons of foreign birth, unless such persons have been duly naturalized."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1 by adding at the end of said section the following: "That no producer, manufacturer, or dealer shall ship or deliver for shipment in interstate commerce the product of any mine, quarry, mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment in the United States which has been produced in whole or in part by persons who live and sleep in any room in which more than three persons live and sleep."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1 by adding at the end of said section the following: "That no producer, manufacturer, or dealer shall ship or deliver for shipment in interstate commerce the product of any mine, quarry, mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment in the United States which has been produced in whole or in part by any foreign-born person between the ages of 16 and 21, unless such person is able to read and write some language."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1 by adding at the end of said section the following: "That no person, firm, or corporation shall ship or deliver for shipment in interstate commerce any products of sewing machines, if said sewing machines are operated by any girl under the age of 18 years."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1 by adding at the end of said section the following: "That no canned goods shall be shipped in interstate commerce if any person under the age of 14 years has assisted in canning such goods, whether by piecework or in canning factories."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1 by adding at the end of said section the following: "That no fish shall be shipped in interstate commerce if caught, cleaned, or packed by any person under the age of 14 years."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all the amendments which the gentleman holds in his hand may be considered en gross.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I will state that I have one affecting the gentleman's State, which I want to give him an opportunity to vote upon separately.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1 by adding at the end of said section the following: "That no oysters, if caught, gathered, or prepared for shipment in whole or in part by any person under the age of 14 years, shall be shipped in interstate commerce."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1 by adding at the end of said section the following: "That no person, firm, or corporation shall ship or receive for shipment in or through interstate commerce any goods, wares, or merchandise if such person, firm, or corporation employs girls or women and pays them less than $8 per week."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman form North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1 by adding at the end of said section the following: "That no newspaper publishing company shall ship or receive in interstate commerce any goods, wares, or merchandise, if such newspaper company employs boys or girls under the age of 14 to vend newspapers in any city having more than 4,000 population."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman form North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1 by adding at the end of said section the following: "That no manufacturing plant shall ship in interstate commerce any of its products, if more than 60 per cent of its labor is foreign born."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman form North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEBB. One more amendment, Mr. Chairman, and this is the last one.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of section 1, the following:
"No producer, manufacturer, or dealer shall ship or deliver for shipment in interstate commerce any product or article produced in whole or in part by the labor of children under 16 who were employed or permitted to work in producing or handling said product or article after the hour of 7 p. m., or before the hour of 7 a. m."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting in line 4, page 2, after the word "antemeridian," the following: "or by the labor of children under the age of 21 who are not members of some organization affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and whose purpose is to protect the interest of wage earners."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting in line 4, page 2, after the word "antemeridian," the following: "or the product of any mine or quarry, which has been produced in whole or in part by the labor of persons who are not affiliated with the organization known as the United Mine Workers of America."

Mr. ADAMSON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ADAMSON. Ought not the amendment to prescribe what they shall have for breakfast and how it shall be cooked? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting in line 4, page 2, after the word "antemeridian," the following: "or by the labor of any person, male or female, who is caused to work more than eight hours in any one day or more than six days in any one week."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting on line 4, page 2, after the word "antemeridian," the words "or the merchandise of any store or mercantile establishment where female children under 21 years of age are employed, and where suitable chairs are not provided for the use of such female employees at reasonable times to such extent that may be requisite for the preservation of their health."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting on line 4, page 2, after the word "antemeridian," the words "or by the labor of children under 21 years of age who receive as compensation for their labor less than $2 per day."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "children," insert "actually performed in any mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment."

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to discuss this proposed amendment for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to discuss the amendment for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read section 2, as follows:

SEC. 2. Proof of the presence within 60 days prior to the shipment of such product therefrom (first) in a mine or quarry of a child under the age of 16 years, or (second) in a mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment (a) of a child under the age of 14 years, or (b) of a child between the ages of 14 years and 16 years for more than eight hours in any one day or more than six days in any one week, or after the hour of 7 o'clock p. m., or before the hour of 7 o'clock a. m. shall be prima facie evidence that such product has been produced in whole or in part by the labor of such a child.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

In line 5, page 2, strike out the word "presence" and insert the word "employment."

Mr. RAGSDALE. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. Has section 1 been adopted?

The CHAIRMAN. It has been passed——

Mr. RAGSDALE. The question was not put as to the adoption of it.

The CHAIRMAN. It is unnecessary to vote on the section. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after the word "employment," insert "in any mechanical capacity contributory to the production of any goods herein excluded from interstate commerce."

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the rule of evidence prescribed in this bill, if gentlemen will reflect a moment, is an exceedingly harsh one. The mere employment in a factory of a child under the prescribed age, no matter in what the capacity, constitutes prima facie evidence of the guilt of the offense described in this bill. A child under the age of 14 in a factory who conveys a message from one department to another at any time within 60 days prior to the shipment of goods would constitute prima facie evidence of guilt and subject the owner of the factory to arrest and prosecution, in a distant court, it may be, and to all the penalties and costs that would accrue from such prosecution.

The amendment is offered to define the kind of employment which shall be considered prima facie evidence of guilt. It ought not to be that the mere presence and employment of a child at a factory in noncommercial work should be held prima facie evidence of guilt. No such rule of evidence has ever been enacted heretofore that I know of.

Not only that, but there are goods made and manufactured in factories within the prescribed age limit for home consumption. That would be no crime under the provisions of this bill. A child employed in the manufacturing of goods which are to be sold at home is not unlawfully employed under your proposed law. But the employment of that child in a lawful occupation if the factory happened to be making goods for interstate commerce at the same time would, under the law you propose, be prima facie evidence of the guilt of the offense you pronounce in this bill. It ought not to be that the employment of a child as a messenger, or in any other capacity not mechanical, or contributory to the production of the goods for interstate shipment, should be held prima facie evidence of the guilt in this law. I hope that the members of the committee and of this House will appreciate the distinction I am trying to make in undertaking to fix a rule of evidence here which would not make a perfectly lawful act prima facie evidence of crime. I think, gentlemen, this amendment is entitled to serious consideration, and that this rule as now stated is harsh and unusual.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment so assiduously presented by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WATSON] would introduce confusion into the application of this rule. I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland moves that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out section 2 of the bill.

[Mr. ALMON addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago I introduced six or seven amendments which are constitutional, if this bill is constitutional. Of course I regard all of the amendments offered clearly unconstitutional, and the bill also, but I wanted to show the House what in my opinion would some day rise up to plague this House. Some of those amendments, if not all of them, in

the same shape as I introduced them will come back to the floor of this House seriously, because if we have power to pass this bill we have power to pass each one of the amendments which I offered.

The amendment I offered in order to shut out foreign child labor made goods, if we are going to deny American child labor made goods interstate transportation, received 57 votes to 101 votes on a teller vote, and I desire to call attention of the House to the fact that the distinguished leader of the Republicans, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] did not think it wise to protect America from foreign child-made goods, and neither did the distinguished Member from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH]. Both of those distinguished gentlemen voted against my amendment. I desire that fact to be on record because we have heard so much talk about protecting America and American children against the manufactures of foreign children.

I would like to see this whole section 2 stricken out, because it is going to be the source of a multitude of spies and informers. I warn you gentlemen from other States, who are going to vote for this bill, not to rest in false security from the provisions of this bill. All of your manufacturers must comply with it, and place thousands of stamps upon all their articles of manufacture. It controls every and all child-labor laws, and your present State laws will be set aside, and this Federal law will operate on your internal manufacture and be enforced in the Federal courts by United States officials. I deny that a child 13 years old in North Carolina works 11 hours a day. They work from 4 to 4½ hours a day; the rest of the time they play on the lawn outside the mill. They handle little spools, 11 ounces in weight, which is much easier labor than they had been doing before they came to the factory. They get from 75 cents to $1.25 per day for such labor which enables the mother to buy good furniture, live in good rooms, such as many of them never had until they came to these "awful blood-thirsty, life-destroying" places, which agitators call southern cotton mills.

I want to resent the charge that any child ever works in my State as much as 11 hours a day. The doffer boys are only employed from 12 to 16, and their work can hardly be called work. They are employed for 10 hours, but only work constantly about half that time, during which they have to pick the spools off the spinning machines and put them in a light box and roll them away, and then they go out and play until they are called to come in again for similar work, and that makes a day's labor. That is the "horrible" condition you want to remedy down in North Carolina. Why not clean up Chicago, where my friend, Mr. MANN, lives? I saw an article from Springfield, under date of January 22, which says:

POVERTY VICE SOURCE—ILLINOIS INVESTIGATORS TELL OF CAUSES OF IMMORALITY—DANGER IN HOMES OF THE POOR—WAGES OF LESS THAN $8 A WEEK INADEQUATE, STATE COMMISSION REPORTS—CONDITIONS OF DOMESTIC EMPLOYMENT ARE ARRAIGNED.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *January 22.*

Poverty is the principal cause of immorality; a minimum wage for girls and women should be $8 a week; and unregulated conditions of domestic employment render the home, in many cases, a breeding place of commercialized vice, according to the Illinois Senate white-slave investigation committee's report made public this week.

Thousands of girls, it says, are driven into prostitution "because of the sheer inability to keep body and soul together on the low wages they receive."

EMPLOYMENT SYSTEM CONDEMNED.

The system of domestic employment in America is condemned in positive terms. "Unregulated conditions of domestic employment, uncertain hours, absence of definite social status, and lack of creative opportunities render the home in many cases for the woman servants a breeding place of immorality," says the report.

Investigation disclosed that more women of the underworld fell into dishonor from domestic employment than from any other work. Of 181 girls sent to the State training school at Geneva, Ill., who had worked for a wage previous to commitment the committee found that 115, or 63.55 per cent, had been engaged in domestic service.

Now, if the Federal Government is going into the general business of correcting the morals and protecting the health of all the people, why do you aim at the little, cleanly factory? Why not make it apply to the big department stores and the poor girl who stands 8 to 10 hours on her feet? Why not make employers pay $8 a week, and thus protect her from shame? Why not regulate her hours of labor in Chicago by Federal power? You can do it with the same ease as you undertake to regulate labor in cotton factories. That would help to clean up Chicago, says this white-slave committee. It says that because of the small pay the poor girls get in that city it makes it a breeding place of commercialized vice. You can not charge any such thing as that to the southern cotton manufacturer, where children and young women are employed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor shall constitute a board to make and publish from time to time uniform rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 2, line 17, strike out the figure "2" and insert the figure "3."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, strike out all of section 3.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] in addressing the House stated that conditions in Georgia were not the same as in South Carolina; that in Georgia the manufacturers were humane and the State threw the strong arm of the law around its children to protect them. I know that every Member learned with delight that the strong arm of the law in Georgia could protect some one. [Laughter and applause.] Likewise the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] lectures the people of the Carolinas. I had the honor of serving as a member of the committee that investigated the Colorado strike, and not only went down into the mines but also into the homes of the miners. I am acquainted with conditions in many cotton-mill villages in South Carolina, and in no village have I ever seen such deplorable conditions as existed in nearly every mining camp in Colorado. I have no doubt that in considering this matter he has in mind the conditions in his own State, but his very ignorance of conditions in cotton-mill villages in South Carolina illustrates the danger of Congress undertaking to regulate conditions of which they know nothing. If this legislation is enacted, then every Congressman must familiarize himself with labor conditions in every State else he can not intelligently regulate such conditions.

There is not on record a petition from a single operative for this legislation. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], without addressing the Chair, says, "Of course not"; and I have no doubt he is sincere in believing that it was not done, because they feared such action would meet the disapproval of the mill owners. But he is wrong. Because of my experience in Colorado I know that in that State, and I presume in others, where the employees are foreigners, the workers are ruled by their employers in political matters, and the employees fear to express their political opinions, unless they coincide with those of their employers. But in South Carolina conditions differ. There the employees never fail to express their views politically and take an active part in politics, and they generally are opposed to the faction to which the mill owner belongs. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. NICHOLLS] was not exaggerating this morning when he said that he was elected to Congress by the cotton-mill operatives and in spite of the bosses. I know the operatives and know but few of the bosses. The operatives, as I say, are generally on the opposite side politically from the bosses, and do not hesitate to express their opinion, and if they were in favor of this measure they would not have hesitated to so inform us instead of sending petitions to oppose it. I know that you wonder then why they are opposed to the bosses in politics. My own opinion is that inasmuch as they come from the farms they have brought with them the independence that is bred on the farm, and while they are willing to let the boss manage the ball team or engage in welfare work, they are quick to resent any effort to influence them in their political views.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a few words in favor of striking out this section, because I was a member years ago, in good old Republican days, of the Committee on the Judiciary of this House that reported unanimously against the constitutionality of this sort of a bill. I urge this House not to do evil that good may come.

Children are the hope of the State. They will be the State. The glorious work of making them worthy citizens, of giving them all a sufficient education, which includes the chance to learn how to earn their own living, their protection from oppression, their uplift, and, to that end, the regulation of every sort of business, this glorious work belongs to each State, to be carried out in every town, in every school, in every church, and in every family. And in proportion as that work is done in the State, in the town, in the church, in the school, and in the family community, that State will go on, and the State that neglects it will fall.

Under the influence of the splendid movement for the proper regulation of labor, especially of women and children, each State is now trying out such regulations as it thinks its condi-

tion and situation demand. They may make mistakes, but their experiments are testing what regulations are practical, effective, and beneficial, and will tend to make the children the most valuable, the most cherished, and the proudest possession of every family, so that they will rejoice in a full quiver. But that regulation is intrusted by the Constitution of the United States to the separate States, and rightly so, for the work can not be done so well by inflexible national rules, not only through the Union but through the islands of the sea.

We have all taken our oath to support that Constitution. I, at least, can not vote for this bill under that oath, even if I were convinced that this jurisdiction ought to be taken away from the States. And the bill itself confesses that we can not regulate labor, for it does not attempt such regulation; but, instead of that, it asks us to legalize a boycott—it is nothing else—of goods that are lawfully made in the State where they originate. A boycott may be fairly defined as a conspiracy or agreement to outlaw a man for doing what is perfectly lawful. Such a conspiracy is itself a crime. We, as a legislature, can lawfully put a ban on what is unlawfully produced. We are asked here to boycott what is lawfully produced, and even to imprison men who deal in what was lawfully made, and we are asked to enact this ban against our sister States—against sovereign States—and to bar their people and lawful products from interstate commerce.

This boycott is likewise to be supported by an army of inspectors and detectives and by the fine and imprisonment of people who deal in lawful goods.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I regret having to do so, but I will have to object. We are objecting to other gentlemen.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I never have made any delay on this bill.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman is one of the most courteous gentlemen on this floor, but in order to facilitate business I shall have to object.

Mr. MANN. Ask leave to extend.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I have the right to extend already.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] objects.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey, under leave to extend his remarks, submits the following:

The ban is not to touch foreign trade and the products of peonage or of child labor in foreign mills. Other nations are left to manage their own concerns, although, indeed, we could lawfully regulate foreign commerce in that regard. This boycott is directed especially against the rights that are guaranteed to our own States under our Constitution.

Did anyone ever pretend that the United States before the war could have barred cotton from interstate and foreign commerce because, though slavery was lawful, it had been raised by slave labor? That case would have had much more in its favor.

Is the law to make it a crime to trade in what is lawfully made? Is it to recognize and use the lawful power of putting men under a ban who have committed no crime? Must a country storekeeper have a certificate every time that he sells a handkerchief or a pair of socks?

If control by inspection and a passport system is to apply to all such transactions, it will be police government and not government by law.

We all sympathize with the objects sought by the promoters of this bill, but they will do the greatest harm to their cause if they take away the interest and responsibility in this matter of the neighborhood and the State which now has full power.

We shall do still more harm to the cause of liberty if we try to legalize an unconstitutional and oppressive exercise of police power in interstate commerce, even in order to secure a worthy end."

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, while it is not often that all of us can enjoy the proud privilege of so distinguished a statesman as he who comes from so great a State as the gentleman from Georgia, yet there are some of us who come from States that may claim a little merit. We feel, at least, that in those emergencies that arise in which the chief executive of our respective States extend the right of executive clemency under the constitution of the State, that while we may fail to rise to broad and patriotic duties on other questions, we will at least rise to as high a point as that to which the distinguished citizens of Georgia arose, and try to defend our chief executive from the attacks of other patriotic, broad-minded patriots in our States when they try to strike down the chief executive while he is trying to discharge the duties devolving upon him under the constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment——

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I move now, sir, that the committee do rise.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] withdraw his motion?

Mr. LEWIS. No; I can not, I regret to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 8234, known as the child-labor bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit the following privileged motion.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Carolina rise?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. To make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and nineteen gentlemen are present—a quorum. The Clerk will report the privileged resolution offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Carolina rise?

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. To move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that the House adjourn. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina demands a division. Those in favor of the motion to adjourn will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Twenty-nine gentleman have risen in the affirmative. Those opposed will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-nine have risen in the negative. On this vote the ayes are 29 and the noes are 169.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum, according to that count.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the point of order is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks a Member has the right to demand a quorum and have a count.

Mr. HOWARD. The Speaker has just counted.

The SPEAKER. Yes; the Chair has just counted; but you do not know how many have gone out since. The Chair will count again. [After counting.] Two hundred and twelve Members are present.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I desire to move a call of the House.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRISP. I make the point of order that the House was dividing, and that under the rules of the House when the House is dividing there is no call of the House.

Mr. MANN. The House was not dividing.

Mr. CRISP. Yes; the House was dividing.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is correct. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on agreeing to the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 48, nays 317, not voting 69, as follows:

YEAS—48.

Adamson	Callaway	Dent	Godwin, N. C.
Almon	Candler, Miss.	Dickinson	Hardy
Bell	Cannon	Dies	Harrison
Blackmon	Clark, Fla.	Doughton	Heflin
Burgess	Coady	Finley	Hood
Byrnes, S. C.	Crisp	Garrett	Houston

Hughes	Pou	Stedman	Walker
Lee	Ragsdale	Stephens, Miss.	Watson, Va.
Lever	Rayburn	Tillman	Webb
Nicholls, S. C.	Sears	Tribble	Whaley
Page, N. C.	Sisson	Venable	Wilson, Fla.
Park	Slayden	Vinson	Wise

NAYS—317.

Abercrombie	Elston	Kincheloe	Rogers
Allen	Emerson	King	Rouse
Anderson	Esch	Kinkaid	Rowe
Anthony	Evans	Kitchin	Rowland
Ashbrook	Farley	Kreider	Rubey
Austin	Farr	Lafean	Rucker
Ayres	Ferris	La Follette	Russell, Mo.
Bailey	Fields	Langley	Russell, Ohio
Barchfeld	Flood	Lenroot	Sabath
Barkley	Fordney	Lesher	Sanford
Barnhart	Foss	Lewis	Schall
Beakes	Foster	Lieb	Scott, Mich.
Beales	Freeman	Lindbergh	Scott, Pa.
Bennet	Fuller	Linthicum	Shackleford
Black	Gallivan	Lloyd	Shallenberger
Booher	Gard	Lobeck	Sherwood
Borland	Gardner	London	Shouse
Britt	Garland	Longworth	Siegel
Britten	Garner	Loud	Sims
Browne, Wis.	Glass	McAndrews	Sinnott
Browning	Glynn	McArthur	Slemp
Bruckner	Good	McClintic	Sloan
Buchanan, Ill.	Goodwin, Ark.	McCracken	Smith, Mich.
Buchanan, Tex.	Gordon	McCulloch	Smith, Minn.
Burke	Gray, Ind.	McDermott	Smith, N. Y.
Burnett	Gray, N. J.	McGillicuddy	Smith, Tex.
Butler	Green, Iowa	McKellar	Snell
Byrns, Tenn.	Greene, Mass.	McKenzie	Snyder
Caldwell	Greene, Vt.	McKinley	Steele, Iowa
Campbell	Griffin	McLaughlin	Steele, Pa.
Cantrill	Hadley	McLemore	Steenerson
Capstick	Hamill	Madden	Stephens, Cal.
Caraway	Hamilton, Mich.	Magee	Stephens, Nebr.
Carew	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mann	Stephens, Tex.
Carlin	Hamlin	Mapes	Sterling
Carter, Mass.	Hart	Martin	Stiness
Carter, Okla.	Haskell	Matthews	Stone
Cary	Hastings	Mays	Stout
Casey	Hawley	Mecker	Sulloway
Chandler, N. Y.	Hayden	Miller, Del.	Sumners
Charles	Hayes	Mondell	Sweet
Chiperfield	Heaton	Moon	Swift
Church	Helgesen	Mooney	Switzer
Coleman	Helm	Moore, Pa.	Taggart
Collier	Helvering	Moores, Ind.	Tague
Connelly	Henry	Morgan, Okla.	Talbott
Conry	Hensley	Morin	Tavenner
Cooper, Ohio	Hernandez	Mott	Taylor, Ark.
Cooper, W. Va.	Hicks	Mudd	Taylor, Colo.
Cooper, Wis.	Hill	Murray	Temple
Copley	Hilliard	Nelson	Thomas
Costello	Hinds	Nichols, Mich.	Thompson
Cox	Holland	Nolan	Tilson
Crago	Hollingsworth	North	Timberlake
Cramton	Hopwood	Norton	Tinkham
Crosser	Howard	Oakey	Towner
Curry	Howell	Oldfield	Treadway
Dale, Vt.	Huddleston	Oliver	Van Dyke
Dallinger	Hulbert	Olney	Vare
Danforth	Hull, Iowa	O'Shaunessy	Volstead
Darrow	Hull, Tenn.	Padgett	Walsh
Davenport	Humphrey, Wash.	Parker, N. J.	Ward
Davis, Minn.	Humphreys, Miss.	Parker, N. Y.	Wason
Davis, Tex.	Husted	Phelan	Watkins
Decker	Hutchinson	Platt	Watson, Pa.
Denison	Igoe	Powers	Wheeler
Dewalt	Jacoway	Pratt	Williams, T. S.
Dill	James	Price	Williams, W. E.
Dillon	Johnson, Ky.	Quin	Williams, Ohio
Dixon	Johnson, S. Dak.	Rainey	Wilson, Ill.
Doolittle	Johnson, Wash.	Raker	Wilson, La.
Doremus	Kahn	Ramseyer	Wingo
Dowell	Kearns	Randall	Winslow
Driscoll	Keating	Rauch	Wood, Ind.
Dunn	Keister	Reavis	Woods, Iowa
Dyer	Kelley	Reilly	Young, N. Dak.
Eagan	Kennedy, Iowa	Ricketts	Young, Tex.
Edmonds	Kennedy, R. I.	Riordan	
Edwards	Kettner	Roberts, Mass.	
Ellsworth	Key, Ohio	Rodenberg	

NOT VOTING—69.

Adair	Fitzgerald	Konop	Paige, Mass.
Aiken	Flynn	Lazaro	Patten
Alexander	Focht	Lehlbach	Peters
Aswell	Frear	Liebel	Porter
Bacharach	Gallagher	Littlepage	Roberts, Nev.
Brown, W. Va.	Gandy	Loft	Saunders
Brumbaugh	Gillett	McFadden	Scully
Cline	Gould	Maher	Sells
Cullop	Graham	Miller, Minn.	Sherley
Dale, N. Y.	Gray, Ala.	Miller, Pa.	Small
Dempsey	Gregg	Montague	Smith, Idaho
Dooling	Griest	Morgan, La.	Sparkman
Drukker	Guernsey	Morrison	Stafford
Dupré	Haugen	Moss, Ind.	Steagall
Eagle	Hay	Moss, W. Va.	Sutherland
Estopinal	Jones	Neely	
Fairchild	Kent	Oglesby	
Fess	Kiess, Pa.	Overmyer	

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. LAZARO with Mr. DEMPSEY.

Mr. ADAIR with Mr. FREAR.

Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. BROWN of West Virginia with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia.

Mr. CLINE with Mr. BACHARACH.

Mr. STEAGALL with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. AIKEN with Mr. FOCHT.

Mr. ALEXANDER with Mr. FESS.

Mr. ASWELL with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. CULLOP with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. HAUGEN.

Mr. DUPRÉ with Mr. GOULD.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts.

Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. GILLETT.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREGG with Mr. LEHLBACH.

Mr. KONOP with Mr. MCFADDEN.

Mr. LIEBEL with Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.

Mr. MORRISON with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. PATTEN with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. WHEELER.

Mr. SMALL with Mr. SUTHERLAND.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The House refuses to adjourn. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion which is now at the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it first.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 107.

That it shall be in order to continue the consideration of H. R. 8234 on call of the Committee on Labor on Calendar Wednesday until said bill shall be fully disposed of before proceeding with the call to any other committee.

Mr. KEATING. I move the previous question on the adoption of that resolution.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Mississippi rise?

Mr. HARRISON. To make a point of order on that motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear it.

Mr. HARRISON. The point of order is that last Tuesday the rule concerning Calendar Wednesday was amended and changed by the House.

Mr. MANN. A week ago Tuesday.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. The rule that was adopted at that time reads as follows:

Provided, That not more than two hours of general debate shall be permitted on any measure called up on Calendar Wednesday, and all debate must be confined to the subject matter of the bill, the time to be equally divided between those for and against the bill: *Provided further*, That whenever any committee shall have occupied two Wednesdays it shall not be in order, unless the House by a two-thirds vote shall otherwise determine—

And so forth. The point I make is that the motion comes prematurely; that it is not in order to make a motion to continue the two Wednesdays that this rule would allow for the consideration of the bill until the time allotted for the two Wednesdays has been exhausted. Now you are placed in this attitude at this time: The time is not yet exhausted. This committee have another Wednesday or a part of another Wednesday in which to consider this bill, but here at this time, prematurely, they bring in a motion to continue indefinitely, as I understood the amendment, the consideration of this bill, giving the Committee on Labor a preference over other committees, and I submit that it is violative of the rule that was adopted by the House a week ago Tuesday and that the motion is not now in order and will not be in order until all the time granted under the rule—that is, the two Wednesdays—has been exhausted.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is in error as to the law and also in error as to the facts. Take the facts first. The Committee on Labor has occupied two Calendar Wednesdays in succession. We passed a bill last Wednesday, on the call of committees, from the Committee on Labor, and commenced and had up for consideration another bill from this committee. By the unanimous consent of the House they have already been granted three hours on next Wednesday, but that is not under the rule. That was by unanimous consent of the House. The rule says that whenever any committee shall have occupied two Calendar Wednesdays, it shall not be in order unless the House, by a two-thirds vote, and so forth. They have occupied two Calendar Wednesdays. The committee has risen to-day and reported to the House. They have occupied the Calendar Wednesday to-day,

and they occupied Calendar Wednesday a week ago. The two Calendar Wednesdays under the rule have been occupied, and the mere fact that the House, by unanimous consent, has given them three hours next Wednesday, not under the rule but under unanimous consent, does not change the language of the rule.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. The gentleman does not pretend that the Committee on Labor has not two or three hours next Calendar Wednesday under the rules of the House?

Mr. MANN. They have three hours next Wednesday, by unanimous consent, but not under any rule.

Mr. HARRISON. If I understand the situation, last Wednesday, it was about 2 or 3 o'clock in the day that rather than proceed there was a unanimous-consent agreement entered into that some other committee of the House might take up their work and utilize the balance of the day.

Mr. MANN. I understand so; that is substantially the case, by unanimous agreement, but if they had only occupied 15 minutes of last Calendar Wednesday, under the rule that would be considered as having occupied a day.

But, Mr. Speaker, as long as this matter is up, it seems to me that there ought to be a broader ruling than that. Here is the case now before the House. Rules are made for the convenience of the House in order to carry on the business of the House. The House may want to know before it begins the consideration of a bill whether it will have one or two days, whether, in taking up the consideration of a bill, owing to the importance of the bill, it will proceed in advance to take three or four days or a longer time. Here is the identical case now. The question now for the House is whether it will authorize the consideration of this bill on next Calendar Wednesday and until it shall be completed, or whether it prefers, if that is not done, to finish it to-day, as it has a right to do. It is a matter for the convenience of the House, and it meets the convenience of the House to give the right to make the motion in advance of the consideration or at any time during the consideration of a bill, so that Members may guard themselves in the actual consideration of the bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. All the rules of the House are intended to expedite business and not retard it, and all the rulings by the Chair ought to be in harmony with that idea. Under certain circumstances the House makes a unanimous-consent agreement, but circumstances may change in 24 hours so that it wants to do something else. It would be tying our hands absolutely to say that you could not change a unanimous-consent agreement. It takes a two-thirds vote to make this extension. It could have been made just as well when the bill was first called up as it can be made now, or it could be made at any particular time the House saw fit. What has happened is that the Members of the House have evidently concluded in their own minds that they can not finish the bill to-day, and they wish it to be in order next Wednesday. Therefore a motion is made to settle the question now. The Chair thinks it is not premature, and that it might have been made on last Wednesday. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado for the previous question.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the resolution of the gentleman from Colorado.

The question was taken, and two-thirds having voted therefor, the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. LEWIS, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. LITTLEPAGE was granted leave of absence for five days, on account of important business.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. IGOE was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of R. W. Pavey, Sixty-third Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon by the Committee on War Claims.

DIRECTORY OF THE ORDER OF RAILWAY CONDUCTORS.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing a letter from the vice president of the Order of Railway Conductors of America.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 25, 1916.*

Hon. FERL D. DECKER, *Member of Congress,*
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The information has come to me that certain persons have carried on quite extensively among Members of Congress and officials in the departments what seems to have been a rather lucrative business, soliciting for a directory and roster claimed to be published by the Order of Railway Conductors.

I desire to state that these persons do not represent in any way the Order of Railway Conductors, and that no one has authority to sign for this organization except the president and the grand secretary. I beg to suggest also that if an attempt is made by anyone to solicit funds from you in the name of the Order of Railway Conductors for any purpose that you inform me, as we desire to prevent the perpetration of frauds of the character indicated.

Yours, respectfully,

W. M. CLARK,
Vice President, National Legislative Representative,
Order of Railway Conductors.

SPECIAL ORDER.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Saturday next, immediately after the approval of the Journal, I be allowed 20 minutes to address the House on some phases of the address of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to address the House on Saturday next for 20 minutes immediately after the approval of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, not to interfere with appropriation bills, privileged matters, and so forth. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan 1,000 tents and 1,000 cots for the use of the encampment of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Birmingham, Ala., in May, 1916; and

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution for repair and rebuilding of the levee at Yuma, Ariz.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan 1,000 tents and 1,000 cots for the use of the encampment of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Birmingham, Ala., in May, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the child-labor bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. COX. I make the same request.

Mr. CHURCH. I make the same request.

Mr. RAKER. I make the same request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen from Wisconsin, Missouri, Indiana, California, and Pennsylvania ask unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the child-labor bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days after Wednesday next within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the child-labor bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 27, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. DILLON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9213) to

authorize the Gary Land Co. to construct a bridge across the Grand Calumet River, in the State of Indiana, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 78), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16) permitting minors of the age of 18 years or over to make homestead entry of the public lands of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 79), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 10027) granting to the State of Montana 100,000 acres of land in said State for the support of a school of forestry at the State university; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 10108) to create a Federal tariff commission, to define the duties and powers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 10109) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 10110) to increase the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Rhode Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York (by request): A bill (H. R. 10111) to construct two national multiroad highways, the first along or near to the thirty-fifth parallel of north latitude, from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, the second along or near to the twenty-third meridian west from Washington, D. C., north to Canada and south to Mexico; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 10112) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 10113) providing for the election, by popular vote, of the members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 10114) making an appropriation for the construction of a bridge at Nogales, Ariz.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10115) authorizing the adjustment of rights of settlers on the Moqui and Navajo Indian Reservations in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10116) for the relief of certain settlers under reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 10117) for the relief of entrymen within the State of Arizona who relinquished their desert or homestead entries for the purpose of filing lieu-land scrip through the Santa Fe & Pacific Railroad Co.; to the Committee o the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10118) to repeal section 2138 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 10119) to amend the Judicial Code; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 10120) governing the hours of work and mileage of railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 10121) to amend section 29 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 10122) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Rocky Mountain National Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10123) for the reduction of the rate of postage on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10124) to add to the Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo., certain lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 10125) relating to the reclamation of arid, semiarid, swamp, and overflow lands through district organizations, and authorizing Government aid therefor; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. CONNELLY: A bill (H. R. 10126) to repeal the bankruptcy act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER: A bill (H. R. 10127) providing for the purchase of a site and erection thereon of a public building at Baxley, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10128) providing for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building thereon at Ocilla, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10129) providing for the purchase of a site and erection thereon of a public building at Jesup, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAGUE: A bill (H. R. 10130) to retire postal employees on an annuity after 25 years' service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CROSSER: A bill (H. R. 10131) to amend the act approved April 8, 1904, entitled "An act to amend section 76 of an act entitled 'An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii'"; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 10132) to provide for an increase of salary, pay, or compensation of certain employees of the United States at San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 10133) to provide for the erection of a public building at Manti, Sanpete County, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10134) to provide for the erection of a public building at Ephraim, Sanpete County, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10135) to provide for the erection of a public building at Beaver City, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10136) to provide for the erection of a public building at Cedar City, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10137) to provide for the erection of a public building at Mount Pleasant, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10138) to provide for the erection of a public building at St. George, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 10139) to authorize the city of Fairmont to construct and operate a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near the city of Fairmont, in the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10140) to amend an act of Congress, approved October 22, 1914, entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLOAN: Resolution (H. Res. 105) authorizing the President of the United States to place an embargo upon the shipment of arms for a period of 60 days or until the grain congestion shall be relieved; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Resolution (H. Res. 106) to investigate the leasing of the Cattaraugus Indian Reservation for oil and gas operations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BARNHART: Resolution (H. Res. 108) providing for the consideration of H. R. 8664; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Resolution (H. J. Res. 117) setting forth principles that should guide Congress in providing for national defense; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 10141) granting a pension to Charles A. Heitzman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 10142) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 10143) to correct the military record of Charles Mace; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10144) to correct the military record of George M. Waltz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10145) for the relief of Martin Cupples; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET: A bill (H. R. 10146) granting a pension to Charles F. Winans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10147) for the relief of Dennis Shevlin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10148) granting a pension to Elizabeth Raines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 10149) granting a pension to William F. W. Gordon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10150) granting a pension to Margaret E. Bultmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 10151) for the relief of William A. Rose; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLEMAN: A bill (H. R. 10152) for the relief of Catherine A. McCue; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 10153) granting an increase of pension to Mary Shultz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 10154) granting a pension to John T. Knotts; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10155) granting a pension to Frank L. Buff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 10156) granting an increase of pension to J. G. Turk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON: A bill (H. R. 10157) granting a pension to Rachel Waskom; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 10158) granting an increase of pension to Martha Jane Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 10159) granting a pension to Dora Hewey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 10160) granting an increase of pension to William A. Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10161) granting an increase of pension to William Locust; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10162) granting an increase of pension to Mahlon R. Gaskill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10163) granting an increase of pension to Henry P. Bradbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10164) granting a pension to Maude A. Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 10165) granting a pension to George P. Vance; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 10166) granting a pension to Frank H. Campbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 10167) for the relief of Andrew Castle, alias Andrew Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10168) granting an increase of pension to Nora Shepard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10169) granting a pension to Mary E. Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10170) granting a pension to Ann Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 10171) granting an increase of pension to Calvin N. Cary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 10172) granting a pension to Jacob Tull; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 10173) for the relief of Anna C. Parrett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 10174) granting a pension to Esther C. Vernell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10175) granting an increase of pension to Rodney W. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 10176) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Fields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEISTER: A bill (H. R. 10177) granting an increase of pension to George W. Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10178) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 10179) granting an increase of pension to Meredith Fletcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10180) for the relief of the heirs of Edmund C. Aiken; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 10181) granting a restoration of pension to Julia C. L. Hulbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 10182) for the relief of the officers of the Philippine Scouts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 10183) granting a pension to Georgianna L. Peabody; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 10184) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGEE: A bill (H. R. 10185) for the relief of Alfred E. Lewis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONDELL (by request): A bill (H. R. 10186) granting certain lands to the National Childrens' Aid Society, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 10187) granting an increase of pension to George W. Dawson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OAKEY: A bill (H. R. 10188) granting an increase of pension to Caroline W. Flagg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 10189) to reimburse certain lobstermen for destruction of lobster traps, and the estimated loss of each season's catch, by United States naval vessels off Block Island, R. I., during the naval maneuvers of 1912 and 1913; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 10190) granting a pension to Carl O. Nelson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 10191) granting a pension to Thaddeus M. Clarkson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 10192) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Daniel W. Light; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 10193) granting an increase of pension to Charles Flynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10194) granting an increase of pension to James Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 10195) granting an increase of pension to Merritt D. En Earl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 10196) for the relief of J. N. Lummus and C. L. Huddlestone; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 10197) for the relief of Nathaniel Monroe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 10198) granting a pension to Catherine Swesey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 10199) granting a pension to David K. Craft; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10200) granting an increase of pension to Phillip L. Melius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10201) for the relief of Samuel Snyder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS; A bill (H. R. 10202) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Sweet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10203) granting an increase of pension to Emily P. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 10204) granting an increase of pension to Isaac E. Hurff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STOUT: A bill (H. R. 10205) for the relief of John E. Woods; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10206) to allow credit in the accounts of Wyllys A. Hedges, special disbursing agent; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 10207) granting an increase of pension to Tennessee Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10208) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hottenstein; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOTT: A bill (H. R. 10209) granting a pension to John P. Yingling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10210) granting an increase of pension to William H. Chenoweth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10211) granting a pension to William Hinker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10212) granting a pension to Maria Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10213) granting a pension to Dora Hoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 10214) granting an increase of pension to Paulina Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10215) granting a pension to Thomas V. Graham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 10216) granting an increase of pension to George N. Shepherd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10217) granting an increase of pension to Otto Hauschildt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10218) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Colton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10219) granting an increase of pension to Julia M. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10220) for the relief of John C. Shay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 10221) granting a pension to Louisa Ishmael; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Rochester Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution, urging preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of E. T. Allan, of the Union Thread Co., and others, of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Ohio Millers' State Association, favoring legislation for growing grain and licensing of warehouses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Lady Garfield Council, Daughters of America, Mansfield, Ohio, favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of business men of Newry, Pa., favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNET: Papers to accompany bill for a pension for Elizabeth Raines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Bronx Co., New York City, favoring tariff on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Charles F. Winans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: Petition of Patchett Worsted Co., of Keyser, W. Va., in support of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Dunn Woolen Co., in support of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of American Association for Labor Legislation, favoring passage of House bill 476, workmen's compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Veterans' Relief Corps, favoring pensions for widows of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of J. A. P. Delanney, protesting against furloughing without pay certain employees in the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., in favor of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Arnold W. Brunner, of New York, against House bill 743; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Edin P. Gleason's Sons, of New York City, favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William D. Schmidt, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Cigarmakers Progressive International Union, No. 149, Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to convening a congress of neutral nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Consumers Chemical Corporation, relative to barges while in tow of steam vessels navigated by Government pilots; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of New York Board of Trade and Transportation, protesting against reduction of mail deliveries in New York City; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Central Labor Union of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 6871 relative to convict labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the public forum of the Church of the Ascension, New York; Louise Banks Lott, Brooklyn; and Henry Street Settlement, New York, favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Matmakers Union, Local 946, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 6871, relative to prison goods; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Petitions of sundry cities, towns, and villages of the third congressional district of Minnesota, favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Northfield (Minn.) Knitting Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DILLON: Petitions of citizens of Watertown, S. Dak., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Knights of Columbus, Woonsocket, S. Dak., favoring House bill 4699, to make October 12 of each year a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DYER: Memorial of members of John R. Tanner Camp, No. 7, Department of Columbia; Samuel M. Porter Camp, No. 45; Captain Charles Young Camp, No. 6; and Colonel William D. Beach Camp, No. 4, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring pensions for widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELSTON: Memorial of local Sons of the Revolution of California, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Claud Wright and 31 others, of Onalaska, Wis., favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of Brooklyn Branch International Wood Carvers' Association, favoring passage of House bill 4770, providing for labeling, etc., of goods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Consumers' Chemical Corporation of New York, relative to barges while in tow of steam vessels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Central Labor Union of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 6871, relative to convict labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of V. A. Prendon, relative to investigation by Congress of cooperative marketing system in Yucatan, Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of United Textile Workers of America, favoring passage of House bill 6871, relative to convict-labor goods; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of House bill 1462, for the relief of Perry Jarrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 8972, for the relief of David W. Corson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of Mazon, Ill., favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petitions of theater owners of Boston, Mass., relative to more equitable tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Federated Irish Societies of America, demanding even-handed neutrality by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENSLEY: Memorial of Missouri Cattle, Swine, and Sheep Feeders Association, favoring uniform system of accounting of all corporations doing an interstate business in the manufacturing, buying, and selling of feed products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of R. A. Shind Co., Harbeson Textile Co., and S. L. Hempstone Co., of New York, in favor of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: Memorial of Utah Federation of Women's Clubs, in favor of the Keating-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of S. I. Goodwin, of Salt Lake City, against Federal censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of Federation of Woman's Clubs of Salt Lake City, in favor of child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Memorial of National Association of Bureau of Animal Industry Employees, urging the passage of House bill 5792; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of St. Louis Cotton Exchange, protesting against section 11 of cotton-futures bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition of E. R. Butler, Russellville, Ark., protesting against Federal censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions of Le Bon Bleach and Dye Works and Dempsey Bleachery and Dye Works, of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KETTNER: Resolutions in support of efforts of Oil Industry Association, to secure relief by Federal legislation; California Development Board; and Colton Merchants' Association, of Colton; also telegram from Riverside Board of Supervisors; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolution of San Diego County Farm Bureau, in favor of national rural credits system and national marketing and information system; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of officers of Coast Artillery Corps, National Guard of California, for passage of militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of Traffic Club of Erie, relative to compensation for common carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McDERMOTT: Petition of Chicago Federation of Musicians, favoring the creation of a nonpartisan tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John O'Brian and E. O. Kowalski, of Chicago, Ill., protesting any increase of the tax on beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: Petition of Wilton Woolen Co., of Wilton, Me., in favor of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN: Papers accompanying House bill 8573, for relief of the estate of John C. Phillips; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Memorial of Stockton (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Major McKinley Council, No. 9, Pittsburgh, Pa.; and Sons and Daughters of Liberty, favoring passage of Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of attorney general, Harrisburg, Pa., relative to appointment of clerks of the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Hartje Paper Manufacturing Co., favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles M. Fairman, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Frederick W. Shaefer, Frank Davis, Nick Billinger, and others, of Philadelphia, favoring embargo on arms, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Delaware: Memorial of Pomona Grange, No. 1, Patrons of Husbandry, of Stanton, Del., relative to the spread of the foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NEELY: Papers filed in support of bill for the relief of George W. Dawson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Mr. A. Hohl, of Slaterville Springs, N. Y., favoring an embargo on further shipments of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of F. W. Ross, Thomas Wrigley, Carl N. Marshall, Robert H. Pearch, Joseph V. Foley, Robert N. Dixon, F. E. Kingsbury, Karl W. Fisher, Walter P. Ross, Edward L. Roe, Matthew O'Brien, Vincent Spraker, George V. Ganung, Harry J. Cooklin, Edward G. Wallace, Thomas Leary, C. E. Swayze, A. J. Mosher, J. E. Murphy, Joseph Raniewicz, Charles S. Miller, Joseph McInerney, Harry B. Hazen, John F. Malone, P. E. Dixon, Albert D. Miller, Harry Baltz, George B. Williams, R. J. Benedict, D. L. O'Neil, Thomas McCarthy, Jacob Golos, Henry Kane, Ed. Havens, Asher Golos, and Edward Gaus, all employees of the Elmira Herald, of Elmira, N. Y., in favor of adequate national protection as advocated by either President Wilson or the National Security League and other organizations, and also in favor of training in the public schools as an essential for military preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE: Petions of sundry citizens of Talbott County, Md., asking for appropriation for dredging and opening of the harbor at Black Walnut Point at mouth of Great Choptank River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of sundry citizens of Albany, N. Y., favoring passage of the Smith-Hughes bill for a Federal motion-picture commission; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of Charles Mount & Co., Mr. Crawford, Mr. Burke, and D. V. Perrine, of Freehold, N. J., favoring passage of the Stevens-Ayres bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions of Utica Steam and Mohawk Valley Cotton Mills and others, of Oneida Valley; Little Falls (N. Y.) Fiber Co.; New York Mills, and New York Bleachery, favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Pocono Hosiery Mills, of East Stroudsburg, Pa., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Westerly (R. I.) Textile Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of citizens of Hickory City, Pa., favoring amendment abolishing polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS: Memorial of Local No. 1862, United Mine Workers of America, against preparedness and conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Local No. 1862, United Mine Workers of America, favoring the printing of the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Dr. Max Mailhouse, president of the Connecticut State Medical Society, and others, for the expansion of the Medical Corps of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of Roosevelt Worsted Mills, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *January 27, 1916.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come reverently before Thee that we may give prayerful attention to the problems that confront us in our national life. We know that beyond the measure of our minds there are great issues that do not yield their answer to the intellect alone, but lie back in the region of divine revelation. We come to seek Thy grace that we may address ourselves to the tasks that pertain to the welfare of this Nation in the spirit of the Christ, with a spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice and of piety and of brotherly love. Guide us in the discharge of these sacred duties this day. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PROPOSED EMBARGO ON MUNITIONS OF WAR.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I present a petition, signed by 1,000,000 citizens of the United States, against the exportation from this country of munitions of war. The petition, now separated into a thousand parts, is in front of the Secretary's desk; and while the subject matter of the petition is not unusual, being a petition to Congress to place an embargo on the shipment of ammunition and war utensils, yet the size of the petition is something unusual, and I should like to take two or three moments, and two or three other Senators will take two or three moments, if there is no objection. Of course we realize that objection could be made, but we very earnestly hope it will not.

I ask that the heading of the petition may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The heading to the petition is as follows:

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN WOMEN FOR STRICT NEUTRALITY,
Baltimore, Md.

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned, citizens of the United States, men and women, unite in earnest protest, for humanitarian reasons, against the exportation from this country of "the things which kill" for the use of nations engaged in the present conflict. While this sale of arms may be legal, it is morally wrong, and an embargo on arms is certainly legal and morally right. We base our protest on international law and precedent, as follows: Woolsey International Law: "If the neutral, instead of wheat, should send powder or balls, cannon or rifles, this would be a direct encouragement of the war, and so a departure from the neutral position."

President Taft in 1912 issued a proclamation forbidding the export of arms and munitions to Mexico.

In 1913 President Wilson, continuing the policy of President Taft, said that an embargo on arms "follows the best practice of nations in the matter of neutrality."

On April 23, 1898, after the Spanish-American War had begun, the British Government placed an embargo on munitions of war. The British Government also has a law on its statute books conferring discretionary power on the King of England to forbid the export of arms and ammunition.

Germany did not permit her citizens to sell arms or munitions of war to Spain during our war with that nation.

Besides all this we have President Wilson's own declaration of neutrality: "We must be neutral in fact as well as in name, and we must put a curb on every transaction which might give a preference to one party in the struggle over another."

Your signature will help stop this war.

Mr. KENYON. This petition, Mr. President, is presented by a band of women who are denominated "Organization of American Women for Strict Neutrality." The petition is signed by over a million people, reaching into every State, in this Union, and if joined together in its various parts it would reach some 15½ miles.

There is no desire on the part of these women to irritate in any way the present conditions; to do any unpatriotic act or to in any way do anything sensational. The signers of this petition from every State in the Union are not pro-British or pro-German; they are pro-American, pro-humanity, and pro-Christianity; they are actuated only by the highest humanitarian motives.

The tremendous manufacture and shipment of things to kill people with is, however, prompted by no patriotic motive. It is not done merely because international law may permit it. It is a cold-blooded, money-making proposition for gain, profit, dividends. "Thou shalt not kill" is recognized as good morals as well as divine law, to which may well be added, "Thou shalt not assist others to kill."

Let us not deceive ourselves or hug to our bosom any delusion as to the prosperity coming to us from profits arising from helping to slaughter men, to widow women, and to orphan children. The jingle of the bloody dollar can not drown the sound of the groans and cries of misery arising from the battle fields of Europe. International law may permit it; moral law condemns it.

On October 4, 1914, the religious people of the United States, at the suggestion of the President, assembled and prayed for peace. Mr. President, to pray for peace on Sunday and to permit the balance of the week to be spent manufacturing and selling instrumentalities to prevent peace is rank hypocrisy.

The signers of this petition believe it is bad to continue these shipments, bad because it is inhuman, and this petition represents their dignified, solemn protest against the practice. Likewise it represents the toil, labor, heart throbs, and hopes of a noble band of women, who abhor war and pray that it may soon cease.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, at a later period I expect to speak at some length upon this subject. I merely wish to say at this time that I believe sooner or later the awakened conscience of our Christian Nation will sweep aside the sophistries that have been invoked to support the inconsistent and incongruous spectable of loading one ship with food and clothing for widows and orphans and loading another ship with the instrumentalities with which to make more widows and orphans.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] has presented this enormous petition, signed by over a million people of the United States, praying for prohibition on the exportation of arms and ammunition.

Mr. President, before I sit down I shall move that this great petition, instead of being referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which were referred the bills to prohibit the exportation of arms and ammunition introduced by the Senator from California and myself, shall be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

I shall do this for two reasons: First, I think the original reference was probably a mistake, for the reason that this is not a foreign affair. This is purely a domestic question.

I also do it, Mr. President, because yesterday and to-day I have received several telegrams which indicate a condition throughout the West which should attract the attention of the Committee on Commerce. I desire to read some of those telegrams for the enlightenment of the Senate. The first one is from Byron, Nebr., and is addressed to me, and reads as follows:

BYRON, NEBR., *January 25, 1916.*

Hon. GILBERT M. HITCHCOCK,
Washington, D. C.:

We are tied up here; can not move any grain car. Shortage situation desperate. Please work for an immediate embargo on shipments of war munitions, to remain in force until the accumulated grain is released.

BYRON FARMERS' ELEVATOR CO.,
By J. G. JAMES, *Manager.*

Another one is from Pleasanton, Nebr., also addressed to me, and reads as follows:

PLEASANTON, NEBR., *January 25, 1916.*

Hon. G. M. HITCHCOCK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Please work in Congress for an immediate embargo on shipment of war munitions, embargo to remain in force until the accumulated grain is unloaded and released at the seaports. Shortage of grain cars in this territory is becoming alarming and getting worse. The condition of corn demands immediate movement.

D. PHILLIPS.

Another is from Potter, Nebr., and reads as follows:

POTTER, NEBR., *January 25, 1916.*

Senator HITCHCOCK,
Washington, D. C.:

Car shortage is very serious—tied up. Can you work in Congress for an immediate embargo on munitions of war, embargo to remain in force until accumulated grain is released? Situation desperate with us.

FARMERS' GRAIN & MILLING CO.

Another is from Farwell, Nebr., and reads as follows:

FARWELL, NEBR., *January 26, 1916.*

Senator HITCHCOCK,
Washington, D. C.:

Can not get grain cars here to move our wheat and soft corn because of the preference given to munitions of war in eastern ports. Situation getting worse daily. Kindly take up with Congress for embargo on munitions of war until we can get accumulated grain released.

FARMERS' COOPERATIVE GRAIN & SUPPLY CO.,
Per JOHN HOFSETH, *Manager.*

Mr. President, I call these to the attention of the Senate, and particularly to the attention of the Committee on Commerce, because they present a new issue. This manufacture of deadly arms and ammunition has become of such absorbing and controlling interest in the East as to require new factories for the manufacture of these munitions and the enlargement of the old factories upon such scale that the industry is becoming the chief business in the eastern part of the United States to-day; and the arms and ammunition being thus manufactured for their deadly work in Europe absorb the cargo space of our ocean-going vessels that ought to be given to the legitimate business of the United States.

If the appeals to the sentiment of the country, to the moral sense of the country, to the religious sense of the country, are not sufficient in this body to arouse a responding action, if they are not sufficient in this body to command the attention of Senators, perhaps they will listen to the cry that is coming up from the West, where legitimate business is being paralyzed by the absorption of the ocean-carrying vessels of the country in this damnable trade in arms and ammunition.

Shall this country be converted into a great arsenal and shall our legitimate business be paralyzed in the West in order that millionaires may be made in the East, that munition stock may be doubled and trebled and quadrupled in value by men who are bringing upon this country a heritage of hate abroad, by men who are bringing on this country a sense of contempt abroad even by the nations that are benefited by this trade? It is now fashionable in those nations to proclaim that the Yankees, as long as they are making money out of this damnable commerce, will submit to any interference with their neutral rights.

Mr. President, I say this is not a matter of foreign affairs for the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is a matter of domestic concern, not only because of the legitimate interests which are imperiled but it is a matter of domestic concern because it is no business of any country in Europe, of any belligerent in Europe, whether we place an embargo upon the exportation of arms and ammunition or whether we do not. We can be neutral and permit this outrageous trade under international law, there is no doubt of that, but we can also be neutral and prohibit it.

No country has a right to demand that we prohibit it. No country has that right, neither has any country the right to deny to us the privilege of prohibiting it. It is purely a domestic question, and it is an American question, Mr. President, which involves not only our legitimate business interests, which involves not only our moral conscience and our religious sense, but it is a domestic question because it involves the integrity and solidarity of our population. Shall we permit this damnable trade to go on and breed hate at home among the great foreign-born population that is in our midst? Shall we permit this trade to go on and to continue to stimulate this feeling of hate not only abroad but at home among the millions of citizens who are a part of us? Whether those citizens are English born or Swedish born or Danish born or Irish born or German born or Bohemian born or Polish born, it is not within the limits of human nature for them to behold the great resources of our country dedicated to the manufacture of deadly weapons to be sent abroad to kill their relatives in the Old World without being filled with indignation and hate. When they see that these great banking and industrial resources of America are used for that purpose, it is natural for them to resent it, and thus breed in this country a dangerous race hatred. If it continues long, it will tend to produce in our population a disintegration into the races which ought to be amalgamated into the great new American race.

So, Mr. President, I say that this is a domestic or American question, one involving our welfare, involving the solidarity of our people, and I hope it will be considered without regard to its effect on Europe.

I am a neutral, Mr. President. I do not want to see either side in this war crush the other side. I am against having either of them victorious. I am for America.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator whether perhaps the situation as to the movement of grain might not be entirely relieved if favorable action were taken on this petition at present, the circumstances being that two-thirds at least of our shipping is controlled to-day by foreign nations. We have less than 2,000,000 tons under the American flag. The rest of the tonnage necessary to move the commerce between the United States and foreign countries is entirely controlled by those countries. So it is a question of very serious moment in connection with the movement of corn and other grain as to whether or not we are ever going to provide for an American merchant marine which can move our commerce to foreign ports.

Mr. STONE and Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to enter into this discussion. I do not think it a proper time for that. I was advised by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] that he wished to address the Senate for two or three minutes in presenting these petitions, and that one or two other Senators would like to occupy about the same length of time; but the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] has made an extended speech on the general subject of embargo, and the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] followed with a speech relating to the shipping bill. Heaven only knows where or to what length this discussion will run if it continues without interruption.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. STONE. I hope the discussion will not be further persisted in, and I make the point of order that debate is not in order on a mere question of referring a petition. I ask whether the Chair thinks such a question is debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that the motion of the Senator from Nebraska is in order and is debatable.

Mr. STONE. Then in that view the debate can proceed on that motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has been examining the rules, and does not find that this is one of the questions that are to be settled without debate, it being a question for the Senate to determine whether these petitions should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which the Chair would have felt compelled to send them if there had been no question raised; but it is the right of the Senator from Nebraska to move to send them to any other committee, and that question is debatable.

Mr. STONE. Undoubtedly the Chair would have referred the petitions to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as the bills to which they relate have already been referred to that committee. It would be an odd proceeding to send a bill to one committee to-day and on to-morrow send petitions relating to the bill to a different committee. Either the whole matter should remain with the Committee on Foreign Relations or the Committee on Foreign Relations should be discharged from the consideration of the subject and the whole matter be referred to another committee.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri permit me to interrupt him for a minute?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. I wish to call the attention of the Chair to section 5 of Rule VII.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

Mr. SWANSON. I understand this is simply a question as to the reference of a petition, and I understand that under section 5 of Rule VII all petitions shall be presented and referred without debate. This is not a motion to refer a bill. The rule directs how petitions shall be received and referred; it seems to me it states clearly that petitions shall be received and referred without debate.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SWANSON. I will read what the rule says, if the Chair desires me to do so. It provides:

> 5. Every petition or memorial shall be signed by the petitioner or memorialist and have indorsed thereon a brief statement of its contents, and shall be presented and referred without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Virginia will read section 4 of Rule VII he will observe this language:

> 4. Every petition or memorial shall be referred, without putting the question, unless objection to such reference is made; in which case all motions for the reception or reference of such petition, memorial, or other paper shall be put in the order in which the same shall be made, and shall not be open to amendment, except to add instructions.

The rules sometimes seemingly conflict.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Chair will permit me to make a suggestion, that means that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] can not move to amend the motion for reference by inserting the Committee on Foreign Relations for the Committee on Commerce, but the question of debate is settled definitely by section 5, which says such papers shall be "referred without debate."

I do not see any conflict, if the Chair will permit me, between the two sections. The rule simply says that the motions shall be put in the order in which they are made. The Senator from Nebraska first made the motion, and that takes precedence of any motion for reference to another committee, and can not be amended by motion to refer to another committee; but section 5 distinctly states that petitions shall be presented and referred without debate. It seems that section 4 simply provides the order in which those different motions for reference must be made, voted on, and determined.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is quite likely to be wrong, but the Chair is clearly of the opinion that this is what all the rules of the Senate mean when construed together, that it is not proper to discuss a petition or memorial presented to the Senate of the United States; and the Chair assumes that that is the reason why the Senator from Iowa spoke to the Senator from Missouri about the matter, in order that there should be no objection to the discussion on the memorials or petitions which have been presented. The Chair has no doubt at all that under the ordinary procedure of the Senate of the United States petitions and memorials are not to be discussed, but are to be referred without debate; when, however, any Senator takes issue with the Chair, or, without taking issue with the Chair, desires a petition or memorial to be referred to a certain committee, then the Chair believes that the Senator has a right to move to refer it to a certain committee, and that that question is debatable—not the merits of the petition but the question as to where the petition shall go—but, of course, from that decision of the Chair the Senator has the privilege of appeal.

Mr. STONE. I should like the Chair to submit that question to the Senate.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I did not hear the last part of the rule which the Chair read. Was it to the effect that the motion to refer to a committee was not amendable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I could not hear the rule as read by the Chair, but that was the impression I got as the Chair read the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This rule provides:

> Every petition or memorial shall be referred, without putting the question—

And without debate, as the Chair understands, under section 5 of the rule—

> unless objection to such reference is made, in which case all motions for the reception or reference of such petition, memorial, or other paper shall be put in the order in which the same shall be made, and shall not be open to amendment, except to add instructions.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Now, then, my parliamentary inquiry is, Is not the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to send these petitions to the Committee on Commerce amendable by moving to send them to some other committee, and would not the amendment be debatable, as well as the original motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment.

Mr. STONE. I should like to say while the Chair——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. In other words, what is in my mind is this: If a Senator introduces a petition and moves its reference to a particular committee, if it is not within the power of the Senate to amend the motion by substituting some other committee, then the only method of procedure open to the Senate is to vote that motion down if they disagree to the reference and then move to send it to another committee. I think the custom is—I have repeatedly seen it done—that a Senator moves to substitute another committee than the one suggested by the Senator who makes the motion.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I make an appeal to the Senator from Missouri? We would have been through with this matter by this time if it had not been for this interruption. Will not the Senator wait and let the few speeches that are to be made be concluded? They will all be very brief, and will not take, I think, more than 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. STONE. That was the assurance the Senator gave me in the first instance.

Mr. KENYON. And that assurance was carried out.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] was not very brief, and the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] did not discuss this subject at all. Can the Senator assure me that there is no Senator here present who will occupy more than one or two minutes and that the discussion will be confined to this petition? Of course, the Senator can not do that.

Mr. KENYON. That would be a preposterous thing to assume about the Senate.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. If the Senator from Missouri will yield to me for a moment, I will say that I do not desire to take the time or to interfere with the business of the Senate; but I feel that this is a subject of the greatest importance to the American people, and I should like to express my feelings in a very few words, with the permission of the Senate.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the Senator knows I would yield to any request of his as quickly as to that of anyone, but I desire to have this matter ended now, if it can be ended. I object to any implied, much less express, unanimous consent. No express unanimous consent was asked and none given.

Mr. President, speaking to the point of order, if the ruling of the Chair is correct, it would leave the Senate in a somewhat helpless condition. Any Senator wishing to delay the proceedings of the Senate could offer a petition and a motion then be made to refer it; and if the matter is then open to debate, every Senator here would have the right to debate it.

Mr. OVERMAN. And take up the morning hour.

Mr. STONE. Not only one morning hour, but the morning hours for a week or a month in debating the motion to refer. If that is the rule, it ought not to be; and, with a view to testing the sense of the Senate, I think I will appeal from the ruling of the Chair, unless the Chair will voluntarily submit the question to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I think, under the ruling of the Chair, it is a debatable motion, and an appeal from the decision of the Chair on a debatable proposition is itself subject to debate. I would not care to occupy much of the time of the Senate; but I think the Chair is right.

Of course, many of our rules may be condemned by pointing out the fact that they are susceptible of abuse when any considerable group of Senators see proper to practice that form of abuse known as unlimited debate. That particular question has been repeatedly considered by the Senate, and after a hundred years of resistance the other side of it has appeared to be the stronger.

I think the whole purpose of our proceedings here is to afford a clear opportunity to put the Senate in possession of the reasons why a certain thing should be done or the reasons why it should not be done. There may be exceptional reasons in this case. Ordinarily matters of this kind can be disposed of by the Chair. In nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of a thousand they are disposed of by the Chair and by the clerks at the desk. It occasionally comes about that there is a necessity for saying something about a particular proposition; but I think the common sense and fairness of the Senate can be relied upon to put a necessary limitation on the occasion. I therefore think that the ruling announced by the Chair is founded on the reason of the case and harmonizes perfectly with the general scope of proceedings here.

Now, take this particular case. Ordinarily it would be a matter of indifference as to what particular committee a number of petitions on any subject should go. It is almost the constant practice here to pay no particular attention to petitions, but this particular case takes a significance at this time that it would not take at another time. I believe that there should have been an embargo laid upon the export of arms. I believe this country, in its greatness, should have set the world the example of refusing to be a party, directly or indirectly, for commercial or any other reasons, to the slaughter of human beings that is going on in the Old World. I believe that the enlightened conscience of the age would have justified it, and that such action would have added one more reason why this should be regarded as the greatest Government that ever was instituted among men. I do not believe that we did our duty when we fell in behind the ancient precedents, made at a time when slaughter was the rule; that we did not concrete into our action the enlightened spirit of the Christian humanity that exists to-day, and which we preach theoretically but which we fail to enforce practically.

Many insist that to do so now would be a breach of neutrality; the question loses its character of one where the proposition is to lay an embargo or not, and the question of neutrality is injected into it. Nations have been forced to rely upon it; they say they have; and they have built their foreign policies and other relations to us on the theory of our past practice, and now to undertake to stop it as a mere commercial question at home would not meet the question in its ultimate boundaries.

I think the petition should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It has now become a vital question of international policy. It may be too late to take definite action such as we ought to take—if it is ever too late to do right—and it may not be; but in the confidence of that committee, in my opinion, would be the best place to consider it in its present aspect, and I think those of us who feel that way about it ought to have an opportunity to say that.

The Committee on Commerce is a strictly commercial committee. It deals with the commercial aspect of the shipping question, most particularly with reference to that part of the shipping function that takes place on the waters. There is another committee of the Senate that deals with it in the aspect which relates to the railroads, but now time and circumstances, past practices, contentions upon the one hand, and denials upon the other, have made another question out of it. It is a matter, in my opinion, peculiarly fit for decision by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I feel very much in sympathy with the suggestions advanced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. I feel that this is a peculiar and remarkable situation; and for myself I want to take this opportunity to express my feelings a little on this subject, and I feel very deeply about it.

My father came from France; my good mother came from Germany; so you may wonder what my sympathies may be in this hellish war and controversy in Europe. I will say that my heart bleeds for Europe and its people. Do you ask me my sympathies? My sympathies are with humanity, wherever they may be found and wherever they may go.

I care not whom this matter of embargo may benefit. That is a question as foreign to me as the pole. The question with me is as to the justice, the humanitarian side, and the right of the proposition. I will not aid my brother in the slaughter of his fellow man. The business side of the proposition that has been advanced here has no appeal to me. Money is valuable, but, great God, better and above all that is the love for humanity!

I feel, Mr. President, that a greater danger will come to this blessed land from the money changers in our land than from any force of arms that can be arrayed against it. I am thankful, indeed, that the petition has been brought in here, and I trust that it may be potent with the governing power of this country toward staying the shipment of arms to further bring blood and sorrow to the soil of Europe.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I do not always agree with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]; but he has spoken eminently to my satisfaction this morning.

It might be proper for me to recall that in the Sixty-third Congress, during the third session thereof, the distinguished Senator who contributes such credit to this Chamber and such usefulness to his own State, Mr. HITCHCOCK, introduced to an appropriation bill an amendment laying an embargo upon the shipment of arms to the belligerents of Europe.

I took pleasure in voting for his amendment; and I embrace this opportunity to express my belief that the 1,000,000 signatures of persons who have seen fit to exercise their constitutional prerogative and send their petition here could be multiplied fifty or sixty times, because of the feeling throughout the Nation that we are not guiltless before the moral law when for mere "profits" we send arms to the belligerents that they may grind up more human flesh to be buried nameless in a trench. We can not simply stand off, point to the width of our phylacteries, and say we are wholly guiltless while we take blood-money profits from the warring powers.

Mr. President, I am not so simple as to pretend that I believe it is contrary to international law to send arms and munitions to the warring powers. Of course, it is according to international law to ship arms to warring nations. It is also according to the "profits." We have heard of "the law and the prophets." It is the "profits," however, rather than "law" that move these munition makers to reap and glean in such a doubtful field.

The Senator spoke of "Yankees." What is the sentiment of the Yankees on this subject? When guns made by foreign

powers were aimed at their breasts, their statesmen, warriors, poets, orators, writers, and lecturers objected to the shipment of arms to their antagonists; and that great writer in a little couplet—I believe it will be found in the Bigelow Papers—said:

You wonder why we're hot, John?
Your mark was on the guns—
On the guns that shot, John,
Our brothers and our sons.

So, Mr. President, if there be to-day one influence in our country more baleful than another it is that the continued shipment of arms and ammunition to the warring nations is causing the suggestion that the United States is a country seeking only profit and not seeking wholly to do justice to humanity.

When the eternal verities of the world are finally presented and the living thunders of eternal truth clear the atmosphere, it ought to be the destiny of our advanced, our American, civilization to take an exalted position in the tribunal which will compose these world-wide differences. What will be our position when the day of reckoning comes? When the immortal roll of the nations of the earth is called to make up a peace tribunal, what nation is there more able, more worthy than the United States to take its place and stand at the head of the supreme court of arbiters which will settle that unhappy conflict which is dislocating all the currents of the world? How compromising will be our position in that great tribunal if our hands be even indirectly stained with human blood. Will it not be inferred that we are biased or prejudiced when it is remembered that we encouraged the warring powers by the shipment to them of arms and ammunition? Our country should be the nation set upon a hill whose light should shine and encourage all. It should be the one nation above all ready to set an example to the others, and when peace finally comes our Nation should enter the great Sanhedrim of nations—the great Sanhedrim of the world—stainless and pure, able truthfully to look all the other nations in face and say, "We have not contributed in any way to the perpetuation or the prolongation of your gigantic strife." Let us enter that great court with clean hands. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] says, sotto voce, "shake not thy gory locks at me."

Let us hope, Mr. President, when the day of reckoning comes we can truthfully say to the other powers:

Thou canst not say I did it; never shake
Thy gory locks at me.

Hard feelings, resentments, and enmities which I fear will endure longer than the life of any person in this Chamber, including the pages who serve us here, are being created, and will smolder from this traffic in arms and munitions carried on at this time. These shipments of arms and ammunition, owing to the great profits which are arising from them, breed the war spirit in our country, and are causing many honest people to believe that we should turn our country into an armed military camp.

The baleful influence of this traffic of such doubtful propriety does not stop there, however. For more than 20 years the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] has labored to secure the erection of a factory for the purpose of permitting the Government to manufacture its own armor plate, its own munitions, arms, and its own powder, in order that the extortionate profits taken by the manufacturers may be somewhat curtailed. But with all his eminence as a statesman, with his continual work of 20 years he has made little progress. And to-day I doubt very much if he will be able to bring in a bill providing for the construction of a Government-owned armor-plate factory and a factory for making our own arms and munitions.

What has caused this country for 20 years to be deprived of an armor-plate factory and a factory for the manufacture of its own munitions? Profits, not law; profits in order that certain men may reach out and gather in not only 50 per cent but 500 per cent.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to address myself to the rule. Of course I always dislike to differ with the Chair.

The rules fix a morning hour. What is the morning hour for? The introduction of petitions; to allow the committees to make reports; to allow concurrent and joint resolutions to be introduced. And you see all through this rule, Rule VII, that debate is prohibited.

Now, a large part of the morning hour has been taken up with debate on this matter. I am making no objection to the merits of what has been done this morning; but as to the rule, it seems to me that if the Chair is right any Senator or a small number of Senators can absolutely take up the morning hour, and deprive us of introducing our petitions, our bills, and our reports of committees.

Reading along in this rule, it says:

Until the morning business shall have been concluded, and so announced from the Chair, or until the hour of 1 o'clock has arrived, no motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the calendar shall be entertained.

And so, Mr. President, in every section there is a limitation upon motions or a limitation upon debate; showing that the Senate intended, when it made this rule, that there should be an hour during which Senators could present the reports of committees and introduce their bills.

Therefore, while I hate to differ with the Chair, I think the Chair is wrong.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, with what has been said by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] I am in sympathy. Nevertheless, I believe that if this subject is to be discussed now it should be pointed out that heretofore the United States never has adopted the policy of manufacturing for itself a sufficient supply of munitions of war to provide it in case this Government should become engaged in conflict.

During all the wars in which we have been engaged the United States has been compelled to purchase abroad much of the munitions which we have used in war. While it is true that as a result of the increase in this trade we are now manufacturing in the United States greater quantities of munitions than ever before in the history of the country, it is also true that at this time we are not equipped with sufficient machinery and factories to supply the demands of the United States in case she should become involved in war.

I hope, sir, that the day will never dawn when this country will be called upon to enter into another serious conflict. I belong to that class of citizens who believe that the time is approaching when men will find some means of settling their disputes, however bitter they may be, without resorting to war; and yet I realize that force is still the most powerful factor in the arbitrament of the important questions that arise before the peoples of the world. The time has not yet come when we can expect to continue at peace without the possibility, at least, of becoming engaged in war.

I merely want to suggest to the Senate that in considering the matter of placing an embargo on arms and munitions of war we should bear in mind the necessities of the United States itself, and not too quickly commit this Government to a policy which would deny her the means of self-defense in case we should become involved in a war with a foreign power. For if we assert as a doctrine of humanity, or as a doctrine of international law, that a neutral nation can not sell arms to a belligerent, then we must expect to have that doctrine invoked and applied against us in case we should find ourselves compelled to combat an aggressive enemy. Of course embargoes for retaliatory purposes rest upon a different basis. I do not discuss that now, but merely suggest that the safety of the United States may be involved in the question under present conditions and while we have no provision for manufacturing adequate munitions to meet the requirements of this Government in case of war.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I am in very hearty sympathy with the objects and purposes of the good women of the country who have brought this petition before the Senate.

From the very beginning I have been opposed to the exportation of arms and munitions of war. Early in the last session of Congress I introduced a bill to place an embargo upon the trade, not in the interest of any foreign nation but in the interest of our own country. I believe the trade to be immoral and demoralizing to the people of the United States. I believe that most of the complications that have grown up between this and foreign nations now at war have been the result of the trade in munitions of war. I believe that if it had not been for the fact that we were dealing in that nefarious trade the people upon the *Lusitania* would not have lost their lives.

We have, in effect, made our country a party to the war across the ocean. It is our ammunition, our shot and shell, that are taking the lives of the citizens and subjects of friendly nations in Europe. We can not justify ourselves in that position or in that trade by saying that it is allowed by the laws of neutrality. There is something higher that should control the people of the United States than the mere strict law of neutrality. The law of neutrality at most only permits the exportation of arms and places no obligation upon us to do so.

My convictions upon this subject were intensified when circumstances so came about that we could furnish arms only to one set of the belligerent nations as against the other. Then to my mind the trade ceased to be neutral; it ceased to be

justified even by the permission of the laws of neutrality. But I have tried to put the question upon higher grounds than that. I insist that the trade is immoral; it is participating in the war across the ocean, and for that reason it ought to be stopped. Therefore, I am saying these few words in support of the petition that is now presented to the Senate.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I am now and at all times have been opposed to the exportation of munitions of war to the citizens of one country with which we are at peace to kill the citizens of another country with which we are at peace. I fear that sooner or later we, as a nation, will have to answer for it; that it will create deep-seated resentment and perhaps a hatred of us by the people of other nations—good people—who will find it hard to forgive us for the death of their brothers, their cousins, and their fathers and their sons who have been killed by missiles made in this country, propelled by powder made in this country. I have felt that no good—or, rather, nothing but harm—could come from it; that we had better do without the money which we make in that way. I would be willing to vote for an appropriation to ship to those who have suffered from the results of the war in Europe shiploads of baby shoes, of condensed and prepared milk upon which to feed the starving infants and clothing for the women who are suffering from want, and to convoy them with battleships, if necessary, to see that they reach their destination.

I believe that infinite harm will result in this country, in our own affairs, from the hatred that has been bred among our own people, which will last for generations. I have regretted, and I am sorry, that many people in business in this country have felt differently, and have felt that they were justified in entering in that kind of a trade. I am neutral as between the nations. If we could have kept entirely out of it, it would have been one of the greatest blessings not only for them but for us.

I am in sympathy with the petitioners, and I could not let the occasion pass without saying so.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long upon the direct issue before the Senate, which is the ruling of the Vice President.

The Vice President has held that a motion to refer a petition is debatable. I think that rule would be very disastrous to the business of the morning hour. I think it would be ruinous to have that rule adopted as a rule of the Senate. It seems to me that it is so plainly against the clear, specific provisions of Rule VII that I want to call the attention of the Senate to Rule VII, section 5.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia permit me to call his attention to a ruling made by the Chair on the 28th of March, 1914, in connection with the subject he is now discussing? It will save the trouble of bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate at a later time.

Mr. SWANSON. I will.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. On page 95 of the Precedents this appears:

> The VICE PRESIDENT. In this connection the Chair desires to make a statement. The Chair was in error in ruling that the question of the reference of a bill to a committee is not debatable. The Chair was under the impression that the question was one of those questions which, under Rule XXII, are not debatable; but the Chair finds that the question is debatable. Therefore the ruling of the Chair heretofore made in reference to the matter will not stand as a precedent.

The ruling made by the Chair this morning is in exact accord with that ruling.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, there is this difference. There is no motion here of a resolution or bill for reference. No resolution is on the table; none has been introduced. The specific question is whether petitions when presented, not a bill or a resolution, are debatable.

Mr. KENYON. That is not the question at all. The question is on a motion to refer.

Mr. SWANSON. Here are petitions presented. There is no resolution, no bill. A motion is made to refer those petitions. That is the issue. The question is whether a motion to refer a petition is debatable.

I will read section 5 of Rule VII, and I should like to hear the Senator from Arkansas explain it away. This is not a motion to refer a resolution or a bill. Here is the rule of the Senate governing petitions:

> Every petition or memorial shall be signed by the petitioner or memorialist and have indorsed thereon a brief statement of its contents, and shall be presented and referred without debate.

Mr. KENYON. We are not debating the petition but the motion.

Mr. SWANSON. The rule says that a petition shall be referred without debate. You are attempting to reverse the rule that it shall be referred without debate.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, if there were no motion pending.

Mr. SWANSON. It is laid down in the compilation here—

> The presentation of petitions and memorials shall be determined without debate.

The Senator was correct in reference to a motion made to refer a resolution or a bill, but that is not the issue. The issue is when a petition is presented here in the morning hour, and a motion is made to refer it, whether we shall continuously debate it. Section 5 of Rule VII says that petitions shall be referred without debate. That is all we have asked in this case.

Before I conclude my remarks I wish to say a few words about the reference of the petition. Bills have gone to the Committee on Foreign Relations which appertain to the petition. Bills have heretofore been introduced covering this question, and they have been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The question involved more than all else is whether the shipment is an act of neutrality, whether it is good faith with all the belligerents in this great war, and the Committee on Foreign Relations is to determine that question. It is to determine the effect of it. It is to determine whether it will embroil us in war or not. The Committee on Foreign Relations is empowered to consider our intricate foreign relations, and that is the proper committee to dispose of this petition.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I understand the question to be submitted to the Senate is whether or not this question is open to debate. Am I correct about that?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to refer the petitions to the Committee on Commerce is a debatable question. Upon that an appeal has been taken, and the pending question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I think the ruling of the Chair is correct. I do not think this question presents a mere matter of reference of a petition which under the rule is to be disposed of without debate. We have gotten beyond that. The Senator from Nebraska has moved that the petitions be referred to a particular committee, and that question, it seems to me, very clearly is open to debate. Passing that, however, and coming to the question of the disposition of the motion, it seems to me very clearly that the petitions ought not to go to the Committee on Commerce, but that they should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To what subject are these petitions directed? To the subject of an embargo. They ask the Congress of the United States to pass a law placing an embargo upon the shipment of certain goods to foreign countries. The proposed legislation, therefore, to which the petitions are directed clearly would be a class of legislation which would go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The subject matter of an embargo comes under the general principles of international law. The Committee on Foreign Relations is constituted for the express purpose of dealing with such questions, and I am at a loss to understand upon what theory the proposed legislation itself should go to one committee and petitions requesting that that specific legislation shall be passed should go to an entirely different committee.

Obviously the petitions belong to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

But, independently of the rule and in support of the policy of the rule, it is peculiarly appropriate that these petitions should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, because in the last analysis they deal with an exceedingly delicate question of our foreign relations, namely, the question of our neutrality. If Europe was not at war, if peace prevailed throughout the world, we might pass an act prohibiting for the future the transportation of munitions of war from our country to any other country without affecting the question of neutrality at all. But that is not the situation. A condition of war prevails in Europe. It is idle for us to pretend that the act of Congress with reference to this question will not have a very profound effect upon the warring nations in Europe.

I undertake to say if we should pass a law here prohibiting the shipment of munitions abroad it would be a very great aid to and very greatly strengthen the hands of one of the contending parties in the war.

In that state of the case it is proper that we should consider the question as to whether we would not, by complying with these petitions, be committing an unneutral act; and, that being so, it is clearly a question the Committee on Foreign Relations should consider and determine.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I realize the importance of the subject of these petitions. I understand the serious interest which all of the people feel, and I do not desire that

sympathy or impulsive sentiments should betray me into supporting a measure that mature judgment might find to be detrimental to our country. Yet, Mr. President, I can not see how the United States can in good conscience take any other position than the one proposed by the petitioners and so strongly advocated by the senior Senator from Nebraska. We have taken the position of neutrality; at least, we have attempted to take it. We have professed it from the beginning, and yet one of the belligerents to whom the great supply of arms is shipped has repeatedly changed and in some cases annulled the international law, since the war opened, as to our neutral rights. Those changes have been detrimental to the commerce of the United States, and our repeated polite and diction-perfect diplomatic protests have been ignored.

Therefore it seems to me that we could not be embarrassed, as suggested by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], if at this time we take action which certainly we had a right to do at the beginning of the war and which has been postponed too long already.

I voted at the first and only opportunity I have had to accomplish that end. I do not believe the status of international relations has been so changed as to preclude us now from doing the thing which I think most disinterested Americans would have recognized as the right thing to have done at the beginning.

Mr. President, I think it is generally believed that the United States has not been impartially neutral in reference to the European war. I think we are regarded at home and abroad as one of the allies, and all through the shipment of arms and munitions of war to them, while permitting, with only weak protest, the violation of American rights by Great Britain in a manner greatly detrimental to both the United States and the central powers.

I express no favorites among the belligerents. I have none. I am absolutely neutral in this respect. Our country should have none. That it does have I have no doubt. That it can not be truly neutral so long as it permits the shipment of war supplies to one of the belligerents which denies us the right to ship food material to another belligerent with which we are at peace is equally certain. I am in sympathy with these petitioners and with the million others who have not thus spoken to the Senate. I trust their prayer will not fall on deaf committee ears. I believe, however, that its proper reference is to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The subject matter to which these petitions refer is there. It is being considered, or at least should be considered, by that committee. I hope that committee will consider it and present it to the Senate for action at an early date. It is right to the Senate that this should be done. There should be a full and free discussion, and such can only be obtained through a committee report submitted to the Senate.

It seems to me that a reference to the Commerce Committee, where nothing pertinent to the subject is pending, would be wrong. The Committee on Foreign Relations has complete jurisdiction of the subject, and it should receive the request which a million people of the United States have asked of Congress. I am not suggesting precipitate action, but I am insisting that serious consideration be given to this all-important matter, to the end that the United States Congress take steps as American rights and duties require.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the petition itself. I will state, however, that my sympathies have been that the Government of the United States being the great neutral country of the world should have undertaken, in the first place, to prohibit the exportation of munitions of war to belligerent countries. I was in favor of the embargo that was placed upon the exportation of munitions of war into Mexico by President Taft. I deplored the lifting by President Wilson of that embargo, as I told the President in person. The question of a prohibition at this late date will meet difficulties that would not have been met if a prohibition had been imposed at the beginning of the war, and might perhaps be very embarrassing for our country to enforce.

But, Mr. President, I rose to say a few words about the ruling of the Chair, because I fully agree with all that has been said by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. I am not going over the ground again, but I want to call attention to the ruling of the present occupant of the chair. Under the head of morning business, page 173 of the Precedents, on June 21, 1913:

> During the morning hour, Mr. NORRIS moved to refer a communication from the Attorney General to the Committee on the Judiciary.
>
> Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas objected to debate.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The VICE PRESIDENT (Mr. Marshall). The Chair holds that during the morning hour the motion is not debatable. The Chair will state for the information of the Senator from Nebraska that the Chair rules that the communication from the Attorney General can lie on the table, and the Senator from Nebraska can call it up at the proper time and proceed to discuss it.
>
> Mr. NORRIS. In order to get the parliamentary situation settled for future reference, when it may be desirable to enforce this rule, if it is to be established, I want to inquire in the best of faith if a motion to refer a communication to a committee after the morning hour is debatable?
>
> The VICE PRESIDENT. It is. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 2117, 2118.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has broadened his knowledge since then.

Mr. SMOOT. I think, Mr. President, the ruling of the Chair at that time was perfectly right. I am jealous of preserving the rights of the Senate in attending to its necessary business during the morning hour. If the present ruling stands, any morning can be consumed by a Senator moving to refer a petition that he is not interested in in the least and cares nothing about; and the whole of the morning hour could be taken up in the discussion of that motion.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I appeal to the Senate now to express itself upon this subject, knowing full well what it means for the future conduct of the business of this body.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I have no intention now, as I stated when on the floor a short time since, to debate the merits of the question of placing an embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions of war or anything to any foreign country. I have some opinions upon that question, but I have not thought that this was the proper time or occasion for a debate upon the subject. There is nothing before the Senate of an affirmative character. The proposed legislation itself has been introduced and referred.

I was apprehensive when the Senator from Iowa suggested in presenting these petitions that there were two or three Senators who desired to speak for two or three minutes each. I did not object. There were petitions presented, signed, as I have been informed, by a very large number of American citizens, mostly women, I understand, but no doubt by a number of men also, relating to a subject of great public interest. I did not feel disposed under the circumstances to object to a brief discussion, although the time for discussion did not, as I thought, seem opportune just now. I feared then that what so often happens when we are promised that only a few moments will be occupied in doing something out of the rules, and the doing of which requires unanimous consent, expressed or implied, might result in the consumption of a large part of the morning hour, if not the whole of it. Instead of taking 6 or 8 minutes or 10 minutes, it has taken an hour and a half. The morning business has lost its place.

Mr. President, I pass from that subject now and will say just a word on the appeal I have taken from the ruling of the Chair. Undoubtedly—I think I can say undoubtedly—the purpose and policy of the rules when they were adopted and as they have been administered were to preserve the morning hour to the uses to which it was to be devoted. To say that a petition, which under the rule in express terms must be referred without debate, may be made a debatable question by a mere motion to refer is in effect an evasion of the rule. As the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] suggests to me, it is not only an evasion, but a nullification of the rule.

Of course, the Chair understands without assurance that in asking, as I do by the appeal, to have the Senate itself pass on this question, it is done only in a kindly spirit, so far as the Chair is concerned, but I regard it as a matter of such far-reaching importance that we ought to be very careful about adopting that ruling, for we should thereby establish a precedent that would come home, Senators, all through the future years to plague the Senate, unless the rules themselves should be changed.

Mr. President, it endangers the business of the Senate—important business transacted in the morning hour—and I think it ought not to be done. A practice of that kind would be violative of the spirit, and I think also of the language, of the rule.

Therefore I have appealed, so as to get the judgment of the Senate upon it, whether or not the reference of a petition is debatable, and, coupling them as one question, whether a motion then made to refer is debatable.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming and Mr. BORAH addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I have great respect for the rules of the Senate; I have a great desire to see the Senate's business conducted in accordance with those rules; I have great respect for the morning hour; but I think that there are things for which the ordinary business of the morning hour—

introducing bridge bills or public-building bills and things of that sort—may well be laid aside in the consideration of the greater questions that confront us.

I believe that the Chair is absolutely correct in his ruling that a motion to refer a petition, even though it be made in the morning hour, is debatable, and I think that is true, particularly upon an occasion of this sort, when it is a public question of the most momentous importance, as the Senator says. When are we to discuss these public questions of great importance? Has there one come before the Senate?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me——

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. If the Senator will pardon me just a moment, I shall not speak more than a minute, and the Senator does not want to waste too much time——

Mr. STONE. I want to ask the Senator a question; that is all. I ask the Senator if he does not remember that a number of speeches have been already made before the Senate, and at great length, on this very subject of an embargo?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, the Senator pointed to the clock a moment ago. I desire to say that more time has been consumed on the appeal of the Senator than was consumed on the discussion of the main question. When are we to have any opportunity to discuss these public questions? The Senator rises in his seat day after day and says the time is not opportune; that it is inappropriate; that these matters of great public importance must not be discussed in the Senate either in the morning hour or at any other time; that they must all be referred to a committee without discussion and that the merits of them must not be inquired into. Does the committee give us time for discussion?

Mr. STONE. I never said such a thing on the floor of the Senate or elsewhere.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator from Missouri for the past three weeks has been complaining of discussion in the Senate and has sought by argument, or at least by expression, to prevent discussion on the floor of the Senate, insisting that the time is too valuable; and at the same time the Senate adjourns for two or three days when all these great public questions are before the Senate and the country; and they are referred to committees. When will the committees give us some action on these questions?

I am not reflecting now upon the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I do say that it is trying the patience of the Senate when, not only for weeks, but for months and for years, resolutions have been pending touching great public affairs of this Nation and we are told to wait until the proper time comes for their discussion, while the resolutions and the bills in the meantime are reposing in the confidence and the secrecy of the committee.

I think, Mr. President, that the Chair is absolutely correct in his ruling, and I hope that the ruling will be sustained.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the decision of the Chair will be sustained. I believe that it is sound and that it is supported by authority and precedent.

But, sir, I trust that the Chair will be sustained for another and broader reason.

For 300 years the right of petition has been regarded as a sacred popular right. The framers of the Constitution sought to preserve the right to the people. The Constitution seems to guarantee to citizens the certain opportunity to have direct speech with their representative in Congress by petition. But the rules of the Senate make the right of petition little more than a sham and a mockery. Petitions are received without reading and referred without debate to a committee. That ends it. Petitions representing the arduous labor of months, expressing the hopes and convictions and prayers of thousands of people, are brought to the doors of this Chamber in the belief that they will receive the considerate attention of this body. They reach the Clerk's desk, are noted of record, and then go their way swiftly to the lasting silence of the committee's rubbish room.

Senators express the fear that if the ruling of the Chair is sustained every Senator thereafter presenting a petition will move its reference to some committee, and on that motion proceed to take up the time of the Senate debating the merits of the petition.

Mr. President, such fears are groundless. It will doubtless afford opportunity to bring a petition of special importance to the attention of the Senate. If it does this it will make the constitutional right of petition of some value to the people of the country and thereby subserve the public interest. Any attempt to abuse a privilege which a Senator would have in thus bringing to the notice of the Senate a petition of no concern to the country would defeat its own aims. But, sir, the petition before the Senate this morning justifies the severest condemnation of the rule and the practice of the Senate, which in effect have operated to abolish the right of petition.

This petition speaks the mind and makes appeal for more than a million people. It cries out against the mercenary spirit that would coin the honor of our country into profits for the manufacturers of arms and ammunitions.

And it can only find expression through petition.

The subsidized press of the country is no indication of what the plain people are thinking. We should therefore give the largest possible consideration and weight to any other avenues of expression of which the people avail themselves. But out among the plain folk, let me say to you, there is a different speech. It was my privilege a little while ago to speak at St. Paul to 7,000 farmers, drawn from Montana, the two Dakotas, northern Iowa, Minnesota, and northern Wisconsin.

This body of representative farmers adopted resolutions condemning the preparedness program. Their action was not prearranged. It was spontaneous and unanimous. I believe they voiced the calm judgment of the agricultural population of the Middle West.

Mr. President, it is conceded that the manufacture and shipment of arms and munitions of war is within the accepted precedents and principles of international law as heretofore construed and maintained by this country and by most of the other countries of the world.

But, sir, never before in history has traffic in arms with belligerents had the significance that the shipment of munitions of war by us to Europe has to-day. The maintenance of that right by us has given the breath of life and perpetuity to a war that recognizes no compromise or finish except mutual extermination.

In the face of such a struggle, involving more than half the people of the world, which has already sacrificed 14,000,000 lives, precedents must yield to the appeal of a common humanity.

In my judgment, this petition is most significant as an expression of the sentiment of the masses of men and women of the United States.

After the first great horror to the plain people of this country of the war came the shock of learning that we are supplying the arms and ammunition to maintain it.

Those who assume that the average man and woman have become hardened to what is transpiring, that they go about their daily work unthinking and unmoved by the fact that the money power of America is reaping fabulous profits from the awful destruction of fellow men in Europe—those who make this assumption are mistaken. This monster petition is a demonstration of that fact.

The people of the East and, perhaps, of the populous centers of the West, under the influences of the financial, commercial, and industrial pressure, may appear to have caught the war fever and to be overwhelmed with fear of attack and mad for preparedness. But the great undercurrent of opinion of the common folk is one of solemn protest and indignation.

During the months that I was on the platform this summer I found the almost universal sentiment of my audiences to be of gratitude that we have been kept out of war, and a no less universal desire for some other way of settling international troubles than war.

The average man does not understand why the United States Congress and this administration are so indifferent to the world situation. I fully realize the enormous difficulties, but I believe that history will hold us accountable for our contribution to the general holocaust, and I think it will be hard for future generations to understand why the neutral powers kept aloof; why they did not unite, under the leadership of the United States, in an effort to restore peace and order. I believe, too, that if one-tenth part of the energy and time now directed in agitation and investigation of preparedness were to be turned toward other means of settlement of international problems for the future we should restore the confidence of the people and redeem our place in history.

This petition, although it relates more particularly to one phase of our responsibility, is a call to action. It should be heeded as an appeal for the higher statesmanship that these times demand.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not want the opportunity to pass without taking advantage of the moment to say that I believe in the right of petition as much as any man who ever lived, and that the rules of this body can never prevent the discussion of any subject that may be brought to the attention of the Senate through a petition. After the morning hour, which would perhaps have closed a few minutes after 12 o'clock, any Senator in this body could have spoken the remainder of the day upon the petition presented by the Senator from Iowa. No Senator could possibly be denied that privilege; I never

would want him to be denied it; and I never would support a ruling that would in any way deny him that right. A petition of this kind, as the Senator from Wisconsin has said, is indeed quite different from one that may be presented coming from an individual interested in an ordinary subject in regard to which he desires to appeal to Congress. Even the one citizen has the right to have presented such a petition; and, not only that, if he can interest a Senator of the United States to bring it to the attention of the people through the Senate, not one day but a month, if that one Senator can occupy the attention and the time of the Senate so long, can be consumed by him in discussing the subject in which that one citizen is interested.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is, on this particular occasion, after the routine business has been pursued and completed and after this petition had been carted away to the oblivion of some committee to which it might be referred, then, if I understand the Senator, he means that when the Philippines bill or some other bill came before the Senate some Senator, after the occasion passed, with the interest passed, might rise and, by the indulgence of the Senate, address himself to the principle involved in this petition when it was considering some other subject. Does the Senator conceive that to be a hearing upon a petition?

Mr. SMOOT. Not necessarily, Mr. President, the situation described by the Senator. The Senator must not feel that if these petitions were referred to a committee they would be carted into oblivion. The subject matter of these petitions, Mr. President, is one so grave that the mere reference of them to a committee can not place them in oblivion. The subject matter of these petitions will be discussed upon this floor during the next two or three months, not for one day, but perhaps for weeks.

I say to you, Mr. President, and to all the country that it is a most important subject, and I know that not only are the million who have signed the petitions interested in the matter, but that other millions in the United States are likewise interested. Mr. President, as far as I am concerned in this matter, that what I said about the rule I fully believe to be not only the rule of the body but its practice; and when I vote not to sustain the ruling of the Chair at this time I want it distinctly understood that I am not voting with reference to the petition or the subject of the petition in any way.

I simply wanted to say that much because I did not want to be placed in a wrong attitude before the people of the United States. It is for that reason, and that only, that I speak at this time, and I vote as I shall because I believe the rule to be as I have stated. Not only do I believe the rule to be that way, but it has been the practice. Through the rule and by the practice of the Senate no man or woman in the United States can ever be denied the right of petition or ever be denied a hearing upon this floor, if our rules are adhered to by this body.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I have listened with some attention to what Senators who antagonize the ruling of the Chair have had to say without being convinced that the opinion I have heretofore expressed is erroneous.

The force of the argument seems to be that the rule announced by the Chair would destroy the morning hour. The morning hour is habitually destroyed by taking a recess from the day before whenever the exigencies of the occasion seem to demand such action. It is within the recollection of all Senators that it is likewise habitually set aside by the unanimous consent of the Senate on nearly every day for the purpose of considering, by unanimous consent, uncontested bills that are presented by the committees.

The rule is not likely to become abused, for the reason that it is at all times under the control of the Senate. If a motion to refer is made for captious purposes, or for purposes to delay, a motion to lay it on the table will take the whole matter out of the control of the Senate, if that is the wish of the Senate. There is not any possible force in the suggestion that we are deliberately abolishing the morning hour simply because we allow reasonable debate on a proposititon to refer, or to take a matter from one committee and refer it to another, because the particular question now before the Senate is this:

The Chair announced that under the practice it would be proper to refer the petition to the Committee on Foreign Relations, but that he would recognize the Senator from Nebraska for the purpose of making a motion to refer the petition to the Committee on Commerce. The logical effect of that was a motion to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from the further consideration of the subject and substitute the judgment of the Senate, if it should ratify the motion of the Senator from Nebraska. Everybody concedes that that motion, made in that form, by observing those formalities, would be debatable.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows that that motion could not be made in the morning hour.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator does not know any such thing. If he did, he would not be talking as he is talking now.

As the Chair properly said, it is a matter that is in confusion if we take the simple text of any one of the three rules that bear on the subject. The Chair is doing now what has been done for a hundred years—formulating a sensible and enforceable rule that in proper cases will extend a proper remedy. Whenever the abuse of it is to be dealt with, I take it for granted that the same ingenuity which the Senate always has exercised on such occasions will relieve it from any serious embarrassment.

I think the ruling of the Chair is right, and I intend to vote to sustain it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. KENYON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hardwick	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Hitchcock	Newlands	Smoot
Borah	Hollis	Norris	Sterling
Brandegee	Hughes	O'Gorman	Stone
Bryan	Husting	Overman	Sutherland
Catron	James	Page	Swanson
Chamberlain	Jones	Phelan	Thomas
Chilton	Kenyon	Pittman	Thompson
Clapp	Kern	Poindexter	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Pomerene	Townsend
Clarke, Ark.	Lane	Robinson	Vardaman
Cummins	Lea, Tenn.	Shafroth	Wadsworth
Curtis	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Walsh
Dillingham	Lippitt	Sherman	Warren
du Pont	McCumber	Shields	Weeks
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Williams
Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.	Works.
Harding	Myers	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. TOWNSEND. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I desire that this announcement may stand on all votes for the day.

Mr. CURTIS. I am requested to announce that the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] is unavoidably detained from the Senate, and that the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] is detained on account of sickness.

Mr. STONE. I desire to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] on account of illness. He is paired with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. BRADY] on account of illness. He is paired with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have been requested to announce the absence of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] owing to illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, inasmuch as something like two hours have been taken up in debate, and I imagine all Senators who desire to express themselves on the general subject embodied in the proposed legislation have said what they wished to say, not desiring now to further detain the Senate, I will, with the consent of the Senate, withdraw the appeal, stating, however, that I challenge and protest against the ruling, and that on some future occasion when the question arises I shall be glad to debate the matter again before the Chair and the Senate and ask the judgment of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before the record is finally made the Chair desires to announce, in connection with the ruling, that the Chair is not of the opinion that the ruling of the Chair made on June 21, 1913, is at all in conflict with the ruling made to-day. That ruling was in connection with a communication from the Attorney General of the United States, and was neither a petition nor a memorial.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion to refer the petition to the Committee on Commerce, and I leave the matter to the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will refer the petition to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I send to the desk a very short letter, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the letter was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

BERLIN, *December 18, 1915.*

Senator HOKE SMITH, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: As our association has stood, and still stands, for the development and promotion of American trade with Germany, we take the liberty of bringing the two following cases to your notice.

We have since outbreak of the war had several instances where American goods have been held up by the British Government, causing our American branches in Germany a great deal of trouble. If this policy is continued, the offices of our American houses will have to close business.

One of the two very flagrant cases we are sending you to-day is the complaint of the representative of the John B. Stetson Co., of Philadelphia—members of ours—in which we are informed that goods will not be accepted in New York by the steamship companies for transportation unless certified to by a sworn statement that such goods will not go to Germany or the central powers. The John B. Stetson Co. have until recently been able to get their goods through to Germany via the Scandinavian countries.

The second complaint is that of our member, the Remington Typewriter Co., which company has succeeded in getting its goods as far as Goteborg, but can not honestly make a sworn statement that the goods are not intended for Germany. One very interesting fact in connection with this latter case is that these goods, being some hundred cases of typewriters, are allowed to go to Russia.

We would also call your attention to the fact that the British Government, in refusing to allow these goods to enter Germany, is striking a blow at American trade and only assisting German typewriter firms to better compete with the American product.

We are well aware that you must be flooded with similar requests from our American firms, but as these two firms are well known all over the United States, we think you might be able to make good use of these two cases and possibly bring the matter before Congress.

If this policy continues to be pursued by Great Britain, it will in very short time completely ruin American trade in Germany and Austria, which it has required many years of hard work and painstaking to build up.

Knowing, as we do, that you take great interest in this matter, and trusting that any efforts you may make will create a more favorable situation, as we take the standpoint that United States manufacturers have the perfect right to do business with any belligerent, provided the products in question are not contraband.

We have the honor to remain,

Very truly, yours,

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE AND TRADE,
GEO. S. ATWOOD, *Secretary.*

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of the Layman's Missionary Association of Duluth, Minn., remonstrating against the repeal of the treaty of 1855 prohibiting the sale of intoxicants in certain territory in the State of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Commercial Club of Little Falls, Minn., remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have a letter from Mr. J. D. Goldman, president of the Lesser-Goldman Cotton Co., of St. Louis, Mo., in regard to the cotton-futures act, and with especial reference to section 11 of that act. I ask that the letter may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *January 15, 1916.*

Hon. JOS. T. ROBINSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In regard to the cotton-futures act which has been reintroduced in the House by Mr. LEVER, section 11 of the bill forbids sending orders to buy or sell futures on the foreign exchanges, and, in consequence, the European merchants are given such an advantage that it is possible for them to monopolize the export business, which amounts to 60 per cent of the American cotton crop.

In consequence of this, the American cotton merchant hereafter can deal only with the European merchant by reason of the fact that he can not deal direct with the consumer abroad, as the consumers abroad buy for forward deliveries, and always buy based on Liverpool or Havre futures, and if we sell cotton abroad for forward delivery the natural hedge is the market in which we sell the cotton and not in the New York or New Orleans markets, which in no way reflect the variations in exchange, freights, etc.

We also do not see how we can continue to ship cotton to Europe for sale on or after arrival, for the reason that if we ship or hedge in New York we run the risk of the freight and exchange markets between the time the cotton is shipped and sold, and, as freights are seven times higher than normal values, this is a risk no one wants to undertake.

Consequently the effect of section 11 is as follows:

First. European merchants are given a monopoly of the European business, competition is restricted, and prices are affected in this country.

Second. By reason of the fact that the American merchants can not do a forward business and are unwilling to ship cotton to Liverpool on consignment and hedge in this country, exports are obstructed, and the surplus of the crop is remaining in this country and affecting prices.

LESSER-GOLDMAN COTTON CO.,
COTTON BUYERS,
112–114 South Main Street, St. Louis, Mo., January 15, 1916.

Hon. J. T. ROBINSON:

We are inclosing you an example of a transaction showing clearly the injustice done to an American cotton merchant, who is obliged under the Lever bill to hedge in New York.

This bill affects the cotton merchant in this way: They have many times during the season opportunities to buy in the interior on a safe Liverpool basis, and if they can do so they would take the cotton off the market and sell in Liverpool against their purchases; but, as the Lever bill prohibits this, they are obliged to stay out of the market and the cotton then becomes a weight until such time as the American mills may want it or there is an outlet from some other source. As the mills generally know the amount of cotton left in the country they take their time about buying, and for that reason it very often depresses values, as the cotton merchant can not relieve the situation unless he can insure himself by covers against loss.

As this bill in its present form is so obviously unfair to the American cotton merchant, we are writing you to call your attention to the objectionable feature of the bill and ask you to vote for the elimination of section 11 when the bill is again presented, leaving the rest of the bill intact.

Yours, very truly,

LESSER-GOLDMAN COTTON CO.,
By J. D. GOLDMAN, *President.*

Example of 100 bales of cotton sold Sept. 1 for shipment to Liverpool, hedged by the purchase of 100 bales January contracts New York or hedged by the purchase of 100 bales of January–February contracts in Liverpool and liquidated Jan. 6, 1916.

Sold Sept. 1, 100 bales middling Texas, January shipment; cost, freight, insurance, and 6 per cent tare Liverpool (basis ocean freight at $1.25)	$12.94
Bought Sept. 1, 100 January contracts, New York	10.28
TRANSACTION LIQUIDATED JAN. 6.	
Bought Jan. 6, 100 B/C middling Texas, January shipment; cost, freight, insurance, and 6 per cent tare Liverpool (basis ocean freight, $2.75)	16.65
Sold Jan. 6, 100 January contracts, New York	12.25
NET RESULT OF TRANSACTION BASED ON NEW YORK HEDGE.	
Sold Sept. 1, 100 middling Texas	12.94
Bought Jan. 6, 100 middling Texas	16.65
Loss on spots, 371 points.	
Bought Sept. 1, 100 January contracts	10.28
Sold Jan. 6, 100 January contracts	12.25
Profit on futures, 197 points.	
Net loss on transaction based on New York hedge, 174 points, equal $8.70 per bale.	
SAME TRANSACTION BASED ON LIVERPOOL HEDGE.	
Sold Sept. 1, 100 bales middling Texas, January shipment; cost, freight, insurance, and 6 per cent tare Liverpool (basis ocean freight, $1.25)	$12.94
Bought Sept. 1, 100 January–February contracts Liverpool	5.92
TRANSACTION LIQUIDATED JAN. 6.	
Bought Jan. 6, 100 bales middling Texas, January shipment; cost, freight, insurance, and 6 per cent tare Liverpool (basis ocean freight, $2.75)	16.65
Sold Jan. 6, 100 January–February, Liverpool	8.00
NET RESULT OF TRANSACTION BASED ON LIVERPOOL HEDGE.	
Sold Sept. 1, 100 middling Texas	12.94
Bought Jan. 6, 100 middling Texas	16.65
Loss on spots, 371 points.	
Bought Sept. 1, 100 January–February contracts, Liverpool	5.92
Sold Jan. 6, 100 January–February contracts, Liverpool	8.00
Profit on futures, 208 Liverpool points, or 416 American points.	
Net profit on transaction based, 45 American points, equal to $2.25 per bale.	
Therefore, if the transaction had been hedged in New York, there would have been a loss of $8.70 per bale.	
If hedged in Liverpool, a profit of $2.25 per bale.	
Difference in favor of Liverpool, $10.95 per bale.	

EXPLANATION.

September 1: January New York, $10.20; January–February Liverpool, $5.92; difference equal 156 points.

January 6: January New York, $12.25; January–February Liverpool, $8.00; difference equal 375 points.

New York advanced 197 points; Liverpool advanced 416 points.

Liverpool advance compared with New York is represented by advance in freight.

Mr. KERN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Allen County and of Noblesville and South Wabash, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Sud-Seite Schwaben, of Indianapolis, Ind., and a petition of sundry citizens of Grant County, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit citizens of this country from using the ships of belligerent nations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Saratoga, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of Local Grange No. 19, Patrons of Husbandry, of Eden, Wyo., praying for the establishment of a system of rural credits, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WEEKS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., praying for a readjustment of the tax on the admission to theaters, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Holyoke, Mass., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of the Federated Irish Societies of Massachusetts, praying for the placing of an embargo on munitions of war, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented petitions of the congregation of the First Congregational Church of Bay Shore; of the Centenary Methodist Episcopal Church, of Malone; and of sundry citizens of Albany, all in the State of New York, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of the Ingalls Co. and the A. C. Cheney Piano Action Co., of Castleton; of the H. F. Chalfonte Paper Co., of Rock City Falls; and of John Leggett & Son, of Troy, all in the State of New York, praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PAGE presented a petition of the Ryegate Paper Co., of East Ryegate, Vt., praying for the imposition of a tax on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DU PONT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wilmington and Greenwood, in the State of Delaware, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 43, for the appointment of a committee to investigate and inquire into the causes of the existing freight blockade and embargoes on the trunk-line railroads entering into the port of New York, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to which was referred the bill (S. 668) making it unlawful for any Member of Congress to serve on or solicit funds for any political committee, club, or organization, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 73) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 665. A bill to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to publicity of contributions and expenditures made for the purpose of influencing the nomination and election of candidates for the offices of Representative and Senator in the Congress of the United States, limiting the amount of campaign expenses, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 74); and

S. 669. A bill to limit the use of campaign funds in presidential and national elections (Rept. No. 75).

Mr. HUGHES (for Mr. SHIVELY) submitted a report (No. 71), accompanied by a bill (S. 3984) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was read twice by its title, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to that committee:

S. 9. Patience Rosa Archer.
S. 86. John T. Pribble.
S. 87. Sarah Saxey.
S. 88. Erasmus W. Tatlock.
S. 104. Silas W. Norris.
S. 118. Simeon L. Wilson.
S. 120. John Nighswander.
S. 123. William E. Howard.
S. 148. Paleman S. Castle.
S. 150. Jennie R. Cusick.
S. 170. Annie Bridges.
S. 173. Rosa Rossiter.
S. 182. Anna Barker.
S. 183. Gustav Schoneck.
S. 203. Theodore Basterdes.
S. 209. Margaret P. Sherman.
S. 249. Charles R. Potter.
S. 297. Hiram F. Brundage.
S. 354. Mary C. Hills.
S. 363. Patrick J. Quigley.
S. 368. Nellie Judkins.
S. 369. Alva M. Titchout.
S. 371. Francis Blanchard.
S. 402. Fidelia M. Waffle.
S. 423. John R. Mabee.
S. 525. William I. Scott.
S. 528. Edwin D. Kaynor.
S. 533. George A. Barker.
S. 534. Melcenia C. Baker.
S. 566. Christiana H. Nicholls.
S. 658. John S. Corson.
S. 659. Clarinda A. Spear.
S. 663. Daniel L. Thompson.
S. 772. Robert H. Barton.
S. 859. Aad Peterson.
S. 960. Adeline Reynolds.
S. 962. George H. Shefter.
S. 964. John F. Treadwell.
S. 965. Henry G. Wilson.
S. 994. John R. Snook.
S. 997. Elizabeth Kniffin.
S. 1008. David Youts.
S. 1014. George Bateson.
S. 1018. Daniel W. Coan.
S. 1043. Mary King.
S. 1108. John W. Greene.
S. 1110. Peter S. Hare.
S. 1119. Jefferson Lyons.
S. 1125. Andy Perrin.
S. 1127. Burton Gillaspie.
S. 1135. Henry Creery.
S. 1144. Turner Barns.
S. 1146. Rachel A. Woodmansee.
S. 1154. James E. Bacon.
S. 1238. Alden Powers.
S. 1239. Duane F. Perkins.
S. 1249. Sylvester Stewart.
S. 1305. Joseph F. Grawe.
S. 1329. George F. Cowan.
S. 1335. Frederick A. Heebner.
S. 1347. William H. Manley.
S. 1419. William Cake (alias William Baker).
S. 1427. William H. Hills.
S. 1440. Eliza J. Banning.
S. 1443. Martha Connor.
S. 1444. Anastasia Corcoran.
S. 1446. Mary C. Daniels.
S. 1451. Sarah F. Hovey.
S. 1505. William Roudebush.
S. 1507. Charles Whitkemper.
S. 1508. John Smiley.
S. 1511. Nancy Wilson.
S. 1516. William Whitten.
S. 1518. Georgia B. Nelson.
S. 1521. Sarah T. Wright.
S. 1522. Eliza J. Wells.
S. 1524. John M. Pittman.
S. 1531. Martha A. Reynolds.
S. 1694. Albert A. Lance.
S. 1729. Oliver K. Landrew.
S. 1735. George Crawford.
S. 1785. Edward Morris.
S. 1787. Nelson Briley.
S. 1789. James L. Spaulding.
S. 1794. James M. Jameson.
S. 1928. Henry Wilcox.
S. 1935. James A. Snodgrass.
S. 1941. James P. Weter.
S. 1945. William H. Lewis.
S. 1957. Elias B. Thompson.
S. 1962. Sarah E. Prender.
S. 2243. Enoch F. Anderson.
S. 2246. Maria Savage.
S. 2251. Marrietta Fowler.
S. 2283. Francis B. Nofsinger.
S. 2294. John Alexander.
S. 2313. Mary Jane Drew.
S. 2333. Enoch M. Martin.
S. 2350. Gardner B. Taylor.
S. 2400. Agnes E. Tooker.
S. 2479. Nelson Haggerty.
S. 2488. Minnie Mahler.
S. 2494. Annie T. McCreary.
S. 2495. James A. Lucas.

S. 2516. Amanda Phillips.
S. 2523. Ellen L. Webster.
S. 2561. Annie E. Nave.
S. 2577. Maria J. Mahon.
S. 2583. Sigmund Bauer.
S. 2655. Martin B. Worrell.
S. 2733. Ruth A. Smith.
S. 2786. Edwin W. Haynes.
S. 2866. Daniel K. Cummings.
S. 2867. James M. Crossman.
S. 2877. George Dallison.
S. 2906. Elijah Booher.
S. 2927. Mary E. Taylor.
S. 2944. Burton Vanhook.
S. 2945. Andrew J. Woolf.
S. 2952. John Woods.
S. 2996. Milton P. Julian.
S. 3068. Mary C. Lyon.
S. 3080. Lucie B. Kasson.
S. 3113. Norman B. Stacy.
S. 3138. Florence K. Patterson.
S. 3214. Mary A. Hoon.
S. 3299. Milton T. Callahan, jr.
S. 3363. William Thomas.
S. 3366. Edmund Hishley.
S. 3399. Stephen P. Stites.
S. 3411. Carrie V. Lawton.
S. 3427. John M. Null.
S. 3437. Mary H. Babcock.
S. 3440. John Johnston.
S. 949. Ella Taylor.
S. 3515. Sidney A. Ladd.
S. 3627. Daniel Casey.
S. 3652. Jimeson S. Tweed.
S. 3698. Lucinda Applegate.
S. 3717. Bernard McNancy.

Mr. HUGHES (for Mr. SHIVELY), from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8493) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 72) thereon.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) to amend Senate joint resolution No. 8, approved May 4, 1898, entitled "Joint resolution providing for the adjustment of certain claims of the United States against the State of Tennessee and certain claims against the United States," reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 88) thereon.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 31. A bill for the relief of John L. Sevy (Rept. No. 83);

S. 32. A bill for the relief of William G. Williams, sr. (Rept. No. 84);

S. 33. A bill for the relief of Daniel M. Frost (Rept. No. 85); and

S. 36. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to the town of Duchesne, Utah (Rept. No. 86).

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 3346) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to adjudicate the claims of the State of Massachusetts, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims; which was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3391) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California," approved March 4, 1913, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 87) thereon.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 1388. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to furnish hot water from the hot springs on the Hot Springs Reservation for drinking and bathing purposes free of cost to the Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital Association (Rept. No. 82); and

S. 1843. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain right of way near Engle, N. Mex. (Rept. No. 81).

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 3132) providing for the homestead entry of certain lands in the State of Washington, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 79) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 1840. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Court of Private Land Claims and to provide for the settlement of private land claims in certain States and Territories," approved March 3, 1891, and the acts amendatory thereto, approved February 21, 1893, June 27, 1898, and February 26, 1909 (Rept. No. 80); and

S. 3581. A bill releasing the claim of the United States Government to that portion of land, being a fractional block, bounded on the north and east by Bayou Cadet, on the west by Cevallos Street, and on the south by Intendencia Street, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla. (Rept. No. 78).

RICHARD DAELEY.

Mr. MYERS. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 809) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the application for land entry of Richard Daeley, and I submit a report (No. 76) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] to the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

LAND IN PENSACOLA, FLA.

Mr. MYERS. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 3580) releasing the claim of the United States Government to lot numbered 306 in the old city of Pensacola, Fla., and I submit a report (No. 77) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to the report.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. Let us get through with the morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 3985) for the relief of C. E. Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3986) granting certain coal lands to the town of Kaycee, Wyo. (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3987) to patent certain lands to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HOLLIS:

A bill (S. 3988) to correct the military record of Joseph Kenney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 3989) for the relief of Luanna Ross; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 3990) for the relief of Samuel A. Russel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 3991) granting an increase of pension to Frederick J. Young (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3992) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Campbell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3993) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Thompson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3994) granting an increase of pension to Jonas O. Johnson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3995) granting a pension to Alice A. Kearney (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 3996) granting an increase of pension to Mattie Tryon Spangler (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3997) granting an increase of pension to Ledroit C. Prosser (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Virginia:

A bill (S. 3998) to amend an act relating to the public utilities commission of the District of Columbia, approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 3999) to remove the charge of desertion against James Madden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 4000) granting an increase of pension to John L. Blackburn (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4001) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Beckwith (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4002) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Yount (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4003) granting an increase of pension to Edward D. Litsey (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4004) granting a pension to Nelson White (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4005) granting an increase of pension to Emily P. Hubbard (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4006) granting an increase of pension to George W. McComb (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 4007) to correct the military record of Ralph Cloud;

A bill (S. 4008) for the relief of John Fitzgerald (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4009) for the relief of Nathan Manzer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4010) for the relief of Thomas J. Gardner (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4011) for the relief of William H. Lung (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 4012) granting an increase of pension to Ruth A. Hazzard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey:

A bill (S. 4013) granting an increase of pension to William J. Hull (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE (for Mr. SAULSBURY):

A bill (S. 4014) to supplement existing legislation relative to the United States Court for China and to increase the serviceability thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

OIL AND GAS LANDS.

Mr. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 406) to authorize exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

THE NAVY.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that to-morrow, Friday, the 28th instant, after the conclusion of the routine morning business, I shall address the Senate on the subject of the Navy.

GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 381.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

[Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas addressed the Senate. See Appendix.]

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I am very sorry that the Senator from Arkansas has seen fit in his wisdom to propose this very radical amendment to this very well-considered bill, a bill which has not only been considered in the present Senate Committee on the Philippines, but in the Senate Committee on the Philippines of the preceding Congress, and which, substantially in its present form, passed the House of Representatives after full consideration by the committee there.

I recognize, Mr. President, however, that there is—particularly on this side of the Chamber—a strong sentiment favorable to the idea which this amendment proposes to enact. It is apparently an impulsive and rather thoughtless sentiment in favor of getting rid of the Philippines regardless of the consequences, regardless of the history of the past 15 years, regardless of the interests over there which have become vested under American control, and regardless of the international results which are likely to follow. Out of deference to that sentiment on this side of the Chamber, I propose to-day particularly to point out what I consider to be some very serious defects in the pending amendment, even if it is proposed to enact it.

I ask the attention of the Senator from Arkansas to what I shall say in the nature of an analysis of the amendment that he proposes. First, let me draw attention to the difference between the bill and the amendment. The bill proposes to carry out the past policy of the United States with regard to the Philippine Islands by giving to the people of the Philippines a larger degree of self-government than they have ever had in their history before. It also proposes in the preamble to give to the Philippine people the pledge of the United States that some day it is the intention of the United States to bestow independence upon them when their permanent interests require it.

Now, I shall not discuss the reasons for that phraseology in the preamble. I may say to the Senate that the committees that considered the preamble found great difficulty in agreeing on the phraseology, and that the phraseology finally adopted was in the nature of a compromise in order to come as near as possible to harmonizing the different views of Senators, and with the view all the time of conveying to the Philippine people such a promise as would satisfy them with the present legislation, and such a promise as would lead them on in the course of the development of self-government to higher and higher standards. But that preamble I shall not consider.

Let me now draw attention to the amendment, which is really the pending question before the Senate. The Senator from Arkansas first drew his amendment so that it would result in the separation of the Philippine Islands from the United States within two years. He soon found, after he had presented it and discussed it informally, that that would not do. He soon found that that was impracticable.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Let me say to the Senator I did not change two years to four years as a result of any attention I gave the subject. I think two years amply sufficient now, but I had to conform to the views of other Senators. If anybody is responsible for that, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] is.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will change it. I will say the Senator from Arkansas soon found that it was necessary to change the amendment, just as I think I can demonstrate to him it will be necessary to change the present amendment, either to secure votes for it or to comply with obligations which I am sure the Senator from Arkansas will recognize when I point them out.

First, he provides in his amendment that the President, within four years, must act, unless after the four years have expired he finds conditions such that he should not act. The Senator evidently intends to say that the President shall act within four years, unless some time during the four-year period he finds he should not act before the limit arrives. There is a slight change which he must make if he would make his amendment workable.

The President of the United States is required by this mandatory provision to act within four years; and yet it is said that after the four years have expired, if he finds at that time, after he has failed to comply with the law, he may then find a reason for not complying with it and submit it to Congress. He evidently intends, I am sure, to provide that if the President finds at any time during the four years——

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No; the Senator is entirely mistaken. It is contemplated that there will be some strife among political parties. It may go beyond permissible lengths; it may be to-morrow. It may arise and disappear before the expiration of the four years; but if there is a continuing condition such as to warrant the President in saying it is likely to grow infinitely worse, and in growing worse involve upon us the exercise of authority, to give time to submit it to another Congress, to see whether or not it is necessary to somewhat modify the rule laid down in existing law.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But the Senator does not submit it to Congress.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Congress needs no right. The President has a right to submit to Congress anything he desires to submit at any time. It is not necessary to confer this by statute. On the other hand, Congress can take up the whole subject, without reference to the President or anybody else, at any session of Congress, this one included.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator intend by his amendment that the President may submit it at any time?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No; it simply affords Congress an opportunity to take it up without the President. It is not necessary to submit it in order to confer jurisdiction on Congress to deal with it again.

The amendment itself settles that. That answers the question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the President fails to act within four years, he has violated this act.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Yes; if he fails to act in four years and does not extend the time, he has violated the act and violated his oath of office.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then you compel him to violate the act before he submits it to Congress.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. We do not compel him to submit it to Congress. He issues a proclamation extending the policy.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But you compel him to violate the act.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I do not know what the Senator means by that.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I can not believe that the Senator from Arkansas realizes what the Senator from Nebraska means, because it is very plain that the intent of the Senator from Arkansas is not covered by the language of the act.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is rather a minor matter, and I shall proceed to the next difficulty. Under the amendment which the Senator offers the President is only permitted to submit this question again to Congress in case the interests of the Philippines make it desirable.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No; it does not say that. It says if he shall find as a fact that the condition of the internal or external affairs of the Philippines in respect to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government would warrant him in so doing.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am sure the Senator ought to include in that, whether it is his intention or not, a direction to the President of the United States to submit the matter to Congress if he finds that the interests of the United States makes it mandatory.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The supposition is that we shall have the services of the able Senator from Nebraska before the five years run out, and if the interest of the United States is jeopardized in the slightest degree he will not fail to exercise his constitutional function.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Later on I can tell the Senator from Arkansas better whether I will be here in five years, but the amendment as drawn by the Senator takes into account nothing but the interest of the Philippine Islands and makes no provision for the President submitting the matter to Congress in case he should find it vitally necessary for the interest of the American people. He expects the President to live up to this act. He expects the President to carry out its terms. Should he not include a direction to the President to lay the matter before Congress if he finds it either to the interest of the Philippine Islands or of the American people?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The reply to the Senator's question is that I do not direct the President ever to submit it to Congress at any time or under any circumstances. It would simply force Congress to take it up. If it sees proper to do so——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will read the language:

Provided, That if the President, at the expiration of the said period of four years, shall find that the condition of the internal or external affairs of said Philippines in respect to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government thereof is such as to warrant him in so doing, he is hereby further authorized, by proclamation duly made and published, to extend the said time to and including the date of the final adjournment of the session of Congress which shall convene next after the date of the expiration of the said period of four years.

Now, I ask the Senator, suppose the President of the United States found it vitally necessary for the interests of the United States that this period should be extended?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. If he did his duty and observed his oath he would submit it to Congress, if it required congressional action.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Why has not the Senator included that here?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I have not directed him to submit anything. I simply give him an opportunity to take it up.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from Arkansas has given the power to extend the period, if the interests of the Philippines demand it, but he has not given the President the power to extend the period if the interests of the United States demand it.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator is entirely mistaken about that. The phrase he is criticizing is the work of probably the best lawyer on this floor, and he is not a supporter of this amendment, either. It is the delegation of power to the President to suspend an existing law, and it must be carefully done. There is very little latitude allowed in cases of that kind. That would be the only reason the President would have for extending it, because it is the only reason that can exist. As long as we are responsible for governmental conditions in the Philippine Islands nothing could happen there that would disturb the internal or external relations of that country without involving the United States, and the thing that would present one condition would present the other. I did not think it was necessary to amplify something that by implication is so plainly provided for.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator in his amendment gives the President the power to extend the period one year if the interest of the Philippine Islands demands it, but he has not permitted the President to extend it five minutes in case the interest of the United States demands it. I think that is an omission which clearly should be made good, if the amendment is to be voted upon with a view to the interest of the United States.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, does the Senator from Nebraska recognize the fact that we are going to have at least four sessions of Congress between now and the time when the four-year limit will be up? Of course, if the President of the United States finds that there is any interest of the United States that should be protected he has those four years before the time of his proclamation to call the attention of the Senate and House and ask for their advice or their consideration of the same.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I am very well aware that Congresses will come and go before this period of four years elapses, and for that very reason I think this Congress should not undertake to fix a date. I think it should leave it as it left it in the case of Cuba. I think any attempt to fix a date in advance is a dangerous exercise of power. We do not know what the four years will bring forth.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield further to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. SHAFROTH. One of the main objects of fixing the date is to assure the Philippine people that they will get their independence. There is always a feeling of unrest where it is uncertain as to whether they will get their independence. They are unanimous about it, and if it is hedged around with too many ifs and ands the result will be that they will come to the conclusion that the United States does not intend to give them independence. That produces unrest, it produces conditions which are bad, and it might even produce revolution or insurrection. We do not want to have——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I can not yield for a speech.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yielded for a reasonable interruption. I realize that the amendment is an attempt to fix a definite date, but it does not do it. There is still a string tied to it, a string which the President is to pull. Even under this amendment the Philippine people may not have their independence for 20 years. It is not made definite. In my opinion the preamble which is presented to the Senate by the committee, and for which the Senator from Colorado voted, and which I supposed had his approval, is a preamble which once adopted binds the United States much more firmly to a policy of independence than this amendment.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas is adopted the Philippine people will get their independence without further congressional action, unless Congress should change its policy in the future?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. Whereas if the preamble, as suggested by the Senator, were adopted that would not be true?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; they would get their independence.

Mr. HARDWICK. But not without further affirmative congressional action?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is true; but Congress would be morally bound to give it.

Mr. HARDWICK. The action in the one case——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There is that difference. It is not an absolute grant of independence.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to state to the Senator from Nebraska that I did vote for the preamble because, under the conditions that existed in the committee, it was about the best that we could get. The Senator knows from the various expressions that I made during the proceedings of the committee that I was always in favor of a stronger preamble than we produced, but as a matter of compromise we did as a matter of fact agree to it, reserving, however, the right to make liberal amendments when it came to the Senate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is true, Mr. President, except as to the reservation. I supposed that the members of the committee on this side of the Chamber at least would be bound by the committee report.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; at the very time the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] said that they wanted to reserve the right to amend I stated that I did not suppose anyone was bound as to this matter. We were trying to get an early report to the Senate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Now, Mr. President, I proceed to the third point of criticism of this amendment. It provides that the Philippine government shall protect and guarantee personal and prop-

erty rights of Americans. It makes no provision, no condition, that the new government set up there shall not be recognized until it protects and guarantees the rights of other nationalities in the islands. Yet, Mr. President, we as a Nation are not only morally bound to do so but we are specifically bound to do so by the terms of the treaty of Paris. If this is an amendment which my friends on this side of the Chamber desire to engraft upon the bill, they should at least take the precautions which were taken in regard to Cuba and provide in this amendment that no government should be recognized there until it had bound itself to guarantee not only American rights in the islands but other rights which have become vested under the protection of the American flag, rights which we have solemnly promised Spain in the treaty of Paris we would see were protected.

I certainly think that the Senator from Arkansas can hardly be willing to leave his amendment in such a shape as not to protect those rights, compelling the President to recognize a government in the Philippine Islands before he has secured from it sufficient guaranties for the protection of the rights of other nationalities in those islands, rights which are as good as American rights.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator need not consume any time on that proposition. I am perfectly willing, in the line where it says "citizens or corporations of the United States," to insert the words "or others." I do not believe other nations expect us, in dealing with a sovereign—as I hope to see the Philippine Islands before long—to take care of their own interests. I believe they can do that in the Philippines. They generally do that elsewhere for themselves. If it will obviate the necessity of discussing it, I have no objection to putting in the words "or others."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am glad to hear the Senator say these are rights we ought to protect.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. We ought to protect the Philippines as far as we can so long as we stay there and protect our own rights.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, is it possible the President of the United States will not protect rights without specifying in a provision that he shall do it? It is absurd.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. In answer to that, I may say the Congress of the United States did not leave this matter as it stands in the case of Cuba. The Congress of the United States instructed its agents to require of the constitutional convention of Cuba that it should enter into certain obligations to do the things which I think we should now require the new government in the Philippine Islands to do. It is easy to frame a bill or an amendment and make it general in its terms, but when a great Nation like the United States has assumed solemn treaty obligations I think those treaty obligations should be provided for in every act of legislation by which American sovereignty is relinquished over the islands.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, there is no question but that those rights ought to be guaranteed, and there is no doubt in my mind that the President will require that guaranty. You can not specify in an amendment or in a bill every detail and every step necessary. We know that any President will want to protect not only citizens of the United States but citizens of any foreign country. So, even if there was no guaranty or any expression whatever, I have not any doubt that, in the interest of the Filipinos themselves, protection would be extended to them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The trouble is the Senator forgets that the Senator from Arkansas in this amendment has undertaken to specify the things that the President shall require of a new Philippine government, and he has omitted the very treaty obligation that we are solemnly bound to perform.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator need not take any more time on that, if he is willing to be satisfied with the suggestion I now make, and that is to add, after the words "United States," in line 3, page 3, the words "and others," so as to read "and safeguard all of the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States or others resident or engaged in business in said Philippines or having property interests therein."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think it should be more specific than that, because our guaranties to Spain are more specific than that.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. We do not need to duplicate it in a statute.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We did in the statute we passed relating to Cuba give very specific and elaborate directions to the constitutional convention of Cuba. Those directions were sent direct to that constitutional convention, and it was required to place them in the constitution which the Cuban people adopted.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No; but we did not require the Cuban people to assume to pay the debts Spain had contracted on behalf of Cuba. We left that saddled on Spain, and she has had to pay it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We did whatever we were under any treaty obligations to do. That is all there is in this case.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I do not want to mix in this transaction any idea that we have got to ask the consent of anybody to do anything we want to do. We have a treaty obligation with Spain and we will meet it according to its spirit and meaning. We do not want to have our hands tied so that we can not legislate according to the powers of Congress, simply because some imaginary difficulty will hereafter arise with some other country.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Let me read some of the obligations we took to Spain in the treaty of Paris:

> Spanish subjects, natives of the peninsula, residing in the Territory over which Spain by the present treaty relinquishes or cedes her sovereignty, may remain in such Territory or may remove therefrom, retaining in either event all their rights of property, including the right to sell or dispose of such property or of its proceeds; and they shall also have the right to carry on their industry, commerce, and professions, being subject in respect thereof to such laws as are applicable to other foreigners.

Is it proper in our act permitting the President to make a treaty with the new government of the Philippine Islands to simply guarantee Americans in their rights and fail to guarantee the rights of Spaniards and other foreigners?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator is a lawyer and he understands that the document from which he is reading speaks of the obligation of one party to it to another. There is not any limitation upon the power of the United States to get out of the islands and turn that government over to another government. It is simply a stipulation that the United States will not deny any of the things granted there. If, when the Philippine Islands become an independent republic, it is violating any of those regulations or stipulations it will then be the proper occasion for Spain to make representations to the Philippine Islands and have them corrected in the usual way.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Philippine people can only become an independent people by the consent of the United States, and we, in giving that consent, should make it a condition that they shall carry out and observe to the letter all the solemn obligations we took to Spain.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Then they are not independent. The very idea of independence is the privilege of doing wrong if you want to do it, subject to your responsibility. To stay there and say that the Philippines shall carry out every contract we ever made would not be to grant them independence.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Article 10——

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. It seems to me the Senator from Nebraska has now reached a very interesting point. His argument inevitably leads to the conclusion that we must ask the consent of Spain before we leave the islands.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Not at all.

Mr. CUMMINS. Suppose Spain should say we are willing to take the obligation of the United States that these things should be done, but we are entirely unwilling to take the obligation of the government in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Not at all. We shall simply, in relinquishing the sovereignty which we got from Spain, relinquish it upon the condition that the power to which we relinquish it shall carry out the obligations which we assumed. We did in Cuba exactly that thing. We required the new Cuban Government to undertake the same obligations. For instance, here is another article in the treaty of Paris:

> The inhabitants of the territory over which Spain relinquishes or cedes her sovereignty shall be secured in the free exercise of their religion.

Suppose a new government set up there should undertake to interfere with that; we would have put that new government into existence, and before we put it into existence we should obligate it to carry out exactly the obligations which we had assumed.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will yield for just one moment, I wish to ask, suppose we kept up that and the new government went along and did those things anyhow, how could we be held responsible for it?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Because we had created it; we have an absolute sovereignty there at the present time, an unquestioned sovereignty.

Mr. HARDWICK. In other words, then, we would have no right to leave them?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We would have the right to leave them if we required them to sign an obligation to make good the promises we had made.

Mr. HARDWICK. Then, suppose they did not?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, we would have the power to enforce it; but if we go out of there without making them assume that obligation, we shall have no power to enforce it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Would the Senator agree to the amendment if there should be inserted in it language to the effect that we shall require that all the obligations that the United States Government has agreed to with Spain shall be agreed to by the Philippine people?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That would make the amendment a great deal better, and it may be that I shall be brought to the point of supporting it, but I certainly can not support it in its present shape. That is only one of the criticisms I have to make of it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I sympathize with a great deal that the Senator from Nebraska has said, but I should like to know whether I understand him correctly to say that when the United States shall part with the Philippine Islands, surrender all its sovereignty over the islands, and when an independent government shall be set up by the Filipino people, the United States will be still bound to see that the stipulations of the treaty entered into between the United States and Spain are carried out by the government of the Philippine Islands? Is that the position of the Senator?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, my position is that we ought at least to make them promise to observe our obligations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The question is whether we would be bound. If that is true, it is rather an unfortunate condition. The Senator, if I understand him, would try——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. They may violate American rights there, and there may come a question whether we shall step in and protect American rights; but we certainly owe to them as much obligation to carry out these treaty promises as we do to American citizens who have gone in there under our flag, and we can not in honor dodge those obligations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will bear with me, this treaty between ourselves and Spain is binding upon the Governments of those two countries; and when we leave the Philippines, whether we surrender them to the people of the islands themselves or whether we turn them over to some other country, whatever we may do with them when we finally leave them and surrender our sovereignty, our responsibility to Spain under the treaty has entirely ended. Those stipulations are not in the nature of covenants running with the land, and they are not covenants that bind us after we have parted with the land, as it seems to me.

Mr. McCUMBER. But the responsibility of the Filipinos continues.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator from North Dakota suggests that the responsibility of the Filipinos continues. It does not as to this treaty, because the treaty was not made between the Filipinos and Spain.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We secured the sovereignty over the Philippines by treaty with the power that had that sovereignty, and in making that treaty we entered into certain obligations with respect to the Spanish citizens of that country. I can not conceive that the Senator from Utah would be willing to turn them over to a comparatively irresponsible power, without making the stipulation that our promises should be carried out. The Spaniards are still there; the business still continues. Would the Senator omit that from the amendment, and thus invite the new Philippine government to discriminate against those Spaniards?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is another proposition.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is the same proposition.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is only the other side of it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No. I think, when we come to sever our relations, that we ought to protect other countries as much as we can; but, after all, we do it not as a matter of obligation, not as a matter of treaty responsibility, but purely as a matter of comity.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. May I ask the Senator from Nebraska a question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. Suppose that the Filipino people did not want the Spaniards, or their kind, to live in the country at all, and that the policy of the Philippine government, about to be established, were that all such aliens should leave the country; would our right to liberate them or to allow them to become independent depend upon securing from Spain consent to that policy?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not endeavoring to secure anything from Spain; I am endeavoring, as a condition of the recognition of a new government, to say to that new government, "You must carry out the obligations which we were bound to carry out while we were in the islands."

Mr. CUMMINS. Then, the Senator believes that any new government, the independent government, sought to be established in the Philippine Islands should be bound by all the obligations that the United States has undertaken?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; with relation to that country.

Mr. CUMMINS. With relation to anything?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; not with relation to anything; but with relation to matters under that new government and under that new sovereignty.

Mr. CUMMINS. And that we are not at liberty to surrender our sovereignty there unless the people of the Philippines are willing to undertake those obligations?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think so.

Mr. CUMMINS. That necessarily, of course, involves the further suggestion made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], that if the Philippine government should disregard these obligations, we would be bound to enforce them or be responsible to the government to which they were given.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As to our responsibility to the other governments I am not undertaking to say. I am, however, undertaking to say that we should not put this power into new hands without requiring them to exercise it as we were bound to exercise it.

Mr. CUMMINS. If that is true, the independence of the Filipino is a dream, and never can be accomplished.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, is the independence of the Filipino a dream if we require him to protect American rights and interests there?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly, it is a dream.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I can not see that it is any more a dream when we are required to protect American rights than when we require them to protect Spanish rights, which we have agreed to protect.

Mr. CUMMINS. I suppose we have the right—I am sure we have—to insist upon a certain constitution or plan of government before we surrender our sovereignty.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think so.

Mr. CUMMINS. That we have a right to do, or we should maintain our possession of the islands; but when that is done, then the Filipino people stand independent before the world; and if we can not escape the consequence of anything which the Filipino government might thereafter do, I, for one, do not want to see them independent. If we have to be responsible for their conduct, I would rather administer their government.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not seeking to assume responsibility for them; I am seeking to exact a promise from them that they shall, in taking over the government, also take over the promises which we have made.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am not disputing the advisability of requiring that; but the reason which the Senator from Nebraska gives for requiring these promises is that we are held to Spain and must answer to Spain for this obligation, and I entirely dissent from the Senator in believing that we have any such obligation toward Spain.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator agrees with my proposition, I, of course, am not particularly disappointed that he criticizes my reasoning; that may not be correctly stated; but certainly some provision of this sort, recognizing the treaty obligations of the United States, should be put into the amendment if it is to be solemnly enacted into law.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I may say there, if the Senator from Nebraska will allow me, that, in my opinion, he has not touched the gravest objection to the amendment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have not yet finished.

Mr. CUMMINS. He is possibly passing the point I have in mind. The United States, in this amendment, does not reserve the right to exercise, nor does it have any opportunity to exercise, any discretion over the plan of government which the Filipino people are expected to establish.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am coming to that. Now, I want to call attention to what there is in the Philippine Islands. Besides our army of 12,000 Americans and 1,000 marines, there are 2,000 Americans in the civilian employ of the government, and a civilian population engaged in business of 8,500. There are 6,500 white Europeans, probably the larger portion of whom are Spaniards, but included in the number are English, Germans, Swedes, Swiss, Danes, Russians, and other nationalities. They all have business interests; they all have investments; many of them have gone in there under the protection of the American flag. Are we to pull out and leave those islands without asking the new government to protect the lives of those people and to guarantee their interests the same as American rights and interests are protected and guaranteed? Yet the amendment as proposed by the Senator from Arkansas would leave that unsaid, would leave the new government entirely capable of discriminating against those people.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Will the Senator permit me to make one observation in that connection?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. With pleasure.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. In delegating authority to a responsible source, it is always the preferable plan to delegate it in very general terms. It is a principle of law that enumeration will weaken in the delegation of authority, because when you go out to deal with subjects outside of the text they must be of the same general class under the doctrine of ejusdem generis. In writing this amendment I kept that principle in view, and provided that—

the President is hereby invested with full power and authority to make such orders and regulations and to enter into such negotiations with the authorities of said Philippines.

If the United States stands in the attitude of an indorser of any pledge that has been made to Spain that affects its relations with the Philippine Islands, of course under existing provisions of law the President would have a right to take that into consideration; and, as the Senator from Iowa properly says, in any government that they set up there there must be, or there should be—and there will be—a provision made for respecting in good faith the rights of everybody who would be affected, remotely or otherwise, by the change of sovereignty that takes place. It is not to be assumed that the President is seeking to do anything he should not do, to run away and leave the obligations of the United States unprotected. He is to settle and adjust the matter finally, and upon the high plane on which a great Government like this will deal with all of its obligations; and the assumption is that they will be dealt with justly and honorably. That is so obviously so that every fair-minded man must admit that the settlement will be made on that basis.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am aware that the Senator has drawn his amendment in very general terms; that is what I am criticizing. I say that, according to the precedent in the case of Cuba, this amendment should be so drawn as to specifically include the things that we know the new government of the Philippines should recognize; and it should not specify American rights any more than it should specify other rights guaranteed by the treaty, and for which we are morally responsible.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Would this suggestion meet the views of the Senator, by inserting after the words "United States" the words "and of other countries," so that it would read:

And to cause to be acknowledged, respected, and safeguarded all of the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States and of other countries resident or engaged in business in said Philippines or having property interests therein.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think that would improve the amendment a great deal; but, as the Senator from Arkansas has himself stated, the amendment is somewhat of a patchwork already, and, in my opinion, it should be redrafted.

Now, Mr. President, I want to call attention to the next matter of which I have made a note here, and that is an amendment which the Senator from Arkansas has already indicated he may accept. He provides in his amendment that immediately after the passage of this act the President shall undertake to enter into negotiations with other countries for the neutralization of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I have no objection to that being stricken out.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understand. I can not imagine a worse time than the present for the United States to undertake to enter into negotiations with other countries for a joint guaranty of the independence of the Philippine Islands or for anything else. We know that with most of the nations at war it would be absolutely impossible at the present time to initiate, much less secure, such an agreement, and I think that should be left wholly within the discretion of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I concede that it would be very difficult, even in times of peace, to secure from the nations of the world a guaranty of the neutrality of the Philippine Islands when the matter is left in the condition it will be left in if this amendment is adopted. Guarantee the independence of what? Of a nation that has not come into being? Guarantee the independence of the Philippine Islands when the next Congress or the Congress after or the Congress four years from now may not grant it? Guarantee the independence of the Philippine Islands when the President by his proclamation has power to continue American control for another year? I think that that is a matter which the President should not take up until it has been definitely arranged that the new government is to go into existence and exactly what it is to be. It is going to be hard enough in any event to secure joint action from the great nations of the world to guarantee the independence of the Philippine Islands.

Do Senators think, for instance, that it will be easy to secure a guaranty of the independence of the Philippine Islands from Great Britain—Great Britain that has three or four million Malay subjects within a few hundred miles of the Philippine Islands; Great Britain that is exercising dominion over a number of different races of the world with whom she is having trouble in maintaining her sovereignty at times? I doubt very much whether the British Empire will undertake to guarantee the independence of a Malay republic or any other republic in the Orient, because it will simply add to the agitation among her own people. I might continue the illustration by mentioning other nations. I think the securing of an international guaranty is a very difficult matter, and is certainly not one which should be undertaken at this time when the world is aflame with war.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, does the Senator think that there would be any difficulty in getting Great Britain or any of the other nations to assert, as they did assert in the case of the independence of Hawaii, that they would respect the possessions of the Philippines and would not attempt by the extension of suzerainty or in any other way to exercise jurisdiction or control over them?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. A joint guaranty of that kind involves representatives of those countries meeting together and discussing it; and it is not within the possibilities this year or possibly next year or the year after next to get such representatives together. This is the most inopportune time that could possibly have been selected.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I agree with the Senator that the word "immediately" ought to be stricken out. I do not believe that it is a very opportune time right now; but, at the same time, I believe that we could get an agreement with other nations to respect the territorial possessions of the new Philippine Government.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Colorado, with the permission of the Senator from Nebraska, a question in connection with what has just been said?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. TOWNSEND. What would the Senator from Colorado do in case they made an agreement and did not respect the agreement?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I believe that we would have to rely very largely upon the good faith and honesty of the nations. Sometimes when there is great stress and the motives are strong agreements may be violated; but I do not believe, in the absence of any such condition, that there will be any difficulty. Those conditions do not seem to be applicable to this case; but, in any event, at the end of the five-year period our responsibility would be ended and we could do what we pleased at that time.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does the Senator believe, or can he conceive, that it would be possible to involve the United States in war over that proposition?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I think not. Our responsibility now might involve us in war, if it were attempted to do something in contravention of our rights; in fact, I think it unquestionably would; but we are now proposing a lessening of our responsibilities, and it seems to me that we ought to try to bring about the best possible conditions. The difficulty with this situation is this——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator permit me to finish? I have only a little more to say.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well. I merely wanted to amplify my suggestion.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I come to the provision which requires the President to recognize any stable government that may be set up. We required the people of Cuba to do something more than that; we required the people of Cuba to erect a republican form of government.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. And the Cubans were within 100 miles of our own shores, while the Philippine people are 7,000

miles away in a locality where republics are not very fashionable.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is true, Mr. President; but it is also true that this great Nation has spent tens of millions of dollars in the attempt to erect a republican form of government in the Philippine Islands, and I tell you that any party which would take the responsibility of destroying a republican form of government and permitting the creation of an autocracy where the seeds of freedom have once been planted, will be repudiated by the American people. While we are requiring the people of the Philippine Islands to erect a stable government, it is just as easy to say that they shall have a government republican in form. That is the idea that the United States stands for; that is already an idea that will be welcomed by the Philippine people. We should not permit a limited class of the Filipinos to erect a monarchial form of government or an autocracy; we should at the time we are relinquishing our sovereignty over the Philippine Island give to the people of those islands at least the protection of requiring the new government to be republican in form.

Moreover, Mr. President, we should require that this new government should be established by peaceful means. There is nothing in the pending amendment that would prevent the new Philippine governmet from being established by a bloody revolution, so when we are relinquishing our authority in the Philippine Islands, we should lay down also as a condition of recognition that the new government shall be republican in form, and that it shall be established by peaceful means. I think, as I have already said, that the American people will hold any party responsible in this country that fails at least to do that much for the Philippine people when they are turned loose, as the phrase goes, on the great unknown sea of self-government.

Mr. President, I have said this much by way of criticism or analysis of this amendment. I am sorry that it has been introduced. I think that the bill which was presented by the committee had been carefully drawn and carefully digested. I believe it would have received the support not only of the Senators on this side of the Chamber but of a very large number of Senators on the other side of the Chamber. I believe it would have settled the Philippine question, and settled it in a nonpartisan way. I know the Philippine people were satisfied with it. I know that they thought that the first great step toward independence would have been taken by its passage. That bill, if passed, would not only give them their own legislature but the control of almost all of their public officials, the control of taxation, and it would have given them the solemn promise of the Congress of the United States that they were to become an independent nation. It would have been satisfactory; and we could have, with confidence, left to other Congresses the carrying out of the promise made, and, with confidence, we could have left it to the Philippine people that they would work up toward the ideal of self-government in the hope of receiving all the earlier the final act of legislation which would give them their independence. I had hoped that the bill might pass in that form. I believe if it could have remained in that form it would have been passed readily, but this amendment is here, and I present to-day these criticisms of it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not remember that in the course of the colloquy which occurred during my remarks on the pending bill the principal criticisms made by various Senators upon the other side of the Chamber were as to the indefiniteness of the promise, and that Senator after Senator rose and said that there ought to be a more definite promise of independence; that discord would be produced unless the Filipinos were given some such assurance? The preamble, as it existed in the bill, instead of satisfying Senators upon the Republican side of the Chamber, seemed to create a storm of discord over there.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I remember some discussion of that kind.

Mr. President, before I sit down I want to come to the last point of criticism. The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas closes with a direction to the President, or with authority given to the President, to give the guaranty on behalf of the United States alone for the protection of the independence of the Philippine Islands in case the President is not able to secure the cooperation of other countries. Now, Mr. President, I, for one, am not willing at this time to enter into that obligation. The time may come after the establishment of a Philippine government, after we know what they are going to do, when I shall be willing to empower the President of the United States with authority to give that guaranty; but, Mr. President, I think it is altogether too large an obligation for this Government to assume so long in advance. I know that for the United States to guarantee the independence of the Philippine Islands even for five years after the expiration of the four-year period will be as serious an obligation as any we are incurring now in the control of the islands. I know it will cost as much money, and I know it will involve a great many more dangers and complications; and when the proper time comes, if the Senator from Arkansas insists on his amendment in its present form, I shall move to strike out at least that part of the amendment.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, I should like some expression of his views as to the propriety of our maintaining a naval base and a coaling station in the Philippines, with the complete independence of the islands.

Suppose that we should give the islands independence, and that they should grant to us a coaling station or naval base, and immediately after obtaining their independence they should proceed to grant the same kind of rights to Japan, or to Great Britain, or to Germany. What would our attitude be, and what authority would we have to exercise over those islands in order to protect our own naval base?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I think the Senator raises a very serious question; and it is a question that I, for one, think the present Congress should not undertake to meet. It is not in the original bill. It comes up only as a part of this amendment. There seems to be a general sentiment that when we recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands we should perhaps retain a naval base and a coaling station, or some other property rights or privileges of that sort. That, however, is a question for the future, and in my opinion it is one that this Congress ought not to attempt to settle.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nebraska whether the hearings developed the value of the island of Batun, which is a small island southeast of Luzon, as a naval base?

I recall that when I was a member of the Committee on the Philippines the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] proposed some measure for the development of that island because of the large measures of coal there. During the discussion it was developed that the island was almost uninhabited; that these coal measures existed; that there was a fairly good harbor upon the island; and that if we should at some time determine to cut loose from the Philippines Batun Island, on account of its lack of complications as to population and its separation from the main islands, would make an excellent naval base and commercial station for the United States, somewhat resembling Hongkong, which, as the Senator will recollect, is an island detached from the mainland of China. Can the Senator give me any information upon that subject?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I am not able to do so, because our committee gave very little of its time to the consideration of military or naval questions or policies. We were engaged in the effort to frame a bill that would extend a measure of self-government to the Philippine people, with the promise of ultimate independence. We were expecting to leave to future Congresses the decision of the important question whether the independence of the new government, when recognized, should be guaranteed; and we were not supposed to take into account the values of the various islands for those purposes. I have no doubt the Senator is better informed on that subject than I am.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, for that reason it seems to me it might be well to postpone final action upon this bill until a later day, some time in this session, meanwhile giving the Committee on the Philippine Islands an opportunity of fully investigating the questions that are covered by the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. It is very clear, as the Senator from Nebraska has stated, that this committee confined itself entirely to the question of giving the Filipinos a larger share in their government, and not to the question as to the preparations that might be made for finally cutting loose from those islands.

It now seems to be the opinion of the Senate, from the expressions which I have thus far heard—an opinion in which I share—that we ought now to determine decisively, so far as we can, the relation of those islands to this country. In that view a very important inquiry remains yet to be developed by the Committee on the Philippines, and that is, what preparations are to be made by the United States with a view to shaping gradually the separation of those islands from this country.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. NEWLANDS. If the Senator will permit me, I will conclude in a moment.

My own view was as I expressed it in 1906, after my return from a trip to the Philippine Islands with Mr. Taft and his party, that we should prepare for that separation within a period of 20 years, and that we should address ourselves with the greatest vigor to giving the Filipino people a common language, appropriating money directly from the United States Treasury if necessary in order to accomplish that purpose. It is perfectly evident that out of a total insular revenue of only $11,000,000, or with the municipal revenues added, only $17,000,000, they could not assign to educational purposes more than the $2,000,000 then annually appropriated, and that was sufficient to take care of only one-fourth of the children of the islands.

I also contended during that time that we should teach the Filipino people how to work, and therefore industrial training was essential; and that industrial training necessarily meant not only industrial schools but an agricultural bank that would aid the Filipino farmer to get the improved instruments of production and to use them. At that time they were using the forked stick instead of the plow. I urged that an appropriation should be made, if necessary, by the United States Government for the establishment of such a Filipino bank, with a capital of at least $10,000,000.

I also urged that it was essential that we should untie those islands so far as their tariff relations with the United States were concerned; that if we looked to a thoroughly individualized life for the Philippine Islands that meant an uncomplicated fiscal and tariff system of their own eventually, and that we should not by a favored tariff system, giving their products favor in our markets and our products favor in theirs, create a condition of mutual subsidy which it would be hard to undo, and which if undone abruptly at some future time would involve those islands in industrial and commercial complications that would bring about depression in business, unemployment, and want, and as a necessary result revolution itself, which would entirely undo the good work which we had accomplished.

All these things, it seems to me, ought to be looked after in any rational preparation for parting with those islands. Whilst I am in favor of parting with them as soon as possible, I want to part with them as creditably as possible. It seems to me that the Senate could well defer its final action upon all the amendments to this bill for a period of a month or six weeks or two months, fixing a certain day for their consideration, and that meanwhile the Committee on the Philippine Islands could address itself to these questions which it has not thus far considered, and present to us a complete scheme of gradual withdrawal from the islands.

If the suggestion which I then made had been carried out, they would have been much better prepared for separation than they are now, for my suggestion involved securing to the Philippines a thoroughly individualized life, with their own fiscal and tariff system entirely uncomplicated with our own, the only connecting link between the islands and our own being the commission itself, which constituted the higher legislative body of those islands. Later on, if a native legislative body were substituted for this, they would be prepared to carry on an individualized life after a president or an executive of that republic were selected in the place of the Governor General whom we have there.

These complications exist. We do not know what naval bases we want, if any. We do not know what commercial stations we want, if any. We hardly know to-day what our tariff relations are with those islands. We do not know to-day what our complications are as to trade. We hardly know to-day what our complications are with those islands as to our navigation laws. We have undoubtedly, both in Cuba and in the Philippine Islands, built up favored conditions of trade for this country under which we have ousted the trade of other countries hitherto enjoying trade with those islands and substituted our own; and we are now about to give the Philippine Islands a separate existence.

This question of complicated trade relations is a very important one. I do not wish to see this country enter upon the decision of a great economic question without preparation. We have been accustomed to play with economic questions in the gayest of ways, unmindful of the disruptions in business, in trading conditions, of unemployment and want, created by our action. I should like to see the great American Nation finish this great job, this altruistic job, that it has started out to perform, with a proper regard not simply for vague principles of liberty and independence but with a proper regard for the substantial economic welfare of the Filipino people.

Mr. President, with the permission of the Senate, I should like to insert in the RECORD the whole or portions of two magazine articles, one in the North American Review and the other in the Independent, written in the years 1905 and 1906, respectively, after my return from the Philippines, and at a time when I was a member, I think, of the Philippine Committee, and when these questions of tariff adjustments were under consideration. These articles contain much that is applicable at the present time regarding the policy of gradual separation from the Philippines, although the forecast regarding possible importations of sugar from the islands has not been fully realized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? If not, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

A DEMOCRAT IN THE PHILIPPINES.

[Article from the North American Review of December, 1905, by Francis G. Newlands, United States Senator from Nevada.]

When Secretary Taft invited me to accompany him on his trip to the Philippines I hesitated. I had been opposed from the start to the acquisition of the islands. On the day following Dewey's victory I had personally urged President McKinley to order his fleet to Cuba, insisting that the purpose of the war was not to conquer the Philippines, but to free Cuba, upon whose soil we had not yet landed a soldier. After Spain passed her scant title to us, I had urged that we should hold the islands in trust for the Filipino people, that we should make an immediate declaration of our purpose to grant them independence, and that we should take steps to quickly accomplish this purpose.

I had no illusions regarding the Filipino people. I did not believe them fitted for democratic methods of government, nor that they could quickly develop into a homogeneous people, or act with unity of purpose. I thought it probable that, if we left them to themselves, there would be civil war and continued disorder until some foreign power should intervene, or one race should gain the mastery over the others, or the leadership of some masterful man should result in military dictatorship.

While these consequences might be deplorable, I did not deem it our duty to attempt to avert them by subjugating the numerous races of the archipelago. If the Filipino people were to be killed, it were better that they should kill each other than that we should kill them; or if they were to be conquered by a foreign power, that some other country should undertake the destructive task. Besides, I believe that the proper evolution of the Filipino people was not be accomplished through subjection to an alien people, but through the slow process of self-development by which nations have risen to strength and power.

I was concerned more for our own people and institutions than for the Filipino people or their institutions. I felt that a great nation, established for the first time in the history of the world upon the basic principle that just government rests upon the consent of the governed, and that taxation and representation are inseparable, should not qualify ideals which had advanced democratic institutions everywhere. I felt that our institutions were endangered by an intense commercialism, which had lowered the standards of municipal, State, and national life, and that our concern should be to save democracy at home rather than to promote imperialism abroad.

Such were my views regarding the Philippines, but the country had in two campaigns decided that the Philippines should be retained. While my views had not changed, I felt the futility of further contention, and feared that a trip to the Philippines would simply be a waste of time.

But I also recognized the fact that the two parties, as represented by their leaders, Roosevelt and Bryan, did not stand far apart. Bryan from the start had insisted that there should be an immediate declaration of our purpose to grant independence to the Filipinos. Roosevelt, in a recent message, had declared that it was his firm belief that the United States could help the Filipinos to rise higher and higher in the scale of civilization and capacity for self-government, and that it was his earnest hope that in the end they would be able to stand, if not entirely alone, yet in some such relation to the United States as that in which Cuba now stands.

It was clear, therefore, that the best men of both parties were now intent upon solving the question in a manner consistent with the theory and the traditions of our Government.

The most potent factor in this dispassionate view of the question had been Judge Taft, whose fixed determination to conduct the government of the Philippines in the interest of the Filipino people as a sacred trust, uncontrolled by selfish considerations, had aroused the moral sentiment and challenged the admiration of the country. I felt that the invitation of such a man to members of the opposite party to accompany him upon his proposed trip of inspection, affording, as it did, opportunity for nonpartisan consideration of the Philippine question, was not to be lightly regarded, and I concluded to accept the invitation.

THE FILIPINO PEOPLE.

At almost every city and town we visited we were entertained by processions representing the army, the native scouts and constabulary, the various industries and the schools, as well as by banquets in which leading Filipinos participated. We also had hearings of those interested in the various agricultural and business pursuits and those who had suggestions and complaints to make regarding existing political conditions. From my observations and inquiry, I should say that the Filipinos are an interesting people and capable of much development. The children learn English with great facility and there seems to be a general desire among all classes for education, the night schools being crowded by those who are occupied during the day. The total population is about 7,000,000. The number of children of school age (7 to 15) is over 2,000,000, of whom only about one-sixth are enrolled. I was told that there was much eagerness to attend the schools, but that insufficiency of funds prevented the increase of the enrollment.

We listened to the Filipino leaders at banquets and public meetings. They had, as a rule, pleasing voices, of a vibrant tone that appealed to the emotions, and I have no doubt that they would be very potent in influencing the masses of their people. They carried themselves with dignity and self-control. They showed much familiarity with our struggle for independence, and spoke persuasively, earnestly, and eloquently regarding the aspirations of their people for independence. But it was

not apparent that they had much conception of the individual rights and the fundamental liberties which independence should secure. It is impossible that they could have. The educated class constitutes a very small percentage of the population. Most of them had been trained under the Spanish government of dishonesty and graft, in which almost every official was the oppressor, certainly not the servant, of the people, and under which the peasants, constituting about 90 per cent of the population, were exploited by the official and influential classes, both Spanish and Filipinos. These peasants are said to be patient, submissive, easily influenced and easily led. Under the influence of their leaders, the patient agricultural peasants of to-day become the ladrones or the fanatical pulijanes or the patriotic insurrectos, or all combined, of to-morrow. They have been accustomed to the orinetal system, represented by rulers such as sultans, datos and caciques, headmen who direct the energies of their people, and to whose will the peasant class is subject.

That the peasants also desire independence can not be doubted. They would prefer to be led and governed by their own leaders, even though the latter have in view their industrial subjection. I am satisfied, from what I have seen and heard in the Philippines, that there can be no permanent friendliness between the Filipinos and the Americans. The Filipino people, as a rule, wish a national life, even though most of them have no real conception of what liberty means.

The islands were not quiet. A long and expensive campaign had been waged in Cavite against the ladrones, necessitating martial law and the reconcentration of the natives, who were disposed to shelter and protect them.

Samar had been in confusion as the result of the outbreak of the pulijanes or "red breeches," the mountain people of that island, in an insurrectionary movement, half religious and fanatical and half protest against the native officials, who, though elected under American administration, thought their offices justified Spanish and Oriental extortion and oppression. All these movements taxed to the full the strength of the scouts and the constabulary forces.

PRESENT CONDITIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

In contrast with the beautiful appearance of the islands was the doleful story of the people. Added to the ravages of the civil war with Spain, and of our war of conquest, were the disasters caused by cholera, rinderpest, surra, the locusts, and typhoons. The agricultural depression was great. The sugar plantations were without modern machinery and modern methods, and it was impossible to borrow money for their renovation. And yet, notwithstanding these untoward conditions, the apparent contradiction of an increase in wages also existed and it was difficult to get laborers for agricultural industries. This was accounted for by the statement that the movements of the military forces and the public works had withdrawn the laborers from the farms. Indisposition to work was also complained of. The increase in wages enabled the natives to secure by one day's labor what used to require two. The result was that the laborer, having earned in one or two days enough to secure a week's supply of rice, would lie off until the pressure of hunger again drove him to work.

THE INSULAR COMMISSION.

The Philippine Commission is conscientiously working out the problems of good government, with a single eye to the prosperity and advancement of the Filipino people. It is not yet a government of the people or by the people, but it is preeminently a government for the people, and its purpose is to instruct the people, and particularly the peasant class, so as to give them a realization of what justice, individual rights, and civil responsibility mean.

Believing that a common language and the creation of a public opinion are essential to self-government, the Commission has prepared to make the universal language English. English is taught first by American teachers and later on by Filipino teachers, who have been instructed by them. The educational expenditure, insular, provincial, and municipal, is about $2,000,000 gold annually. At least $6,000,000 is required.

This educational system, of course, involves the danger that the educated child is likely to drift from manual labor, but the commission is wisely directing it in industrial channels by promoting agricultural and manual-training schools.

In addition to the requirements of education, money is also required for road building, for railroads, for harbor and municipal improvements, and for the development of the agricultural interests. The municipal and harbor improvements and road building have been covered by bond issues authorized at the last session, with interest, if I am right, at 5 per cent.

Congress recently authorized the construction of about 1,000 miles of railroad in the various islands by private corporations, involving a cost of about $30,000,000, and the issue by them of bonds for such construction, with interest at 4 per cent, the interest to be guaranteed by the insular government. As the amount of the bonds will doubtless build the railroads, I urged in the Senate that we should authorize the insular government to build the railroads and to issue bonds therefor to the extent of $30,000,000 at 2 per cent, with the guaranty of the United States as to both principal and interest. While not prepared to urge Government ownership at home, owing to the complexity of our Government and the difficulty of insuring businesslike methods of administration, I felt that Government ownership suited the necessarily paternal nature of the insular government and was merely in line with the policy now adopted as the result of experience with both State-aided and State-owned railroads in the British and Dutch East Indies and that the commission was a body of such capacity, integrity, experience, and administrative qualifications that it could easily undertake the work. The saving between 2 per cent, the rate of bonds so guaranteed by the United States, and the income which a private corporation would expect, would pay for the roads in 30 years, and a light cost of transportation would greatly lighten the burdens of the Islands. I regret to say that the movement failed.

AGRICULTURAL BANK.

There is strong need of an agricultural bank, resembling those of Germany and Egypt, with a capital of at least $10,000,000. It is impossible to expect such a bank to be organized by private capital when the condition is such as is described by the Manila Chamber of Commerce in these words:

"The country, generally speaking, is in a state of financial collapse. The agriculturists and merchants are passing through the worst crisis ever known in the annals of Filipino history. A series of calamities have contributed to bring the country to this deplorable state."

An agricultural bank could loan the money necessary to introduce improved methods, particularly on the sugar plantations. It could also aid in the development of the 400,000 acres of land purchased from the friars, which are still on the hands of the insular government. Assisted by the bureau of agriculture, it could accomplish the development of the general agricultural interests of the islands upon a thoroughly modern and scientific basis. All moneys advanced could be properly secured upon the improvements made, and thus an insular agricultural bank, with a capital derived from the sale of insular bonds at 2 per cent, guaranteed by the United States, could do a business that would earn at least 6 per cent.

It will be economy for the United States to move generously and efficiently now. Economic distress may result in discontent that will cause outbreaks whose suppression will cost infinitely more than the aid at present needed. It must be remembered that the tropical islands have been languishing for years. The Temperate Zone has beaten the Tropical Zone in competition in sugar and tobacco. The outbreak of Cuba against Spain was largely due to economic distress caused by the low price of sugar. I think it likely that it has also had something to do with the contemporaneous discontent in the Philippines.

The insular revenues are now only about $9,000,000 in gold, to which may be added $3,000,000 in gold as the municipal revenues for Manila and $2,000,000 in gold as the provincial and municipal revenues outside of Manila. Fourteen million dollars in gold is the sum that is now available annually for all purposes—insular, provincial, and municipal—in a government of 7,000,000 people. When we recall that the District of Columbia, with less than 300,000 people, requires about $9,000,000 or $10,000,000 annually for municipal and District purposes, it seems amazing that the Insular Commission should have accomplished so much with so little.

ABOLITION OF TARIFF DUTIES.

The main measure of relief for the Philippine Islands thus far urged is the abolition of American duties on Philippine products, to be followed, when the Spanish treaty expires three years hence, by the abolition of Philippine duties upon American products. Such a proposition involves the closed door in the Philippines at a time when we are strenuously urging the open door in China, Manchuria, and Korea. This is both wrong and impolitic; wrong because consistency is required of nations as well as individuals, and impolitic because it will give Japan and China an excuse for securing favored arrangements in the Orient which will exclude our products. If we get the monopoly of imports into the Philippines, it would not compensate for the losses which we would sustain in the rest of the Orient by the assertion of this policy. If we refuse equal opportunities for Japanese trade in the Philippines, how can we insist upon equal opportunities with Japan in Manchuria and Korea?

I am aware that this suggestion of free trade, or freer trade, appeals to many Democrats; but reflection, I think, should convince anyone that the arrangement, so far as the Philippine Islands are concerned, means restricted trade, not freer trade. At present the Philippine Islands have a tariff which conforms to the theory of a tariff for revenue only, so strenuously urged by many Democrats, for it imposes a duty of only 20 per cent upon importations from all countries, including the United States, without preference to any. It is now proposed that this tariff should be maintained as to all other countries, but be abolished as to the United States, the very purpose being to give the United States the monopoly of imports into the Philippines and to exclude the products of England, France, Germany, Spain, and other countries. Can this restricted trade be called free trade or freer trade? At best the proposed arrangement will be one of subsidy.

SUGAR SUBSIDY.

The tendency of our policy in the Tropics has been to destroy the revenue feature of the sugar tax by giving the tax as an additional price to the producers of sugar in the tropical islands. The world's price of raw sugar is about 2 cents per pound, or $40 per ton; the price in America is $75 per ton, because the customs duty of 1¼ cents per pound, or $35 per ton, is added. When, therefore, sugar is imported from the tropical islands duty free, it sells in our markets at the same price as the duty-paid sugar—$75 per ton—and thus the tropical planter gets on the duty-free sugar, as a subsidy, the amount of the duty which the Treasury loses. Porto Rico, Cuba, and Hawaii send all their sugar to the United States, because the sugar of Porto Rico and Hawaii comes in duty free, and the Cuban sugar comes in with one-fourth of the duty, or about $9 per ton, off. On their production the planters in these islands get in the United States markets the following amounts annually more than they can get anywhere else, and this constitutes the annual subsidy of these tropical islands:

Hawaii, 400,000 tons, duty free, $35 per ton	$14,000,000
Porto Rico, 100,000 tons, duty free, $35 per ton	3,500,000
Cuba, 1,000,000 tons, one-fourth duty off, $9 per ton	9,000,000
Total subsidy	26,500,000

The imports from Cuba are increasing, and it is claimed that during the coming season they will be 1,300,000 tons.

Under similar circumstances there is no reason why the Filipino planters should not restore their old maximum of 400,000 tons annually, on which a similar subsidy of $35 per ton would amount to $14,000,000 per annum above what they could receive in Hongkong or in any other sugar market except the United States.

If, as has been done in Cuba, under the influence of a smaller subsidy, the increase should be to 1,000,000 tons annually, the total subsidy of the Filipino planters would amount to $35,000,000 annually, and the United States Treasury would suffer loss in that amount. In time, therefore, the sugar tax would lose its character as a revenue producer and would be turned into a subsidy for tropical islands.

POLITICAL COMPLICATIONS.

Important political difficulties are also likely to arise from complicating our revenue system with that of the Philippine Islands. The Philippine Islands are now almost entirely dependent upon customs duties for their revenue. If this plan of mutual subsidy goes through and the United States secures the monopoly of the Philippine markets, it necessarily follows that little or no revenue will come from the customs and that the Philippine Government will be compelled to substitute land and other internal taxes. Already it has taken measures to institute the land tax, and the protest is so loud and deep as to compel the postponement of its operation.

Again, I understand our purpose is to train the Filipino people in self-government, in the hope that ultimately they will be fitted for independence. If this be really our purpose, it would be very unwise to complicate the fiscal and revenue systems of the two countries; for, when separation comes, industrial disturbance may follow the

change in these fiscal and revenue relations. Our policy should be to hold the Philippines as an entity absolutely separate from the United States, the only connection between them being the civil government, which should gradually draw the Filipinos into participation until the time is ripe for independence. Then the United States can at any time declare its trust ended and turn over the government of the Philippines to its ward. It is an essential doctrine of equity that the trustee should not mingle his ward's property or interests with his own, and our government in the Philippines should be so administered as to enable our ward, when she comes to the maturity of her powers, to move among the nations in a thoroughly uncomplicated and individualized life. Would it not be uncandid, whilst professing a desire to fit the Filipino people for self-government and independence, to bind the two countries together, at the same time, so strongly by navigation laws and tariff legislation and commercial ties generally as to make it impossible to cut the political ties without a serious and perhaps fatal readjustment? If American capital secures the monopoly of ocean transportation between the islands and the United States, of interisland navigation, and of railroad transportation, and also the control of subsidized sugar planting, every selfish and commercial consideration will stand in the way of a moral settlement of this important question.

SUGGESTED LEGISLATION.

I would suggest, therefore, in place of the proposed reduction in duties the following legislation:

(1) The repeal of the act extending our coast navigation laws to the Philippine Islands. These will confessedly impose a higher burden on the transportation of her exports and imports than now. Their operation has already been postponed for a time by a recent act.

(2) If not too late, the repeal of the act authorizing insular aid for railroad building by the insular guaranty of 4 per cent interest on the $30,000,000 of bonds, and the substitution of insular construction and ownership of the proposed railroads accomplished by means of an insular bond issue at 2 per cent guaranteed by the United States.

(3) The authorization of insular, provincial, and municipal bonds sufficient to cover needed permanent improvements, the bonds bearing interest at 2 per cent, thus facilitating the application of a larger portion of current revenues to education, particularly of an industrial character. The enrollment of the schools should be trebled.

(4) An issue of $10,000,000 of bonds for an insular agricultural bank, the bonds to bear interest at 2 per cent and to be guaranteed by the United States; such bank to aid the introduction of machinery and improved methods in agriculture by secured loans to the farmers.

All these bonds should run for 30 years, in which time the saving in interest should pay for them. The total, including railroads, would be about $600,000,000, or, without railroads, $30,000,000.

SEPARATION.

When the time comes for final determination of the relations of the Filipinos to us, a plebiscite can be taken. If separation is then desired by either, it can be accomplished. Meanwhile, the United States can largely center its own expenditures at Subig Bay, which, cut off by the mountains from the rest of Luzon, and having but few native occupants, can be made an easily defended naval, coaling, and commercial station for our Navy and merchant marine. When the time comes for separation, we can easily retain Subig Bay and thus make it a link in the chain of our naval and commercial administration.

If the bonds authorized by us are not by that time retired, and if the islanders can not bear the burden of debt contracted by our authority, we can pay it and cancel the obligation, thus adding a timely generosity to the hundreds of millions now irreclaimably lost in the military and naval expenses connected with our control of the Philippines.

This will be more businesslike, wiser, and cheaper than the proposed tariff subsidy, which within 40 years would probably turn over to the Filipino planters from $300,000,000 to $600,000,000 in sugar subsidies paid by the American consumers in an unjust tax diverted from the United States Treasury. The islands will then be on a healthy and uncomplicated basis, instead of on a stimulated and complicated basis which will make the nursing bottle of subsidy essential to their existence.

I have not the space to enter into the consideration of the strategic mistake of having possessions occupied by unwilling subjects so far removed from our base—impossible of defense should the time come in the Orient when we may be beset by foes outside the islands and by insurrectos within, or of the great military expense entailed by holding them as an asset instead of a trust.

The fact is that, prior to the war, if Spain had offered them to us, we would have refused. Dewey's victory happened to be in Manila Bay instead of in the open sea. Shall we, therefore, permit ourselves to remain always under the tyranny of an accident?

But far above these practical considerations are the moral considerations for which Roosevelt, Bryan, and Taft stand as representatives of true democracy, which has not yet lost faith in government of the people, for the people, and by the people. We can not check the aspiration for independence in the Philippines when such advocates of political morality in both parties voice it in the United States. Separation will some day come. Let us intelligently prepare for it.

THE RIGHT WAY TO HELP THE FILIPINOS.

[An article from the Independent of Mar. 8, 1906, by FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS.]

(Senator NEWLANDS, of Nevada, was a member of the Taft party, which visited Japan and the Philippines last summer, and on this account as well as because of his special study of Philippine affairs, he is an authority in Congress and the country on the islands.—Editor.)

It is easy enough to theorize and criticize, but before we can practically and impartially discuss the Philippine situation and develop the right way to help the Filipinos, two primal questions must be answered without partisan prejudice, to wit, What do we want of the Philippines? and, What do the Filipinos want?

In one word, the Filipinos want independence. This is true of the Filipinos almost without exception, from the highest to the lowest, from the richest to the poorest, from the most intelligent to the most ignorant.

What we want of the Philippines is harder to answer, because, in the past, at least, according to our conditions, we have wanted various conflicting things; but a process of elimination has been going on as our eyes have been opened by time and experience.

Some were controlled by commercial sentiment. They wanted to make money out of the Philippines, but they are now realizing that no money is to be made. This is the class that is now clamorous for Chinese labor and for an American tariff subsidy to Filipino production, to be guided and controlled by American exploiters.

The convictions of some have been guided by religious sentiment, but they have discovered that the Filipinos are already at least a nominally Christian people, under the guidance of the Roman Catholic Church.

Some have been controlled by military spirit. Conquest and expansion has been their cry. Now they realize that there is no glory in conquering the Philippines, and that the military expense connected with the retention of the islands has been and will continue to be enormous.

Some claimed that we had acquired a commercial base in the Orient and that the Philippines would be a connecting link in our trade with China and Japan. They now realize that this trade, via the Philippines, must take two sides of a triangle instead of one, and that the idea of making the Philippines a base of trade with China and Japan is as absurd as for England to make Jamaica the base of her trade with the United States.

But the controlling factor in our sentiment toward the islands has undoubtedly been that the Filipinos were unable to take care of the Philippines, and that we owed a duty both to the people there and to civilization which compelled us, for a time at least, to exercise sovereignty. This conviction is not lost, but the prevailing feeling of the American people corresponds with the prevailing feeling of the Taft party—regret that we are there and longing to get out creditably. We have no wish to hold them as a subject dependency. We have no desire to exploit them. On the contrary, we all—or almost all—honestly wish to train and educate them as speedily as possible in a common language and the principles of self-government for either qualified or absolute independence.

The Filipinos desire independence and the Americans wish them to have it. The only difference between us, or among ourselves, is as to time. When the treaty with Spain was ratified, two resolutions were introduced in the Senate to this end. The Bacon resolution had the support of most of the Democrats and a few of the Republicans. The McEnery resolution had the support of most of the Republicans and a few Democrats. The two resolutions agreed in this: That the Philippines were not to be held as an integral part of the country. The difference was that the Bacon resolution was for speedy withdrawal and recognition of independence, while the McEnery resolution declared for their future disposal according to the best interests of the people of the United States and the people of the Philippine Islands. It was therefore a unanimous declaration of the Senate that the islands were not to be held as an integral part of the United States.

TARIFF SUBSIDY.

The danger of the course which we are at present attempting is that it will surely result in making them an integral part of this country by legislation, instead of holding them as a separate political body, having all the attributes of autonomy except the Central Government, which we have created—the Philippine Commission. It is proposed to extend our coast navigation laws to them, so as to give our shipowners the monopoly of their business, and to withdraw the tariff barriers between the two countries in such a way as to practically destroy their tariff system and to seriously affect our own by complicating the tariff policy of both countries. The fiscal and tariff interests of the two countries will be so interwoven as to prevent us from cutting the Philippines loose from connection with this country when it becomes desirable to do so.

The alleged purpose of this legislation regarding the tariff is to give Philippine products unrestricted access to our markets, where the price of sugar and tobacco, and some other products, is raised high above the international level by our protective tariff. But it means much more to us than simply extending to the Filipino producer the same high rates which protection affords our own producers. It means more to the country, more to every American.

The result of this legislation, so far as sugar is concerned, is to double the price which the Filipino could obtain anywhere outside of America. It will undoubtedly encourage him in the production of sugar, but the price will be paid by the American consumer, who is compelled to stand the burden of nearly $100,000,000 annually on sugar, under a tariff the purpose of which was to encourage home production and raise a large revenue from the foreign product. It will render abortive the very purpose of the tariff, and will accustom the Filipino to a price for his sugar which is double what he can get from the rest of the world, thus preventing any political action in the future which would sever the two countries. So, also, the extension of our navigation laws will build up a great shipping interest, whose profits will depend upon the monopoly of Philippine transportation. This interest will also seek to block any legislation in the future looking to the disposition of the islands.

If our purpose is, as we have declared, to fit the Filipinos for self-government and to give them their independence, shall we not defeat our purpose by building up powerful interests which, in the very nature of things, must block such legislation? If we pursue this system of subsidy to the Filipino, shall we really benefit him in the end? Will not the withdrawal of it, in case we finally conclude to follow our original purpose and give the Filipinos the independence which they want and we want them to have, plunge them into a condition of suffering and distress such as they have never realized?

SELF-SUSTAINING METHODS.

The real difficulty with the Philippines is that the people do not know how to work to advantage and how to produce in large and profitable quantities. The islands are agricultural, and never will be anything else, but the methods of production are primitive beyond description—a forked stick for a plow, the soil stirred to a depth of 3 inches, a buffalo for the motive power of the sugar mill, and hand labor everywhere instead of machinery. Subsidizing the products with fictitious prices is one way to stimulate them, but artificial aid can not be suspended without unnecessary suffering.

The right way to help the Filipinos is to train them in self-sustaining methods. The declared purpose of this whole movement in the Philippines is philanthropic. Philanthropy always costs the philanthropist something, and whatever form our philanthropy takes, we must be prepared for certain expense; but this proposed scheme of philanthropy, through subsidized inflation of prices to be obtained in America, not only threatens grave danger in the future; it also creates dishonest bookkeeping. It can easily be shown that through this system the islands will cost America, in subsidies alone, in the next 20 years, from $300,000,000 to $500,000,000, which our accounts with the Philippines will not show a penny of.

A much wiser way is that the aid should take two forms—one for education, one for improved methods in agriculture.

In the Philippines there are 2,000,000 children of school age. Only 500,000 are now at school. If we wish to train them in a common language as a means to self-government, it should be done at once. Delay will only add to the cost. The school system is established. The $2,000,000 per annum which the Filipino Government, out of its scanty revenue, applies to this purpose, is insufficient. It will require much more, particularly if the needed agricultural and manual training schools are started. If we are bent upon real philanthropy we should appropriate the additional amount necessary and let the books show the loss.

Improved methods of agriculture should be accomplished not by direct appropriation but by the organization of an agricultural bank, such as has proved so advantageous to the Egyptian peasants. This Government should furnish the capital. Private enterprise can not be relied upon for this kind of banking. The only banks in the Orient are commercial corporations, mainly engaged in exchange, not in loaning money. They make large profits out of the inequalities in the value of money in the various countries, and have nothing to loan upon farming securities. It is the farmer, in the Philippines, who must receive aid. Direct and artificial aid will simply demoralize him or encourage foreigners to crowd him off the soil as long as it lasts. Loans by an agricultural bank, secured by the land he must improve and by the modern machinery required for its best development, would tend to promote both independence and self-respect. A Government bank could be so conducted as to effect the agricultural regeneration of the Philippine Islands, if the islands are worth anything at all—if they are worth regenerating. If they are not worth anything, the sooner we find it out the better—and we shall find it out quicker and at less cost in this way than in any other.

If we should properly develop the field of action of an agricultural bank, taxable property would be created in the Philippines that would relieve us of the expense of education, and enabling the islands to assume the burden without knowing it.

A SEPARATE AUTONOMY.

Thus the desired end would be accomplished, with the maintenance in the Philippines of an absolutely separate autonomy, at a cost which is nothing compared with the three to five hundred millions which we shall actually pay, if the subsidy system is followed for the same length of time, and with the infinitely better result that, instead of being tangled in tariff and navigation complications impossible to sever without causing untold distress, the islands will be self-sustaining, self-supporting, self-governing, only connected to this country by the appointed Philippine Commission, acting as the higher house—the Governor General as chief executive.

By this means we shall have established, in 20 years, a complete, autonomized government in the Philippine Islands; a government absolutely uncomplicated with our own; with its own fiscal system, its own revenue system and all the attributes—judicial, legislative, and executive—that are essential to national life. Then, when the time comes to cut the knot, it will be a safe and easy matter, after reserving a naval and coaling station, to permit the Filipino to cast off and sail away into the ocean of independence.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 28, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 27, 1916.

SECRETARY OF EMBASSY.

CLASS 5.

Oliver B. Harriman to be secretary of embassy or legation of class 5.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Mary G. Mails, San Quentin.

COLORADO.

James A. Rutledge, Woodmen.

CONNECTICUT.

Daniel F. Finn, Jewett City.
John F. Oates, Windsor Locks.

FLORIDA.

P. M. Elder, Sanford.

GEORGIA.

Buford L. Heartsill, Dalton.
H. J. Jolly, Cartersville.
David A. Trundle, Ringgold.

INDIANA.

Henry O. Eldridge, Lagrange.
Vern Hahn, Wakarusa.

IOWA.

George F. Althouse, Ackley.
James Duggan, Melrose.
Harold H. Holmes, New Albin.
Charles F. Irons, Garrison.
Fred L. Ives, Hamburg.
Magnus A. Merkel, Keystone.
Carl Reinecke, jr., Elkader.
Philip D. Switzer, St. Charles.
William B. Trullinger, Farragut.
Thomas J. White, Whittemore.
Clyde L. Woods, Garwin.

KANSAS.

Cecil Calvert, Quinter.
T. J. Foley, Chapman.
Dorothy F. Derrick, Hugoton.
Edward Grauerholz, Esbon.
W. L. Ringo, Girard.

KENTUCKY.

J. Walter Payne, Paris.

LOUISIANA.

Charlton Fort, Minden.
Floyd C. Mitchell, Zwolle.

MAINE.

A. W. Willey, Cherryfield.

MISSISSIPPI.

Coke B. Wier, Quitman.

MISSOURI.

Edverda Barnes, Pilot Grove.
Thomas P. Diggs, New Haven.

MONTANA.

Mary E. Turrell, Drummond.

NEW JERSEY.

F. J. Dushanek, Garwood.
Paul F. Edwards, Newfield.
Charles R. Grover, Atlantic Highlands.

NEW YORK.

James W. Larkin, Brockport.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Frank W. Miller, Waynesville.

OKLAHOMA.

Alva P. Daniel, Commerce.
Alfa Gibbins, Fort Sill.
Ora E. McCague, Ralston.

OREGON.

Walter L. Hembree, McMinnville.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

James A. Barrett, Clover.

TEXAS.

Mrs. Ross Manning, Madisonville.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Ida J. Garrison, Lost Creek.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate January 27, 1916.

POSTMASTER.

William M. Huntley to be postmaster at Rush Springs, Okla.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *January 27, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and ever-living God, in whom all our longings, hopes, and aspirations are centered, we thank Thee for the phenomenal growth of our past, for the auspicious present, for the hopes and ever-widening promises of our future as a people. Impress, we beseech Thee, every American citizen with the responsibility resting upon him as such, and illumine the minds of these their servants that they may be guided by Thy counsels, that in the present crisis of the world everything may be put to the crucial test of reason and justice. If it is wisdom to prepare for the worst, let it be adequately and efficiently done; but let us hope and pray for the best, that we may not be called upon to defend our sacred rights by the destructive agencies of war, but rather by the rational and peaceful methods of arbitration. And Thine be the praise forever and ever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LIFE AND PUBLIC SERVICES OF WILLIAM M'KINLEY.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, next Saturday, the 29th, is generally recognized as "McKinley Day" inasmuch as that was the day on which he was born, and I desire to ask unanimous consent to address the House for 40 minutes on the life, character, and public services of William McKinley, to follow immediately Mr. HENRY, of Texas, who I believe has the consent of the House to speak on that day immediately following the approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] asks unanimous consent to be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes on next Saturday at the close of the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], said remarks to be commemorative of former President McKinley. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

EXPOSITION AT PENSACOLA, FLA.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Legislature of Florida with respect to the holding of an exposition in the city of Pensacola to celebrate the cession of Florida by Spain to the United States, said exposition to be held in the year 1919, and at a later day I will address the House on the subject of asking Congress to assist us.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. WILSON] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a resolution of the Legislature of Florida looking toward an exposition to celebrate the cession of Florida to the United States. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida, is it the purpose of this movement to make this exposition national in its scope?

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Well, at this time it is in its incipiency, and we hope the Congress will assist us.

Mr. BARNHART. If it were purely a local matter with which only the State has to do, I should be disposed to object, but if it is to be national in its scope, as other expositions have been, I would have no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. We intend, as I stated, to ask Congress to help us to make the matter more than of local interest, because I think it should be.

Mr. BARNHART. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

THE EUROPEAN WAR AND INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered by Hon. Joseph E. Davies, chairman of the Federal Trades Commission, before the American Manufacturers' Export Association, in New York City, on the European war and industrial democracy.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered by Hon. Joseph E. Davies, of New York, on the European war. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia if the author of this speech holds any official position?

Mr. HOWARD. He is chairman of the Federal Trades Commission, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MANN. That is the new commission.

Mr. HOWARD. And the speech, I will state to the gentleman from Indiana, is one containing information gathered by this officer, which, I believe, will be of much value not only to Congress but to the country in general.

Mr. BARNHART. Does the Federal Trades Commission make an official report to Congress?

Mr. HOWARD. I think it does, but I do not know.

Mr. MANN. Once a year.

Mr. HOWARD. It is a very recent organization, as the gentleman knows. I do not know what they have done or what they propose to do, but this is a speech worthy of the consideration——

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman from Indiana——

Mr. HOWARD (continuing). Of all statesmen like the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MANN (continuing). Will not object because the Federal Trades Commission, whatever they may do, are trying to do something.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, as far as "the gentleman from Indiana" is concerned, he is not disposed to object to anything that will contribute information to the public by a public official in relation to what his department may be doing; but in these instances, where these commissions and other departments have the facilities and money appropriated to make reports from time to time, I would doubt the propriety of permitting the promiscuous admission of their statements to the RECORD. So far as I am concerned, however, in this instance, I think I will not object.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, as I tried to present my importunity to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART], I desire now, as he yielded on my rising, to thank him for his amiability.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CHARLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks on the child-labor bill inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. There is general leave to print on the child-labor bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the request.

Mr. CHARLES. I want to ask unanimous consent to have my remarks on the child-labor bill printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Everybody has leave to print for five legislative days.

Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks inserted in the RECORD on the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Banks, of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CARTER] asks leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of the late Gen. Banks, of Massachusetts. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LATE REPRESENTATIVE ALFRED MILNES.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to address the House briefly on the life and character of Alfred Milnes, a former Member of this House during the Fifty-fourth Congress, who has recently passed away.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to address the House. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is with profound sorrow that I rise to speak upon the life and character of a former Member of this House during the Fifty-fourth session, who at that time represented the district which I now have the honor to represent in the State of Michigan.

The Hon. Alfred Milnes was one of the prominent citizens of that great State. His life and character were interwoven with the best traditions and the civic progress of that great Commonwealth. He passed away on the 15th day of January, 1916, after a somewhat protracted illness, at his home in the city of Coldwater, which is a thriving city in my district. In the Biographical Congressional Record it is stated of him:

Milnes, Alfred, a Representative from Michigan; born in Bradford, Yorkshire, England, May 28, 1844; came with his parents to the United States in 1854, and settled in Newton, Iowa; moved to Coldwater, Mich.; attended the common schools of Utah, Iowa, and of Coldwater, Mich.; enlisted as a private in the Seventeenth Michigan Infantry, the "Old Stonewall Regiment," June 30, 1862, and served throughout the war; engaged with his regiment in every battle in which it took part, from South Mountain, Md., in 1862, to Lee's surrender at Appomattox in April, 1865; city alderman of Coldwater one term and mayor two terms; member of the State senate 1888–1890; lieutenant governor of Michigan in 1894, and presided over the State senate until his resignation, June 1, 1895; elected as a Republican to the Fifty-fourth Congress, to fill vacancy caused by the resignation of Julius C. Burrows, and served from December 2, 1895, to March 3, 1897; appointed postmaster of Coldwater in 1898; delegate in the Michigan constitutional convention 1907–1908; member of board of managers Michigan Soldiers' Home; a resident of Coldwater, Mich.

Much might be added to this modest sketch of his life, which probably received his approval for use in the directory, if it was not wholly written by himself. The life of Mr. Milnes was blended with the civic and business activities not only of his home city of Coldwater but of the State of Michigan. It was my pleasure, and I might say good fortune, to make his acquaintance during the convention which nominated him for Congress in 1895. I was a candidate for the same office, but was defeated by one vote on the two hundred and seventy-fourth ballot. Since that time and always thereafter we were the best of friends, and I am sincerely sorrowful because of his departure.

It must be said of Mr. Milnes that he was a firm and resolute man; a man of strong activities and of strong convictions. He was prosperous in his business undertakings and always took a prominent part in public affairs. He held many positions of public trust, in all of which he gave his best efforts and filled them with much credit to himself and with ability and honor to

the position. We knew him as the soldier-statesman. Courageous and strong, he was a good debater and an opponent worthy of one's best efforts. It was my privilege to serve with him in the convention of 1908 which drafted the new constitution for the State of Michigan, which was so strongly approved and ratified by the people and now so favorably considered by them. Many of its best provisions bear the impress of his efforts and are tempered with his strong mentality. I think it can be said of him that he never shrunk from a duty or turned lightly from a task.

He was always proud of having served his country in the great rebellion that preserved its Union. During his services in this House in the Fifty-fourth Congress he voted for the bankruptcy act. He also voted for the immigration bill containing a literacy test. He also voted for the recognition of Cuban belligerency on the 2d of March, 1896. He served as a Republican member upon the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River and on the Committee on the District of Columbia. He was sworn into office on the 4th of March, 1895, and his term expired on the 4th of March, 1897.

He has gone, but his kindly deeds and loving memory will live on and lend comfort to all who knew him for years to come. He died in the Christian faith. He was vestryman of his church when he passed away. He will be missed by his State and his city, and be mourned by a large concourse of friends. His citizenship was of the highest order. His life was worthy of our emulation. And whether birth or death is but the beginning of a brighter future, may all be well with him.

And thus asserting my profound respect for his memory, and in his closing the book upon a useful life I can only say farewell to my friend, a former Member of this House, knowing his deeds will last although his labors have ceased.

Sleep, Holy Spirit,
While the stars burn, the moons increase,
And the great ages onward roll.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. KALANIANAOLE, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House the papers in the case of Barclay S. Dennison (H. R. 11627, 62d Cong.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

PREPAREDNESS.

The SPEAKER. Under special order, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] is recognized for 30 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest and admiration a few days ago to the remarks of the distinguished Republican leader of this House, who is always interesting and who has always something to say of an illuminating nature, when he was advising both sides of the House as to the position he takes on the question of preparedness. His was a truly American speech [applause], and I was one of those who most warmly congratulated him for it. I think he said, and I agree with him, that this session is one of the most momentous in the history of Congress. We are confronted with problems growing out of the European war and the disturbance on our southwestern borders which call for the highest statesmanship that the men in this Congress can bring to bear upon them, for upon their wise solution will depend in a great measure the future welfare of the country.

Grave issues are confronting us, and there is need of the most disinterested patriotism if they are to be discussed and settled for the Nation's well-being. Let me say at the outset that I am one of those who believe in getting ready. I stand firmly and unchangeably for a program of preparedness. [Applause.] And let me say also that I believe a policy of preparedness, involving a change at variance with all the traditions of the past, is not to be lightly entered upon, but must be viewed calmly in all its bearings before a judicious decision may be reached. No one man's ipse dixit can be a reason for bringing about such a far-reaching change, and we must remember this fact. The measure is fraught with consequences too tremendous for the future, and the collective wisdom of Congress will be put to the test to find the adequate and proper solution. In my judgment in no other manner will we be able to agree on the kind of preparedness that this country now needs.

Mr. Speaker, we must be calm in the discussion of these new questions that have arisen, and we must be just in our view in judging of events and their bearing upon our national life, and our decision must be free from every other consideration than the welfare of this Nation.

How necessary this temper of mind is in the present crisis is apparent to anyone who has been following the trend of recent events. If at any time within the last decade of years before the opening of the European war anyone were to prophesy that the Congress of these United States would shortly be engaged in discussing the ways and means to meet the aggressions of an European foe and would be considering the advisability of creating an enormous military and naval establishment and of increasing to an unheard-of extent the burden of taxation, such a prophet of evil would be laughed to scorn.

Yet, strange to say, such is the unexpected turn events have taken. How did it happen that we, who were pursuing the ways of peace, free from entanglements of European politics, with no enemies on our borders whom we need fear, and with no cause of offense before the great warring nations, but equally at peace and on friendly terms with them all, should suddenly feel ourselves menaced with danger and forced to think of making a violent leap into the costly business of military and naval expenditure on an enormous scale? How did all this come about? Who is responsible for it? Is anyone guilty? Or must the blame be placed merely upon the logic of events? These are questions of vital and far-reaching importance. Upon the answer to be given to them will depend in a great measure the character of the action we are about to take. Mr. Speaker, the country has a right to know the answer, for its supreme interests are involved. It is the duty of every Representative of the people to find out where blame should be put, if blame there be, that he may act intelligently and patriotically for the best interests of the Nation.

Oh, I wish that the Farewell Address of Washington, the Father of his Country, had been in our hands for constant study since the opening of this dire conflict on the other side of the Atlantic! The one admonition which stands out in that imperishable document and which has had more to do in shaping our traditional policy with the nations of Europe than any other influence is his warning to beware of entangling alliances with them. I take these words in their fullest and broadest sense. I believe that the mind of Washington was that we should be not only neutral in their quarrels but absolutely impartial. He was a wise man and a great patriot. Would that his advice had been followed and that we could appear before the world to-day, as I think he would have us appear, without even the suspicion of favoring one side or the other.

When this tremendous war broke out we were in peaceful and friendly relations with all the belligerents. As far as human prudence can foresee our providential mission was to maintain strict neutrality and the friendship of each and all. It was not our quarrel; we were in no way involved. The future of our country depended in no way whatsoever upon the result of the contest. We had been kept free for almost a hundred years from war with any real European power. Our plain destiny pointed to the supreme office which should be ours. Our country loved peace and was following in its ways, and everything seemed to indicate that ours was to be the high and noble task of peacemaker.

The President's message on neutrality was received with universal acclaim. We rejoiced in the fact that we were citizens of a free and peaceful country. I want to say now, Mr. Speaker, that did we hold the position to-day which we then occupied the war would be at a close and the belligerents would be looking to neutral and impartial America as to the ark of the covenant to bring about peace. We would to-day occupy a position of moral grandeur never yet held by any nation in the world. We would be the peacemaker of the earth. Can any gain in material prosperity compensate us for the loss of such a high vantage ground? Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that such an opportunity was allowed to be lost. It may not return again. I deplore the following of mere legality instead o the higher morality and sensitive impartiality and the substitution of economic advantage for the new freedom. Instead of now standing on the heights with our faces turned toward the morning and the dawn of a better era, I fear we are groping in the lowlands, with the conflicting passions which have ever separated men and nations dinning in our ears.

I can not help thinking—and although I say it with all candor, still I utter it with deep regret—that if the policy of "watchful waiting" had been used toward the European war and the one of "alert action" toward Mexico, we should to-day occupy in the world a proud moral eminence, surrounded by the universal gratitude and admiration of the nations. [Applause.] How could we be so shortsighted as to lose such a glorious opportunity? I do not think for a moment it was mere love of money, although that has been always one of the most potent causes of human action. No, Mr. Speaker, I think I can here and now place my finger on what I consider the worst menace in this country to-day. We are hearing much of "hyphenated citizens" and "America first," but the most violent propaganda working among us at the present time and the most dangerous one, to my mind, is the pro-British, whose protagonists reveal

in their every utterance that the dominant motive power in their lives is not "America first," but "England first." [Applause.]

I do not know whether it is a disease or a deep-seated prejudice, but it is mischievous and unpatriotic. [Applause.] It is based on a false conception of historic facts, yet it steals all the assurance of truth with the superadded effrontery of humbug. Modesty it has none. It fills the public press with its clamor, and really one begins to think after a while these people are obsessed with the idea that the one mission America has in the world is to save England. And a portion of this press, I am sorry to say, allows its columns to be fed by misinformation and news pervisions supplied from British sources, and its editorial expression is inspired from British "news" agencies, written by interests antagonistic to American peace and well-being.

I refer only to those newspapers that aim to poison the American public mind against the patriotic interests of America, and seek by falsehood, slander, and misrepresentation to set one class of Americans against others. These are the papers responsible for the so-called "hyphen" campaign to discredit a class of American citizens whose loyalty and fidelity to the Republic have been proven on a hundred battle fields. [Applause.]

And what shall I say of our great American statesmen? This much at least: I have no sympathy with the Lodge-Roosevelt-Choate-Root interpretation of history. [Applause.] It is spurious and superficial; it does not get down to the origin of things. They would have us believe that all the fundamental rights we possess are a heritage bequeathed to us by England. I can not accept such a low estimate of American liberties. I do not for a moment acknowledge any such debt. I do not ascribe to any lower source the principle of individual liberty upon which this Government is founded than to the founder of Christianity Himself.

I beg to remind these advocates of a pro-British policy that the Magna Charta to which they are constantly appealing was forced from a reluctant despot, King John, by the barons of England with the help of the Christian Church when that church was one throughout all Christendom. It was simply the translation to the political order of the principle of equality which the church had preached from the beginning. But in the Magna Charta it is quite limited in its scope. The first experiment on a large scale of this principle to political government occurred among us when the framers of the Constitution, acting under the impulse of a higher power, we can not doubt, and as a protest to the tyranny of oligarchical England, established democracy here in its plenitude. [Great applause.]

For 40 years, Mr. Speaker, we enjoyed the blessings of a pure democracy before the effect of this universal application of the rule of the people reached England and brought about the reform of 1832, the first advance of centuries on the part of England toward our democratic ideal. These people who seek to give us any different explanation of the facts of history are not genuine Americans; they are Tories. We have always had them in our history. I do not believe for a moment that America, as we know it to-day, is an offspring of British institutions. I believe she has a character and genius of her own. Discovered after centuries of life had been granted to the nations of the European Continent, the lifting of the veil that concealed her, a feat that was accomplished by the intrepid genius of Columbus, had in it the providential promises of a new future. That providence will be secured if we are all truly Americans first—not in any spurious sense, but in the real meaning of the term—conscious of the high vocation to which we have been called as the crusaders of a new era in which the rights of man occupy the foremost place and the peace of the people is put before the pecuniary advantage of a moment.

Upon Congress devolves the high and noble duty to find some way to lead the country to these higher ideals. There is no nobler work to which the representatives of a free people may set their hands. May the collective wisdom of this Congress find for us the way of safety and of honor that leads to national rectitude and moral grandeur which should be to-day, as they ever will be, the hope and ambition of a free people. [Long-continued applause.]

MEXICO.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] is recognized for 40 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact of the killing of many Americans recently in Mexico, the news of the last of which has come to us to-day, the murdering of four American soldiers, confirmation of which I understand has just reached the State Department, I make no apology for talking upon affairs in Mexico.

I think it is a good thing for us to stand by the President in all matters of foreign affairs where we can, but I think it is a better thing for us to stand by our own country. [Applause.]

I want to take for my text to-day a plank from the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore, and I will apologize to my Democratic friends for reading it, and will assure them that it is not done in malice:

> The constitutional rights of American citizens should protect them on our borders and go with them throughout the world, and every American citizen residing or having property in any foreign country is entitled to and must be given the full protection of the United States Government, both for himself and his property.

That is in the platform upon which Woodrow Wilson was elected, and that is the plank that has been forgotten and superseded by "watchful waiting." What patriotic Democrat can read that plank in his platform to-day breathing, as it does, of patriotism and real red-blood Americanism, and then read the list of assaults, assassinations, and murders in Mexico without a feeling of humiliation and regret? And yet that immortal document of decadent and discredited promises ended with these heroic words:

> Our pledges are made to be kept when in office as well as relied upon during the campaign.

No one doubts the patriotism, the honesty of purpose, and the high ideals of the President in regard to his foreign policy; but it is with regret that I say that I believe that the opinion of the great majority of the American people of all parties to-day is that he is a scholar, a dreamer, a theorist that has been remarkably successful when he has had the power of coercion in dealing with weaker and immature intellects, as strikingly demonstrated in his domineering control of college students and Democratic Congressmen. But in larger affairs he apparently becomes timid and uncertain. Napoleon declared:

> By sticking to no plan you risk being beaten everywhere. The worst fault in the conduct of affairs is vacillation.

Vacillation is the trouble with the Mexican situation. Vacillation has superseded "watchful waiting." Obstinacy and timidity is not an unusual combination even in men of great intellectual ability, especially where the library takes the place of experience.

The President's policy in Mexico is not based upon his party platform. It is characterized by weakness, uncertainty, vacillation, and uncontrollable desire to intermeddle in Mexican affairs. He has not had the courage to go into Mexico nor the courage to stay out.

The President has repeatedly declared that he would not interfere in Mexico nor permit others to do so. At Indianapolis he said:

> Have not European nations taken as long as they wanted and spilled as much blood as they pleased in the settling of their affairs; and shall we deny that right to Mexico because she is weak? No, I say.

At Columbus, Ohio, in his recent speech he said:

> The Mexicans may not know what to do with their government; but that is none of our business, and, so long as I have the power to prevent it, nobody shall "butt in" to alter it for them.

At the notable talk in the White House not long ago to the Democratic National Committee where he referred to other people "talking through their hat," if he is correctly reported, he declared "that the Mexicans can raise all the h— they please; it is none of our business." Remember, the language I am using is not mine but the reported language of the President. Certainly their ability to raise what he so delicately described, ought to satisfy even the President and that wing of the Democratic Party that believes in "watchful waiting."

But if the President had followed these declarations, however un-American and indefensible they may be, it would have been far better for us and probably for Mexico. But his deeds have been strangers to his words. Instead of a policy of "hands off" it has been a policy of constant interference in Mexican affairs.

The President told Huerta that he must not be a candidate; that he would not be recognized. He talked about fair elections and constitutional government, and showed a strong desire not only to control Mexican politics but to go into Mexico and regulate the land system of that country. He sent his secret special agents to Mexico City and became involved in a personal quarrel with Huerta. This controversy reached its climax in the most grotesque and stupendous piece of folly in the history of civilized nations when the President appeared here before Congress and virtually asked that the United States declare war against Huerta, the individual. And, what was even more ridiculous and absurd, it was done. And for what reason? Who to-day will tell us the cause of that action? Americans had been driven from Mexico; American property had been destroyed in Mexico;

American men had been murdered in Mexico; American women had been outraged in Mexico, but all these did not disturb the serenity of "watchful waiting," or recall to the mind of the President the Democratic platform declarations about protecting life and property of American citizens along the border and on foreign soil.

We were told that Huerta was a murderer, an assassin, a usurper and a traitor, and a man that we would never under any circumstances recognize. But Huerta, the individual, not representing Mexico but himself, had refused to salute the American flag on a gasoline launch in a place where it had no right to be; or, to be exact, for the sake of history, Huerta agreed to fire 6 guns in salute, while the President, as I recall, demanded 21. This insult from an assassin and a murderer that we would not in anyway recognize was more than this administration, too proud to fight, could endure. Our magnificent battleship squadron was hurried to Mexican waters, although at that time the Mexican Navy consisted of one old antiquated gunboat. The Army was sent to Mexico, and, after Vera Cruz was bombarded by our Navy, it was landed on Mexican soil. Seventeen of our own soldiers lost their lives and more than 100 Mexicans were killed. We seized the customhouse and carried away more than a million dollars. And all this for what purpose? Why did we go to Mexico and what did we accomplish and why did we return? We were told that a German vessel was about to land a cargo of guns and ammunition, and this was the reason for hurrying our Navy to Mexican waters. But that same German vessel landed its cargo in Mexico. We are told that our Army and Navy went to Mexico to make Huerta apologize. Has anyone read that apology? We are told that our Army and Navy went to Mexico to make Huerta salute the flag. Has anyone heard that salute? And after this magnificent performance we returned again. What did we accomplish and under what pretense did we take the $1,000,000 belonging to Mexico, and what has become of it and where is it now? The immortal general that marched his men up the hill and then marched them down again was a great military genius and won a magnificent victory as compared with our vaudeville and discreditable performance in Mexico.

Many times after we withdrew from Mexico the flag was desecrated and insulted without protest and almost without notice. After the Huerta incident James McManus, an American citizen of high standing, was killed by Mexican soldiers in his own dooryard. The American flag flying over his house was torn down and trampled in the filth of the street. Some weeks afterwards the Secretary of State made a report on this cowardly assassination to the effect that they—meaning the particular bandit that he was at that time assisting—had agreed to pay an indemnity for the killing of McManus, but that he had forgotten whether or not they had agreed to apologize for insulting the flag.

At one time this administration was so sensitive of the sacred honor of our flag that the Army and Navy were used to force a salute, when murder and assassination of our citizens could not provoke action. Again, the trampling of our flag in the dust was such an insignificant trifle that it left no impression on the ponderous intellect of the great preacher of Chautauqua peace at most any cash price.

There are none to-day but what know that the flag-saluting episode was but a mere pretext eagerly sought to invade Mexico and drive out Huerta.

Poor old Huerta! He has "gone home and ta'en his wages." According to our standards he was an old villain, but he at least had courage and ability. His name is written forever among the immortals as the only individual in all the world's history with whom a mighty nation went to war.

And yet we have been told countless times that the administration is entitled to great credit for keeping us out of war with Mexico. If we had landed an army in Japan or Germany or England or any other first-class power; if we had bombarded one of their cities, killed their citizens, landed our army on their soil, seized and carried off their customs revenue, would we have had war? If that is not war, what does it take to make war? Are we entitled to any credit for escaping war only because we bullied and fought a nation too weak and helpless to defend itself?

Our policy in Mexico has earned us the contempt of the world and beyond question has greatly influenced the warring nations of Europe in their present attitude toward us.

Our Mexican fiasco, discrediting and humiliating as it was, taught us nothing. "Watchful waiting" continued to be only a phrase, for we still intermeddled and interfered. The administration still insisted on helping one bandit and highwayman against another. Villa now became the administration's pet. Laudatory letters giving an account of the career of this bloody cutthroat were sent out with the approval, if not at the suggestion, of the State Department. He was permitted to purchase arms and ammunition in the United States, and this was done against the earnest protest and warning from many American citizens and especially those along our international boundary. Some of this very ammunition may have been used in the recent dastardly and cruel murder of Americans.

Negotiations were carried on with Villa and promises made to him, and it seemed as if the administration were going to recognize him as the head of the Mexican Government. But suddenly and without explanation the administration turned to Carranza and began to help him as against Villa. It permitted Carranza to send soldiers and guns and ammunition through American territory to be used against Villa. This act is believed by those who are best fitted to judge to be largely if not entirely responsible for the recent tragedy where 18 Americans were killed—one of the most cruel and unprovoked murders that ever took place in that land of blood and assassination, the details of which are too horrible to relate. It was feared that such would be the result of permitting Mexican troops to pass through our country. Many who had friends in Mexico believed that such action on our part would lead to the slaughter of Americans. Nor can the administration plead that it was not warned of the probable result upon American life if this were permitted. The distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, Senator FALL, wrote the State Department a letter, pointing out the great danger of such action and pleading that no such permission should be given to any of the factions. According to press reports published at the time, the acting governor of Sonora, Carlos Randall, sent to the State Department on October 29 last a protest that reads as follows:

> Urge him (President Wilson) to revoke immediately permission granted Carranza to send troops over American territory into Agua Prieta, because otherwise we will have to lament any fatal consequences on account of the great danger in which all Americans in Sonora will be placed, for it is impossible for me to repress the fury of the people and the army against the American Government for apparent partiality shown in helping one contending Mexican faction, contrary to all rights. I trust the American Government realizes the gravity of the situation and will revoke the many-times repeated permission.

Many other warnings besides these were received, and the administration can not claim that it permitted this action with no idea of what the result might be.

What right had the administration to rely upon the promises of Carranza? They knew that he was the most unreliable, most uncertain, and most untruthful of the entire bunch of bandits with whom they had been dealing.

On the same day that the press carried the warning from the governor of Sonora it published a statement from Cardinal Gibbons, in which he said:

> Poor Mexico! Things are in bad shape there. I have read much in the papers about the final solution of the Mexican situation. I have heard all kinds of promises. But how are we to believe that the problem is solved? Can we place any faith in these promises?
>
> A man of promises; that is Carranza. He can promise many things. But where are the assurances that these promises will be fulfilled? I am hoping and trusting that the troubles in Mexico are at an end, but I am not sure that Carranza is the man who will bring about these desired conditions.

Cardinal Gibbons spoke the feeling that possessed all those who were familiar with conditions in Mexico. Why did not the administration give heed to such warnings as these and take steps to see that Carranza's promises were carried out?

How could the administration expect any other effect from its action favoring Carranza? For months they had favored Villa. They had given him every promise and encouragement. They had advertised him to the world as a great and good man—a patriot fighting for freedom. It is believed that they had given him a promise of recognition, and that if the report of Gen. Scott should be made public it will prove there was such an arrangement.

Then came the sudden change. Villa was pushed aside and Carranza taken up. It was one of those sudden changes from the White House without explanation, such as we have had upon preparedness, upon the Panama Canal, and upon many other propositions which have so recently characterized Executive action.

When Villa with an army of 13,000 men, that he had led across plains and mountains and waterless, treeless deserts, suffering privations and hardships beyond description, arrived at Augua Prieta, where he expected to find a garrison of 1,500 men, he found instead that it was occupied by a force of more than 5,000, that had been sent there through the United States while he was on his way to capture the place. When he attacked he was repulsed by artillery that had been sent there through this country. Here was the former favorite of the administration that believed that he had been deliberately betrayed by his former friends. What would anyone expect would be the result upon the mind of such a bloody-minded

scoundrel as Villa? Is it any wonder that he vowed vengeance against all Americans, and what reason had the administration to think from his career that this vow would not be carried out to the fullest extent in the most cruel and brutal manner?

If we had not the courage to go into Mexico and pacify it, then certainly we ought at least to keep out of this quarrel and not endanger American lives by constantly favoring one faction or the other.

We make a tremendous bluster about the killing of American citizens upon the high seas and fill the air with the tumult and the noise of many typewriters, although the killing is only accidental and undoubtedly really regretted by those who did the act. But so far we have looked with equanimity undisturbed while hundreds of Americans have been purposely foully murdered in Mexico in a most cruel and fiendish manner.

If the people of this country could but read the fearful tale told by the records now hidden in the State Department, if they but knew the truth, they would make the atmosphere so hot that no longer could anyone advocate "watchful waiting" and breathe it and live.

The whole policy of the President in Mexico has been wrong from the very beginning. It has been one of meddling between factions. It has been one of secret and private special agents representing the President personally. It has been a modified plan, followed by Peter the Great, the Cæsars, and the Emperor of China. It has no place in this country. Special agents of this character seldom report the truth. They report what they are expected to report. The plan of cutting off the head of the bearer of bad news is not yet entirely obsolete in political life. The foreign affairs of this Government should be carried on through diplomatic channels, in accordance with the recognized system of modern civilization. Diplomatic chaos supreme and irretrievable would reign in this country under this administration if Col. House were to die.

Pitiless publicity has given way to private, special secret negotiations through personal agents and representatives.

The President says that the Mexicans should have "the right to spill all the blood they please," and it is none of our business. Certainly the American people have regretted this expression of the President. I do not believe that the American people believe in this policy of slaughter and savagery. Certainly this has not always been the policy of this Nation. When the shrieks and groans of murdered and tortured men, the sobs and cries of starving women and children in Cuba reached us the American people demanded that these atrocities should end, and when that demand was disregarded our answer was not "watchful waiting," nor did we tell them that they could shed all the blood that they pleased, nor did we say that it was none of our business, but the American people arose as one man, drove the yellow flag of Spain from the Western Hemisphere, and placed Cuba among the nations of the earth. And the day is not far off when the people of this country, regardless of the attitude of the administration, will see that peace is brought to unhappy Mexico.

The President may believe that the Mexicans have the right to shed all the blood that they please. But I most emphatically deny that the Mexicans have the right to shed American blood upon either American or Mexican soil. Paraphrasing a sentence of the eloquent Ingersoll, "A flag that will not protect its citizens everywhere is a filthy rag that contaminates the air in which it floats."

What are the conditions in Mexico to-day after all this time of "watchful waiting"? Starvation, famine, want, robbery, plunder, rapine, assassination, and murder. Every crime and every cruelty that ignorance and hate can invent has been perpetrated, and still there is no end. The only thing that profits by the conditions in that unhappy land is the eager vulture that circles above the scene of slaughter waiting to feed and fatten upon the dead and dying. Dante's hell could add nothing to the horrors of that unfortunate country.

Whenever the question of Mexico is discussed some Democrat in his solemn majesty arises and, with a look of superior wisdom, inquires, What would you do? That question is a confession on the part of the administration of their inability to deal with the situation. Almost any Republican can advise the administration to the advantage of the country upon this question if it will follow the advice.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. What was the policy of President Taft in Mexico when similar circumstances were transpiring there?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. In the first place there were no "similar circumstances" under President Taft; but if President Taft made a mistake, it is no excuse for the present administration.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Is it not a fact that ex-President Taft has practically indorsed the policy of Woodrow Wilson in Mexico?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. President Taft has done some very unwise things, but I do not think he ever went that far. You can not expect a great man to always be right.

Mr. SCHALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SCHALL. Does the gentleman know whether Turtle Island is fortified by the Japanese?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I have no information whatever on the subject.

Speaking for myself, but believing that I voice the sentiment of the American people, there are some things that I would do in regard to Mexico if upon me rested the responsibility. I would either go into Mexico and pacify the country or I would keep my hands entirely out of Mexico. If we are too proud to fight we should be too proud to quarrel. I would not choose between murderers. I would not permit either side to procure guns or ammunition in this country that may hereafter be used to murder Americans. I would not depend upon secret personal agents for my information. I would deal openly and in the light of day with the Mexican situation. I would practice pitiless publicity as well as preach it. I would give the American people the facts. I would let them know the truth, and if that is done the American people will quickly decide what shall be done. And, above all, I would do this, the thing that should have been done more than three years ago, and if it had been done, the letting of American blood in Mexico would not have occurred; I would serve notice upon all factions that no longer would any of them be permitted, under any pretense whatever, to destroy American property or to murder American men or to ravish American women, and back of that notice I would place the power of this great Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back 10 minutes.

PREPAREDNESS.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I know there are a great number of Members of the House of Representatives who are anxious to become leaders. Every good man wants power, to wield it for a good purpose, even though bad men want it for bad purposes. Knowing the love of power to be almost universal and that my colleagues entertain the desire for leadership, I have requested these 15 minutes to give them consolation and some pointers.

This morning's Philadelphia Inquirer has a leading editorial entitled "Congressman MANN as a real leader." I can not read it all—it would take too much time—but I will read the first paragraph. It says:

> The vigorous and clearly defined speech of Congressman MANN in favor of strengthening the Army and Navy, and his eloquent plea to make this a national and not a partisan or political question, lifts him into immediate prominence as the real leader of this most important movement.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Thereby all previous floppers are relegated to the rear. [Laughter.] And this is made the true slogan of leadership—that he who makes the latest flop shall lead us all. [Laughter.]

Now, this latest feat occurred in the garden of my distinguished friend the gentleman from Illinois. He was sitting in his garden—not working in his garden—meditating, and a vision of blighting war came o'er his dreams. He saw this country in deadly strife with the greatest naval power in the world—England—and he decided certain things that he thought ought to be divulged to the House and the country. I wish I was in the secret of the dreams that came to haunt his vision and disturb his peace when he saw his country locked in a struggle with this great naval power, seeing that he had just gone to his garden from a session of Congress where he had led the fight against a larger Navy.

In that session, occurring a few months before this garden meditation, my friend thought the American Navy was greater than that of England——

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Germany.

Mr. DIES. Germany; and he argued that point on page 2673 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Then he thought that $1,000,000 in the naval bill was too much for air craft, and he proposed to cut it down to $500,000, as you will see at page 2881. He then thought that $1,300,000 was quite too much

for air craft in the Army bill, and proposed to cut it down to $600,000.

Before this garden meditation, in the Congress which preceded it, he made the point of order against $400,000 for marine barracks, as you will see at page 2888. He also made a point of order against $500,000 to complete the radio stations, as you will see at page 2922 of the RECORD. He also made a point of order against two first-class battle cruisers——

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Amen! [Laughter.]

Mr. DIES. That is what we all said when he was leading that fight.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. I say it now.

Mr. DIES. While no record of the vote appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is not to be doubted that the gentleman from Illinois voted against the amendment to bring into the bill 16 submarines, instead of only 2 as proposed in the bill. Finally he voted against two battleships and in favor of one. He would have done more against the bill, but for the fact that there is a courtesy among leaders, when they are leading an assault upon a bill, that they shall not all assault it at the same time. Other leaders were assaulting different parts of the bill, while the gentleman from Illinois was assaulting these particular parts.

These other leaders, I may say, have meditated in their garden during the vacation between the last session of Congress and this. They will be heard from later as to their attitude, and disclose their garden meditations to the American public.

Page 2108 of the RECORD. Mr. MANN adduces some irresistible logic against the colossal expenditure for the American Navy. I suppose his logic in the meditation in the garden went to smash along with the views he expressed a few months previous. He said on page 2108:

> In making reasonable provision for war, that is all we ought to be expected to do; it would be foolish, it seems to me, for any country to spend all of its resources in preparing for war and neglect other things which are much more important.

That brings me to the question which I would like to ask of this new leader with reference to his statement that we should prepare for a greater Navy than Great Britain—I wish he would state to the House the cost of building a navy equal to that of Great Britain. I wish he would suggest to the House the cost of maintaining an American Navy equal to that of Great Britain. I wish he would state in specific terms to the House how much the building program of the American Navy would be if we are to keep pace with Great Britain.

It is easy to glibly say at one session that we will construct but one battleship and be against submarines and aviation, and then, after meditation in the garden, the next session propose that we shall embark upon a program which no political party would stand for, a program which the gentleman himself when reduced to figures would not stand for.

Mr. Speaker, a little later on in the session I shall crave the indulgence of the House, when I can have the time, to discuss the whole preparedness question. I also have meditated somewhat in my garden during the summer, and my meditations were just about what my votes and speeches were when I followed the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois against these large expenditures.

A year ago Germany, England, and all Europe were at war, and a year ago the same state of international politics existed as now, and it naturally produces a lurking suspicion, in my mind at least, that these gentlemen were not so much meditating in their gardens as they were reading the great metropolitan newspapers of the country, which have not published the truth in regard to the American Navy.

The American Navy, which the gentleman from Illinois said was greater than the German a year ago, in spite of his assault on the program, received the largest appropriation in its entire history. In the two years of Mr. Wilson's administration more money was appropriated for the construction of the Navy than in the entire four years of President Taft or in any four years of the Terrible Teddy. Admiral Fletcher says that it is 15 per cent stronger to-day than it was a year ago. To-day the marksmanship of the American Navy is 30 per cent better than it was a year ago. These European Governments, which a year ago, according to the leader from Illinois, were bleeding to death along the lines of Russia and France, have shed oceans of blood and issued billions of bonds. There is less excuse for hysteria to-day than there was a year ago. [Applause.]

There is more need for statesmanship than a year ago, with moving pictures running in this city illustrating the devastation of our country, the ravaging of our homes, all calculated to drive the American people war mad. I wish the gallant leader from Illinois had continued to do battle for the best traditions of our country instead of following off after this maudling moving-picture campaign, which shows the destruction of our Navy and the invasion of our country without the loss of a single foreign life upon our shores. [Applause.]

INTERNATIONAL HIGH COMMISSION.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up the bill H. R. 8235, to provide for the maintenance of the United States section of the International High Commission.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to take up for present consideration the bill 8235, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bill H. R. 8235, to provide for the maintenance of the United States section of the International High Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I ask that the bill be reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby given authority, with the approval of the President, to request the United States section of the International High Commission to cooperate with the other sections of the commission on determining the most satisfactory means of carrying out the recommendations of the First Pan American Financial Conference.

For the purpose of meeting such actual and necessary expenses on the part of the United States section of the commission as may arise from its work and investigations, or as may be incidental to its attendance at the meeting of the said International High Commission, the sum of $40,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, to be immediately available, and to remain available until expended.

The Clerk also read the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 9, both inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the appointment of the nine delegates by the Secretary of the Treasury to represent the United States in the proceedings of the International High Commission to be held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, during the year 1916, in accordance with the action of the First Pan American Financial Conference held in Washington during the year 1915, pursuant to the provisions of an act of Congress, approved March 4, 1915, entitled 'An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916,' be, and the same is hereby, approved and confirmed; such delegates shall be known as the United States section of the International High Commission and shall cooperate with the other sections of the commission in taking action upon the recommendations of the First Pan American Financial Conference; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to fill any vacancies that may occur in the United States section of said international commission."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, if it is intended by the passage of this bill to approve any agreement entered into between the different representatives of these countries at the last meeting of that commission?

Mr. FLOOD. No; it is not. The international high commission will consider the suggestions made by the financial conference and put them into such shape as they think proper and make recommendations to the legislative bodies of the different countries with reference to them. These recommendations will have no effect unless they are approved by the legislative bodies of the various countries.

Mr. WINGO. Is it intended that this commission at its next meeting shall take up any propositions tending to an alliance between this country and the South American countries with reference to Pan American affairs?

Mr. FLOOD. It is intended to take up business propositions with reference to bills of exchange and matters of business intercourse and make recommendations to the legislative bodies of the different countries with a view to bringing about a uniformity in business transactions.

Mr. WINGO. It is intended to limit their work entirely to financial and commercial exchanges?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. No political agreements of any kind?

Mr. FLOOD. None whatever.

Mr. WINGO. That would enter into the foreign or domestic policy of the United States or any of those countries?

Mr. FLOOD. None whatever. It would not deal with any such question.

Mr. WINGO. Is it intended that the positions of these delegates appointed on the part of the United States shall be permanent?

Mr. FLOOD. No; they are appointed for this one conference.

Mr. WINGO. This particular meeting?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; and this appropriation is made for this particular meeting and to bear the expenses that will be incurred between now and the time of meeting and the making of the report to Congress and the publishing of the proceedings of the meeting.

Mr. WINGO. As I understand the gentleman, they are to report whatever their recommendations are to this Congress for action. Of course, any agreement that had to do with foreign affairs would have to take the form of a treaty between the countries affected and would have to be reported to the Senate. Is the gentleman advised whether it is intended to consult the Congress upon any arrangement they may make with reference to financial or commercial agreements?

Mr. FLOOD. Any suggestions that this international commission, composed of not more than nine delegates from each of the 20 or 21 American Republics, shall make will be reported to Congress, and Congress can accept or reject them.

Mr. WINGO. There is no intention to bind the United States through its executive departments to any kind of financial, commercial, or diplomatic arrangements?

Mr. FLOOD. No; it would have no binding effect at all until it is passed by Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in the Committee on the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8235.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8235, with Mr. DIES in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If no one desires to be heard on general debate, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if no one else desires to be heard, I do. I think the gentleman from Virginia ought to explain something about the bill and also something about what this conference did at its meetings last summer while it was here. I believe that it was said that a report was sent to each Member of Congress, and doubtless that is true, but it was sent during the summer, probably, when no one was here. At least I never received any copy of the report of what the conference did.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, in the winter of last year Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo conceived the idea of bringing together in a conference the financiers and business men of all the American Republics, with a view to strengthen the ties of friendship existing between these countries and to bring about closer and more important trade relations between them.

His idea was heartily indorsed by the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress, and provision was made in the 1916 diplomatic and consular appropriation bill for this conference to be held in Washington. An appropriation of $50,000 was carried in that bill to defray the expenses of it.

This conference was held in this city last May and was attended by a large number of the important financial and commercial men of this country and 18 of the Central and South American countries.

The conference was in session for almost a week, and one of the results of its deliberation was the passage of a resolution unanimously recommending the appointment by each of the countries represented in the conference of a section of an international high commission, which was charged with the duty of perfecting the suggestions made by the conference, and after these suggestions had been perfected of submitting them to their several Governments for adoption or rejection.

This commission was empowered to take up particularly the questions of a currency and exchange standard, the law of negotiable instruments, fiscal and custom regulations, rules for commercial travelers, patent and copyright legislation, and an extension of the process of arbitration for the adjustment of commercial disputes and other matters.

The proposition for such an international high commission was readily adopted by all of the countries concerned, and all of them have appointed sections of this commission.

The suggestion was that each country should appoint not more than nine members of the commission, which should be known as the section of the commission for that particular country. The 19 countries, including the United States, have made their appointments.

It was provided that in each country the secretary of the treasury, or the finance minister, should be the chairman of the section of the commission from his country. Soon after the conference adjourned, Secretary McAdoo named the United States section of the International High Commission, and it has done much work toward preparing the suggestions which will be made at the meeting of the high commission. The Argentine Government has extended a cordial invitation for the International High Commission to meet in Buenos Aires on April 3, 1916. This invitation has been accepted by all of the countries involved.

The purpose of this bill is to make an appropriation to bear the expenses arising from the appointment of the United States section of the International High Commission, to confirm the appointments of the United States section made by Secretary McAdoo, and to give our section an official status not less definite than that enjoyed by the sections of the commission of other countries.

This appropriation is asked for by the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out these purposes. It is indorsed by the Secretary of State and the President.

I hold in my hand a letter from the President, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

JANUARY 12, 1916.

Hon. HENRY D. FLOOD,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: I hope that you will not consider it an unwarranted liberty on my part if I write to urge very strongly the appropriation of $40,000 for carrying on the work of the United States section of the International High Commission appointed as a result of the action of the Pan American Financial Conference. All of the Central and South American Republics have appointed their sections of this commission; the work of the commission was initiated by the action of the United States; our relations with the Central and South American countries are now upon a happier footing than ever before; and it seems to me of vital consequence for the support of one of the most important parts of our foreign policy that we should sustain our own portion of this work now so successfully inaugurated and progressing so admirably.

Cordially and sincerely, yours, WOODROW WILSON.

The conception of this conference by Secretary McAdoo was a wise piece of statesmanship; the dignity with which he presided over the conference, and the ability with which he has handled all matters raised by the conference, or suggested by it, has won the admiration of those of all countries who attended the conference or have kept in touch with it.

I will say, Mr. Chairman, that I attended this conference, and the ability with which the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States presided over the conference and the ability and energy with which he has since carried out the suggestions arising from that conference has met the approval of the representatives of all the countries which had representatives in that conference; and I believe he is entitled to the highest commendation on the part of our people.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. Of course I did not attend that conference, was not here, and have not read the proceedings of the conference. I did read something in the newspapers concerning it, but I am perfectly well aware that that is not always the way to get at what a body really does; but I got the impression somehow, I suppose from something I saw in the newspapers, that the main purpose of this conference when it met was to boost the McAdoo shipping bill. Now, the gentleman was there, and he will know whether that was the case or not.

Mr. FLOOD. I was there, Mr. Chairman, and I know that was not the case.

In the first place, all of the delegates of the foreign countries were, by the action of the United States Congress, the guests of the Nation. It was not possible, and certainly it was not desirable, that they should be forbidden to express their views upon any question which they thought was vital to the commercial and financial interests of Central and South America and the United States. The expressed purposes of the conference were to promote more intimate financial relations between the countries represented in the conference, and, of necessity, everything material to the discussion was properly brought forward. Before the conference assembled in Washington the delegates from Argentina and Chile expressed themselves in newspaper interviews in New York to the effect that the most important thing to be done for the strengthening and development of our financial and commercial relations with South and Central America was the prompt provision of adequate steamship service. They regarded this as of paramount importance. As practical business men they realized that no other element in the structure of international trade was of such absolute and objective necessity.

On the first day of the conference, May 24, 1915, the chairman of the Argentine delegation, Dr. Samuel Hale Pearson, addressed the conference as follows:

Mr. President, before finishing the session of to-day I would like to say that this morning we heard with great pleasure and satisfaction the words of His Excellency the President of the United States with regard

to the ability to strengthen the relations between our countries of North, Central, and South America if we had fast and good steamship communications. I am sure that every one of us here present—I mean of all the Americas—would be very pleased if the honorable Secretary of the Treasury would name a special commission of a few of the principal citizens and most interested men who could give the best ideas as to how to form this combination of North, Central, and South America, united in a special commission that we might call the "commission on fast navigation," to work out a plan whereby with individual capital or with the help of our Governments we could in a short time see a powerful steamship line that would help us to develop our common intercourse and at the same time know that we would be free from having to depend on European powers for the transportation of our merchandise and also to bring us here and to take you south, as we want all the Americas to know each other as we have been accustomed to knowing Europe.

On the following day, May 25, the Secretary of the Treasury appointed a committee representing the South American Republics most interested, namely, Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, Chile, Peru, and Ecuador, and appointed to represent the United States on the same committee Hon. Edward N. Hurley, of the Federal Trade Commission; Mr. R. Goodwin Rhett, of the United States Chamber of Commerce; Mr. Paul Fuller, of New York; Col. Franklin Q. Brown, of New York; Mr. George W. Norris, of Philadelphia; Mr. Harry A. Wheeler, of Chicago; and Mr. J. G. White, of New York. Manifestly he could not do less, as presiding officer of the conference, than to accede to the wishes of our foreign guests and permit this important subject to be discussed and considered by a committee of the conference and later by the conference itself.

At the seventh session of the conference, May 29, 1915, the committee on transportation submitted its report.

As a result of the discussion and by unanimous vote of the conference, including not only the foreign delegates but those representing the United States, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this conference that improved ocean transportation facilities between the countries composing the Pan American Union has become a vital and imperative necessity, and that every effort should be made to secure, at the earliest possible moment, such improved means of ocean transportation, since it is of primary importance to the extension of trade and commerce and improved financial relations between the American Republics.

When this resolution was introduced an attempt was made to inject the discussion of the shipping laws of the United States through the offer of an amendment, which the Secretary of the Treasury, as presiding officer, declined to entertain because it had relation to national policies, with which he thought the conference could not properly deal.

On pages 283 and 284 he used the following language:

Now, as I said before, this is not a convention for the purpose of determining national policies. It is a conference for the purpose of exchanging views, laying upon the table all facts and information obtained, together with expressions of opinion from the various countries represented here as to what things are needed, with suggested possible remedies. These are to be sifted by you, and we are going to try to extract from this crucible into which we put all of these suggestions some refined thing which we hope will work to the advantage of our respective countries.

I would therefore suggest that we confine our expression to the resolution which Gov. Francis has offered. I do not think that we are here to discuss government ownership or subsidies or any other such matter. That has become rather a political controversy in this country, and this is not the place to thrash it out.

Dr. Pearson, of Argentina, seconded the resolution above quoted, which was put to the conference and adopted unanimously.

On page 290 Mr. Roger W. Babson, of Boston, asked the chairman if he would consider a motion to have the Secretary of the Treasury appoint a committee from this country on a shipping bill, and so forth. His reply was as follows:

I think it would be unwise to do that. It seems just a bit outside of the scope of this conference. The shipping question here has become very much of a political question, and I am most anxious that politics shall not be injected into this meeting in any form at all.

The gentleman will see from this that the conference was not used at all to boost the shipping bill.

Mr. MANN. I gave, with some reluctance, my personal assent to the provision that became the law and made the appropriation last spring, and yet when I read the newspapers it must have been that I got the impression from them that the conference was being used, it seemed to me, wholly politically, though I did not credit it, as I often do not credit everything I see in print. It seemed impossible that a man like Secretary McAdoo would make use of such an occasion for political purposes. So I am glad to have in the RECORD the statement which has been made.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; and I am glad to make it. I was myself very much impressed with the dignity and ability and force with which the Secretary of the Treasury presided over that conference and the intimate knowledge he showed of every question that was raised before it. I was there when this particular matter came up, and I do know that he did everything he could with propriety to prevent any kind of discussion of the question referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and I am very glad to have been able to make this statement here. Of course we know, Mr. Chairman, that our political opponents will criticize things we do, whether there is justification for the criticism or not. And some of the newspapers did refer to this matter in criticism of the Secretary.

I am going to take occasion to refer briefly to the very severe attack which has been made upon the Mexican policy of the administration by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] in his speech to-day. I hope some time in the near future to get an opportunity to reply in detail to that attack, and I am satisfied I can show to this House and demonstrate to the country that the course pursued by President Wilson in reference to Mexico is the only course that any administration could have pursued with due regard to the honor and interests of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The one happy circumstance arising out of the present distressing condition of the world is that it has brought the Americas closer together. This situation and the tendency of the cooperation which has resulted therefrom has been strengthened by every act of the present administration. [Applause.]

The President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Treasury have accomplished great results in replacing the feeling of suspicion and distrust with which we were regarded by our Pan American neighbors with a feeling of trust and generous cooperation and affection. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Our political opponents will, of course, criticize the administration and the majority party, but when the time comes we will appeal from that criticism to the American people upon the record of the Democratic administration and the Democratic Congresses, confident that the people will sustain that record and give the country the blessing of another Democratic administration. [Applause.]

The Wilson administration has drawn the Americas closer together, it has brought prosperity to the entire country, and it has kept us out of war. [Applause.]

To-day we are the only great Nation in the world throughout whose borders peace and prosperity walk hand in hand. These splendid facts will not be forgotten by the people and will give Woodrow Wilson a second term in the White House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania and Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it seems entirely proper, in view of the depleted condition in which the Treasury of the United States finds itself, that we should discuss this problem of financing South America. It is another one of those interesting problems of the present administration that diverts attention from the difficulty that confronts it in the way of raising resources to run the country. But that is not altogether what I want to say.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who has risen from the floor to the Chair, and who now presides with great grace over this body, is axiomatic. A little while ago he paraphrased the familiar quotation "He who laughs last laughs best" by suggesting that "He who makes the latest flop shall lead us all." And he had the temerity and the courage, in this present day and generation of kaleidoscopic changes on the part of a Democratic administration, to apply that suggestion to the Republican leader because, in his wisdom, after holding to certain principles of economy in times of peace he suggested that this country should prepare itself against the possibility of an attack.

Now, in all fairness, gentlemen, if he "who flops last is to lead us," then how are we to regard the present occupant of the White House? Is it not apparent, when it comes to the question of flopping, that as a flopper upon great public questions, as a flopper in the face of a platform that he was pledged to live up to, there has never been the superior of the present leader of the Democratic Party? [Applause on the Republican side.]

CHANGES OF FRONT.

Upon this question of a tariff board—and, for the sake of relieving the suspense of the country we may call it a tariff commission—let us consider the announcement which came from the White House only yesterday. After destroying a Republican tariff board, that was as effective as any commission can be under the Constitution; after supposedly covering the powers of such a board in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; after "sneaking" a provision into the so-called trade commission bill that was to give ample powers to the administra-

tion for all the purposes of a tariff board or tariff commission, or whatever it might be, we find the gentlemen who marched up the hill upon the Baltimore platform coming down yesterday morning, with the announcement from the White House that after a conference with the distinguished leader of the Democratic Party in this House the program for the future is to include "a tariff commission bill that is to be reported by the Committee on Ways and Means." Speaking of flopping, which is akin to a change of front, the doing to-day that which you promised yesterday not to do—let us see where the leader of Democracy stands in this matter.

WHAT THE PRESIDENT SAID.

In his letter of acceptance to that assembled multitude of Democrats who wandered over to the shores of Jersey two and one-half years ago, the Democratic nominee for the Presidency said.

It is obvious that the changes we make—

And this was with respect to the tariff—

should be made only at such a rate and in such a way as will least interfere with the normal and healthful course of commerce and manufacture. But we shall not on that account act with timidity, as if we did not know our own minds, for we are certain of our ground and of our object.

Mark you, then, when the Democrats had destroyed the Republican tariff board, when you believed that you were in a position to establish a system that would be an improvement upon it, you did not proceed as your candidate for President then said, as if you "did not know your own minds," because you were "certain of your ground." Yes; as certain of your ground as you were when in that speech delivered at Washington Park, N. J., some time after, your same candidate for President declared that that platform which you had adopted at Baltimore was "not molasses with which to catch flies," but was to be lived up to even though in the course of time those who rebelled against it might "be hanged as high as Haman."

Your President "knew his ground" when he was a candidate. You followed him faithfully, believing you knew your ground when you destroyed the institution of protection and that tariff board which the Republican Party had provided for the ascertainment of tariff facts.

THE REPUBLICAN TARIFF IDEA.

Mark the difference. President Taft in his letter of acceptance on August 1, 1912, said:

The American people may rest assured that should the Republican Party be restored to power in all legislative branches all the schedules in the present tariff of which complaint is made will be subjected to investigation and report by a competent and impartial tariff board, and to the reduction or change which may be necessary to square the rates with the facts.

Let us carry the contrast a little further. In your party platform at Baltimore you declared against the constitutional right of the Federal Government to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue. You denounced the Republican tariff system and appealed "to the American people to support us in our demand for a tariff for revenue only." The Republican platform adopted at Chicago, on the other hand, declared for protection as usual, and for information that—

can best be obtained by an expert commission as to the large volume of useful facts contained in the recent report of the Tariff Board.

The following quotation from the Republican platform is highly illuminating at the present time:

The pronounced feature of modern industrial life is its enormous diversification. To apply tariff rates justly to these changing conditions requires closer study and more scientific methods than ever before. The Republican Party has shown by its creation of a Tariff Board its recognition of this situation and its determination to be equal to it. We condemn the Democratic Party for its failure either to provide funds for the continuance of this board or to make some other provision for securing the information requisite for intelligent tariff legislation. We protest against the Democratic method of legislating on these vitally important subjects without careful investigation.

CUTTING DOWN OUR INDUSTRIES.

Thus the issue was joined upon which the campaign of 1912 was fought out. Your candidate, observing the destruction of the Republican Tariff Board, "knew his ground." We promised to restore that Tariff Board in order that the President and the Congress might ascertain the facts upon which to base the legislation which would bring sufficient revenue into the Treasury to run the country without internal taxes. But your President, who knew his mind, and who said your platform was "not molasses to catch flies," was not convinced. He "knew his ground" when he came into the House of Representatives on the 8th of April, 1913, to deliver his first message from the "throne." He held the same views then that he held when he was a candidate. He was not yet prepared to "flop" on the question of the Tariff Commission, for with respect to the situation he then said:

Only new principles of action will save us from a final hard crystallization of monopoly and a complete loss of the influences that quicken enterprise and keep independent energy alive. It is plain what those principles must be. We must abolish everything that bears even the semblance of privilege or of any kind of artificial advantage, and put our business men and producers under the stimulation of a constant necessity to be efficient, economical, and enterprising, masters of competitive supremacy, better workers and merchants than any in the world. Aside from the duties laid upon articles which we do not, and probably can not, produce, therefore, and the duties laid upon luxuries and merely for the sake of the revenues they yield, the object of the tariff duties henceforth laid must be effective competition, the whetting of American wits by contest with the wits of the rest of the world.

THE TRADE COMMISSION INCIDENT.

Your President, now enthroned in his high office, still did not change his mind. Experience in the raising of revenues, with the Treasury fast running low, even did not make him change his mind, for out yonder at Indianapolis a year or so ago the President made another address, in which he told of the effectiveness of the Democratic tariff for revenue system. That was the address in which he reminded the country that the Republican Party had had no new ideas for 30 years, and was competent only "to sit upon the lid." That was when he told the country that in this matter of exercising jurisdiction over the tariff rates he had "put one over us" on the Republican side by "slipping into" the Trade Commission bill a provision which gave it ample powers.

We had been told in a discussion in the House, and we knew it for a fact, that in abolishing the Republican Tariff Board the Democratic Party relied for its influence upon the Bureau of Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which it created as an excuse for abolishing the Bureau of Manufactures. The claim upon your side then was that you had full authority to ascertain tariff facts. You reiterated your claim under your trade-commission bill, and the President reasserted it yonder in Indianapolis; but it must be recalled that neither you nor he had then prepared to flop.

SPEECH AT INDIANAPOLIS.

In that remarkable speech at Indianapolis, the President, speaking of the "scientific handling of the tariff question," said:

That kind of science I do not care to know anything about, except enough to stop it. But if by scientific treatment of the tariff they mean adjustment to the actual trade conditions of America and the world, then I am with them; and I want to call their attention—for though they voted for it they apparently have not noticed it—to the fact that the bill which creates the new Trade Commission does that very thing. We were at pains to see that it was put in there. That commission is authorized and empowered to inquire into and report to Congress not only upon all the conditions of trade in this country, but upon the conditions of trade, the cost of manufacture, the cost of transportation—all the things that enter into the question of the tariff—in foreign countries as well as in the United States, and into all those questions of foreign combinations which affect international trade between Europe and the United States. It has the full powers which will guide Congress in the scientific treatment of questions of international trade.

It was not thought necessary, even for political purposes, to change front on the "scientific" and "efficiency" tariff platform at that time. Assured Democratic methods were good enough. The administration had ample authority to do as it pleased.

WHO "PUT ONE OVER"?

"Full powers." Why, if you did not have it before, this provision that the President suggests was "put over us" on this side of the House in the passage of the trade commission bill gave you ample power. The President asserted it and reasserted it. He "knew his ground." But—

Being by profession a schoolmaster—

He says—

I am glad to point that out to a class of uninstructed Republicans, though I have not always taught in the primary grade.

No, sir; the President was no novice at this tariff business. It was not new to him. He was "a schoolmaster" who had taught yonder at Princeton; he had told the boys about it, and they believed it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa and Mr. ADAMSON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. ADAMSON. I just wanted to say, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the gentleman from Georgia will pardon me, the gentleman from Pennsylvania yielded to me.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will gladly yield to the gentleman from Georgia in a moment.

Mr. ADAMSON. And I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa, and with pleasure.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The President uses the expression that the Republicans, though they voted for it, did not know it. As I remember that matter, when the provision was considered

by the House there was an elaborate discussion. Am I not correct about it?

THE SCHOOLMASTER DEFENDED.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes. There was an elaborate discussion, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] made a very strong speech on this proposition, in which it will be found that the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Stevens, had something to do with the introduction of that paragraph in the Trade Commission bill. And I think, if the record be brought forth, it will be found that the President had nothing to do with that provision, but claimed it on his arrival at Indianapolis.

Now I yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, the extended conversation between the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and the equally distinguished gentleman from Iowa has removed me from the context where I wished to make a remark to the gentleman. [Laughter.] Was the gentleman alluding to the fact that our distinguished Executive was the schoolmaster? If so, I wish to remind him of the old adage that the schoolmaster is abroad in the land, and to remember that on election day he will be still more prevalent in the land. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If that is the opinion down in Georgia, I fear it does not prevail throughout the country; but the President will probably know more about it when he returns from the stumping tour he is now conducting with the view of convincing the people differently.

Mr. ADAMSON. Oh, the gentleman need not be timorous.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Georgia has more fear than the gentleman from Pennsylvania has. I think the discussion has become so hot at this particular point that the gentleman from Georgia will probably not pursue the discussion further.

THINKS THE PRESIDENT WILL BE REELECTED.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; of course.

Mr. ADAMSON. I want to say to my friend that my fears are all imaginary, and not like those on his part; and I have not only hope but faith, which is the substance of things hoped for. And I am not like the old negro preacher whom the genial gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] speaks about, who preached a sermon at the funeral of a friend of somewhat doubtful life, and said, "I do not know much about my friend, this old nigger, but I hope he has gone where I am afraid he aint." [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think I can say to the gentleman, paraphrasing Mr. HEFLIN'S story, to which he has made such happy allusion, that I have heard of instances where even a Georgian could go awry as a political prophet. I think that confidence in the future which the gentleman professes is not indulged by Democracy generally, and particularly not by the Representatives upon this side of the House.

BUILDING UP AGAINST REPUBLICANS.

Mr. Chairman, we were discussing the manner in which the President and the Democratic Party had built up their case as against the Republican tariff board. They had reached that point where they had no hesitancy about asserting the completeness and the efficiency of their laws to administer the tariff as they saw fit and as they thought would produce the revenue necessary to run the country. But now the sad second chapter of that story may be opened up in a reference to the financial figures, which, after all, are the best test of the efficiency of an administration. The whole issue between the Republicans and the Democrats in the last campaign was as to the method of raising revenue. We contended that it should be raised by taxing the foreigner upon the goods he sent into the United States, thus protecting American labor and American business men by keeping wages high here and not compelling them to go to the foreign level. We contended that we could raise this revenue at the customhouses, and that it would relieve the people of the burden of internal taxation, such as income tax and a war tax, and things of that kind, which the Democrats have been forced to resort to in order to save their faces. And we could have done so, but the people believed the prophets of the economic evil that was to come.

THE CHANGE ON THE SURFACE.

From day to day, under the Democratic system, the Treasury reports show that the tariff-for-revenue policy initiated by the President, and which he stood for even up to his Indianapolis speech, was not effective; on the contrary, it forced internal taxation, forced heavy burdens upon the backs of the people, and took away the employment of hundreds of thousands under the operation of the law despite the accident of the European war. But, Mr. Chairman, "the proof of the pudding," even though distasteful, "is in the eating of it," and over the surface of the Democratic moon has come a change. The tariff-for-revenue system is not productive, and the President has come to view the situation in a different light than that which illumined his thought in that rather chipper speech at Indianapolis. The Secretary of Commerce, that Secretary who probably wrote the word "efficiency" in the President's first message delivered here from "the throne"—that Secretary who seemed to think we could live upon bookkeeping in this country.

BOOKKEEPING AND TAXES.

Bookkeeping and formality and supervision which even the smallest employer of labor might comprehend as readily as the greatest corporation; that Secretary who was keeping in touch with the Treasury conditions, and who had taken a good deal of the burden of the criticism of the administration, had begun to recognize, in his public utterances at least, that all the harm which business felt was overtaking it was not seriously intended. Cognizant, doubtless, of the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury in favor of new forms of internal taxation, the Secretary of Commerce came forward with a statement of the customs revenues which was most alarming. The administration may have "known its ground" on the tariff question, and it may have stood to its guns, but the last horn was about to blow. In a confidential statement to the newspapers, released January 20, Mr. Secretary Redfield, of the Department of Commerce, said:

Decreased customs revenues in the fiscal year 1915 clearly reflect the influence of war.

Ah, when it comes to political economy and the issue between the two great parties, how imposing is the influence of the European war! The European war, it "is but to laugh"! The damage was done before the European war opened. The great loss of employment involving hundreds of thousands; the great loss to business, involving billions of dollars in this country, were all effected before the first shot was fired over yonder in Belgium territory; but the Secretary, like all loyal Democrats, holds to the apology. It is the easiest way out.

LOSSES BEFORE THE WAR.

But the Secretary says:

The influence of war, which operated to cut off imports generally, and especially merchandise from Europe, the leading sources of dutiable goods, and then our cutoms revenues in 1914—

Says the Secretary of Commerce, the efficiency expert of the administration—

amounted to $283,700,000, a decrease of $28,700,000, or less than 10 per cent, when compared with 1913. In the following year, under war, they fell to $205,800,000, being $78,700,000, or 27½ per cent below the total for 1914.

Is it any wonder they were disturbed about revenues, with free imports piling up apace? The Secretary was not speaking of imports which came in free, and which have continued throughout the war to compete with American goods and American labor. He was not telling us of the inrush of foreign-made goods despite the war and during the war in foreign countries, that kept flooding our shores, from which no revenue was being derived. He was just telling us of the dead-cold loss in dollars and cents that was resulting from the continued attempt to establish a tariff-for-revenue policy on such goods as did pay and that policy was breaking down. [Applause on the Republican side.]

There was a loss of 10 per cent in revenues in 1913, but the President was not yet scared. He was not yet ready to flop; but in 1914, when the figures were all brought to the front, and it was found that the loss during that year was not 10 per cent, but 27½ per cent in revenues, then the President began to think, and then he began to send for the Democratic leaders, and then he began to talk to the big interests of the country as well as to the little interests and tell them to be still.

CALMING THE TURBULENT SPIRITS.

It was time to stop the storm that was brewing. After the President had told the people that their trouble was only "psychological" he began to tell them to be at ease and peace with the world; that the business interests need give themselves no concern. Even the Attorney General told them that, under the inspiration of the chambers of commerce of the United States. Apparently the great Democratic leader was getting ready to flop; the bare, cold, financial facts were so dead against him that it became necessary to go to the country with some sort of a program and endeavor to explain the situation.

The President is now on his journey; he will tell his story to the people. But wait a minute! Before he left the Capital, and we have the newspaper reports of this morning to prove it,

there was a conference of Democratic leaders at the White House. The President sent for the Democratic leader of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], and in consequence of that interview we have the declaration this morning that the new policy upon which the administration is about to embark includes legislation for a tariff commission on lines similar to the Republican tariff commission that was destroyed by the Democratic Party when it came into this House. We are to have a Democratic tariff commission despite the fact that we have a Democratic Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, which was to supply the needs of a tariff board, and totally unmindful of the creation of an expensive Federal Trade Commission, into whose organic law the President, at Indianapolis, indicated there had been slipped a provision giving the administration ample power to make the investigation and reports desired.

ARE THE DEMOCRATS UNITED?

Has the President flopped in making this declaration? And in flopping has he carried the entire Democracy with him? My distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] seems to think that the Democrats will stand unitedly behind the President upon this proposition. Why, Mr. Chairman, we had some evidence of how unitedly they stand together upon any proposition in the discussion of the child-labor bill upon this floor yesterday. We had an evidence of the manner in which they will stand together upon any proposition, when we discussed the good-roads bill for three or four days, and found them beautifully disunited, some for economy and some for expenditure, some for the President and some against.

So, with reference to the tariff commission, we find in the declaration of the leading Democratic paper of the city of Philadelphia, and one of the best in the country, this explanation of the interview between the President of the United States and the Democratic House leader, somewhat reluctant methinks, to discuss the problem with his chief.

THE PANIC (?) OF 1907.

Mr. HOWARD. Will my friend from Pennsylvania yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield.

Mr. HOWARD. I hold in my hand a statement from a Republican paper in which it gives the increase of wages of thousands of wage earners in this country from plate glass to cotton mills, a voluntary increase from 5 to 20 per cent. This is the first time I have known of a voluntary raise of wages. Can the gentleman give any reason why these great industrial plants have increased wages when there are such depressed conditions as he speaks of?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Certainly I can. I will not run away from the question put by the gentleman, but before answering him I would like to ask the gentleman if the increase in the lines that he gives with respect to employment and increases of wages, prevailed during the pendency of the Underwood tariff law, from October 13, 1913, until August 1, 1914, when the war broke out in Europe? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HOWARD. In reply to the gentleman, I will say that neither did they exist in 1907 when I saw 30,000 men in Pittsburgh walking the streets begging for bread. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is fine. I expected that some Democrat would applaud, and I see that three did applaud. That panic of 1907 is the only thread that the Democrats have to hang their hats upon, and that was not a tariff panic. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HOWARD. I want to say to my friend in reply——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did not that great trouble start with the Knickerbocker Trust Co. in New York, a financial institution? And have not the Democrats cited it ever since as a tariff panic when as a fact the tariff had absolutely nothing to do with it? Will the gentleman from Georgia answer that, and will the Democrats applaud his answer?

Mr. HOWARD. One thing I can not explain——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know the gentleman can not, and that is the trouble. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

A CONTRAST OF TARIFF CONDITIONS.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield further to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield. I think this is a subject on which the country ought to be enlightened and its memory refreshed. It is the richest morsel that the Democrats ever got hold of although it is entirely apart from the tariff question.

Mr. HOWARD. I am very much interested in what the gentleman from Pennsylvania says, for he is one of the few Representatives who is always pleasant, and because he is always so fair. I would like to ask him if he believes that the Underwood tariff bill was responsible for the conditions in 1914 when it never went into full operation in that year, and does he believe that the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill would have produced any more revenue?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, yes. I will answer the gentleman, and I want the indulgence of the House while I do it. For months prior to the passage of the Underwood bill there was fear and dread throughout the whole length and breadth of the land in all business circles, and particularly where labor was employed.

WHY THERE WAS STAGNATION.

It was believed there would be such a slash in the industries of the country as to practically put them out of business. Men everywhere who had capital invested, who had pay rolls to make good, who had to meet workmen face to face were perturbed; everywhere these men were beginning to retrench, preparing, as it were, for the disaster which they expected to come. And long before the bill was actually enacted into law mills were closing up, men going out of employment, because the new conditions were to be so harsh and unfavorable that ordinary common sense dictated self-preservation of business and fireside. When finally the law was enacted most of the damage had been done. It continued, however, with unabated fury until the expiration of nine months after the passage of the law, when there was a loss of billions in the business in the country. Other countries began to pick up in their industries. They were taking courage out of our misfortunes and our markets were opened to them. I do not exaggerate when I say that workmen began to leave the United States and obtain employment in Canada and Europe, while men at home began to walk the streets.

It is absolutely true, and I am glad the gentleman has given me an opportunity to answer, that our imports were increased. At the same time the exports were falling off at such a rate that it was bringing distress and wretchedness to our farms as well as to our industries, and it was mighty fortunate that the administration, responsible for bringing it about, had the European war to fall back upon when the crash came.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

NO PROTECTION FROM DUMPING.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Is it not a fact that millions of dollars worth of goods were dumped on American markets immediately after the passage of the tariff bill, putting a great many factories out of business?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is absolutely true, and although the Democrats had an antidumping clause originally in their bill, they took it out. To-day, however, we hear that along with their proposition to give us a tariff board they propose to restore the antidumping clause to save that situation.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. If that statement of the gentleman is true, why is it that the American products to-day are selling as high as they ever sold in our country?

WHEN PEOPLE STOP BUYING.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Because—and it is well for the gentleman to know this—the war in Europe did not have everything to do with it, as the gentleman thinks. It was by reason of that fear and dread in the industrial world in anticipation and due to the actual operation of the Underwood tariff law that men ceased to manufacture, men ceased to buy; the country merchants did not come to town, the purchasing agents went out of business, and everything ran down to bedrock.

It will be recalled that merchants ran out of stock, mills were not making anything, we were down at the heel, and the time had come when some of the importations from the foreign countries having been checked by reason of the war, we had begun to manufacture again. We had run out and had to start again. The industries picked up, to be sure. But that is not all; the cotton industry in the South got very busy after its panic of 6½ cents, and the people began to discuss manufacturing cotton in the United States, which was encouraged here during the war, when cotton was kept out of Germany, as it was never encouraged by the Democratic Party in normal times. And then, again munitions of war were demanded of the United States, and the industries began making munitions

of war; that gave men employment. Good wages were paid, because we got back from Europe a good deal of our money; but I am afraid it is no compliment to the Democratic Party to say that the prosperity that has come from the manufacture of munitions of war is a real or substantial prosperity. That kind of prosperity will go just as soon as the war in Europe closes; it will be all over then; and when it is over God help the United States if we must still operate under the Democratic low-tariff law. [Applause on the Republican side.]

RAISES THE IMMIGRATION QUESTION.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. HOWARD. As I understand the gentleman, of course he is in favor of the importation of foreigners to this country, for he has always voted against any immigration bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have made myself clear on that. I have opposed the literacy test, which is not a test of morality, which is no test of the capacity of a man to work, which is no test of his readiness to labor in the United States for a better position for himself under our laws and Constitution. That is all.

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman believes in free trade so far as labor is concerned?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not at all. We have much restrictive immigration law which I approve.

Mr. HOWARD. But a high tariff so far as the products of labor are concerned?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. As to the products of foreign labor competing with the products of American labor, yes.

Mr. HOWARD. That is the gentleman's record.

ILLITERACY NOT IMMORAL.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have voted against the literacy test, but when you bring a bill in here that has so many problems involved in it that no one can vote for or against the literacy test without voting the bill up or down I would rather take the safe side of the question and vote against the bill than to punish innocent and deserving human flesh and blood. I have contended that we ought to give the worthy and law-abiding immigrant a chance for his "white alley" in the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. Would not the gentleman vote against any bill that would even tend to restrict foreign immigration to this country, no matter of what class?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not necessarily. I would vote for an immigration bill that proposes to keep out anarchists or other trouble makers. But that, as the gentleman knows, is already covered by law. Why, of course, I would vote to keep out the criminal, the unfit, the dissolute——

Mr. HOWARD. But that is the law now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know it is the law, and the new thing in the bill that you have presented to us and ask us to vote for, and which is the matter of difference, puts against the foreigner who is willing to toil and behave as a useful citizen in this country, a bar, because he can not read or write. I say reading is no moral test; it is no test of the worth of a man; the forefathers of many of us possibly came into this country unable to read or write. The question is one of humanity, of conserving human flesh and blood.

A HINT AT ONE TERM.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SLOAN. I trust the gentleman will not close his admirable speech until he says something more on the subject of flopping. We heard the authoritative statement on this floor, for the first time I think, that the next to the last plank of the Baltimore platform should be repealed. This is an announcement in the form of a prediction that the present Executive will succeed himself—a repeal and repudiation of that historic plank. The prediction of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FLOOD] announcing the most modern flop either of the Executive or the platform itself on the second-term proposition must be authoritative. It should find a place in the gentleman's speech.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman, as I observed a moment ago, not intending to interrupt him in the course of his question, is a mind reader, for he knows exactly what I was about to say.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Has the gentleman forgotten the emphatic declaration contained in a letter to Col. Evans, in Philadelphia, by the President of the United States as to the sufficiency of the trade commission?

THOUGHT TRADE COMMISSION SUFFICIENT.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The President of the United States did write a letter to Mr. Evans, of Philadelphia, expressing entire confidence in the sufficiency of the tariff clauses of the trade commission bill; but of course this was before the flop of the day before yesterday.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will ask the gentleman if he will be good enough to read section 3 of the bill which I introduced early in December, it being the bill which in 1913 passed both Houses of Congress, with a solid Republican vote, to provide for a tariff commission. If he will read section 3, which provides for the duties of that board, he will see whether there is any difference whatever between that and what the President of the United States recommends to-day in his letter to Mr. KITCHIN.

LIKE THE LONGWORTH BILL.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think, without reading it carefully, because I do not want to consume the time, that everything contained in this paragraph is contained in the President's newest suggestion. The President is a schoolmaster, as he stated in his Indianapolis speech, and it is just possible that he or some of his friends may have seen this Republican provision before they made their Democratic suggestion.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think it will be worth while for the gentleman to read that section into his speech. It is short.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Very well, I will take the gentleman's word for it. This is a bill introduced by Mr. LONGWORTH on December 6, 1915, being H. R. 154, to create a tariff commission. Section 3 reads as follows:

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of said commission to investigate the cost of production of all articles which by any act of Congress now in force or hereafter enacted are made the subject of tariff legislation, with special reference to the prices paid domestic and foreign labor and the prices paid for raw materials, whether domestic or imported, entering into manufactured articles, producers' prices and retail prices of commodities, whether domestic or imported, the condition of domestic and foreign markets affecting the American products, including detailed information with respect thereto, together with all other facts which may be necessary or convenient in fixing import duties or in aiding the President and other officers of the Government in the administration of the custom laws, and said commission shall also make investigation of any such subject whenever directed by either House of Congress.

In commenting on that, I want to say that while this bill is the work of Mr. LONGWORTH, my colleague from Ohio, it has an extremely familiar sound, and since the utterance from the White House as published to-day sounds just as deep-dyed Republican as it does Democratic, showing how great minds work along, after all, in the same groove.

ABANDONED, NOT FLOPPED.

I was saying a moment ago when interrupted by some one that there was a grave question of doubt as to whether the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] was accurate in his statement that all the Democrats would stand behind the President, and that as a result of his tour of the country it would be found that with one voice they would rise up and demand the reelection of Mr. Wilson.

The Democratic Philadelphia Record, from which I started to quote, the leading exponent of its party in the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, a hornet in the side of Republicans, and which has a very bright man obtaining its news from the White House and sending it over to Philadelphia every day, has this to say with respect to this phase of Democratic unity:

In proposing the creation of an independent board to investigate customs methods and tariff needs and report its recommendations to Congress along the lines described on December 8—

It does not say "flopped"—

the President has abandoned the project most favored by him for the present project.

CHANGING BY DEGREES.

Now, the President was once for one project, but he has "abandoned" that project, and now he is for another project; but it is explained without using the word the gentleman from Texas unfortunately threw into this discussion a little while ago—the offensive word "flopped"—that—

He was then of the opinion that the tariff could be divorced from political influences by expanding the powers of the Foreign and Domestic Trade Bureau of the Department of Commerce.

That is when he held the other view—the view entertained at the time he made the Indianapolis speech.

This plan—

Says the Record—

was favored at the time by Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo and Secretary Redfield, who, in common with a number of the President's other advisers, opposed the suggestion to confer the necessary powers to initiate tariff revision upon the Federal Trade Commission.

COMMISSION DID NOT MEASURE UP.

Apparently there were three steps in this transaction: First, the abolition of the Republican Tariff Board; second, the creation of the Democratic Interstate and Foreign Commerce Bureau; and then a Democratic Federal Trades Commission. But the writer continues:

This commission, according to Democratic leaders, has not fulfilled the expectations that prompted its creation.

This is the one, as the President observed at Indianapolis, he put over on us. Now, it does not appear to be satisfactory. Something further is needed:

The new plan will segregate the tariff in the proposed board. In this way it is the belief of the President—

Perhaps this method is a little more "psychological"; may be a little more efficient. If we could "segregate" the tariff from Congress through the proposed board, we might get another start and fool the people a third or fourth time. "Segregation" might then take the place so lately occupied by "psychological." The new plan will segregate the tariff in the proposed board. Says the writer:

In this way, it is the belief of the President, his aim to perfect the Underwood tariff law purely upon the basis of merit, and not because of political influences, can be best accomplished.

"PERFECTING" THE LOW-TARIFF LAW.

Note the language, "perfect the Underwood tariff law," as if from the Democratic viewpoint that law is not already perfect. But do not stop with "perfecting" the law. Bear in mind that this new tariff board which is to aid in perfecting the law is to be devoid of political influence. We are to have a tariff board appointed by a Democratic President, which is to deal with the tariff on merit and without regard to politics. That is at least helpful.

Now, here is something that I almost hesitate to read, although I think it ought to be read here, so the House can understand the inappropriateness of the suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia that all Democrats will stand together. It says:

Leader KITCHIN did not subscribe to this view—

That is to say, this segregation view—

during his talk with the President regarding it this morning.

This disclosure violates no rule of the House, because it is published in a newspaper, and I have a right to read it in my time.

Leader KITCHIN did not subscribe to this view during his talk with the President regarding it this morning—

Evidently the gentleman from North Carolina, who is now upon the floor, did not want to go into the segregation business so far as it affected the tariff. That is the statement of our distinguished friend from North Carolina as it is given here, and he, of course, may answer this in his own time if he so sees fit.

In fact, he asked to be relieved from the management of the measure on the ground that he had always opposed—

A SLIGHT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN LEADERS.

That is to say, it is now the second or third proposition that the President had after he had enunciated his suggestion that they knew where they stood and the platform was not made to "catch flies."

And Mr. KITCHIN asked to be relieved from the management of the measure on the ground that he had always opposed such a proposition.

He was consistent. The gentleman from North Carolina apparently did not "flop" on the question, and frankly told the President so.

That he had always opposed such a proposition in the past and had led the fight against President Taft's recommendation for such an institution in 1908.

There you have it. There is the position of one great leader on the Democratic side and another great leader on the Democratic side; one willing to flop and change several times and the other endeavoring to be consistent and stand his ground so that he might not be accused of being "molasses with which to catch flies." [Applause on the Republican side.]

But listen to this:

As a way out of this difficulty he suggested to the President that Congressman HENRY T. RAINEY, of Illinois, who is the next ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, be given charge of the legislation.

ILLINOIS SUPPLIES THE CHAMPION.

Now, there it is. Everyone who knows the amiable gentleman from Illinois knows that he is a determined advocate of the policy of tariff for revenue only; that he dislikes protection and a tariff in general, though he has made himself a master of the subject. And what does Mr. RAINEY do? According to this report, after it has been suggested that Mr. RAINEY should relieve Mr. KITCHIN of the arduous task which the President was trying to impose upon the gentleman from North Carolina, this paper says:

The President assented and will have a talk with the Illinois Congressman in a day or so.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

And then we have it straight from the shoulder—

RAINEY this afternoon indicated his readiness to undertake the commission.

So now, in the course of these rather desultory remarks upon a rather dry subject, we find that the leader of the Democracy in the House, our distinguished and eloquent friend from North Carolina, will not follow the President in the "about-face" movement with respect to a tariff board, but that gently but firmly he unloads upon the distinguished and forceful gentleman from Illinois, who, at the behest of the President, will take up the task. The Lord be with him! [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

DO THOSE WHO FLOP LEAD?

In conclusion, gentlemen, with respect to the suggestions thrown out by my friend from Texas [Mr. DIES], who continues to preside with grace and dignity over the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, I think it is fair to say that "he who flops will not always lead." [Applause on the Republican side.]

Why, Mr. Chairman, flopping is not new on the other side of the House. For instance, there was the flop on the plank written into the Democratic platform of Baltimore promising free tolls to American ships through the American-paid-for canal. That was a plank put there to stay until the day of judgment. It was not "molasses with which to catch flies." But we saw in due course that our Democratic friends came in with pallor on their faces, indicating that the President, after minute study of the international problems involved, had induced them, for the safety and preservation of the Nation, as they saw it, to vote against their own platform and charge Americans just as much as they charge any foreigners for using their own canal. And they did that to us good and hard. Then came the suggestion from the Democratic convention at Baltimore that the extravagance of a Republican Congress should be abolished and that Democratic simplicity of expenditure should prevail; and it came shortly thereafter out of the mouths of the Democratic leaders themselves, raising their hands to high heaven in expostulation against the aggrandizement of their own Members, unable to check their wild horses seeking appropriations, that their Congress had been the most extravagant in the history of the Nation, and there never had been anything like unto it during the administration of the Republican Party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

THE CONSISTENCY OF DEMOCRATS.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Does not the gentleman know that universal consistency is the sole virtue of idiots?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think that is the trouble with the Democratic Party. It is too infernally consistent on some questions and too inconsistent on others.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is in favor of a nonpartisan tariff commission?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If you can find a nonpartisan tariff commission, I am in favor of it. [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. One other question——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think I can quote the Speaker of this House——

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask one other question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Six minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

RESERVING THE RIGHTS OF CONGRESS.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is in favor of that kind of a tariff commission that the Republican side of this House has stood for in the past?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have no objection to a tariff board that ascertains the facts and gives both the President and Congress such information as will enable them to properly adjust the tariff rates. I hope that answers the gentleman.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like an answer to my question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have answered the gentleman. The gentleman may differ as to the meaning of the term "board" or the term "commission." From my point of view there is very little difference between the two terms. As interpreted by the Republicans heretofore and the Democrats now, there is absolutely no difference. They propose, under the Constitution, to ascertain the facts and report to Congress, and let Congress attend to its business of fixing the rates.

Mr. LENROOT. I was in good faith——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know it.

IS A TARIFF BOARD NONPARTISAN?

Mr. LENROOT. I want to know the gentleman's position—whether he is in favor of the kind of legislation, with reference to a tariff commission or tariff board—it is immaterial which you call it—that the Republican side of this House has stood for and voted for?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I say to the gentleman this, that I am in favor of any kind of a board or commission that will ascertain the facts and send to the House the information that it is necessary for the House to have in order to exercise its constitutional duty of fixing the rates equitably.

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly. That answers my question.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. I desire to ask the gentleman if a law should be passed by which a tariff commission should be appointed, and it should be appointed by President Wilson, do you believe that our present tariff law would be very materially changed?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I scarcely think so, if it is what some gentlemen think it will be—a partisan commission, because it would be impossible for the President of the United States to appoint an impartial tariff board. It is not the history of the President of the United States that he has ever deviated from his party line. In every instance where he has appointed commissions—these expense-eating commissions, these revenue-burning commissions of recent date—he has appointed Democrats, and some of them have had trouble in finding something to do.

DEMOCRATIC APPROVAL OF REPUBLICAN BOARD.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have only a few minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move that the gentleman have five minutes additional time.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania have five minutes additional time. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, will the gentleman permit me to read at this point, as I think it will be apropos here, an opinion by a very prominent Democrat of the Republican Tariff Board and its work?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will keep within the five minutes.

WHEN THE CHEMICAL SCHEDULE WAS UP.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is very brief. In a speech which the gentleman, who is now Governor General of the Philippine Islands, made in this House—I refer to the Hon. Burton Harrison—on the 19th of February, 1912, being in charge of the chemical schedule of the Underwood tariff, he said:

> But more than this, and in addition, the Democratic membership of the Committee on Ways and Means in the preparation of this bill has had the benefit of the report of the Tariff Board on Schedule A. [Applause.]
>
> The report of the Tariff Board consists of a glossary of the paragraphs of the existing law and, in addition, an economic review of the chemical industry in the United States, in Canada, in France, in England, and in Germany. The members of the Ways and Means Committee take this opportunity of expressing to the Tariff Board their appreciation of the very valuable assistance which this report has been to them in the preparation of their bill.

That is a strong Democratic indorsement of the work of the Republican Tariff Board which they, however, saw fit to abolish for purely partisan reasons.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for reminding the House of that very interesting statement.

GATHERING THE FACTS FOR CONGRESS.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I will remind the gentleman that that is but an informal opinion of one member of the committee, but if the gentleman will examine the report on the Underwood bill I think he will find a distinct repudiation of all those statements in the action taken on the part of the Senate and on the part of the House, that they did not utilize that information in making up the tariff law.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think, however, that does not affect the statement read by the gentleman from Wisconsin, which places on record the thoughts that were uppermost in the minds of the chairmen of some of the subcommittees of the Committee on Ways and Means bringing the tariff bill into the House; that without the information presented by the Republican Tariff Board they would have been at sea in fixing the various schedules.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit another interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. They brought in, in two consecutive years, two chemical schedules, one of them purely ad valorem and the other its opposite in principle, based upon specific duties.

GOOD WORK OF REPUBLICAN POLICIES.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes, Mr. Chairman; another flop. The gentleman from Wisconsin is clear and he is right. Not only did they bring in two bills on the chemical schedule, but they also brought in various bills on various other schedules, testing out and experimenting with the prosperity of the United States. And if any Democrat finds fault to-day with any of us for reminding them of those things, let it be said in the interest of the people of the United States that, having brought them up under a Republican system of protection as to tariff rates, which imposed the burden of taxation upon the foreign manufacturers of competing commodities, and having brought the country into a condition of happiness and domestic felicity such as it had never known before, we rightfully resent the intrusion upon that prosperity the experimentation of schoolmasters and others who, by reason of their undermining legislative practices, dragged it down and put the country for a time in the very lowest depths of industrial despair. [Applause on the Republican side.]

FINE ASSORTMENT OF FLOPS.

Now, as to this matter of the text furnished by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who presides over the committee, we have observed that there was a flop on the Panama Canal question. We have also observed that there was a flop on the question of extravagance, and we all know there was a complete flop and breach of promise in the matter of the reduction of the high cost of living, because the cost of living has gone up and soared higher and higher since the Democrats have been in power.

There was also a breaking of the promise to the people that the Democratic Party would relieve them of the burden of taxation, because instead of taking off the burden of taxation they have put on additional burdens, large and small, on the people as individuals and otherwise, and they have put upon business such a system of inquisition and such a system of commission government as was never known before. They have piled up war taxes and stamp taxes such as would not have been tolerated under a Republican system. They have flopped upon every pledge that they made in the platform adopted at Baltimore—sugar, the trusts, the tariff, and all—because their policies, social, domestic, economic, and financial, were wrong. The effect of their failure has proven the absolute righteousness of the Republican system of protection and of the Republican system of building up and sustaining the industries of the country.

THE SINGLE-TERM PLANK.

But in still another platform plank have they made a breach; on another plank has the distinguished Democratic President and party leader made a flop. It was not made when his letter of acceptance of the Democratic national nomination and platform was written. It was not made known until a few weeks ago, when the political situation became so acute that the public had to be informed whether the President of the United States would again be a candidate for office or not.

Democracy knows, Republicanism knows, every man who reads the newspapers knows, and certainly everyone who reads the Commoner knows that the one-term plank put into the Democratic national platform was not "molasses intended to catch flies." That plank meant business. There was a gentleman out in Nebraska who wrote that platform with malice aforethought. [Laughter.] The President knew what that political plank was. There was a suggestion, formerly made, that some one out in Nebraska was to be "knocked into a cocked hat," but instead of

being "knocked into a cocked hat," he was taken into camp as a member of the Cabinet. But he did not stay in long; the one-term plank was burning a hole in his ambition, and he wanted to come out and talk to the people about it; he is now endeavoring to convince the people of the country that the one-term plank was right.

DISAPPOINTING MR. BRYAN.

But the Democratic President was not in accord with the gentleman from Nebraska on the one-term idea. He said little about it, but a long time ago he wrote to a distinguished Democrat and former Congressman in this House, Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer, his views on the one-term situation. He thought the people should determine such a question as Mr. Bryan wrote into the Baltimore platform. Why did we not get that letter a year ago? Why was it kept in Mr. Palmer's pocket from that time down until this? Why did not the President authorize Mr. Palmer to publish that letter so that the country might have a clean-cut understanding of his position? Perhaps some Democrat will tell us. We got the letter only a couple of weeks ago. In that letter we find discussed certain matters of public policy and political insight which induced the President, having served one term, to leave it up to the people as to whether he shall be elected a second term.

PRESIDENT DID NOT PLEDGE.

Here is the last breach in the Democratic platform. We can not blame the President for it, because in no published word can we find any acceptance by him of the suggestion that the one-term plank met with his approval. The Commoner lost no opportunity to let the country know where it stood upon this important matter both before and after the Baltimore convention. It had small regard for the man who would run upon a platform and not abide by its terms. But Mr. Wilson, the Democratic nominee, was not baited. His letter of acceptance might be scanned from start to finish without revealing a thought or line upon the plank that laid so close to the heart of the Commoner's distinguished editor. The letter to Mr. Palmer, the publication of which was long deferred, was the first inkling of the President's disbelief in the amiable thought of his erstwhile Secretary of State. It was the last "flop," not so much on the part of the President as on the part of those devoted followers of Mr. Bryan, who have been persuaded that the Democratic platform was in error when it sought to limit the tenure of a President to a single term.

WHEN REPUBLICANS COME BACK.

And now, Mr. Chairman, accepting the text of the eloquent gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], let me suggest to our friends on the other side that they may continue to "flop" among themselves to their hearts' content. Upon this side we are standing pat upon the Republican doctrine of protection and prosperity to the Nation, which we hope to restore when a consistent Republican administration again takes up the reins of office. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RAINEY rose and was recognized.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I want to speak only five or ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Wisconsin that he recognized the gentleman from Illinois before the gentleman from Wisconsin indicated his desire to speak.

Mr. RAINEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled to the floor in my own right, but I do not care to exercise that right now.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I can understand the difficulties under which a standpat Republican like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] labors in his attempt, even in an hour and five minutes, to discredit the President of the United States. And I want to say to the gentleman, who is an expert along that line, that he can throw as much mud at the President as he pleases; it will have no more effect upon the President and upon his policies, and upon the things he stands for in this country and before the world than the gentleman could accomplish by throwing mud at the Washington Monument. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Speaking of flopping, I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania is going to flop? I wonder if gentlemen on that side are going to flop? Let me read from the campaign platform adopted by the last national Republican convention, upon which gentlemen on that side of the aisle were elected and upon which they have been pretending to stand:

The pronounced feature of modern industrial life is its enormous diversification. To apply tariff rates justly to these changing conditions requires closer study and more scientific methods than ever before. The Republican Party has shown by its creation of a tariff board its recognition of this situation and its determination to be equal to it. We condemn the Democratic Party for its failure either to provide funds for the continuance of this board or to make some other provision for securing the information requisite for intelligent tariff legislation. We protest against the Democratic method of legislating on these vitally important subjects without careful investigation.

Now, that is the Republican position. That is the platform you will all stand on if you do not flop when this matter is presented to you soon. I understand from the position taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] that he objects to the creation now of a nonpartisan tariff board, for the reason that the Democrats are in control, and for that reason it can not be nonpartisan; and then he proceeds to show that upon this question Democratic leaders are not united. He proceeds to prove that our proposition is not partisan.

I want to say concerning the report made by our distinguished former colleague in this House, Mr. Harrison, of New York, now Governor General of the Philippine Islands, that those bills which formed the nucleus of the Underwood tariff bill, and which were framed in the Sixty-second Congress, were all based on the reports of President Taft's tariff board, and we sent some of those bills clear on up to President Taft, and demonstrating this lack of consistency in the Republican Party, he vetoed them. Yet every one of them could be defended by simply calling attention to the collection of facts and data appearing in the reports of that special tariff board.

Now, I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] that I know the kind of a tariff commission he wants. He does not propose to stand on this Republican national platform. He proposes to stand upon the platform recently announced by his leader, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, who in his speech before the New England Club, of Providence, R. I., on the 16th day of October, 1915, defined his position, and speaking for the gentleman who has just taken his seat [Mr. MOORE], evidently also defined his position. He said:

First get back a protective tariff, and then select a permanent tariff commission.

That is the platform upon which Republican partisans upon that side, blinded by partisanship, stand in this economic crisis of our history as a Nation. That is the kind of a nonpartisan tariff commission they want now.

Here is the way some of the rest of these distinguished Republican leaders and certain Republican journals now stand. Every one of them flops from this platform declaration of theirs which I have just read, and here is the kind of a platform they stand on now. Here is an expression from the Manufacturers' News, last October:

The tariff commission idea has whiskers. Political pressure would rule. The tariff can not be taken out of politics. The proposed commission would delay for two years a tariff revision.

Here is what the Hartford (Conn.) Courant said in September, 1915:

It would be difficult to have a nonpartisan tariff commission. A tariff commission works in Germany because there is no dispute as to the protection principle there.

Here is the kind of a platform to which they have flopped from the national Republican platform of two years ago, as expressed by the Muncie (Ind.) National Republican:

If the tariff is taken out of politics, it will be when free traders cease firing on the American policy. We favor a tariff commission when there has been a prompt upward revision of the tariff after the inauguration of another protectionist President.

Here is what the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] said recently in the American Economist of August 20, 1915. This is how he has flopped from the nonpartisan tariff-commission expressions of his Republican platform:

I am not in favor of such a commission as would be appointed by the free trader now in the White House.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON] about the same time, in fact in the same issue of the American Economist, said:

The people want the Republican Party to revise the tariff. There are too many commissions.

Here is what the distinguished Senator from Washington, Senator JONES, said on August 13, 1915:

I am in favor of a commission to revise the tariff on a protective standard.

Here is what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], who has just taken his seat, said on the 6th day of August, 1915, in the American Economist:

The question can not be answered until we find whether a nonpartisan tariff commission is possible.

Here is what the American Economist said in July, 1915:

The tariff-commission idea is a fallacy. It is all right in Germany, because the policy of protection prevails there—

And so on.

That is the platform upon which Republicans stand now who are blinded by partisanship. That is how they have flopped from their own platform, adopted in their national convention at Chicago.

You can depend upon the President of the United States and upon the Democratic Party to stand always patriotically for the best interests of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Does the gentleman who has just taken his seat realize the changed conditions which confront us now, the changed world conditions? Why, the Underwood tariff law had just commenced to work, it was yielding as much and more revenue than we expected it to yield, but suddenly there was a red glow in the eastern skies, and from out of the clouds of war a hand of iron reached and stopped the ships upon the seas, the ships that were bringing goods to our ports, the goods that were to pay the revenue under the Underwood tariff bill. Can the gentleman from Pennsylvania with all of his shrewd partisanship and unfair logic convince the country that the United States is responsible in any measure for that war? Talk as much as you may about the blood-streaked prosperity on this side of the water, who is responsible for prosperity of that kind? Talk about manufacturing munitions here in private plants, and shipping them across the seas to be used for the purpose of dealing out death on the battlefields of Europe, who is responsible for that? Why, the party which was in power for so many years and refused to build up Government munition factories in this country. That party is responsible for the trade in arms which is now possible. They can not charge us with that sort of business. Are men being killed on European battlefields by guns manufactured in America? Who made that possible? Why, the party that was in power when that business was built up throughout the country and which refused to establish Government plants for the manufacture of arms. That party must answer for it now and when the question is presented to the electorate next November.

Now, speaking of prosperity, I want to read from Republican journals something about what is going on in this country at the present time. I read from the Washington Post of October 25, always against the administration and always speaking for the Republican Party:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 25.]

A WEEK OF IMMENSE TRANSACTIONS IN BUSINESS.

The week that has just closed has been a week of sensational advances in many stocks of industrial companies.

* * * * * * *

Among the large orders placed in this country during the past week may be mentioned one for railroad ties to the value of $2,500,000.

* * * * * * *

The report of the General Chemical Co. for the quarter ended September 30 is an exhibit well up in the line with the prosperity reports of many big business concerns.

The net profits for the quarter were $1,705,273, an increase over the preceding quarter of $945,352.

During the nine months since January 1, 1915, the profits were $4,058,741, an increase of $1,872,734 as compared with the first nine months of 1914.

* * * * * * *

Exports of wheat from United States and Canadian ports during the past week broke all records, totaling 11,113,093 bushels.

For the 16 weeks ended October 21 corn exports were 3,426,689 bushels, as against but 1,861,040 bushels in the same period of last year.

Recently in the Chicago Drovers' Journal J. Ogden Armour, a better authority than the gentleman from Pennsylvania—and the gentleman will admit it himself—on commercial matters, on the question of prosperity in this country, gave out this authorized interview on the 11th of November, 1915. I read this interview in full:

UNITED STATES IN RECORD BOOM ERA, SAYS ARMOUR—AMERICA RISING RAPIDLY TO UNPRECEDENTED PROSPERITY, INCONCEIVABLE A YEAR AGO AND ENDURING, SAYS PACKER.

[From the Drovers Journal, Nov. 11, 1915.]

J. Ogden Armour, in an interview on crop, market, and financial conditions, said: "America is rapidly rising to an unprecedented prosperity, a prosperity which would have been inconceivable a year ago, and which will be enduring. It will be boomlike for, say, three years, and should not be affected by a termination of the European war within that time."

For a captain of industry, whose reticence, restraint, and conservatism are proverbial, the above declaration is interesting and instructive.

"The idea that the cessation of European hostilities must affect us adversely is, I believe, academic," said Mr. Armour. "In the first place, emigration from the countries now at war will be prohibited. They will be forced to take this step because the conflict means an exhaustion of men as well as of treasure. Men will be needed over there as much, if not more, than money. There can be no competition between a country of America's great vigor and infinite resources and countries that have spent themselves.

AMERICA TO LEAD.

"America was destined to lead the world commercially and financially in 15 years. The war simply hastened that manifest destiny. For an American to fear the aftermath of the war appears to me baseless."

The president of Armour & Co. then proceeded to give reasons for his unshakable optimism:

"Ours is not a war prosperity, although, to be sure, ammunition orders are accelerating the pace," he said. "It is fundamental, in that the products of the farm are the basis of it. We are still largely an agricultural community, and as agriculture prospers the whole country prospers.

"Look at our crops and the prices we are getting for them. Both have no parallel in the country's annals. Wheat was late in harvesting, but is now coming abundantly to market. The enormous daily exports show that the corn yield is bountiful. The run of hogs will be large.

EUROPE BUYING HEAVILY.

"The demand for these necessaries is in proportion to their supply. Europe is buying as she has never bought before, and the swelling bank deposits reflect the heavy European payments as well as the affluence of the farmer.

"Take, for example, the National City Bank of New York" (of which Mr. Armour is a director). "A year ago the gross deposits of that institution were $245,000,000. To-day they are more than $500,000,000." (The shares of the institution have risen 150 points.)

"Bankers as a rule have been hard put by these startling increases. Rates are low, but the money will all be profitably employed. It is only a question of time, and the employment of so much money will mean just so much more prosperity.

"The South, which only a few months ago was in despair, is now, to speak colloquially, drunk with prosperity. Planters are finding no difficulty in marketing their cotton at good prices. That section of the country is fortunate, too, in enjoying a revival in the lumber trade. Timber in the South has advanced $2 a thousand.

"I have no doubt that the Pacific coast, whose timber trade has been lagging, will soon thrive. In fact, every leading industry is flourishing or beginning to flourish. Building permits throughout the country are at a high mark. So it is with what might be called the luxurious or semiluxurious lines, such as jewelry and furniture. Our reports from Grand Rapids, the furniture manufacturing center, show that the factories are operating at full capacity."

RAILROADS ARE BAROMETERS.

It may be noted here in parentheses that the Armour organizations have unusual facilities for obtaining widespread and accurate statistics on current commercial conditions. The packing company, for example, has an agent in every city of consequence, while Mr. Armour himself is a director in several banks and in the Illinois Central and the St. Paul Railway system.

"Then," continued Mr. Armour, "there are the railway revenues. These are infallible indicators of trade tendencies. Earnings are increasing by leaps and bounds. There is a car shortage for the first time in five years. I know of western roads which could use double the cars they have at their disposal at present. In brief, we—the United States—are 'it' with a capital 'I' and will continue to be in that enviable position indefinitely."

From Dun's Weekly Review of Trade for the week ending November 12, which ought to be as good authority as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has just taken his seat, I read:

WEEKLY REVIEW OF TRADE.

NO SLACKENING IN SIGNS FORECASTING GREATEST COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN HISTORY, SAYS DUN—MILD WEATHER RETARDING RETAIL BUYING, BRADSTREET REPORTS.

NEW YORK, *November 12.*

R. G. Dun's weekly review of trade to-morrow will say:

There is no slackening of the advance that foreshadows the greatest commercial development in the history of the country.

Following many months of gradual recovery and adjustment to new conditions, progress has come with such a rush that reaction is feared in some quarters; yet the economic position steadily gains in strength, and seldom, if ever, has the situation so favored continued expansion.

Business is no longer wholly dependent upon the war demands, the bumper crops, the widespread increase in production, in the working force and in the power of the people to purchase having established the basis for an era of unexampled prosperity.

There is, moreover, the further and highly significant increase of abundant supplies of money for all legitimate purposes while the arrangements for supplementary foreign credits augur well for the maintenance of the phenomenal movements in over-sea commerce.

The figures of merchandise exports, pig-iron output, bank clearings, and railroad earnings bring to light achievements without precedent, and to the list of remarkable attainments have been added those of unfilled steel tonnage and commodity prices.

* * * * * * *

The lumber trade improvement, first visible at the South, has reached the Pacific Northwest, where prices have been advanced; winter wheat marketing is freer, thus improving collections, and sales of spring wheat are large, despite holding by farmers; demand for coal is better, activity in steam grades testifying to enlarged industrial operations; railway transportation is of record proportions, the margin of idle cars has about disappeared, and shortages loom up as the railways strain to move the freight offering overcrowded rails and through congested terminals.

As to what is being accomplished in the matter of good times and prosperity under Democratic rule I might read now extracts from an Associated Press article sent out over the country on November 27:

NEW YORK, *November 27.*

The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad, whose lines are choken as far back as Scranton with loaded freight cars it can not

move, to-day notified its agents to accept no more freight for export until further notice.

More than 6,000 cars from the West, loaded with grain, feed, flour, copper, and hundreds of other commodities, have virtually turned the terminals of the road into a storage warehouse for weeks. Some of the cars have been here for 80 days.

Nearly every road terminal entering here is glutted with loaded freight cars standing idle on sidings for hundreds of miles back along the line, and it was stated that other roads would follow the Lackawanna's lead shortly.

* * * * * * *

I now read from an article in the Washington Times of a recent issue:

* * * * * * *

A gain of $445,241,906 was made during the 10 months in the total value of exports of breadstuffs, cottonseed oil, cattle, hogs, sheep, meat, and dairy products, cotton, and mineral oils. Up to November of the present year these exports totaled $1,145,240,826, as against $699,998,920 for the first 10 months of last year.

More than $87,625,000 of the gain this year was made by cotton, the exports being valued at $349,975,904, as against $262,349,975 last year. A total of 3,796,856,462 pounds, or 7,276,280 bales, of cotton have been shipped abroad thus far this year.

Among the big export items were 420,451,068 pounds of bacon, valued at $55,683,943; 714,496,902 gallons of illuminating oil, worth $42,385,934; 250,962,514 bushels of wheat, worth $12,448,746; and 218,168,774 pounds of fresh beef, worth $38,073,197.

For October of this year the exports of foods, cotton, and oil showed a gain of $26,906,869 over the corresponding month last year, the figures being $110,615,275 for the tenth month of this year and $83,709,406 for last year.

I read from the Washington Herald of November 14, 1915:

[Washington Herald, Nov. 14, 1915.]

BROAD EXPANSION OF BUSINESS ACTIVITY ALL OVER COUNTRY.

The outstanding feature of the business situation in October has been the fact that all trade has been unmistakably better. We expressed the opinion two months ago, says the November bulletin of the National City Bank of New York, that as the season for fall trade came on, the country would swing into a broad, general state of activity, and that expectation has been realized. Every part of the country now sends good reports, and the contrast they make with the conditions of a year ago is calculated to inspire the most profound sentiments of relief, satisfaction, and gratitude.

* * * * * * *

The woolgrowers have sold this year's clip at record prices, and the live-stock interests are exceptionally prosperous. Farm seekers from other States are pouring into the States of the Northwest, where a limited amount of comparatively cheap lands are still to be had.

The metal mining industry of the West, which was badly crippled a year ago, is now in full swing. There is enormous activity in the production of copper, lead, and zinc; it is now up to capacity of the mines and smelters, and in the case of zinc the smelter capacity is being materially increased. So far as agriculture, stock raising, and mining go the West is exceedingly prosperous.

* * * * * * *

The available supply of labor is so fully employed that the situation is on the verge of being critical. Food supplies promise to be abundant and moderate in price for the coming year, and the outlook for general comfort and prosperity in the United States is at present very promising.

Here is an Associated Press dispatch from Washington:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 13.*

Uncle Sam's coffers were swelled during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1915, by the collection of $415,681,023 by the internal-revenue bureau, according to the annual report of Commissioner W. H. Osborn to Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo. The collection was the greatest in the history of the bureau.

If you will examine closely the reports issued from this office you will find that this increase in collections is due not only to the unexampled prosperity which prevails in this country under Democratic rule, but to the fact that this office is equipped now to collect these revenues, and is collecting them. There have been no scandals in the transaction of any of the business of the Treasury Department in collecting internal revenues or revenues on imports at our ports. There have been no stories of bribing of little fifteen-dollar and twenty-dollar a week Government checkers and weighers or manipulation of scales on Government wharves by which great institutions under a Republican administration were able to steal from the Treasury of the United States millions and millions of dollars. We have conducted these various departments of this Government honestly, and we are collecting the moneys that are coming to this Government from these various sources; and that is one reason for this increase in collections reported from this department of the Government charged with making them. These favorable reports as to trade expansion which will be permanent, according to these Republican authorities, all of them worthy of more consideration than these gentlemen who make partisan speeches on that side of the House, continue until the present time, and they will continue indefinitely in the future.

You declared in your platform that you are in favor of a tariff board or a tariff commission, I do not care what you call it, to apply tariff rates to changing conditions. In the history of this country and of the world were economic conditions ever changing more rapidly than they are now? Germany is our great competitor for the world's markets. As a member of the committee and one of the conferees which had in charge the drafting of the Underwood tariff bill, I want to say, and even gentlemen on that side will agree with me, that the Underwood tariff bill was framed with reference to possible German competition in the future. Germany was our real competitor for the markets of the world, and Germany will continue to be when this war is over our real competitor for the world's markets. You are in favor of a tariff commission, you say, if it can be a Republican tariff commission. You are in favor of a tariff commission modeled upon the German plan, because there you say they are committed to the doctrine of protection. Do you know that they are about to abandon the doctrine of protection over there?

Is it possible the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has not been reading the inspired articles which find their way into our press, copied from journals faithfully representing the ideas of the government in Germany, in which the information is given out that at the end of the war they propose to take off their tariff on foodstuffs entirely? They propose to put foodstuffs on the free list, and they have gone so far as to declare that they propose to put the necessaries of life on the free list. What they propose to do with the other things they have not yet announced, but we know, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] knows, how they revise tariffs over there in Germany. Find fault with us for discontinuing the activities of the tariff board, and then say that we want the kind of a tariff board that is possible over there in Germany! Why, when they get through with a revision of the tariff in Germany they discharge their tariff board from further activities. They have a tariff board there composed of 30 men, 15 of them selected by representatives of certain industries and 15 of them selected by the representatives of the German Emperor and confirmed by their legislative body. After they revised their tariff in 1902—and that is the last German revision—they, in protection Germany, discharged their board. That is what we did here, and nothing else. We followed the kind of program you say you stand for and shut off the activities of this tariff board when we had put upon the books the greatest tariff law ever constructed in this country up until that time [applause on the Democratic side], a tariff law which had already compelled the great Arlington Mills over there in Massachusetts to announce that its next delivery of worsteds would be placed on the market at a reduction of 25 per cent, and all over the country announcements of reductions in wholesale prices were being made when this war broke out.

We have only done in our manipulation of the tariff question exactly what you say ought to be done, for we have followed the German practice. But the German tariff law enacted in 1902 was preliminary to her treaties, and her commercial treaties with all the commercial nations of the world expire this present year. As soon as this war is over, of course, the German tariff will be revised. It must be revised in order to meet the new treaties which they propose to make. According to your own provision contained in your own platform, has not the time come now when there are changing conditions, conditions which require the activities of a tariff board, conditions which require that a nonpartisan tariff board be appointed for the purpose of keeping pace with the approaching German tariff revision, for the purpose of keeping pace and being in a position to inform the Congress, with facts and data as to the changing conditions the world over, which everyone knows this war is going to bring about? We are going to give you an opportunity all of you on that side, to stand on your own platform, or an opportunity to flop from your platform, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and his distinguished leader, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], have already done. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

THE WAR AND THE TARIFF.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. ROGERS. I desired to be recognized in my own right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for one hour.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the first half of the legislative history of the Wilson administration ended when the Sixty-third Congress, the 4th of March last, adjourned sine die. The second half began when the Sixty-fourth Congress convened last month.

We have passed the halfway mark. The moment seems opportune for a review of the record of the administration upon its legislative side. Such a review can, of course, not be even attempted in a single speech, and in my remarks to-day I shall confine myself, in the main, to an analysis of the fiscal policy and accomplishment of the last two years.

Three dates stand out as crucial in any such analysis, and I shall have occasion to refer to them again and again: The first, of course, is March 4, 1913, the birthday of the Democratic administration; the second is October 3, 1913, the date when the Underwood low-tariff law became effective; and the third, the day when the world war began, which may, for convenience, be assumed to be August 1, 1914.

With the enactment of the Underwood law there went on trial a tariff theory which had not been tested since the end of the second Cleveland administration, nearly 20 years earlier. Throughout the intervening period of Republican ascendency the theory—whether or not faultily applied in its details is not at the moment the question—had been that a duty should be levied on all imports from other countries at least sufficient to make up for the lower wage scale which prevailed in those countries; in short, the underlying theory was that our tariff should afford protection to our American wage earners against goods made where lower wages and standards of living made cheaper production possible.

With the advent of the Democratic Party a new theory of tariff making succeeded—that the tariff should be as low as possible—that is, that free trade should be as closely approximated as possible—having always in mind the necessity of raising sufficient funds to carry on the Government. This theory, variously described as the "revenue only" and as the "competitive" theory, found full expression in the Underwood law of October, 1913.

It may not be amiss to say a preliminary and general word about the operation of this law prior to the breaking out of the European war.

For the first seven months of 1913 (January to July, inclusive)—all under the Republican tariff—the imports from other countries into the United States amounted to about $1,016,000,000.

For the same seven months of 1914—all under the Democratic tariff and prior to the outbreak of the European war—the imports amounted to $1,137,000,000.

In other words, under the low-tariff theory of the Democratic Party we brought into this country before the war was even thought of $121,000,000 more foreign-made goods in seven months than we did in the same period of 1913 under the protective theory of the Republican tariff. In short, European and Asiatic labor (instead of American labor) was yearly getting the wages involved in the manufacture of over $200,000,000 worth of goods in excess of its allotment under Republican rule.

But American labor can be employed upon articles for export as well as upon articles for domestic consumption. We have just seen that the Democratic tariff cut deeply into the latter source of American employment. How did it affect the former?

For the first seven months of 1913—January to July, inclusive, all under the Republican tariff—exports from the United States to other countries amounted to about $1,323,000,000.

For the same seven months of 1914—all under a Democratic tariff and prior to the outbreak of the European war—our exports amounted to $1,198,000,000.

In other words, under the Democratic régime, before war was even declared, we sent out to other lands $125,000,000 fewer homemade goods in seven months than we did in the same period of the previous year under a Republican tariff—at the rate of over $200,000,000 a year.

We have seen that imports increased $121,000,000 in the seven months of the Underwood tariff and that exports decreased $125,000,000 in the same period. The sale of American-made goods had consequently fallen off some $246,000,000 in seven months, or at the rate of over $400,000,000 a year and more than a million dollars a day. Wage earners in America suffered accordingly; wage earners in Europe and Asia profited accordingly.

For the first time in 20 years our balance of trade was persistently against us. In the five months—April to August, inclusive, 1914—our imports exceeded our exports by nearly $40,000,000. Our exports had exceeded our imports during 1913 by about $60,000,000 a month; exports exceeded imports for the first nine months of 1914 by barely $9,000,000 a month.

It is no wonder that unemployment was rife during the first half of 1914; that bread lines and soup kitchens were once more established in our cities; that the Democratic Party trembled as it watched the workings of the tariff and its effect upon the industries of the country.

Then came the war. I shall examine in some detail the workings of the war upon our fiscal arrangements and our foreign trade. But first let me point out two or three things:

First. Obviously a world war would have *some* effect upon the foreign trade of the United States.

Second. The fairest time, therefore, to judge dispassionately the workings of a tariff law would be when the world was at peace, when foreign trade was normal.

Third. The natural effect of a great war would be to reduce somewhat the articles which the warring nations would send abroad for sale and to increase the articles which they would seek to purchase of neutrals.

Fourth. Clearly these manifestations are attributable to abnormal conditions, and have nothing to do with the merits or demerits of our tariff legislation.

Fifth. Naturally the party in power would seize upon the unsettled state of things to explain away any troubles of its own, however widely disconnected in fact with the war.

When the war had progressed a short time our imports diminished considerably below what they had been during the Democratic peace period, though not, as I shall show, below what they had been in Republican days. Our exports began similarly to increase, mainly by reason of "war orders." Times inevitably began to improve. But can this improvement be attributed to the Underwood tariff? The Democrats say, "Yes"; the Republicans and common sense say, "No, the European war is simply covering up in part the faults of your tariff theory by reducing imports while increasing exports, and thus establishing a sort of tariff of necessity." Curiously, however, the Democrats while claiming that conditions since the war began prove that their tariff is everything that it should be at the same time attribute their domestic financial straits to the war. In other words, they blow hot and blow cold.

Perhaps I may illustrate this last point by several recent utterances of eminent Democrats.

President Wilson said the other day:

> The Underwood law can not be held responsible for any appreciable reduction in revenue as a result of the war.

Secretary McAdoo, of the Treasury Department, in his annual report refers to certain decreases in revenue and says:

> Practically all of these decreases are the direct result of the European war.

On another occasion he said:

> Because of the decrease of imports on account of the war we have had an enormous deficit. This deficit would have been vastly larger, however, if the old tariff bill had been relied upon. At least $130,000,000 would have been added to the deficit had the country depended on the old bill.

Senator GORE said in Lowell last October:

> McCall says our national finances are disarranged. This is a vague accusation, but we say that the disorganization is due to the war and not to the tariff law or any other Democratic measure.

Here is certainly a cordial, though perhaps not too discriminating, blanket indorsement. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] said recently of our financial condition:

> This condition is due solely to the disturbed conditions resulting from the war.

Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Malburn says that the loss of customs revenue due to the war would have been much greater under a protective tariff than it has been under the Underwood law.

The newspapers have naturally sounded the same keynote. The Houston Post, for example, said the other day:

> Our imports from Europe (since the war) have been negligible.

Many Republican papers have taken up the cry. I quote from an editorial in a Republican protectionist newspaper:

> Part of the effects of the Underwood tariff may be judged by what had happened to our importations before the war intervened to afford to American industry a protection such as it never enjoyed in time of peace. For the present, the tariff is almost absolutely suspended as an element bearing on American manufacture. What would have happened to our cotton and woolen industry by this time if the war had not come along to interrupt almost completely the operation of foreign manufactories and the importation of goods into the United States?

It is easy to deduce from the foregoing quotations that the Democratic leaders have sought to impress two things upon the minds of the people, and that they have been generally successful with superficial observers in their endeavor:

First. That our importations have practically been brought to a standstill since the European war began.

Second. That the admitted financial difficulties of the United States Government are attributable to the loss of customs revenues which results from the suspension of imports.

It therefore becomes of consequence to consider the truth or falsity of the two statements which have been persistently advanced by so many Democratic speakers and writers during the past year.

Perhaps, however, the issue can be most clearly drawn by a further quotation from Secretary McAdoo:

> The European war seriously and adversely affected the revenues of the Government from imports. The revenue from customs for the month of October, 1914, was $16,000,000, and for the month of October, 1913,

it was $30,000,000, showing a decrease in one month of $14,000,000. I have taken the month of October for the purpose of comparison, as the new tariff went into effect October, 1913, and duties were therefore the same. The reduction in revenues is due solely to the falling off in importations.

Here we have the issue squarely presented by the Secretary of the Treasury himself: "The reduction in revenues is due solely to the falling off in importations."

But if we turn to the figures issued by his colleague, the Secretary of Commerce, and showing the importations for the months in question, we find:

Imports.

October, 1913	$132,949,302
October, 1914	138,080,520
October, 1915	149,172,729

Thus it appears that the imports, instead of falling off, actually increased over $5,000,000 in October, 1914, when half the world was at war, as compared with October, 1913, 10 months before the war had begun.

It seems incredible that the Secretary of the Treasury made the above statement with intent to deceive; yet it must be admitted that he was guilty either of such intent or of gross carelessness almost equally culpable. Manifestly as far as the month of October is concerned "the reduction in revenues" is not due solely or at all "to the falling off in importations."

But this, it may be said, was, after all, but one month. How about the war period as a whole? Does it show a great shrinkage in imports? An examination of the figures issued by the Secretary of Commerce shows that the importations have, in general, decreased somewhat during the Democratic war period (Aug., 1914, to date) as compared with the Democratic peace period (Oct., 1913, to Aug., 1914). But, as I have said, the imports during the Democratic peace period were swollen out of all proportion and broke all records in our history. A fairer comparison is with imports under the Republican tariff just before its repeal, during the spring and summer months of 1913.

The imports May, 1913, to August, 1913, averaged $135,000,000 per month.

The imports March, 1915, to December, 1915, averaged well over $150,000,000 per month.

In other words, our imports during the war have recently been averaging $15,000,000 a month more than our imports two years earlier and just prior to the enactment of the Underwood law. For the entire war period, including the months when foreign trade was at its lowest ebb, the average imports are over $140,000,000 a month, or $5,000,000 a month more than in Republican days. But, as I say, with things continuing as they now are, the increase in imports is $15,000,000 a month, or $180,000,000 a year over Republican imports.

Our recent imports, as shown by the bulletins of the Department of Commerce, have been:

Fiscal year ended—	
1911	$1,527,226,105
1912	1,653,264,934
1913	1,813,008,234
1914	1,893,925,657
1915	1,674,169,740

Our recent imports entered for consumption have been:

Fiscal year ended—	
1911	$1,527,945,652
1912	1,640,722,902
1913	1,766,689,412
1914	1,906,400,394
1915	1,648,386,280

The imports for the year 1912 were larger by $100,000,000 than those of any previous year in our history. It will be seen that the imports for 1915, including 11 war months, were $21,000,000 larger than the record 1912 year and were exceeded only by the Democratic years 1913 and 1914. The 1915 imports exceeded those for 1911 by nearly $150,000,000.

Does all this sound like a "dormant" or a "suspended" tariff? Are the imports really "negligible"? In point of fact, the imports are to-day ahead of the Republican high-water mark, although doubtless somewhat below what the Democratic tariff would permit to be dumped upon us if there were no war. [Applause.]

It is undoubtedly true, I repeat, that the war has somewhat served to neutralize the worst effects of the Underwood tariff. To that extent it operates indirectly as a protective tariff. But it is by no means a tariff wall. In June, 1915, for example, our imports were $157,695,140—larger than those of any June in our history. Republican or Democratic, war or peace. This figure is $26,000,000 more than the June, 1913, figure and is 57 per cent in excess of the mark established in the boom year 1906. As we have seen, October, 1915, imports were larger than for either October, 1913 or 1914. November, 1915, imports were $164,319,169, the largest of the 16 war months, and exceeded by but 2 of the 10 Democratic peace months. They are the largest November imports in our history. December's imports were seven and one-half millions larger even than November's—$171,841,665. These are with one exception, 1913, the largest December imports in history.

We have heard much concerning the financial struggles of the United States during the past two years. The Secretary of the Treasury attributes our difficulties "solely to the falling off in importations." We have seen that in fact there has been no falling off in importations as compared with Republican times; quite the contrary. Yet it is undoubtedly true that customs revenues have materially fallen off.

For the period January, 1913, to October, 1913, our customs receipts, under the Republican tariff, averaged $27,000,000 per month.

For the period January, 1915, to November, 1915—the Democratic war period—our customs receipts, in spite of the fact that our imports were on the average a little larger, averaged $16,000,000 per month. Thus with about the same imports we are losing about $11,000,000 a month customs revenues, or $132,000,000 a year.

There is the real explanation of our empty Treasury. The reduction in duties has reduced the revenues; the reduction in importations is a myth in spite of the stress laid upon it by Democratic apologists.

The whole story is told by an examination of the average rates of duty paid upon imports year by year. In the second Cleveland administration this average ad valorem rate was about 20 per cent. During the dozen years of the Dingley tariff it ranged from 22 per cent to 29 per cent. During the Payne tariff it ranged from 17 per cent to 21 per cent. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1915, the first full fiscal year of the Underwood law, it was 12.49 per cent—by far the lowest for a century. Since June it has been sinking even lower and now does not exceed 10 per cent—certainly a close approximation to free trade. For the week ending Christmas Day the rate was 8.7 per cent. This means, of course, that, the imports remaining the same, for every dollar which goes into our Treasury at this rate of duty $2 or $2.50 would have gone in if Republican rates had been maintained. Another interesting sidelight upon the present-day workings of the Democratic tariff is that over 70 per cent of all goods recently entering the country have come in without paying a cent's worth of duty. The other 30 per cent is bearing the burden, imperfectly, of course, but nevertheless as best it can. Under Republican tariffs from 40 per cent to 50 per cent only came in altogether free of duty, and the burden was distributed over at least one-half of all imports, instead of as to-day over less than one-third.

The customs revenues for the last fiscal year were $209,786,672, realized, as above stated, from duties averaging about 12½ per cent upon $1,674,169,740 worth of imports. If a rate of only 20 per cent had been assessed upon these imports, the resulting duties would have been $335,000,000, or about $125,000,000 in excess of what they were in fact. This solution would have put into the Treasury nearly $50,000,000 more than has the iniquitous war tax, with all its annoyances and vexations. In substantiation of this statement it is worth remembering that a Republican protective tariff made possible the building of the Panama Canal without imposing any considerable burden upon the people, but, instead, mainly out of the "loose change" which the Treasury had in its pockets. If we had retained Republican duties and observed reasonable economy, we could have embarked upon the proposed program of national defense without further taxation of any kind.

I have heard the statement made by certain Democrats that, admitting that imports began to flood the country when the Underwood law was enacted, nevertheless that these imports were mainly of raw materials or of goods only partly manufactured, so that their arrival meant more work for United States wage earners. Nothing could be further from the fact, as an examination of the figures of the Department of Commerce will show. Take, for example, the imports of manufactures of cotton and wool, in which the district which I represent is vitally interested:

Cotton cloths.

	10 months ending July—		
	1913 (Republican peace period).	1914 (Democratic peace period).	1915 (Democratic war period).
Square yards	36,735,303	56,713,780	36,978,608
Value	$6,712,274	$10,896,575	$5,671,198

This little table shows two interesting things:

First. The first effect of the Underwood law was to increase the imports of cotton cloth by 54 per cent, or, in other words, to substitute in 10 months, for 20,000,000 yards of American-made goods 20,000,000 yards of foreign-made goods. Four million dollars more went across the ocean to pay for these goods; all this would have remained in the United States under a Republican tariff.

Second. Though importations are said to be "dormant" because of the war, we imported more yards of cotton cloth in 10 war months than we did in the corresponding months under a Republican tariff.

The situation with reference to imports of manufactures of wool is briefly as follows:

Wool manufactures.

Seven months ending July—	
1913 (Republican peace period)	$8,870,101
1914 (Democratic peace period)	29,239,274
1915 (Democratic war period)	11,240,251

It will be here noted that—

First. For every dollar of wool manufactures that was imported under the Republican tariff, $3.30 was imported after the enactment of the Underwood law and before the war broke out.

Second. Even since the "tariff wall," alleged by certain leading Democrats to have resulted from the war, our imports of wool manufactures are about one-third larger than under the Republican tariff.

United States Consul Ingram at Bradford, England, reported a large increase of January, 1914, textile reports. The Bradford correspondent of the Daily Trade Record said:

> If anyone had forecasted that in December of 1913 more dress goods would be sent from Bradford to the United States than in the 11 months previous, very few people would have believed him. But the lower duties have had a wonderful influence on the West Riding trade. Dress goods to the value of £131,570 ($639,430) have been exported, compared with £131,071 ($637,005) for the first 11 months of 1913.
>
> A startling increase in worsted coatings on last January of over 500 per cent has to be recorded. This shows that Yorkshire is going to clothe part of the American nation.

It apparently can not be said with truth that the war—much less the Underwood tariff—operates to bar out completed manufactures of the kind which competes most directly with our own workmen.

If I were to attempt to summarize briefly the effect of the Underwood tariff, in peace and war, upon imports and revenues, I should say this:

First. During the months just before the war, but under the Underwood law, our imports were about $25,000,000 a month more than for the previous year under Republican rule, while our customs revenues were about $5,000,000 a month less. American workmen were making fewer goods at the rate of $300,000,000 a year, and our customs were nevertheless decreasing at the rate of $60,000,000 a year. It is not difficult to account for the unemployment and industrial disaster which were rampant, or to guess what would have happened in 1915 had not war intervened.

Second. Since the war, imports have been, in general, a little more than in the last months of the Republican tariff. Revenues, owing to the low ad valorem rates, have decreased enormously.

Prosperity in the United States can, generally speaking, be promoted by keeping down to a reasonable figure the imports, or by increasing the exports, or both. The United States happily is to-day enjoying a considerable measure of prosperity, conspicuously in contrast with the situation in the spring and summer of 1914. Why? Manifestly for two reasons:

First. Because the war has checked the unconscionably large imports which were flooding the country during the six or eight months just preceding its outbreak, reducing them about to the Republican level.

Second. Because, as everybody knows, "war orders" have increased our exports almost beyond belief.

With apparent lack of candor, Secretary Redfield seems to attempt to make the American people believe that our export trade is normal, healthy, permanent business, attributable to the genius of the Democratic administration. He says:

> You who are told that the increase of exports which has turned the balance of trade in our favor is due to munitions of war are mistaken, if you believe that.

We have seen that under the peace period of the Underwood tariff, our imports, for months at a time, were exceeding our exports; that is, the balance of trade was against us.

To-day our exports are enormously exceeding our imports by from $150,000,000 to $200,000,000 per month. That is, the balance of trade is heavily in our favor.

Does anyone doubt that this unprecedented overturn is ascribable to anything but war orders? Of course not. Secretary Redfield knows it, but apparently seeks to pull the wool over our eyes by limiting his statement to "munitions of war." We are, in part, feeding, clothing, and arming the armies of Europe, and whether you call our exports for this purpose "munitions of war" or "war orders," it in no way alters the nature of our trade.

The following table shows a few of the conspicuous increases in exports. Can anyone doubt their cause?

Articles exported.

	9 months ending September—		
	1913 (Republican peace period).	1914 (Democratic peaceperiod).[1]	1915 (Democratic war period).
Animals, live	$5,600,000	$4,600,000	$96,200,000
Breadstuffs	166,800,000	172,800,000	423,400,000
Explosives	3,800,000	4,900,000	84,300,000
Meats	120,200,000	97,700,000	194,800,000
Cotton, raw and manufactured	323,800,000	276,300,000	378,400,000
Wool manufactures	3,400,000	2,300,000	25,200,000

[1] 2 months war.

Brass and its manufactures, automobiles, chemicals and drugs, rubber goods, iron and steel manufactures, boots, shoes, leather, sugar, and zinc are the other articles which show tremendous increases. The explanation of each is, of course, patent.

The following quotation from a Lowell paper of December 24 last shows more clearly than any words of mine could show the nature and extent of our prosperity of to-day and the reasons for it. Eighteen months ago this concern was employing 600 people; in a few months it will be employing over 8,000:

> The largest amount of money ever paid out by a mercantile corporation in this city was distributed yesterday by the United States Cartridge Co. when its employees received not only their regular weekly wages but, in addition, the money in back pay due them as a result of the finding of the State board of arbitration in the recent hearing granted as an outcome of the strike.
>
> The amount disbursed yesterday totaled $100,000 and was distributed among 6,400 employees. Of this sum $30,000 was the money due on back wages, in accordance with the increase fixed by the State board, to commence September 28. The balance represented the regular weekly pay roll of the company.

Perhaps I can do no better than to quote the recent words of a distinguished Democrat of Massachusetts, Mr. E. F. McSweeney, chairman of the directors of the port of Boston:

> The belief that our foreign trade has improved since the war is unjustified. The great increase in the value of our exports is due wholly to the demand for supplies and materials used in warfare and has upset the industrial balance of the United States. At the present time we are sending out of this country to the warring nations of Europe munitions and accessories of war at the rate of $100,000,000 per month in excess of the normal export before the war. This means that we have about 800,000 wage earners employed for a full year who at the close of the war will be the innocent victims of the gigantic readjustment that must take place in industrial America.
>
> Our prosperity to-day carries great dangers with it. There is no doubt that after the war there will be an extreme reaction, and the longer the war lasts the harsher and more severe this will be.
>
> Our trade balance for the year ending June 30, 1915, in normal legitimate merchandise was smaller than it has been since 1910 and almost $200,000,000 less than that of the year before the war.

In September last, in sending me a speech delivered by Mr. McSweeney, one of his associates wrote me as follows:

> The artificial stimulation to trade due to the export of war orders has given our wage earners an opportunity for employment, but this flurry has operated to obscure the vitally important question of the permanent extension of our export trade on a normal basis. If the war should cease to-morrow, it is likely that the business of this country would be thrown into great disorganization, and wage earners especially would suffer.
>
> Of the present trade balance of $1,000,000,000 in favor of the United States, over $700,000,000 are exports solely for war purposes—ammunition, horses, auto trucks, army shoes, foodstuffs, etc.—trade which will cease the instant the war comes to a close. This leaves a balance of only $300,000,000 of exports of what might be termed "regular merchandise," an export smaller than that of any year since 1909, and almost $200,000,000 less than in the year before the war.
>
> Comparing the present year of exports from the United States with that of the year before the war, we find we have exported only 32 per cent as much agricultural implements, 52 per cent as much sewing machines, and 33 per cent as much steel rails. The most lamentable fact in connection with these figures is that we are losing as much, if not more, to the countries which are not at war as to those which have given up domestic pursuits to take up armed conflict.
>
> Last year's figures show that of our sewing-machine export trade the total in 1915 was only 54 per cent of the 1914 figures; that to South America but 20 per cent, and that to Africa, Asia, and the Pacific Islands but 35 per cent of the corresponding previous year.
>
> Our exports of the staple merchandise which we hope to sell under normal conditions after the war are smaller by a large percentage in practically everything except war orders, and we are losing our exports trade much faster to the neutral countries than to the belligerent ones.

Doubtless we all are thankful that we are spared participation in the horrors of war; doubtless we recognize that we are within our rights in selling all we can to the belligerents, and that in so doing we are accorded a prosperity which would otherwise be denied us. And yet I doubt if any of us are very proud of this

blood-soaked prosperity. The growth which has come to us is of a dropsical character; it is not a normal, healthy, permanent increase in bone and sinew. It will leave us almost in an instant when the war ends.

More than this, as even Secretary Redfield recognizes, when the war ends we shall be subjected to the bitterest competition in history from the countries of Europe which are now at war, but which, after peace is declared, will at once go to work, and yet will be too poor to buy. They will "dump" their products upon us in unbelievable quantity.

How are we to protect ourselves against this industrial invasion? In only one way—by a protective tariff. In this connection an editorial from one of the leading Democratic newspapers of the country (Boston Globe, Nov. 9, 1915) is of interest:

WE MUST PREPARE FOR INDUSTRIAL INVASION AFTER EUROPEAN WAR.

American business conditions will be more disturbed after the great war than during the conflict. At present the belligerent nations are absorbed in crushing each other. Now they are seeking to buy all that we can sell, from shrapnel to shoestrings. With the coming of peace those nations will try to recuperate from their enormous losses by grabbing all the world trade they have lost. An industrial war, in which we will have the most to lose, and into which we shall be drawn, will follow the present crisis. Obviously we must prepare to meet the coming struggle in the best way to safeguard American industry.

The commercial prosperity of this country will be attacked from both flanks. We shall lose our munitions market. This will mean much readjustment of capital and labor. Factories now working overtime to supply war materials must be converted to other lines of trade. How seriously this transition will affect American industry will, of course, depend upon our skill and forethought.

The other attack will come from the belligerent nations themselves in their effort to recover lost trade. To-day their industries are being pauperized by child and female labor. Women have gone into industry to take the place of men who have gone to the front. Since many of the men who have gone to the front will never come back, many of the women who have gone into industry will never go back to home life.

The men who do come back will be forced to seek almost any kind of work they can find to cover the difference between their pensions and a living wage. All this means pauperized industry. Low wages will enable those nations to produce cheap goods. This sudden rejuvenation of production will create commercial rivalry between the new European producers and the American manufacturers, particularly the Americans who have gone into making goods that Europe produced before the war.

The European nations will seek ruthlessly to crush their American rivals, since we shall be their principal opponents in their efforts to recover from the losses by war. Their method will be the most effective one possible. This method is "dumping."

Dumping is an economic expression used to define the industrial process of ruining a rival by selling goods in the rival's territory at prices so low that the rival can not meet them.

Goods produced cheaply will be poured into the United States after the war to undersell American-made goods produced in normal conditions. Our budding dye industry, for example, will be swamped under a flood of German chemicals, sold at prices below the cost of production here.

The sudden renewal of peaceful industry in Europe will soon create a surplus of goods. Then will come the most dangerous form of dumping. Since it is obvious that the European manufacturers will be anxious to maintain prices at home, where they have less competition, they will dump their surplus goods into America at prices even below the cost of production in Europe. This will be killing two birds with one stone. It will be getting rid of an embarrassing surplus which, if kept in Europe, would reduce prices there; it will also be a crushing blow to American rivalry, which had grown during the war.

It is evident that we must be prepared to meet this competition. If we do nothing to stop this flood of European pauper goods our country will suffer one of its worst financial panics. Many businesses will be ruined. Thousands of men will be thrown out of work; the labor market will be drugged with hungry men; the soup kitchen; the bread line; scared capital; industrial chaos.

It is time now, therefore, for us to prepare for the coming industrial war. It is a menace far more vital than actual war, over which we are so much concerned. For us it is a question of national defense arising out of a colossal international war, and it must be met with broad-minded statecraft and not by any party politics.

Obviously we must put up our defenses and place them in the hands of skilled business strategists. It is not a question that can be solved in congressional hearing rooms.

Secretary of Commerce Redfield has a tentative plan to curb European industries by an amendment to the antitrust laws, forbidding foreign corporations from doing business in this country unless they conform to our Sherman law. This means endless litigation, with no hope of a solution until long after the crisis has passed, most of the damage done, American business invaded from coast to coast.

The Sherman law causes enough tribulation in American business circles now without our seeking to apply it to the rest of the world. It will cause more confusion when, of all times, we shall want less. It would be just the method by which to aid the jealous European countries to ruin our new prosperity.

The question is too vital for confusing litigation. It is a question of national defense. Our Army could not repel an invasion by appealing to the Sherman antitrust law. We must not expect our industrial army to suffer this invasion.

Our industrial defense is our tariff. We must keep out pauper goods from war-sodden Europe. The problem is economic and complicated. We must have an industrial board of strategy to watch the situation, learn all its ramifications, and close all gaps in our defenses. This board must be an expert tariff commission.

"Our industrial defense is our tariff." That tells the whole story. The war saved the Democratic Party for the moment; when peace comes nothing can save it from utter dissolution but the adoption of the protective-tariff principle. Some of its statesmen seem to recognize that this is true.

For example, Senator LEWIS, of Illinois, is quoted in the Louisville Courier-Journal of October 31, 1915, as having spoken in part as follows at a rally in Mount Sterling, Ky.:

No intelligent man would urge that the adoption of either of the past tariff systems—that of the unqualified high prohibition of any imports to this country, known as protective tariff of the Republicans, or that other of no tariff beyond that for the purpose of raising revenue, of the Democrats—could be appropriately applied as conserving the uses of the future and as fitting to the future welfare of America.

To allow the manufactured article of Europe to come without limit to this country as a Democratic theory, the goods to be sold at such price as Europe could take in order to obtain money to build up her wasted places, would be to overcome our own manufactures and slay the possibility of establishing in America plants to take the place of those which heretofore in Europe served the uses of America and the world.

Still more recently, in a signed editorial published in the New York American of December 26, 1915, William Randolph Hearst "earnestly urged the Democratic Party to abandon its free-trade policy, a policy which had persistently proved a disastrous failure, which had continually plunged the country into the depths of financial depression during Democratic administrations, and which had invariably resulted in a deficiency of revenue, which had to be met by extraordinary taxation or bond issues."

Mr. Hearst says:

Our so-called war taxes, the burden of which was lately reimposed upon the country by Congress, are, as a matter of fact, not war taxes at all. They are free-trade taxes.

ASSESSED TO MEET DEFICIT.

They are the tax additions which invariably follow Democratic tariff reductions.

They are direct assessments, levied upon the public to meet the deficit caused by the customary and conventional Democratic experiments in free trade.

However destructive the ultimate effect of the European war may be upon the foreign markets of this country, the immediate effect of the war has undoubtedly been to increase the consumption and accentuate the demand in Europe for a considerable number of our American products.

GREAT EUROPEAN DEMAND.

All sorts of food supplies and all sorts of manufactured articles required by the gigantic European armies have been in unusual demand and at extraordinary prices.

America therefore has sold an unusual amount of certain products at exceptionally high rates, with great commercial and financial advantage.

On the other hand, the scarcity of productive European labor, the demands of Europe for its own materials, the difficulties and dangers of transportation by sea, have to a considerable extent excluded European products from the United States.

COUNTRY SAVED FROM DISASTER.

The European war, therefore, and the conditions which it has created, should have brought unprecedented, even though impermanent, prosperity to the United States, and if the war has failed to do this, because of the Democratic depression which it has had first to overcome, it has, at any rate, saved the country from the full disaster of the Democratic policy of reckless tariff reduction.

We have as yet, therefore, fortunately felt but little of free-trade disaster, and only such free-trade depression as must follow conditions of business disturbance, combined with the daze of uncertainty and the dread of impending injury.

Soon, however, the European war must end. Then the full effect of the Democratic policy of unscientific tariff reduction will fall upon our country.

ARTIFICIAL DEMAND TO END.

We will then no longer have the enormous artificial demand for war supplies and food products which has partly sustained our industries, or, rather, which has sustained part of our industries during this war period.

We must then confront the unhappy condition of having our markets much more than ever open to European competition, and our own products much less than ever in demand in European markets.

The present administration is no doubt well meaning enough, but it is impractical and inexperienced.

It is an administration of theories and vagaries, of prejudices and impulses, of incongruities and inconsistencies.

It is an administration of visionary policy conceived in vanity and confirmed in fanatical obstinacy. Our national yield of golden fleece from wealth-producing industries will be diminished to a proportionate degree. Our national resources in products and profits, in work and wages, will be decreased to a similar extent.

Not only individuals, but the Nation has felt a lack of income despite the artificial stimulus of war prices.

Thus taxes have been increased, although our ability to pay them is not as great as it once was.

And the end is not yet.

We have still to face the full and final results of Democratic folly and fatuity, which will surely be upon us at the end of the European war.

Why, then, should the Democratic Party, now reassembled in Congress, not take advantage of the temporary respite which the war provides?

Why should the Democrats in Congress, and in the administration, too, if there be any there, not realize and admit that a tariff for revenue and for protection is not merely a Republican policy—it is an American policy?

It has been approved by the American people, it has been indorsed by history, fortified by fact and sustained by experience.

Two or three sentences of Mr. Hearst's editorial are worthy of especial emphasis:

Our so-called war taxes, the burden of which was lately reimposed upon the country by Congress, are, as a matter of fact, not war taxes at all. They are free-trade taxes.

They are the tax additions which invariably follow Democratic tariff reductions.

Soon, however, the European war must end. Then the full effect of the Democratic policy of unscientific tariff reduction will fall upon our country.

We have still to face the full and final results of Democratic folly and fatuity, which will surely be upon us at the end of the European war.

Why should the Democrats in Congress not realize and admit that a tariff for revenue and for protection is not merely a Republican policy—it is an American policy?

The country can not afford to have the Underwood tariff operative for a single month after peace is declared. It was a failure and a scourge before the war; it is a failure and a menace to-day.

How did it fulfill the high hopes of its sponsors?

President Wilson said in his first address to Congress, April 8, 1913:

The object of the tariff duties henceforth laid must be effective competition, the whetting of American wits by contest with the wits of the rest of the world.

When the Underwood bill was signed by him October 2, 1913, he said:

I feel a very peculiar pleasure in what I have just done. I have had the accomplishment of something like this at heart ever since I was a boy.

Within a few weeks he is reported to have said to the Democratic national committeemen that the tariff was the only issue that the Republican Party had.

While I do not admit the truth of this statement, I think few Republicans would hesitate to take up the gauntlet thus thrown down by the President. But the point I wish to emphasize is that the Underwood law, with all its direful results, was no careless blunder; it represents the considered, final judgment of the leaders of the Democratic Party.

Senator SIMMONS, who had charge of the bill in the Senate, said (1) that it would prove adequate as a revenue producer with an estimated surplus of revenue at the close of the fiscal year 1914 of $16,000,000 and at the close of the fiscal year 1915 of $18,000,000, and (2) that it "will cut down the cost of living."

Mr. UNDERWOOD, in charge of the bill in the House, expressed himself similarly:

This law will do four things:
First. It will reduce the cost of living in the United States.
Second. It will not disturb the business of the country.
Third. It will increase our foreign trade.
Fourth. It will collect revenue sufficient to run the Government.

Let us take up these points in order.

First. Has the Underwood law reduced the cost of living? Both Mr. UNDERWOOD and Speaker CLARK emphatically predicted it would. Every householder can answer this question for himself.

The Democratic Party realized the importance of the problem. Its 1912 platform says:

The high cost of living is a serious problem in every American home; and we assert that no substantial relief can be secured for the people until import duties on the necessaries of life are materially reduced.

Over 70 per cent of our imports now enter duty free. The average rate of duty is only 10 per cent. Nevertheless, where is the cost of living to-day? Common sense gives a complete answer, and scientifically assembled figures are at hand to corroborate common sense. In the New York Times Annalist appears weekly a "cost-of-living" index number.

An index number is a means of showing fluctuations in the average price of a group of commodities. The Annalist index number shows the fluctuations in the average wholesale price of 25 food commodities selected and arranged to represent a theoretical family's food budget.

For 1910 the index number was 137.
For 1911 the index number was 130.8.
For 1912 the index number was 142.9.
For 1913 the index number was 139.98.
For 1914 the index number was 146.07.
For 1915 the index number was 148.05.

In other words, the household supplies which are in daily use upon the table of the average family and which cost in 1911, a Republican year, $1.31, cost last year, a Democratic year, $1.48. Was this increase due to the war? In 1914, a Democratic year, during more than one-half of which peace reigned, the figure was but 2 cents less—$1.46. These figures for 1914 and 1915, as compared with the Republican year 1911, represent percentages of increase, respectively, of 11.5 per cent and 13 per cent.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I will.

Mr. SMITH of New York. In view of the artificial increase in trade, the gentleman would hardly argue that the Underwood tariff law has had a fair chance of operation or that these prices are due in any way to the Underwood law?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I should answer that question in this way: I was rather inclined to think some one would ask the question. The war broke out August 1, 1914. For seven months of 1914 the world was at peace. Probably for at least a month or two thereafter, namely, for the months of August and September, no one would claim that there was any great fluctuation attributable to the war in the prices of the foodstuffs in this country. Certainly for seven-twelfths of the year 1914 there was no war at all, and therefore no possible effect from it upon the prices of our foodstuffs. Yet, as I say, for 1914, taking the year as a whole, the index number was 146, as compared with 148, the index number for 1915. I think myself that the European war has not had very much effect upon the cost of living in this country. It may be that some gentlemen can not agree with me, but I have made some study into that question, and that is my careful conclusion.

Second. Did the Underwood law disturb the business of the country? This, again, is a matter of common knowledge and common sense. I will, however, quote an expert's summary of business conditions in 1914, before war burst over Europe:

Let me summarize some of the features which marked our industrial condition during the first year of the Underwood-Simmons law, features which President Wilson called "a state of mind." Among them are 18,280 failures during the year 1914, the worst record in history in number, and exceeded in amount of liabilities only by another fateful Democratic year, 1893. Bank clearings, a fair measure of the country's business, were nearly $20,000,000,000, or 11.1 per cent less than they were in 1912, the last year of Republican administration. Capital invested in new enterprises was less by over $600,000,000 in 1914 than in 1913 and over $700,000,000 less than in 1912. Railroad gross earnings declined 4.4 per cent; iron production, 25.3 per cent; and copper deliveries, 15 per cent. Steel mills were reduced 40 per cent of capacity; 30 per cent of the looms of our woolen mills were idle on December 1; and capital amounting to $41,000,000 invested in cotton mills was unproductive. The importations of boots and shoes, though still not alarmingly large in amount, have more than doubled. The importation of cotton cloths has increased 80 per cent. England's exports of woolens to the United States show the phenomenal increase to 8,219,000 yards in 1914, as compared with 2,190,000 in 1913, while in the case of worsteds England's shipments to the United States were 32,790,000 yards, against only 9,218,000 in the preceding year.

The most careful surveys showed that where there was one man unemployed in 1913–14 there were two unemployed during the winter of 1914–15. Without exaggeration, it was conceded by those familiar with conditions that one out of every five bread winners was unemployed. This unemployment was concentrated in cities primarily, but the small towns and villages also felt the shock and found it necessary to organize relief measures.

An official canvass in Philadelphia showed 200,000 men unemployed; the house-to-house canvass of the Metropolitan Insurance Co. of its policyholders in New York, thrifty people ordinarily, gave the basis for an estimate of 357,000 men and women out of work in the entire city. The labor organizations in New York City estimated that 472,102 were either out of work or on part time. In Chicago in January the municipal markets commission estimated 189,866 out of work. A Cleveland survey in December showed 61,000 unemployed. The city charities in Philadelphia estimated that Philadelphia's unemployed numbered 175,000.

Third. Has the Underwood law increased our foreign trade, as its author predicted it would?

Prior to the war the total volume of foreign trade—imports and exports combined—was nearly as large as for the corresponding months under a Republican tariff. But, as we have seen, imports—made by European workmen—were vastly larger, and exports—made by American workmen—were smaller in about the same amount. The American workman was, therefore, getting the short end in each respect. The "total-volume" basis of comparison is grossly misleading and utterly worthless under these circumstances. Since the war our exports have increased greatly, as we have seen, and our total volume of trade with them. But, as Mr. McSweeney points out, this is in no way attributable to the Underwood law.

Fourth. Has the Underwood law collected sufficient revenue to run the Government, as its author promised?

I have already dealt somewhat with this topic, but a complete answer involves study into the history of our Treasury during the past two or three years.

At the outset, it may be stated that the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means, in their recent report recommending the extension of the "war tax," themselves admit the present dire straits of the Treasury. President Wilson, in his address to Congress of August 4, 1914, when first recommending the war tax, and again in his annual address delivered to the Congress last month, recognizes the gravity of the situation.

Commenting on these statements, the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee point out:

We, the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee, agree with the majority that the Treasury of the United States is in a distressing condition, and that additional revenues must be raised to meet the current expenses of the Government. We deny the statement of the majority that the necessity for an emergency revenue law is due mainly to conditions resulting from the war in Europe, and we assert that the deficit is due mainly to reduced rates of duty on imports provided for in the Underwood Tariff Act.

On September 4, 1914, when the President of the United States delivered his message to Congress urging the immediate enactment of

additional revenue legislation, he compared customs receipts for the month of August, 1913, when the Payne Tariff Act was in effect, with the month of August, 1914, when the Underwood Tariff Act was in effect, and showed a loss in customs receipts of some $10,000,000. However, during the eight months preceding the war in Europe customs receipts averaged but $22,200,000 per month, while the month of August, 1913, produced $30,934,952. The loss in customs receipts was, therefore, very evident prior to the war in Europe.

Contrary to the impression conveyed by the majority report, imports at this time are not below normal. Imports for the eight months ended November 1, 1915, amount to $1,203,452,698, an increase of $56,000,000 over the corresponding eight months of 1913, when adequate customs receipts were being collected by the Government. In the table presented by the majority imports for the recent months are ignored completely. During this eight-month period, showing an increase of imports of $56,000,000, the customs revenue receipts have declined to the extent of $77,000,000. The average ad valorem rate of duty collected on imports during the 1913 period was 18.4 per cent, and during the 1915 period it was 11.1 per cent. This is due to the change in revenue laws and not the war in Europe. It is interesting and instructive to compare importations and customs receipts for the month of August, 1913 (the month on which the President based his calculations showing the necessity of additional revenue), with the month of August, 1915.

Imports, August, 1913	$137,651,553
Imports, August, 1915	141,804,202
Gain in imports	4,152,649
Customs receipts, August, 1913	30,934,952
Customs receipts, August, 1915	15,780,540
Loss in revenue	15,154,412

Much of what is here quoted I have already discussed at length, but the statement is so clear and pertinent that I think it is worth including by way of summary.

But what are the facts as to the state of the Treasury? In the financial analysis issued daily by the Secretary of the Treasury appears an item, "Net balance in the general fund." This shows the cash on hand which Uncle Sam can use to pay his bills for supplies, employees, and so forth. It corresponds roughly with the checking account of an individual or a corporation:

July 1, 1914, the first day of the fiscal year, 1915, the net balance was	$145,835,502
June 1, 1915, it was	14,000,000
(A loss of over $130,000,000 in 11 months, or about $12,000,000 a month.)	
June 30, 1915, owing to income-tax collections, it had risen to	82,025,716
September 30, 1915, it had shrunk to	40,898,894
(A loss of about $14,000,000 per month, although, as we have seen, our imports were in excess of 1913 imports.)	

The press was full of warning articles, calling attention to the gravity of the financial danger. These warnings apparently got "under the skin" of Secretary McAdoo and "something happened" in the Treasury that memorable night of September 30, 1915. The time-honored method of showing our financial status was abandoned, and the statement of October 1, 1915, to the unbounded surprise of all of us who were watching with alarm our rapidly shrinking surplus, showed a balance of $128,063,000. In other words, if the figures were to be believed, we had "made" $87,000,000 overnight. Were we really richer by that or by any other amount? Not at all. The change was in bookkeeping; it was psychological, that is all. There was not an additional dollar in the Treasury.

How was this change wrought? By two alterations in the old method:

First. Funds turned over by the Treasury to the various disbursing officers of the Government and made available for payment by them of specific Government debts have always, and rightly, been treated as actual payments. They are no longer of any use to the Government, any more than the amount is to us which is represented by a check which we have drawn and sent to the payee. Secretary McAdoo in his statement of October 1 calmly treats these amounts as still assets of the Treasury. He thus captures a neat little item of over $61,000,000 and adds it to his "balance."

Second. Money paid in by national banks to retire their bank notes has always been treated as a liability. It is deposited for one specific purpose, and can not be applied to any other; yet Secretary McAdoo removes this fund, amounting to over $23,000,000, from the liability side of this account and adds that also to his "balance."

I do not charge that Secretary McAdoo was dishonest in apparently adding $87,000,000 to the Treasury by a stroke of the pen. The true figures can still be deduced by careful scrutiny from the statements in their present form. But I do charge that the changes were made, not for financial reasons but for political reasons. On December 17 last the able chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. GLASS, made an elaborate defense of Secretary McAdoo's course. Yet he admitted that as to the second change above referred to—

I venture to think that trust funds should not be counted as available Treasury funds—

And as to the first change, that—

Should anybody ask a layman's opinion as to the proper place of this account on the ledger, I would be disposed to say that it should be segregated in the accounting as well as in fact.

And the expert whom he quotes in defense of the Secretary concludes by saying:

When all has been said that can be said, it remains true nevertheless that these repeated changes by one administration after another in the form and character of the debt and Treasury statements are disturbing and highly objectionable, if for no other reason that they render difficult comparisons with the past on an identical basis. The lesson which the experience teaches would seem to be that the character and contents of these statements ought to be prescribed by law so as to render it impossible for each new head of the Treasury Department to impose on the form of the statement his own ideas as to what it should be.

Secretary McAdoo's formal announcement gives as the reason for the changes that they are in order to make the statements "more intelligible and clearer to the public." I think that even the most ardent admirer of the Secretary would scarcely claim that, made as they were made and when they were made, they were either calculated to serve, or did serve, this laudable purpose.

What has been the course of this inflated balance during the last three and a half months? From $128,000,000 on October 1 it was $100,541,000 on January 16 last—a loss of $28,000,000 in three and a half months, or at the rate of $8,000,000 a month. If the two disputed items—aggregating $83,000,000—were removed from the balance shown in the January 16 statement, there would remain as our true "net balance" but about $17,000,000, as compared with the figure of $145,000,000 on July 1, 1914. Not all this $17,000,000 is regarded as "available" in the sense that it can be readily used to pay our bills. Small silver and other fractional currency and bullion have always been deducted in determining our available balance. These amounted, on January 16, to $27,000,000. So far as available funds went we had, with nearly six months of the fiscal year yet to run, an actual deficit in the Treasury of $10,000,000.

A recent statement of Harvey S. Chase, certified public accountant, who has in the past been employed as an expert by Secretary McAdoo, may be of interest in this connection, although dealing with a date last October, when conditions were materially better than on January 16:

On August 4, 1913, the "free available balance" in the Treasury office and in banks was $106,793,571.44. This I know to be correct, as I was at work in the United States Treasury at that time, and the form of statement from July 1, 1913, to August 4, and for some time later, was prepared under my personal supervision. "Subsidiary silver coin," "silver bullion," and "minor coin" were not included in the balance of one hundred and six millions, as stated above. I have compared the statement of August 4, 1913, with the statement of October 23, 1915, in which $30,472,159.60 of "subsidiary silver coin," "silver bullion," and "minor coin" are included in the balance. This amount should properly be deducted from the stated balance.

On August 4, 1913, disbursing officers' balances, amounting to $69,817,050.50, were included among the liabilities and the "national bank-notes redemption fund" was also included as a liability. It then amounted to $20,760,883.50. Both these amounts were included as liabilities at that time and they have been so included up to October 1, 1915, whereas on October 23, 1915, they are excluded, thereby inflating the stated balance.

I therefore certify that if the Daily statement of the United States Treasury of October 23, 1915, had been made up on the same basis as that of August 4, 1913, the available balance in the Treasury would now be exhibited as $3,517,027.21.

The statement of January 16 shows that the deficit for the six months of the present fiscal year already amounts to over $60,000,000. Yet we have had an income tax—estimated by its authors to yield $82,000,000—in fact, yielding the first year $28,000,000; a war tax, yielding about $80,000,000 a year; and large imports capable of yielding a fair percentage in customs. We have not even embarked upon our program of national defense, so the deficit can not be charged to the "preparedness" movement.

Nevertheless our Treasury is in a bad way—practically bankrupt, indeed, as we have seen. It is a few dollars ahead of zero one day, a few dollars behind zero the next. Can it be said that Mr. UNDERWOOD'S promise that his law would yield ample revenue has been realized?

But it is important to know why the virtual bankruptcy has come about. There are two ways by which a party can play ducks and drakes with the finances of the country: First, by decreasing the revenues, and second, by rolling up the expenses.

We have seen, perhaps at sufficient length, just how and to what extent the Democratic tariff has reduced revenues in spite of the fact that imports were, during the war, of about normal Republican volume.

But how about our expenditures? The Democratic Party came into power on a platform pledging it to strict economy. Yet the Congress which died—unwept, unhonored, and unsung—last March appropriated $177,000,000 more than any Republican Congress in history. This is ancient history. I do not care

to spend much time on it. I should, however, like to quote the words of that able Democrat, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. FITZGERALD]:

[CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 63d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 6553-6554, Apr. 10, 1914.]

In a few months I shall be called upon in the discharge of my official duties to review the record that this Democratic House shall have made in its authorization of the expenditure of the public moneys. Whenever I think of the horrible mess that I shall be called upon to present to the country on behalf of the Democratic Party I am tempted to quit my place.

If I placed my political fortunes above my sworn duty under the law, I would not attempt to carry out the promises of the Democratic platform, but I should place myself at the head of this band of Treasury looters upon every occasion.

They have unnecessarily piled up the public expenditures until the Democratic Party is becoming the laughing stock of the country.

And also the forceful statement of his colleague on that committee [Mr. SISSON]:

[CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 63d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 6209-6210, Apr. 3, 1914.]

We are writing ourselves down in the history of the country as being the most outrageously and the most criminally extravagant Congress that ever sat on the American Continent. I said this in a speech before, in the last session, and when I made that speech Members of the Democratic House came to me and asked me not to put it in the RECORD, because it would be used by the Republicans in their campaign book. Let them use it. * * * You may use that statement now, gentlemen, because when Democrats get to be so violently extravagant that it makes our record look bad as compared to the very wicked record of the Republicans I must apologize to you Republicans for having ever used the words "criminally extravagant" in criticizing the appropriations that you made, for if that expression, "criminally extravagant" was proper to apply to you, my God, the English language has never found an adjective strong enough to apply to Democratic extravagance.

It is, then, because of the combination of reduced revenue, as a result of the application of low-tariff theories, and grossly inflated expenditures that the Treasury finds itself in the worst financial plight since the Civil War.

Extraordinary taxes will be levied, no doubt, more and more, to meet the legitimate increases of Army and Navy. Sound financing of the program would require simply the elimination of all useless extravagances and the resumption of a fair duty on imports. If we do these two things, we need not continue our vexatious war tax, and yet we shall have ample funds to put into effect any reasonable preparedness program.

What do the estimates furnished at the convening of this Congress indicate as to the expenditure policy of the administration for the ensuing fiscal year? The Army and Navy estimates naturally and properly show a very large increase over last year's corresponding estimates. With this I have no fault to find. But the striking and saddening feature of the situation is that the estimate of every department of the Government shows a decided increase over that submitted to Congress in December, 1914, in spite of the fact that those estimates were at the time the largest in our history. The administration thus indicates, by recommending increases aggregating some $45,000,000 outside the preparedness items, no disposition whatever to curtail the ordinary "household" expenses of the Government, but, on the contrary, an apparent determination to plunge us still deeper into the financial quagmire. With a bankrupt Treasury, with customs revenues averaging only 10 per cent on imports, the Democratic Party shows no intention, no desire even, "to cut the garment to the cloth," but, instead, is determined to rush headlong into wilder and more desperate extravagances.

I am proud to number among my most valued friends very many members of the Democratic Party both within and without the House of Representatives. I accord to them the highest virtue, sincerity, and patriotism; nevertheless, I believe that certain of their economic doctrines are fundamentally mistaken and pregnant with danger for the Nation. In saying this I think I am not blinded by partisan bias; indeed, I am not stating my belief as strongly as do certain eminent Democrats holding high public office, some of whom I have already quoted in the course of my remarks. Let me quote from another and very recent speech of a distinguished and patriotic Democrat, Senator NEWLANDS, of Nevada. Much of what I have said to-day might be regarded as almost a paraphrase of his remarks. Speaking in the Senate on January 11 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 921) he said, in part:

Since the commencement of the Civil War, a period of 65 years, the Democratic Party has been in power nationally only 11 years, and of that period only 4 years consecutively, in every instance losing power as the result of the fear or the resentment of the business classes with their accompanying conditions of unemployment, which made most potent with the workingman "the full-dinner-pail" argument and caused them to reluctantly yield to the persuasion and coercion of our opponents.

We were in similar danger at the congressional election of 1914, a danger only averted by the European war.

* * * * * * *

The realization that similar prudence would keep us out of European complications saved the Democratic Party at the last election from the defeat which would have surely come as the result of the general prostration of business, popularly attributed to our economic legislation.

* * * * * * *

An industrial and commercial depression has been experienced and has been coterminous with Democratic control of legislation. It would not do to charge this to the European war, first, because that war, though injurious to our production and trade in its inception, has since become a stimulant to production and export, and, second, because the commencement of this depression antedates the European war and was contemporaneous with our legislation regarding the tariff, banking, and trade.

The recent elections indicate that we will be in similar danger at the coming presidential election, unless the European war continues, and makes the President's sagacious and firm handling of our foreign affairs the overshadowing issue. But if that war soon comes to a close, and the manufacture of munitions ends, and added to this source of unemployment our markets now protected by the war from invasion are overwhelmed by the cheap products of the nations just emerging from war and eager to get back their gold, we may have not only an aggravated industrial depression to meet, but a financial condition fruitful of paralyzing caution. Such conditions may make the election turn not upon our foreign policy but upon domestic economic conditions, and the "full-dinner-pail" argument may again be potential.

* * * * * * *

It is safe to say that the manufacturing, the banking, and the large corporate interests are hostile to the Democratic Party, and that their employees are also preparing to throw their weight against it simply because its administration has not brought good times, but on the contrary has, in their judgment, brought bad times.

* * * * * * *

Regarding the tariff my general view was that the reduction on dutiable articles from an average of over 42 per cent to an average of less than 25 per cent was too great, taking away possibly the entire margin of profit and even more.

* * * * * * *

The effect of the tariff legislation was what I feared it would be.

* * * * * * *

While I accept my full share of responsibility for the tariff bill, which I with apprehension of immediate ill effect voted for, candor will not permit me to assert, as many of its supporters do, that world-wide causes were at the bottom of the general contraction of production following its agitation and passage. It is an indisputable fact that the paralysis came before the European war was inaugurated, and that its causes were mainly domestic.

Upon all the evidence, therefore, I am convinced that the rule of the Democratic Party in national affairs is disastrous to the country as a whole, and especially disastrous to a State like Massachusetts, which, in part, I have the honor to represent on this floor. I base this assertion upon two broad grounds:

First. Because its tariff policy is suicidal for any industrial population. Take the actual words of the Democratic platform of 1912:

We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government, under the Constitution, has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue.

In other words, its historic economic theory, again promulgated in 1912, is that revenue, and not reasonable protection, should be the keynote of tariff making; that the European manufacturer should be actually encouraged to send to our markets the products of his mills and factories. Let me show by two recent illustrations what I mean. Secretary Redfield, as head of the Department of Commerce, is charged with the supervision of our foreign and domestic trade policy. In an official bulletin, sent out last autumn under the Government frank to practically every important newspaper in the United States, he says:

The Swiss legation at Washington has advices from Berne that manufacturers in Switzerland are anxious to supply the Christmas toy trade of the United States, and the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, of the Department of Commerce, has undertaken to assist in having orders placed. Some Swiss firms alone have produced hundreds of new models in wood and pasteboard and more are being added daily. A few of these samples which have reached Washington are skillfully executed lithograph soldiers of all the belligerent nations for the construction of little armies by American children.

Toy making is a considerable and a growing industry in the United States. The last census gives us the following statistics concerning it:

Toys and games.
[Census of 1909.]

	Massachusetts.	United States.
Number of establishments	16	226
Total employed	1,143	5,305
Capital	$1,103,596	
Total expenses	$1,564,503	
Wages	$446,792	
Value of product	$1,750,739	$8,264,135
Value added by manufacturing	$892,165	$4,709,897

New York, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania are the leading States in the industry, dividing over one-half the total production.

While, of course, not one of our great industries, it gives employment already to over 5,000 men. It requires no great experience, technical knowledge, or capital to make Teddy bears, rag dolls, or games. The industry is capable of being made

one of the most productive and desirable in the country. Yet, in anticipation of the Christmas season, Secretary Redfield deliberately and officially states that the Swiss manufacturers—quite naturally—are "anxious to supply the Christmas toy trade of the United States," and that, in view of this, his department "has undertaken to assist in having orders placed." Can you imagine this occurrence under a Republican administration? And if you can, can you conceive that a Republican Secretary would boast of it? The Republican view is that our home industries should be protected, if they need such protection, and to the extent of their need, against foreign manufacturers, whether in Switzerland, Germany, Great Britain, China, or Japan.

Take another brilliant bit of advertising by Secretary Redfield. In Commerce Reports dated November 4, 1915, it is said, presumably with his approval:

Two visitors from Russia have nearly completed the organization of a cooperative sales agency for promoting Russian interests. Their efforts were materially assisted by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Here it is "Russian interests" Secretary Redfield has "materially assisted," but the principle is the same as in the Swiss case. I submit that it is not a safe or sound policy for the American people.

Second. Democratic rule in national affairs is bad for an industrial State like Massachusetts, because the Democracy in Congress is dominated by the South and because the point of view of its leaders seems antagonistic to the even reasonable welfare of a manufacturing and mercantile population. I do not make this statement lightly or in any desire to stir up sectional disaffection. I make it on the authority of public utterances of the leaders themselves. By way of illustration, let me quote the familiar threat of the present majority leader, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]:

[CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 62d Cong., vol. 47, pt. 1, p. 279.]

We in the South intend to make the New England mills come down and put their mills there or else go out of business. [Applause.]

And also the more recent and very enlightening remark by Mr. KITCHIN'S unsuccessful rival for the majority leadership, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], who is so influential on the Ways and Means Committee:

[Quoted from Boston Herald.]

We Democrats are in charge of the House, and I'll tell you right now every time one of those Yankees gets a ham I'm going to do my best to get a hog.

Doubtless we should all agree that it is desirable and wholesome to have two strong and fairly evenly balanced political parties in national affairs, each vigilant to protect the country as a whole from the mistakes or excesses of the other and each entirely national and nonsectional in scope and attitude. It is unfortunate that throughout the southern section of the country there is really no minority party, and that the Democratic Party reigns supreme. This situation tends to give rise to the point of view which I have just illustrated by quotations from two southern Democratic leaders. It is further illustrated by a statement of the present Attorney General of the United States, T. W. Gregory, of Texas:

The brutality and senselessness of the great wrong of reconstruction can not be forgiven or forgotten. It welded every element of the South into eternal opposition to a political party; it made adherence to that party moral, social, and political treason; it made it impossible for us to divide on any issues of expediency, or even of right and wrong; and, to sum it all up, it made it impossible for a southern born and bred man to vote the Republican ticket and go home and face his wife and children.

I have made a much longer speech than I had intended. Perhaps it could all have been said in a sentence. Again I quote from an eminent Democratic source, Senator JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, the former leader of his party in this body:

[CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 63d Cong., 2d sess., p. 6381, Apr. 8, 1914.]

The poor, dear, old foolish Democratic Party is going through the same game that she can be generally trusted to go through with soon after she gets into power.

That is the Democratic Party; that is its history; that is what led old Tom Reed to say in 1894 and 1895:

"You can not last long, because you are not accustomed to governing anybody or anything; you can not govern the country; you can not even govern yourselves; you are incompetent."

[Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Clerk to read the bill under the five-minute rule.

The bill was read.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

That the appointment of the nine delegates by the Secretary of the Treasury to represent the United States in the proceedings of the International High Commission to be held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, during the year 1916, in accordance with the action of the First Pan American Financial Conference, held in Washington during the year 1915, pursuant to the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 4, 1915, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916," be, and the same is hereby, approved and confirmed; such delegates shall be known as the United States section of the International High Commission and shall cooperate with other sections of the commission in taking action upon the recommendations of the First Pan American Financial Conference; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to fill any vacancies that may occur in the United States section of said international commission.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment: Strike out the words "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert the word "President" in line 17, page 2, of the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, amend the committee amendment by striking out the words "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert in lieu thereof the word "President."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill as amended to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 8235, and had directed him to report the same with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FLOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

IMPEACHMENT OF H. SNOWDEN MARSHALL.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina offers a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 110.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary in continuing their consideration of House resolution 90 be authorized and empowered to send for persons and papers, to subpœna witnesses, to administer oaths to such witnesses, and take their testimony.

The said committee is also authorized to appoint a subcommittee to act for and on behalf of the whole committee wherever it may be deemed advisable to take testimony for said committee. In case such subcommittee is appointed it shall have the same powers in respect to obtaining testimony as are herein given to the Committee on the Judiciary, with a sergeant at arms, by himself or deputy, who shall attend the sittings of such subcommittee and serve the process of same.

In case the Committee on the Judiciary or a subcommittee thereof deems it necessary it may employ such clerks and stenographers as are required to carry out the authority given in this resolution, and the expenses so incurred shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall have authority to sign, and the Clerk thereof to attest, subpœnas for witnesses, and the Sergeant at Arms or a deputy shall serve them.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I would not wish this resolution to go through as a privileged resolution. I am in favor of the resolution, but I do not desire it to go through as privileged, and I suggest to the gentleman that he ask unanimous consent.

Mr. WEBB. If the Speaker does not think it is privileged, of course, I will ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. GARRETT. I am not even making a point of order, but merely suggesting this to the gentleman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution just read. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the House that the Committee on the Judiciary has had under consideration House resolution No. 90, which was referred to that committee probably some 10 days ago. The committee has not come to any conclusion yet on the resolution, but feels that it should ask the House for the authority to subpœna some witnesses before it that might throw some light upon the charges made. The resolution was unanimously adopted by the Committee on the Judiciary to-day, and I trust that it may pass and that the committee may secure the authority, which it will immediately exercise.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL PAGE.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 111.

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint an additional page for the remainder of the present session, to be paid for out of the contingent fund of the House, at a salary of $75 per month.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what is intended by this?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The purpose of this resolution is this: One of our colleagues, as we know, suffers under the terrible misfortune of being blind, and it is the purpose of this resolution to create this additional page, who will be assigned to him to go with him to and from his office and about the Capitol here, in order to aid him in attending to his public duties. There are not sufficient pages on the roll now to have one of them detailed for his exclusive use, and this resolution is intended to serve that particular purpose.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit, when the session commenced I asked the Doorkeeper to furnish a page to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] in the House whenever it was desired, and that has been done. But it does not answer the necessity. I quite agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that it would be very proper for the House to provide the additional page for the gentleman from Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, January 28, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of the Navy of the 25th instant, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation amending his estimate on page 77 of the Annual Book of Estimates for the fiscal year of 1917, under the title "Salaries, office of the Secretary of the Navy" (H. Doc. No. 623); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of $32,475 required under the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, for improving the water supply at the naval training station, San Francisco, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 624); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of New York Harbor, N. Y., between Staten Island and Hoffman Island (H. Doc. No. 625); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of harbor at Green Bay, Wis., with a view to securing a channel depth of 21 feet (H. Doc. No. 626); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

5. A letter from from the president of Washington & Old Dominion Railway, submitting report of the Washington & Old Dominion Railway for the 12 months ending December 31, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 627); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Hatchee River, Tenn. (H. Doc. No. 628); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

7. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of East Branch of the Yantic River, Conn., from its junction with the Thames River to some point about 2,500 feet northerly to provide a channel of 14 feet in depth, to include this part of the Yantic River in the Thames River project, and to provide for the closing of the West Branch of the Yantic River (H. Doc. No. 629); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8810) to amend an act relating to the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, approved March 4, 1913, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 80), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9) to authorize the closing of part of Forty-first Street NW., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 81), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CARAWAY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 61) to amend section 260 of the Judicial Code, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 82), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2965) granting a pension to Louis J. Shepard, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10222) releasing the claim of the United States Government to that portion of land, being a fractional block, bounded on the north and east by Bayou Cadet, on the west by Cevallos Street, and on the south by Intendencia Street, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10223) releasing the claim of the United States Government to lot No. 306, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 10224) to provide for the erection of a public building at Bath, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LLOYD (by request): A bill (H. R. 10225) to establish a national flexible currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10226) to repeal all civil-service laws in so far as they apply to the office of Supervising Architect of the Treasury and employees thereof; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10227) to fix the period of residence in the United States necessary to entitle one of foreign birth to the rights of American citizenship; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10228) providing for the erection of a suitable memorial to John Fitch; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LITTEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 10229) to provide for purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Webster Springs, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MURRAY: A bill (H. R. 10230) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Iowa tribe of Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 10231) to amend sections 21 and 31 of the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright" approved March 4, 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 10232) appropriating $50,000 to improve the Ohio River, build and construct a levee at Uniontown, Ky.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SUMNERS: A bill (H. R. 10233) for the establishment of an arsenal and munition-manufacturing plant at Dallas, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 10234) authorizing the State of New Mexico to convey to the United States lands in the national forests in said State and select other lands therefor; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10235) for the construction of a permanent highway across the Mescalero Indian Reservation in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 10236) to authorize national banking associations to avail themselves of State laws providing for the guaranteeing of deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10237) requiring railroads engaged in interstate traffic to move freight trains carrying live stock at a certain speed as a minimum; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 10238) granting the consent of Congress to Interstate Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across Mississippi River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 10239) to aid in the protection of the banks of White River at three points in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 10240) prohibiting the clearance or entry of United States or foreign ships at any port of the United States when citizens of the United States are carried as passengers on ships whose cargo consists wholly or in part of contraband of war; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KREIDER: A bill (H. R. 10241) for the relief of certain officers of the Army and Navy in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 10242) to readjust railway mail pay based on an annual weighing of mail and on space occupied in mail apartment cars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 10243) extending the benefits of the general pension laws to the members of the Eighth, Twentieth, Twenty-sixth, Twenty-seventh, Twenty-eighth, Twenty-ninth, Thirtieth, Thirty-first, Thirty-second, and Thirty-third Regiments, the several batteries of Artillery, the several troops of Cavalry, and the several independent companies which comprised the Pennsylvania Volunteer Militia, otherwise known as the "emergency men," who were called into service by the President of the United States of America, officered by United States officers, and sworn into the service of the United States for an indefinite period, the same as if they had been in the service of the United States for a period of 90 days or more; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 10244) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 10245) to provide for special tools and fixtures necessary for the immediate manufacture of arms, ammunition, and equipment in time of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 10246) authorizing the addition of certain lands to the Colorado National Forest, Colo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McLEMORE: Resolution (H. Res. 109) that the settlement of the Mexican question be left to those States of the Union that are contiguous to Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. IGOE (by request): Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 120) in reference to the employment of enlisted men in competition with local civilians; to the Committee on Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 10247) granting a pension to Sarah L. Sheaff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEALES (by request): A bill (H. R. 10248) to correct the military record of Charles P. Kibler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 10249) for the relief of Blue Springs (Mo.) Baptist Church; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 10250) for the relief of Thomas Aurand; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 10251) authorizing the Kansas City & Memphis Railway & Bridge Co. to make settlement with Crittenden County, Ark., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10252) granting an increase of pension to Frank Kubacki; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 10253) granting a pension to Rebecca Eldridge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10254) granting a pension to Sophia Freeby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 10255) for the relief of David Kirch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10256) for the relief of B. F. Pearsall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 10257) to correct the military record of John W. Parsons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 10258) granting an increase of pension to H. Veatch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10259) granting an increase of pension to John F. Brittain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10260) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo O. Cody; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10261) granting a pension to John W. Harmon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 10262) for the relief of the estate of James H. Newland; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10263) for the relief of the estate of Joel W. Dyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 10264) granting a pension to Hayden E. Evans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 10265) granting an increase of pension to Robert E. Benson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 10266) granting a pension to Gertrude Hunter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10267) granting a pension to Abraham M. Reams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 10268) granting an increase of pension to John R. Greenwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10269) granting a pension to John Weigart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 10270) granting a pension to Mary Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 10271) to correct the military record of Juan Epomoseno Espinosa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10272) granting a pension to Dora Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10273) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10274) granting an increase of pension to Norman Messenger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 10275) for the allowance of certain soldiers' claims growing out of service in the Army, reported by the Court of Claims, known as three months' pay claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 10276) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. McPheeters; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 10277) to authorize the President to appoint Col. L. Mervin Maus to the grade of brigadier general in the United States Army and place him on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 10278) granting an increase of pension to Isaac R. Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 10279) granting a pension to Emma Sheldon Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 10280) granting an increase of pension to Columbus W. Donnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 10281) granting a pension to Mary E. Ruble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 10282) granting an increase of pension to John Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REAVIS: A bill (H. R. 10283) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Yutzy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 10284) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Crippen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 10285) for the relief of the Ninth Avenue Railroad Co., of the city of New York, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10286) for the relief of the Sixth Avenue Railroad Co., of New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10287) for the relief of the Twenty-third Street Railway Co., of the city of New York, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10288) for the relief of the Forty-second Street and Grand Street Ferry Railroad Co., of New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10289) for the relief of the Broadway and Seventh Avenue Railroad Co., of New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10290) for the relief of the Eighth Avenue Rairoad Co., of New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10291) granting a pension to Emma B. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 10292) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor Stahler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10293) granting an increase of pension to Anne E. Nolan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 10294) granting an increase of pension to John B. Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10295) granting an increase of pension to Minerva Lavine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 10296) to correct the lineal and relative rank of Capt. Thomas J. Leary, Medical Corps, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 10297) granting an increase of pension to William Mullen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10298) for the relief of John W. Walsh; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10299) for the relief of the estate of John G. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 10300) granting a pension to George W. Oblisk; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10301) granting a pension to Martha J. Shallenberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10302) granting a pension to George F. Harter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 9629, for the relief of Susan K. Nash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 8052, for the relief of John Toothman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 6938, for the relief of William C. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEALES: Petition of citizens of Hanover, Pa., and O'Neil Silk Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Philadelphia Wholesale Lumber Dealers' Association and Southern Transportation Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of the Small bill, regulating compulsory pilotages on barges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of Henry Street Settlement, New York, favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, relative to survey of the entrance to Buffalo River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Central Merchants' Association and New York Board of Trade and Transportation, relative to curtailment of mail deliveries in New York City; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John Kraemer, of Springfield, Mass., protesting against Federal censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial of port cities of Lake Michigan and Green Bay against the continued diversion of the waters of Lake Michigan into the Sanitary Drainage Canal at Chicago; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of Kenosha County Equal Suffrage League, favoring the Keating-Owen bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of Hough Shade Corporation, of Janesville, Wis., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petitions of depositors in the banks of Kansas, against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELSTON: Memorial of Oakland Chamber of Commerce, favoring appropriations for new vessels, etc., in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petitions of grape growers of northern Ohio, against passage of House bill 6036; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Robert Engelke and 21 others of La Crosse, Wis., favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Chicago Federation of Musicians, favoring permanent tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of William Suggett and 70 other citizens of Salem, Ohio, in favor of printing report of testimony of Industrial Commission; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of Clifton Pierce, of Springville, Utah, against Federal censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of Salt Lake (Utah) Free Kindergarten and Neighborhood Association, favoring child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of the Providence (R. I.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring extension of appropriation to continue the purchase of Federal forest reserves in New England and southern Appalachians; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Rhode Island State Branch of American Federation of Labor, favoring passage of House bill 6871, relative to convict labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of New England Shoe and Leather Association, favoring creation of tariff board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petitions of citizens of Coudersport, Pa., against national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS: Resolutions by Division No. 572, Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees of America, of Frostburg, Md., protesting against the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Philadelphia Board of Trade, against passage of Senate bill 3055, relative to appointment of clerks of United States court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Woman's Alliance of First Unitarian Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Henry Gross, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring embargo on munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request): Petitions of Henrico Lumber Co. Philadelphia Wholesale Lumber Dealers' Association, and Southern Transportation Co., all of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of bill relative to compulsory pilotage on barges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NOLAN: Resolutions of the California Development Board, San Francisco, Cal., favoring remedial legislation in

behalf of the oil industry of the State of California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of the Pacific Fisheries Society, Portland, Oreg., favoring increased appropriations for the United States Bureau of Fisheries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, protest of the Granite Cutters' International Association of America, against the action of the Treasury Department in prohibiting the use of granite in the construction of public buildings in localities where the postal income is less than $800,000; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, protest of the Associated Theatrical Managers of San Francisco, Cal., against the continuance of the war-revenue tax as applied to allied theatrical industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN: Petition of sundry piano manufacturers of New York City and vicinity, in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRATT: Memorial of M. D. Foster, Willis Strows, J. M. Williams, D. C. Howell, E. D. Wickham, Mrs. A. E. Arnold, L. Price, Mrs. W. M. Hall, Clinton Neal, R L. Dodds, Mrs. L. Price, Mrs. George Faulkner, Mrs. A. S. Whalen, Mrs. Willis Strows, Mrs. Belle Dunham, Mrs. James Jennings, Mrs. C. Magee, C. Magee, H. G. Barber, Rev. Z. Evans, A. M. Phelps, Keturah Evans, T. Otis Price, Mrs. A. R. Brown, Gladys Foster, Kathryn Price, Ida Foster, W. K. Mulligan, S. C. Benson, R. W. Neal, L. W. Fink, E. E. Seitz, Charles Bowers, G. A. Kepler, B. A. Hefkins, J. M. Kreider, Charles Leonard, D. C. Howell, G. A. Snyder, David Love, Silas Mead, R. W. Neal, L. S. Bailey, John D. Wilson, F. E. Harris, Tracy Leonard, Esther Houseworth, Christiana A. Sears, Julia M. Kopkie, Howard Howell, Joseph Kopkie, Clarence Matthews, Emmett Weavers, Laurence Riegel, Mrs. A. M. Phelps, Dorothy Magee, Helen De Mun, Freda Kratsley, Hope Williams, Ralph Dean, Harry Cassidy, Claude Sirrini, Osborn Smith, Ralph Wilson, Bernice Dean, H. D. Johnson, W. M. McCoy, Emma Johnson, Ilah Evans, J. M. Dean, Helen Johnson, Mrs. Clara Conover, H. Conover, Mrs. Howard H. Johnson, Mrs. Jessie Kelley, Helen Stilwell, Mrs. Osborn Smith, Mrs. George Case, Maude McCoy, Howard Johnson, and G. J. Case, all of Burdett, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Smith-Hughes bills for the national censorship of moving pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of Claude W. Weaver, Walter Kaubisch, E. I. Kelley, Mark Bernt, William W. Arland, Roger S. McAvoy, H. O. Warns, John Fahey, J. M. Franz, G. J. Seibel, Jacob Aker, Frank Gottfried, W. F. Hilk, Julius Schneider, John J. Illig, Frank Sidoti, H. J. Middagh, Frank Gaiss, Fred Vollgraf, C. E. Githler, John McGannon, Charles Gaiss, T. B. Dowling, Edward Gerber, Joseph Gaiss, James A. Gurnsey, Victor Schosger, John Henry, R. Sarter, G. T. Miles, Charles Miles, A. Kretschmann, Nicholas Drouard, Arthur Fermer, Nels Person, Isidor Bleichner, J. Peter Nockel, August Stenger, Jules Skwerer, Fred Kinch, John Ward, W. S. Holmes, F. E. Cilley, Carl Johnson, Adrian Krebs, G. A. Mayer, Frank Mayer, George Black, Arthur Rooney, John Cunningham, L. J. Cahill, W. T. Scholz, and John Huonker, all of Corning, N. Y., favoring an embargo upon further shipments of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petitions of merchants of the twentieth congressional district of Illinois, favoring a tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REILLY: Petitions of business men of sixth district of Wisconsin, favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWE: Petition of Theatrical Protective Union, New York, relative to tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of public forum, Church of Ascension, New York, favoring child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Memorial of Gilbert Lodge, No. 240, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, Jackson, Mich., favoring retirement with compensation for Federal employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. STINESS: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 10202) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Sweet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill (H. R. 10203) granting an increase of pension to Emily P. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition representing 600 people of the Centenary Methodist Episcopal Church, of Malone, N. Y., for the establishment of a motion-picture commission; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of American Federation of Labor, protesting against repeal of the seamen's law; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WASON: Petition of Hart & Shepard, Shakers, of East Canterbury, N. H., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of Peter Wood Dyeing Co., of Worcester, Mass., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *January 28, 1916.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we have come upon times in our national life and in the world life when we are driven to Thee for aid. An inheritance of honor and manhood makes us unafraid in conflict with men. Death has no alarm to us if it is the price of honor. We fear lest we should stand apart from Thee. Thy will is supreme. Thy law is over all.

We believe that Thou hast given to us a voice and a mission and a power among the nations of the earth. We pray Thee to lay tribute upon these that we may fulfill the Divine plan in us. Guide us this day in the discharge of the duties that are before us. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ARMY POSTS (S. DOC. NO. 261).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 27, 1916.

Hon. JAMES M. BAKER,
Secretary Senate of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to resolution by the Senate of the 6th instant, that the Secretary of War furnish to the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interests, certain information with reference to Army posts in the United States, I have the honor to transmit herewith detailed information covering the first four items of the information requested. As to the fifth and sixth items, I am not now prepared to make specific recommendations on this subject, as the passage of any of the bills now before Congress looking to an increase in the Military Establishment would probably require the use of all Army posts now available.

Very sincerely,
LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to inquire if this report will be published in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was just inquiring of the clerks at the desk the Senator who offered the resolution.

Mr. KENYON. I offered the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would inquire of the Senator from Iowa what is his desire as to the committee to which it shall be referred?

Mr. KENYON. I ask that it be published in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And referred to any committee?

Mr. KENYON. I think not.

Mr. SMOOT. Would not the printing of it as a public document do just as well, rather than to have the RECORD cumbered?

Mr. KENYON. I would prefer that, but I thought it might be more economical to publish it in the RECORD. I ask that it be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the communication and accompanying papers will be printed as a public document, and not in the RECORD.

COMMERCIAL FERTILIZERS AND COTTON PRODUCTION (S. DOC. NO. 262).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 11th instant, a statement relative to the amount of commercial potash, nitrogen, and phosphoric acid available for fertilizer purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the National Academy of Sciences for the year ended December 31, 1915, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON & OLD DOMINION RAILWAY (H. DOC. NO. 627).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington & Old Dominion Railway for the year ended December 31, 1915, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill

(H. R. 8235) to provide for the maintenance of the United States section of the International High Commission, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

RIGHTS OF NEUTRALS TO PURCHASE SHIPS OF BELLIGERENTS.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, when the interesting subject which engaged our attention yesterday morning was under consideration reference was made to the aggravating condition of our shipping interests. I am very glad this morning to call the attention of the Senate to a pleasant feature of that subject.

Yesterday morning there was a brief dispatch in the papers reading as follows:

BRITAIN ALLOWS PURCHASE OF GERMAN VESSELS UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS.

LONDON, *January 26.*

The British Government is allowing the transfer of German ships to United States registry under the condition that they are not to be used, directly or indirectly, for trading with enemies of England.

Lord Robert Cecil, undersecretary for foreign affairs, stated in the House of Commons this afternoon that the transfer of the German ship *Pure Light* to American registry had been sanctioned, as well as the transfer of the registry of 22 ships which were purchased by the Standard Oil Co.

It was announced by the British foreign office some time ago that the clause of the declaration of London relating to transfers of registry had been abrogated by England. This was followed by the seizure of vessels flying the American flag, but which had been German-owned before the war.

In the course of some remarks made by me on this subject a year ago, in a colloquy participated in by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], I said:

When the English representatives are brought face to face with the problem, and it is a question of a straight abandonment of the principle for which they themselves have been contending for a century and a quarter, and which during all that time has been regarded as consistent with their highest interests, I am not quite sure that they will not think again about it.

Furthermore, let me say to the Senator that I am not quite sure that by that time they may not reach the conclusion that it would be very much better to let us buy these German ships and add them to our mercantile marine than to have them go back to Germany after the war.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a telegram addressed to the Senate of the United States, which will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The telegram was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 27, 1916.*

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON MEYER LONDON RESOLUTION,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The undersigned organization has instructed me to urge your consideration of the resolution introduced by Hon. MEYER LONDON, of New York, calling for a peace congress of neutral nations.

Yours, for peace,
AMALGAMATED LADIES' GARMENT CUTTERS' UNION,
INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT WORKERS' UNION,
JOSEPH R. SCHEFLET, *Secretary.*

Mr. PHELAN. I present resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., urging national and Pacific coast defenses, together with a memorial to Congress adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, urging the necessity of the maintenance of a land force on that coast. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Los Angeles, Cal., January 22, 1916.

Resolution urging national and Pacific coast defense.

Whereas the United States is at present practically unprepared to defend itself against an attack by foreign force; and

Whereas the need for such defense may arise following the termination of the present hostilities now being waged among several of the great nations; and

Whereas the cost and consequences of an attack would be inconceivably greater than the cost of even the most elaborate preparedness for defense; and

Whereas the United States Government now has, in the organizations known as the General Board of the Navy and the General Staff of the Army, a highly trained and experienced body of military and naval experts whose opinion on these matters should be the best obtainable; and

Whereas it is our understanding that the plans and suggestions of these boards concerning immediate preparation have not been adopted: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce:

First. That the United States Government take immediate steps to insure the prompt and successful defense of all of its territory.

Second. That the measures adopted to attain the above end should include complete and specific plans providing adequately for the defense of the Pacific coast, which should be formulated without delay by the General Board of the Navy and the General Staff of the Army of the United States, and which should give full consideration and weight to the facts and recommendations embodied in the attached memorial to Congress, which sets forth the conditions on the Pacific coast from which arises the urgent and imperative necessity for the establishment and permanent maintenance on that coast of a land force adequate for its defense.

Third. That the principle of universal military service by the entire manhood of the country, which is a true democratic system, should be adopted as the foundation for our ultimate system of national defense. Such service should be with the colors on the part of those physically fit, as provided for in the Federal Constitution, or else by financial contributions from those unable to serve in person, to be applicable solely to the military and naval services of the country.

I hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of resolution passed by the board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce at the regular meeting held Wednesday, January 19, 1916.

ROBT. N. BULLA, *President.*

Attest:

FRANK WIGGINS, *Secretary.*

Memorial to Congress.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

The facts and recommendations hereinafter set forth are respectfully submitted for your consideration in behalf of the people of the Pacific coast:

1. It must be conceded that no dependence can be placed on bringing naval reenforcements from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast in the event of war. The Panama Canal is uncertain. It easily could be blocked or its locks wrecked with dynamite prior to open warfare by any enemy of the United States. Unless a powerful fleet is kept constantly on the Pacific coast and is equal in fighting power to the combined navies of Asia, it would fail as an adequate defense measure. It would face destruction unless it was provided with fortified naval bases or harbors of refuge similar to those that have protected the navy of Germany in the present war.

2. However desirable it would be for the United States to have a fleet of superior fighting power on the Pacific Ocean, its construction would require many years. By no possibility could an adequate Navy for the Pacific be built in time to meet immediate necessity for an impregnable defense. It appears obvious that the need for such defense will arise, if ever, before the needed fleet could be constructed. For that reason such naval defenses as can be immediately provided for the Pacific coast should be not offensive but defensive in character, including naval bases, harbors of refuge, coaling stations with large reserve coal supplies, transports, swift cruisers, torpedo boats, submarines, torpedoes, mines, mine layers, and large fleets of aeroplanes, with ample ammunition and supplies at all bases.

3. Naval bases should be established immediately and strongly fortified at all vantage points on the Pacific coast in the United States and at Sitka, Cooks Inlet, Unalaska, Samoa, and Pearl Harbor. Unless both can proceed simultaneously, the establishment and fortification of these naval bases should take precedence over ship construction. Sea power on the Pacific depends on the possession of these naval bases, with an adequate fuel supply.

4. The defense of Alaska is vital to the safety of the Pacific coast of the United States, and necessitates the immediate creation and permanent maintenance of a land force in Alaska large enough to insure the safety of this territory. Such an Alaskan land force should include a construction reserve, in which could be enlisted all men employed in Government development work in Alaska, including the mining of coal to supply our naval coaling stations.

5. An Alaskan agricultural reserve should be established, in addition to the Alaskan construction reserve. This reserve should be created by a campaign for the colonization of the agricultural lands of Alaska under a system patterned after that of the New Zealand land settlement, which should be inaugurated immediately by the National Government. It should be so vigorously conducted as to establish speedily in Alaska a permanent population adequate for its protection in the event of war, and every settler should be trained as a reservist, as they are in Switzerland, Australia, and New Zealand.

6. Harbor fortifications should be built immediately for the protection of all cities and harbors on the Pacific coast, and such coast defenses should be at all times fully manned, and should be prepared against a land attack by the permanent maintenance of an adequate land force amply provided with field artillery and automobile transportion and the construction of the necessary military highways. The protection of cities must include the protection of their sources of water and food supplies.

7. The standing Army of the United States should be increased and provided with a reserve by the adoption of the plan proposed by the War Department, which contemplates the creation of a reserve for the Regular Army by a six years' enlistment, of which two years would be given to service with the colors and the remaining four years to the reserve. A separate force should be enlisted for colonial and isthmian service.

8. A national construction reserve should be established and permanently maintained, to embrace all men employed in construction work by the National Government, including the building of highways and waterways, flood prevention and protection, river regulation, forestry, and land reclamation. All such work should be done by a regularly enlisted and organized reserve, under civil control in time of peace and instantly ready for military service in the event of war. The German forestry system might well be the model after which such a national construction reserve should be patterned.

9. A national rural reserve, with an eventual strength of 5,000,000 men, should be created and maintained at proper strategic points in the United States under a system embodying the features of the Australian and New Zealand land-settlement systems. Each rural reservist should be settled upon a small tract of land, no larger than he can cultivate with his own labor with the help of his family. This entire rural reserve should be officered, trained, equipped, and organized so that in the event of war they would be as good soldiers as the reserves of Switzerland, who are at all times ready for instant military service.

10. All the national reserves of the United States should be continuously under the exclusive jurisdiction and control of the War Department in all matters relating to military training, equipment, organization, and service, and should always be prepared to join the colors without delay. That instant readiness of the national reserves for service in defense of the country would be our best safeguard against the breaking out of war. We might then rest assured that no

nation ever would attack the United States, or attempt to invade or occupy any of its territory or possessions.

11. The most imperative need to insure the instant preparedness of the United States for national defense would be a full complement of officers for all the reserves, always in active command. All the national reserves should therefore be under command of officers promoted from the ranks or trained in military schools under the direction of the War Department. All such officers should be classed and ranked the same as officers of the Regular Army. Military schools should be established and maintained in different parts of the United States, where a sufficent number would be regularly trained to provide all the officers necessary for the national reserves. Many of the military posts are improperly located for their present use and should be transformed into such military schools. The plan now in operation in the Regular Army, under which men are, after examination, promoted from the ranks, should be made applicable to all branches of the national reserves.

12. National defense against a foreign invasion may become necessary before an adequate navy or fortifications can by any possibility be constructed, particularly on the Pacific coast, which would in that event probably be isolated immediately by the obstruction of the Panama Canal and the destruction of railroad lines through the mountains. This would make it impossible to transfer military forces or reinforcements or munitions or materials of war to the Pacific coast. It is for this and other reasons imperatively necessary that the entire land force required for the defense of the Pacific coast should be stationed and maintained permanently in the territory lying between the Cascade, Sierra Nevada, and Sierra Madre Mountains and the Pacific Ocean, or in the Colorado River Valley and the State of Nevada. Such a force could not safely be less than 100,000 men in southern California, or in the Colorado River Valley and Nevada; 100,000 in the San Joaquin Valley; 100,000 in the Sacramento Valley; 100,000 in Oregon; and 100,000 in Washington, a total of 500,000 men fully equipped and officered, thoroughly trained and organized, and ready for instant military service. They should be permanently stationed in the localities mentioned to obviate any necessity for transporting troops through or across the Tehachapi or Siskiyou Mountains. The Colorado River Valley and Nevada should be connected with the coast of southern California by several complete systems of military highways.

13. This urgent need for a separate national reserve, constituting a land force of 500,000 men on the Pacific coast, must be recognized, and it should be created by Congress without any delay whatsoever, with the same irresistible energy that would be put forth if it were certain that a foreign invasion of the Pacific coast would be attempted by either England or Germany with an Asiatic ally before the end of the year 1916. In no other way can the security of the Pacific coast against such an invasion be assured, and such security must not depend upon chance or good fortune. It must be made certain and without regard to cost, because the safety of the lives and homes of our people are involved as well as our continued occupancy of the Pacific littoral of the United States and all our Pacific possessions. The necessary appropriations should be made, and all the legislation required for the immediate establishment of a land force of 500,000 men for the defense of the Pacific coast should be enacted at the present session of Congress without delay.

14. It is not possible for a standing army adequate for Pacific coast defense to be permanently maintained on the Pacific coast. Neither is it possible to provide the necessary land force for such defense by either a State or National militia. The sparse population and inevitable isolation of the Pacific littoral in the event of war makes it imperatively necessary that the required land force should be established by Congress by the adoption of a plan for immediately recruiting such a force from the Nation at large. This can be done, and it can be successfully done in no other way than by supplementing the reserves provided under the plans of the War Department by the immediate enlistment and establishment of a national home-croft reserve, composed of 500,000 young men, preferably married men, who would eagerly grasp the opportunity for an enlistment of three years in such a reserve upon the terms and conditions hereinafter specified and set forth.

15. The men enlisted in this home-croft reserve first would be given the military training necessary to make of them as good soldiers as those in the regular standing army, and thereafter they would receive the daily military training necessary to keep them constantly ready for actual military service; but they would also receive all the training necessary to qualify them within the three years to be expert acreculturists and horticulturists. This latter training should include everything required for the intensive cultivation of the land, fruit, vegetable, and berry culture and the raising of poultry, pigeons, and rabbits, as well as community cooperation and organization. Every reservist, at the end of his three years of service, would have been scientifically trained in the art and science of the home-croft system of education and life. He would know how to get his living from 5 acres of land, and he should be entitled to a perpetual lease of such tract of land from the National Government on the expiration of his three years' term of service in the national home-croft reserve, on condition that he should be enrolled and continue his service as a reservist in the national rural reserve until 45 years of age.

16. The national home-croft reserve for Pacific coast defense should be enlisted and organized immediately and their military training begun without delay. While this preliminary training is being given them and the force is being organized the National Government should acquire 100,000 acres of land in each of the five localities above named in the States of California, Arizona, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington. These lands should be paid for by the issuance of Government bonds for the amount of the purchase price, as is done in New Zealand when the Government purchases land for subdivision and colonization. Each tract of land should be subdivided into acre home crofts. A house and all necessary buildings should be erected on each home croft, and roads, streets, waterworks, and sewers should be built. The cost of such improvements should be provided by a bond issue by the National Government, as is done under the Australian and New Zealand system of land reclamation and settlement. The capital invested would be more than represented by the increased value of the land with the improvements.

17. The home-croft reservists should be given the opportunity to do the labor required for the construction of all improvements on the land and should be adequately compensated for such labor. Each reservist, with his family, should have the right to the use and occupancy of a Homecroft during his term of service for three years under a lease similar to the perpetual lease system of Government land settlement in New Zealand, and should pay a rental that would cover the interest on the Government's entire investment, and a low amortization charge. An additional charge should cover the cost of educational instruction and training. Each reservist should be entitled to all the products from his Homecroft and all moneys realized from sales thereof, and no further compensation should be made to him for military service in time of peace, but when in actual service in time of war he should in addition receive the same pay as a soldier in the Regular Army.

18. The land force thus provided for Pacific coast defense should include an Infantry and Field Artillery force, and also the force necessary to fully man all coast defenses and fortifications on the Pacific coast. A Cavalry force adequate for all needs on the Pacific coast should be established on 10-acre farms in Nevada, under a plan modeled after the Swiss cavalry reserve system, on Government lands reclaimed and settled by the National Government under a plan similar to the land reclamation and settlement system of Australia. Such a Cavalry force could be made available not only for the defense of the Pacific littoral, but also if needed at any time for defense on either the northern and southern border of the United States, and should be large enough to fully meet those possible needs.

Respectfully submitted.

LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
ROBT. N. BULLA, *President*.

LOS ANGELES, CAL., *January 19, 1916*.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Pedro, Cal., praying that an appropriation be made for the protection of Los Angeles Harbor, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Canners' League, of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to develop the rivers and inland waterways, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. THOMPSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Hugoton, Halstead, Moscow, Logan, Kansas City, Cedar Vale, Goff, and Soldier, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the placing of a stamp tax on bank checks, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Wichita, Kans., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Chapman, Kans., praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wichita, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. GRONNA. I present petitions signed by more than 300 citizens of the State of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation to fix a standard price for patented and trademarked articles. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. GRONNA. I also present a memorial of Center Local, No. 64, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, of Center, and a memorial of the Farmers Club, of Lemmon Township, of North Dakota, remonstrating against an increase in armaments. I ask that the memorials be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorials will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GRONNA. I further present a petition of the Kotana Medical Society, assembled in convention at Williston, N. Dak., praying for an increase in the Medical Corps of the Army. I ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. OLIVER presented a petition of Major McKinley Council, No. 90, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, of Pittsburgh, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hickory, Pa., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Eastern Ohio and Western Pennsylvania Association of Letter Carriers, remonstrating against a reduction in the salaries of letter-carrier collectors, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I present in the nature of a petition a resolution adopted by the Legislature of Virginia in relation to national aid for public roads. I ask that it may be read.

There being no objection, the resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

A joint resolution.

Whereas the Congress of the United States has for many years, and is now, making enormous appropriations of money for the improvement of our waterways and harbors and in the erection of public buildings; and

Whereas the great masses of the people of the State of Virginia and of the United States are deeply interested in the building and maintenance of our public highways; and

Whereas there is now pending in the House of Representatives of the United States a bill, which has been duly reported and on the calendar of that body, appropriating the sum of $25,000,000, and of that amount giving to the State of Virginia the sum of $591,214 for the purpose of the building of roads in the State of Virginia; and

Whereas this bill is of the most vital importance to the people of Virginia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates of Virginia (the Senate concurring), That the Members of the Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States, in both Houses, be, and they are hereby, requested to support the aforesaid bill, or any similar measure which will give the people of Virginia Federal aid in the construction of its public roads, and the clerk of this body is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of the Senators and to each of the Members of the House of Representatives from Virginia forthwith after its adoption.

Agreed to by house of delegates January 19, 1916.

JOHN W. WILLIAMS,
Clerk House of Delegates.

Agreed to by senate January 19, 1916.

O. V. HANGER,
Clerk of Senate.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I have a resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, urging upon the Congress of the United States of America the duty of adequately increasing the military and naval forces of this Government, which I have been asked to present to the Senate, and ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution urging upon the Congress of the United States of America the duty of adequately increasing the military and naval forces of this Government.

Whereas in view of the terrible loss of human lives and of the ruthless methods that have frequently characterized the present European war we may realize in some measure the distress and destruction that would be wrought upon our own land should this Nation become involved in war with any of the great powers; and

Whereas on several occasions the Secretary of State of the United States has made demands that certain fundamental principles of decency and humanity be observed by the participants in this war, demands that this Government is notoriously unable to enforce; and

Whereas it is our sacred duty to preserve inviolate this Republic with its Constitution and traditions of justice, humanity, and liberty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this house of representatives urges upon the President and Congress of the United States the immediate adoption of a definite and continuing policy which shall largely augment our trained and equipped military and naval forces so that this Republic may be adequately prepared to resist invasion, to protect the lives and possessions of its citizens, and to enforce its reasonable and humane demands; and also, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the recording clerk of this house to the Members of the Congress of the United States from this State, with instructions to present them in their respective Houses.

In house of representatives, January 26, 1916. Read and passed.

CLARENCE H. HOWLAND,
Recording Clerk.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the municipal committee of Duluth, Minn., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a Federal building at Duluth, Minn., which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a memorial of the Commercial Club of Blackduck, Minn., remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Coleman, Mich., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. KENYON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Iowa, praying for the placing of an embargo on munitions of war, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KERN presented a petition of 280 citizens of Elkhart, Ind., and a petition of 300 citizens of Kokomo, Ind., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLAPP presented a petition of the Harvey A. Chapin Camp, No. 11, United Spanish War Veterans, of Austin, Minn., praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the printing of the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations, which were referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented a petition of the Medical Society of Blue Earth County, Minn., praying for relief from inability to import drugs and chemicals necessary in treatment of sick, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, N. Y., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Beacon and Aurelius, in the State of New York, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of Louis W. Carlisle Camp, No. 56, United Spanish War Veterans, of Watertown, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of Louis W. Carlisle Camp, No. 56, United Spanish War Veterans, of Watertown, N. Y., praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee presented a petition of sundry citizens of Tennessee, praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. COLT presented a joint resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island, urging upon the Congress of the United States the duty of adequately increasing the military and naval forces of the Government, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented a petition of the State Board of Health of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a national leprosarium, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented a petition of the State Board of Health of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide national assistance to certain tubercular subjects, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 3509) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue a deed to the persons hereinafter named for part of a lot in the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 91) thereon.

Mr. SHIELDS submitted a report (No. 89) to accompany the bill (S. 3331) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3636) to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as reenacted and amended by act of February 23, 1909, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 93) thereon.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 90) thereon. I give notice that to-morrow, if an opportunity is offered, I shall ask the Senate to take up the bill for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

PROHIBITION IN THE DISTRICT.

Mr. JONES. By direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I report back, with amendments and without recommendation, the bill (S. 1082) to prevent the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 92) thereon. I ask that the bill may take its place on the calendar.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that as soon as practicable after the disposition of the so-called water-power bills, or at my first opportunity, I shall move to take up the bill which has just been reported by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BRIDGE ACROSS PEND OREILLE RIVER, WASH.

Mr. JONES. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 3144) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River between the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, in

the State of Washington, and I submit a report (No. 94) thereon. This is a report on an ordinary bridge bill, and I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDRESS BY HON. CYRUS KEHR.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 83):

Resolved, That the manuscript submitted by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] on January 13, 1916, entitled "A national system of highways and landscape designing," being an address delivered before the American Civic Association, of Washington, D. C., on December 31, 1915, by Cyrus Kehr, of Knoxville, Tenn., be printed as a Senate document.

ADDRESS BY HENRY W. FARNAM.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 84):

Resolved, That the manuscript submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] on January 19, 1916, entitled "The seaman's act of 1915," by Henry W. Farnam, professor of political economy at Yale University, be printed as a Senate document.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 4015) granting a pension to Harry H. Williamson;

A bill (S. 4016) granting a pension to James Turnbull;

A bill (S. 4017) granting a pension to Charles A. Finley; and

A bill (S. 4018) granting a pension to Robert H. Cowan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey:

A bill (S. 4019) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Weatherby (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 4020) granting an increase of pension to Perry Wagy (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4021) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah McBee (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 4022) authorizing and directing the Treasurer of the United States to convey certain land in section 21, Huron County, Mich., to the Pointe Aux Barques Resort Association (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 4023) granting a pension to Caroline Carr (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 4024) granting an increase of pension to Celina Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 4025) to grant patent to certain lands to Christian Fredrickson; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 4026) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to abrogate a contract lease of land and water power on the Muskingum River, Ohio; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 4027) granting an increase of pension to Lars Isaneson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 4028) to amend paragraph (a) of section 4 of the act approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 4029) to authorize the appointment of Axel H. Reed, late first lieutenant Company K, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, to be a captain in the Army on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4030) granting an increase of pension to Ellen A. Sheehan (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 4031) granting an increase of pension to George W. Miller (with accompany papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 4032) for the relief of Francis J. Mattler; and

A bill (S. 4033) for the relief of Dudley Simms; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4034) for the relief of Lemuel Stokes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 4035) granting a pension to Mary C. Coleman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4036) granting an increase of pension to William B. Whiteside (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4037) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cox (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4038) granting an increase of pension to William E. Smith (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4039) granting an increase of pension to William H. Sutton;

A bill (S. 4040) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Baker;

A bill (S. 4041) granting an increase of pension to George W. Barger;

A bill (S. 4042) granting a pension to Harvey L. Rutherford;

A bill (S. 4043) granting a pension to Oliver P. Marsh;

A bill (S. 4044) granting a pension to Joseph Phillips;

A bill (S. 4045) granting a pension to Curtis H. Lewis, jr.;

A bill (S. 4046) granting a pension to John H. Elder; and

A bill (S. 4047) granting an increase of pension to John D. Vance (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of Tennessee:

A bill (S. 4048) for the relief of Sullivan County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4049) granting an increase of pension to William L. McGinley;

A bill (S. 4050) granting a pension to Joe E. Campen;

A bill (S. 4051) granting an increase of pension to William H. Kidd; and

A bill (S. 4052) granting a pension to G. W. Leathers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN:

A bill (S. 4054) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Hospital Corps of the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 4055) to create a Tariff Commission and defining its powers and duties; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 4056) to abolish capital punishment in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 4057) granting a pension to Peter Downey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 4058) making an appropriation for the construction of a bridge at Nogales, Ariz.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 89) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan 500 tents and 500 cots for the use of the military training encampment to be held at Fort Douglas, Utah, during the summer months of 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 90) providing for a committee to investigate certain matters relating to the question of the lack of efficient preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ROOSEVELT ROAD, ARIZONA.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I introduce a joint resolution, and inasmuch as it involves an expenditure of money on forest reserves I think it appropriate that it should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, rather than to any other committee of which I can now think. I therefore ask that the resolution, with the accompanying papers, be so referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 88) providing for the repair and rebuilding of Roosevelt Road in Arizona, lying largely within a forest reserve, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. OLIVER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $30,000 to grade and macadamize Portland Street from the intersection of Nichols Avenue SE. to Fourth Street SW., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CLAPP submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $238,024.08 for the relief of Prof. William H. Hart, principal of the Hart Farm School and Junior Republic for Dependent Children, as payment in full for services in the care and maintenance of certain wards of the United States, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill,

which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

OPEN DOOR IN CHINA.

Mr. SHERMAN. I offer a resolution, which I send to the desk and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 86) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas Japan has renewed its demands upon China by presenting certain imperative requests which are similar to those presented about one year ago, such requests being of that character that may result in the exercise by Japan of sovereignty over and in the territory of the Chinese Empire, and it may be an assumption of governmental jurisdiction exclusive in its rights and including certain powers embraced in such demands as will result in the sole right to Japan of trade, navigation, and commerce, which will close a portion of the Chinese territory and some of the Chinese ports to other nations; and

Whereas since 1899 the United States of America has proclaimed, and jointly with certain European powers has established, what is commonly called the open door in China through diplomatic means and by treaty, some of such powers so acquiescing in or declaring of such open-door policy are now at war; and

Whereas such open-door policy in China is designed to protect the commercial rights of American citizens as well as the citizens or subjects of the Governments of Europe, all of which are threatened to be impaired or destroyed by the demands made by the Government of Japan upon China, or the equal treatment of such citizens or subjects may be thereby impaired or destroyed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the open door in China as heretofore declared, interpreted, and applied in behalf of the citizens of this country as well as the citizens or subjects of other countries so concerned is a necessary and vital element in the foreign trade of the United States; that the Senate looks with profound concern upon such demands of the Japanese Government, and will regard such pressure upon China in insisting upon such demands, if granted, as a restrictive act upon the commercial rights of the people of the United States and their Government, and to be in contravention of the assent of the Japanese Imperial Government expressed December 26, 1899; and be it further

Resolved, That the Executive, through its Department of State, be, and is hereby requested, to communicate through proper diplomatic channels the protest of the Senate and its declaration that it can not look with indifference upon the threatened abridgment of the rights of the American people and the Europeans concerned to an equality of treatment in trade, navigation, and commerce in China.

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. SHAFROTH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 85), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

PRINTING OF THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH (S. DOC. NO. 260).

Mr. CHILTON. I ask unanimous consent that the speech of the President before the Railroad Business Association at its banquet in New York last night be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

ADDRESS BY J. CRAWFORD BIGGS.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an address delivered by J. Crawford Biggs, president, before the North Carolina Bar Association at Asheville, N. C., in regard to interference with courts. I ask to have it referred to the Committee on Printing, with a view to its publication as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

GENERAL MOTORS CO., DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, in the course of some remarks I made last week upon the Government manufacture of armor and munitions I used a statement furnished by the legislative reference bureau of the Congressional Library.

One of the items of the statement indicated that the General Motors Co., of Detroit, Mich., had received large contracts for war materials. I have a letter from the president of that company in which he very positively denies that suggestion. As I have been the innocent means, probably, of doing the company some injustice, and desiring that the correction shall be made as public as the charge, I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MOTORS CO.,
DETROIT, MICH., *January 21, 1916.*

Hon. ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have just seen in one of the daily papers that in a recent speech in the Senate you referred to General Motors Co. as having profited by so-called "war orders." This statement was undoubtedly due to misinformation which you have evidently received.

General Motors Co. has never received one dollar from "war orders." It has no contracts for sales of automobiles or any other commodity for war purposes, and never has had any such contracts. It is true that our English branch sold a few trucks to the Red Cross Society for ambulances, but the order was comparatively small, taken in the ordinary course of business, and can not properly be called a "war order." The profit from this sale was only the usual profit which would be realized from any like contract in normal times.

If convenient for you to correct your statement before the Senate, we would greatly appreciate having you do so.

Assuring you of my personal esteem and regard, I remain,

Yours, faithfully,

C. W. NASH, *President.*

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HENRY CABOT LODGE (S. DOC. NO. 263).

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, on the 22d of this month my colleague [Mr. LODGE] delivered a very comprehensive address on preparedness before the National Security League. I ask that it may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 8235. An act to provide for the maintenance of the United States section of the International High Commission was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE NAVY.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, some days since I gave notice that this morning immediately following the routine morning business I should address the Senate. On yesterday, however, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] gave notice that he would desire to address the Senate at this hour. I am very glad now to give place to him, intending, however, to address the Senate at the conclusion of his remarks.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I am very much obliged to the Senator from Montana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, of course everyone knows it is my duty—and I have tried the best I could to perform that duty since I have been chairman of the Naval Committee—to be familiar with conditions at the Navy Department. Imagine my astonishment when I read in the New York Sun of January 22 the following:

The fundamental defect of the Navy Department is that it has no brain, no competent military organization charged with the preparation of the fleets for war and with their conduct in war, and in consequence the Navy is being built and administered on a police basis and is not being efficiently prepared for war service.

Can any of you guess who made this woeful utterance, and where? George von L. Meyer, former Secretary of the Navy. The speech was made at the New Willard Hotel in this city recently before the National Security League, where many of those patriots who are zealously endeavoring to turn the Democrats out of office and get back in themselves had assembled for conference.

There is so much agitation in the public press and there are so many thousands of varying ideas and suggestions from all sources, that the public mind is becoming confused in regard to actual conditions, and there is danger that the Congress will be driven by clamor into rash and unwise actions. I flatter myself—whether it is true or not—that a large majority of my fellow countrymen have absolute reliance upon my integrity. They believe I will tell the truth if I know it. I therefore feel it to be my duty to make the speech I am now making in order to let the world know what I believe to be the exact conditions, and that I feel warranted in saying what I do in regard to the Navy and the Navy Department.

It behooves us all to be on the alert in regard to increasing our Navy and its adjuncts along all reasonable lines. The United States ought to have a navy second only to Great Britain. But we need not lose our heads and run wild in pursuing that object, and above all no one should be unjust and untruthful in criticisms of existing conditions.

I have served on the Naval Committee now upward of 20 years, and while I know less than I could wish, I flatter myself I have kept fairly posted about conditions in that Department.

Looking further, I found this paragraph in Mr. Meyer's speech:

Nothing demonstrates unpreparedness in the Navy more than shortage of personnel. To go on a war basis we are short about 2,000 officers, after employing all that are on the retired list, and about 45,000 men.

Mr. Meyer forgets, if he ever knew, that at the time he left the Navy Department the service was nearly 6,000 short of the authorized enlisted complement; that 46 per cent of the men discharged in good standing were then leaving the Navy, while 85 per cent are now reenlisting; that during his incumbency

there were 10,360 desertions. Mr. Meyer needed men and did the best he knew how to get them, and yet he left the Navy nearly 6,000 short. Yet he has the cheek to hold his successor responsible for conditions which are due wholly to his own shortcomings as Secretary. How can he speak with authority on the Navy's present needs? Who is responsible for the shortage in officers, pray? Everyone knows officers can not be enlisted like sailors. It takes four years to make an officer, or the starting toward the making, for it requires that time to go through Annapolis and graduate, and it will take two or three years more of actual experience on shipboard to become as efficient as an officer ought to be. Is Mr. Daniels responsible because the Republicans in Congress failed to provide the cadets at Annapolis to graduate?

There are to-day 5,959 more enlisted men in the Navy than there were on March 3, 1913. Yet the expense of transportation of enlisted men has been reduced from $893,000 in 1912 to $615,000 in 1915, and the total expense of recruiting has been reduced fully 25 per cent.

In 1912 only 54 per cent of the trained enlisted men remained in the service after completing an enlistment and in 1915 85.5 per cent of such men were retained in service.

These figures tell their own tale, and no comment is needed.

It may be necessary to quarter midshipmen in tents, for the academy will be filled to overflowing if the recommendations of Secretary Daniels are adopted by Congress. The emergency is too pressing, in my opinion, to wait for any building program at all.

I myself would like to see three midshipmen for each Senator and Congressman instead of two. But surely no sensible, honest man can blame the present Secretary for the shortage in officers.

Not only has the total authorized enlistment long since been obtained, but there is a large waiting list.

I speak advisedly, for it is my duty to know and I do know, that there is less envy and jealousy among the naval officers and more efficient cooperation and coordination of the whole department than I have ever seen in it before. As against 10,360 desertions while Mr. Meyer was Secretary—so far about two and a half years—there have been only 4,375 since his successor entered office. With more men in the Navy by several thousand there have been fewer desertions.

The head of the Navy himself is not a pampered and petted darling of inherited wealth, but a red-blooded, upstanding, forward-looking American, who is a graduate in the hard school of experience and a practical man with wholesome ideas. His religion, in a political sense, is that the door of opportunity shall be thrown wide open so that every man may have an equal chance to rise as high as his hopes and merits entitle him to. I predict that Josephus Daniels will go down in history as one of the greatest Secretaries the Navy has ever had. Paying no attention to political or social influences, he has selected as his lieutenants as brilliant a group of officers as the naval service affords. It would take too long to particularize and point out their several achievements and merits.

Although the Navy Department has no "brains" since Von L. Meyer was forced to go by the people, there still remains Admiral George Dewey, admired throughout the world both for his ability as a naval officer and his thorough knowledge gathered in the school of experience of the Navy in all its details. His services in Manila Bay will never be forgotten by the American people. He illustrated to the fullest the skill and heroism of American commanders, commencing with John Paul Jones and coming down through the long list of naval heroes whom every American loves to honor—Decatur, Perry, Lawrence, Farragut, and a score of others. Their names illumine the brightest pages of our history, but the list is too long, and to call them would take too much time.

Full eight months before Mr. Meyer delivered his remarkable lament over the utter absence of concrete war plans there was established the Office of Naval Operations for the purpose of meeting exactly that need, and the duties and responsibilities and authority of the Chief of Naval Operations embrace all the advantages of an Americanized general staff without any of the dangerous disadvantages which Mr. Meyer would import from Prussia.

The Chief of Naval Operations is Rear Admiral William S. Benson, who is not known at all in the drawing-rooms in Washington or Newport, but is loved by all naval officers as a wise, careful, and painstaking officer, with a grasp of naval affairs second to none.

It is men like him who have really made the Navy what it is, not the butterflies of fashion who have used their social and political influence to get detail in Washington or command at sea.

We next come to a South Carolinian about whom I will brag a little, Rear Admiral Victor Blue, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation. His daring at Santiago in locating Cervera's fleet and his going around the city through the jungle signalized his bravery, which is only equaled by his modesty.

At the head of the Bureau of Ordnance is Rear Admiral Joseph Strauss, who has been identified throughout his naval career with that important specialty.

He completed the Government powder factory at Indianhead and was in charge of it when the first powder was made, and its rapid growth has been due largely to his brain and energy.

Rear Admiral David W. Taylor, who is Chief Constructor of the Navy, is a first-honor graduate of Annapolis and a postgraduate with first honors from the British college at Greenwich. He perfected the central line of fire adopted by all the navies in the world, and is considered second to none of his class in any navy.

At the head of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts as Paymaster General is a young man from my own State, Samuel McGowan; I would not brag on a South Carolinian unless he deserved it, but without his consent or knowledge I invite any Senator to visit his bureau at any time and if he can show me wherein it is not the most efficient bureau in the Government service to-day, excepting none, I will apologize for my remarks in regard to Mr. Meyer, and everybody knows how I would hate to do that.

The Surgeon General, Rear Admiral W. C. Braisted, made a report on conditions in the Japanese Army during the Russo-Japanese War which attracted the attention of medical authorities the world over, which certainly proved he has "brains."

Gen. George Barnett, Commandant of the Marine Corps, and Capt. Ridley McLean, the Judge Advocate General, have both done signal work in their special departments. Under the advice of Capt. McLean a great betterment of the entire penal system of the Navy has come about. The number of naval prisoners has been tremendously reduced. The laws of the country, as they affect the Navy, have been codified in a masterly way.

It would fatigue the Senate and take too much of my time to catalogue all the worthy and good naval officers in the department. I have only selected these because of the specially meritorious work they have done.

While Germany had already won second place, as shown in Von Meyer's first report, he never could persuade his party—he tried only half-heartedly—to grant money enough to recover the lost ground. His predecessor, Mr. Metcalf, told the country that we could not hold second place without more dreadnaughts, and Von Meyer's first report notified us that we were already displaced. His report for 1909, four years before his political demise, admits this. It is true the program he recommended that year was quite respectable in size, but his party associates who are now clamoring for the Democrats to make good Republican deficiencies in a naval program did not give him the money. So that it is proven beyond possibility of dispute that the Republican Party is solely responsible for our present status—lack of officers, lack of personnel, and lack of ships.

It makes a great difference whether one is on the inside looking out or whether he is on the outside looking in. When Mr. von L. Meyer was in authority, and must, perforce, answer to the American people for money spent by his department, he was whining about the "economical limit set for the Navy," and was using constantly such words as "the department recommends only." Now that he is on the outside, a partisan desirous of displacing the responsible administration, which is recommending a consistent and continuous building program such as was constantly urged upon Mr. von L. Meyer, he is assuming the attitude of a carping and unreasoning critic, finding fault with others who succeed where he himself failed.

The only act which signalized his incumbency as Secretary was the closing of a few navy yards and recommending the abandonment of others. He advised that "the navy yards at New Orleans and Pensacola be given up and that the Secretary of the Navy be authorized to make such disposition of the Government property under the Navy as may seem best. Both navy yards are entirely unnecessary for the service of the fleet." He closed the Port Royal yard absolutely and wanted to sell the land. The present Secretary has utilized the costly buildings there as a disciplinary barracks; and the result of more humane treatment of prisoners who have been court-martialed is shown in the decreased number of desertions. He abandoned the whole coast between Norfolk and Panama, in effect, and refused absolutely to do anything for Charleston except as a torpedo-boat base. The five yards in the stretch of 678 miles between Norfolk and

Portsmouth were developed actively; and it apparently did not disturb his patriotism or conscience and convict him in his own mind of sectionalism and narrow vindictiveness, because he seemed to feel that the United States stopped at the Potomac River.

Before the ink dried on his commission he kicked out that sensible plan for navy-yard management perfected after four years' study and handling of navy-yard problems by his predecessor, Mr. Newberry. While Mr. Metcalf was Secretary Mr. Newberry was the wheel horse in the Navy Department as Assistant Secretary. Secretary Daniels has revived this plan and is carrying it out as best he can, and its reapplication naturally displeases Mr. Meyer.

In view of all these facts it is safe to predict that the name of Josephus Daniels will be held in grateful memory by the United States Navy long after Mr. von L. Meyer has been forgotten.

Some one has sent me two newspaper clippings, which are so meaty that I will read them myself. One is from The Rochester Herald, which is Independent in politics. It is as follows:

[From The Rochester Herald, an independent newspaper, Monday, Jan. 24, 1916.]

A FOUL BIRD.

The most conspicuous example of a bird befouling its own nest was that presented by George von L. Meyer in his address before the National Security Congress at Washington last Friday. Every sentence uttered by Meyer in criticism of the Navy was a slap at his own administration of the Navy Department, and of his own Republican predecessors, who turned over to a Democratic administration less than three years ago the fruits of 16 years of incompetent Republican management of that department.

If the country had not become thoroughly disgusted with investigations, it would welcome an inquiry into Republican disposal during those 16 years of the hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated by Congress for naval purposes. Our expenditures annually are double those of some of the foreign powers whose navies critics of the Meyer stripe affect to admire. The question is, Why did not Meyer and his predecessors produce something for the money? Evidently much of it was wasted. Who got it? Does Meyer know? If he does, he is rash indeed to publicly call attention to his own lack of proper administration of the office, by which criminal wastefulness was made possible.

The other clipping is from the Portsmouth Daily Chronicle, a Republican paper, and is as follows:

[From the Portsmouth Daily Chronicle, Monday, Jan. 24, 1916.]

Mr. George von L. Meyer, formerly the society head of the Navy, who has been petted at the Court of Russia and has held other society jobs, appeared before the Security League at Washington on Thursday night and stated that the Navy Department was without brains. Unless George is very careful he may be accused of taking the brains with him when he left. The American people do not worship the Von Meyer type of American citizen. If he had his way the real people of America would only be of his set. The Navy would be a whirling society affair with all the ships and their officers and families anchored permanently at Newport. The real Republican party would do well to box up one George L. von Meyer.

I suppose the editor remembered a couplet quite famous a half century or more ago—

Things have come to a pretty pass
When a man can't wallop his own jackass.

Mr. President, before closing this defense of the Navy Department against the wanton, repeated, and unjustifiable attacks of this Thersites I want to have read a letter which Admiral George Dewey wrote Secretary Daniels last May—May 14, 1915. While I am on my feet, I ask permission to have inserted as an appendix to my speech the letter of Secretary Daniels to President Garfield, of Williams College.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. TILLMAN. I should like to have Admiral Dewey's letter read now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE ADMIRAL OF THE NAVY,
Washington, May 14, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I trust that you will be good enough to convey to the mayor and citizens of New York City my sincere regret at my inability to be present at the ceremonies incident to the review of the Atlantic Fleet, and my cordial appreciation of the hospitality they have shown in the reception of the officers and men.

On this occasion I recall with the utmost pleasure, the magnificent welcome I received in their great city upon my return from Manila on board the *Olympia* in September, 1899, and it is a source of deep satisfaction to know that the interest of our citizens in their great Navy has not diminished in the 16 years that have elapsed since that time.

The people of New York have just cause for pride in the fleet now assembled in their harbor. Not only is it composed of the finest and most efficient warships that we have ever had, but it is not excelled, except in size, by the fleet of any nation in the world. Our ships and guns are as good as any in the world; our officers are as good as any; and our enlisted men are superior in training, education, physical development, and devotion to duty, to those of any other navy. (As president of the General Board for the last 15 years, I can say with absolute confidence that the efficiency of the fleet has steadily progressed, and has never been so high as it is to-day.)

However, we need more ships, more officers, and more men, and should continue the wise policy of increasing the size of our Navy, which must ever remain our first and best line of defense. This defense unless adequate is impotent; and adequacy is not reached until the Navy is strong enough to meet on equal terms the navy of the strongest probable adversary.

Very sincerely, yours,

GEORGE DEWEY.

The honorable JOSEPHUS DANIELS,
Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

APPENDIX.

THE PREPAREDNESS OF THE NAVY.

The progress made by the United States Navy during the past two years is reviewed by Secretary of the Navy Daniels in a letter to President Harry A Garfield, of Williams College. President Garfield a few days ago addressed the following inquiry to Secretary Daniels:

"I shall be obliged if you will have sent to me an authoritative statement concerning the present status of the Navy equipment of the United States. I wish to be in a position to meet the statements made by Representative GARDNER of Massachusetts, alleging that the United States is at present unprepared for military emergencies."

In reply to President Garfield, the following letter was sent:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 24, 1915.*

"MY DEAR PRESIDENT GARFIELD: I am in receipt of your recent favor asking for 'an authoritative statement concerning the present status of the Navy equipment of the United States,' and take pleasure in complying with your request as far as is compatible.

"There are now in active service, fully commissioned, 225 vessels of all characters, which is 36 more than were fully commissioned when I became Secretary. There are also 101 vessels of various types, in reserve and in ordinary and uncommissioned, capable of rendering service in war. We have under construction and authorized 77 vessels (9 dreadnaughts, 23 destroyers, 38 submarines, and 7 auxiliaries) as compared with 54 vessels (5 dreadnaughts, 14 destroyers, 23 submarines, 3 gunboats, and 9 auxiliaries which were under construction on March 1, 1913.

"All the vessels enumerated, those in active service and those in reserve, are supplied with munitions of war. No navy makes public the quantity of ammunition and torpedoes, mines, and other implements of naval warfare which it keeps ready. It may be said, however, that within the last two years the quantity of all has been steadily and greatly increased. For example, we have increased the number of mines, on hand and in process of manufacture, by 244 per cent. With reference to torpedoes, the increase in two years has been 90 per cent. By the enlargement of the naval powder factory we shall soon be able almost to double its former capacity, and like enlargement of the torpedo works and the equipment of a plant to construct mines will still further increase, at decreased cost, the quantity of such stock, and the possession of these plants in times of emergency will enable the department to be in a better state of preparedness as regards the supply of ammunition than ever before.

"The personnel of the Navy is at present composed of 4,355 line, staff, and warrant officers and 53,171 enlisted men. Increases in the number of officers are dependent almost entirely upon the output of the Naval Academy, admission to which is restricted by statute. The number of enlisted men also is restricted, and the Navy is to-day recruited to the maximum strength allowed. There are now with the colors 5,824 more men—an increase of 12 per cent—than were on March 1, 1914.

"My professional training as a journalist has always inclined me to the conviction that any officer, within the prescribed limits recognized in the Navy, should feel free to express his opinion in regard to matters in the service; and there is not an officer who commands a ship to-day who could or would say that his ship, without or within, was not as good as it was two years ago, or that the officers who command it and the crews who man it are not as thoroughly disciplined, sober, loyal, and efficient as they were two years ago, or as they ever had been.

"The Atlantic Fleet has just returned from Guantanamo, where it has for many years held its annual winter practices. This year more battleships and destroyers have participated in the maneuvers, and for a longer period, than ever before.

"Under the direction of Admiral Fletcher, upon plans evolved at the Naval War College and approved by the department, the fleet has been busied in tactics to try out its efficiency and readiness. All reports tell of the enthusiasm of officers and men in this practice and the splendid record made by the ships. The fleet is now in Tangier Sound and on the southern drill grounds, where it will be busy in target practice until May, when it moves to New York for a week's well-earned leave. Then will come the review at New York, followed by maneuvers in Narragansett Bay region, and finally the review in Hampton Roads prior to sailing through the Panama Canal to the Pacific en route to the exposition at San Francisco.

"These spring practices followed close upon the heels of valuable maneuvers and tactics in October, November, and December last. This was indeed strenuous practice, but it is the way the Navy is kept fit and ready, and the new admiral in command of the fleet and the department planned such extensive evolutions because the only way that the Navy can be always prepared is by practice and practice and then more practice. This simple statement of the operations of the fleet since October is one of the best answers I can give to your question as to the Navy's preparedness. The necessity of keeping ships in Mexico last year denied Admiral Badger the opportunity for as long practice as he had wisely planned, but the sudden call for the expedition to Vera Cruz demanded and exacted unusual service, to which the fleet responded with an alacrity and readiness which amply justify the faith of the country that there exists to-day no more efficient institution than the United States Navy. Some critics have said the efficiency of the fleet was reduced by reason of going to Vera Cruz. To our regret, certain maneuvers and target practice of value were necessarily omitted. The emergency experience, however, of a year of stress and strain was of far greater value in one important respect than the well-planned routine, because it gave a demonstration of the readiness of the Navy in every department, afloat and ashore, to meet an urgent call. Its flexibility was shown in adjusting itself to entirely new and unexpected situations, as well as its remarkable adaptability in handling every problem presented to it.

"It must be conceded by all that the best school and preparation for war is war itself, and it was almost under this condition that our fleet acted in proceeding almost in a day to Mexican waters. The stay at Vera Cruz, however, did not prevent practice, for the ships

individually or in divisions, during a great part of the time held tactical maneuvers, torpedo-proving practice and subcaliber drills in preparation for target practice.

"For many years officers have written and talked about the formation of advance base material and the practice of exercising landing parties of seamen and marines in the use of this important adjunct to naval warfare. Congress appropriated money for this important plan of campaign, but never until January of last year was the Navy thus exercised. There had been plenty of talk, but not until January of last year was it undertaken. Then, under instructions from the department, Admiral Badger carried out a comprehensive exercise in which the professional advantages gained by officers and men were inestimable. Three months after this extensive practice had been given for the first time in our Navy, the same fleet, and the same men were called upon to land at Vera Cruz, and in the taking of that city the Navy carried out under fire what had been learned at Culebra.

"These details are given because every man knows that the efficiency of the Navy depends upon constant practice, but nobody in the Navy thinks anything like perfection has been reached, and constant study and work are pursued with the aim of continued improvement. If the fleet was efficient in any degree before Admirals Badger and Fletcher carried out the drills thus detailed, it is much more efficient to-day, and it will be made more ready every year. All that capable and trained officers and men can do to accomplish this steady improvement is being done. Only the uninformed or the partisan deny the steady improvement of the past two years, thanks chiefly to Rear Admiral Badger and Admiral Fletcher.

"But, you say, how about equipment and preparation for military emergencies? What has been done since Wilson's inauguration to make the Navy stronger in ships, in ammunition, in mines, in torpedoes? These questions are of the utmost importance. Let me answer them briefly:

"First, as to ships: During the last two years of the Taft administration Congress authorized the construction of two dreadnaughts to cost about $13,000,000 each. During the first two years of the Wilson administration, upon my recommendation, Congress authorized the construction of five dreadnaughts to cost about $14,000,000 each. Stated in dollars, the Wilson administration, in its first two years, authorized $70,0000,000 to be spent on the chief fighting force of the Navy as against $26,000,000 authorized during the last two years of Taft's; stated in numbers, it authorized five dreadnaughts instead of two; and stated in effectiveness, the five dreadnaughts authorized under Wilson will mount 36 more 14-inch guns than the two authorized under Mr. Taft.

"Second, as to submarines: These wonderful agencies of war have astonished the world in the present European conflict. The Sixty-third Congress, elected with Wilson, adopted my recommendation to give us all the money it could for submarines. It ordered the construction of three sea-going submarines, the largest ever authorized by any country, and 23 submarines of the same size and type which have done such fearful execution in the present war. These submarines will cost $16,260,000. Now what was done during the last two years under Taft? Twelve submarines, to cost $7,958,936, were authorized. Some of our submarines are not as perfect as they should be, nor are the submarines of any other nation. Under the administration, however, the board of inspections has adopted stricter tests before accepting submarines from contractors. Nobody has as yet perfected a satisfactory engine or satisfactory battery for submarines. Upon my invitation, Mr. Edison, last year, at the New York Navy Yard, went down into a submarine and closely studied its every feature. He thinks he has a battery that will meet the need. Our tests at the Brooklyn Navy Yard cause us to believe Mr. Edison has the right principle. Without waiting for the completion of his battery, he has been given an order for two, one to be put into an old submarine, accepted before March 4, 1913, whose battery does not give satisfaction, and one for a new submarine which I have ordered built in the Portsmouth (N. H.) Navy Yard. Private firms building submarines have not given entire satisfaction. We have equipped the Portsmouth Navy Yard to build submarines, and by competition between private and Government construction it is hoped that every obstacle may be overcome.

"Third, as to torpedoes: A statement has been put in circulation that the Navy is not making adequate provision to supply itself with torpedoes. The only answer I can make is to state the fact that we either have on hand or have placed orders for all the torpedoes the General Board prescribes. Is this administration going backward in this respect? It would not be proper to make public the number of torpedoes we have on hand, but this much may be said: For every 100 torpedoes which the department had on hand in March, 1913, 96 more are completed or in course of manufacture. Therefore, within a few months, the supply of torpedoes will be almost doubled. Upon my recommendation Congress has enlarged the torpedo plant at Newport, R. I., more than trebling its capacity, and the cost of manufacturing torpedoes has been reduced from $4,202.11 to $3,245.71 each. The reduction has already effected a saving of $326,700.

"AS TO MINES AND MINING.

"During the last two years unprecedented progress has been made in the expansion of our mining equipment. This was begun and was well under way before the last Congress met. The Navy is not, as many suppose, charged with the mining of our harbors. That is a function of the Army. The extent of the mining operations of the Navy is confined to the immediate vicinity of the fleets and such mining as may be necessary on the high seas. For the execution of this work and a further study and development of mines and mining the Navy now has three ships: The *San Francisco* and *Baltimore*, mine layers and mine-depot ships, and the *Dubuque*, mine-training ship. The general board as early as 1908 recognized the need of mine-depot vessels and recommended the conversion of two old cruisers for this purpose. The same year Congress authorized the conversion of the *San Francisco* and *Baltimore*. Work was started on the *San Francisco* June 12, 1908, but was not completed until December 2, 1911. Work on the *Baltimore* was not started until April 5, 1913, and was completed April 1, 1915. As to mine sweepers, a division of seagoing tugs and a division of torpedo boats have recently been equipped with mine-sweeping gear, and the destroyer tender carries mine-sweeping gear for a division of destroyers operating with the fleet. Additional gear is being supplied. At Pensacola during the winter the *San Francisco* and submarine flotilla have been operating jointly in mining exercises. The department has begun the manufacture of mines and in a short time will have 31 mines for every 9 it had two years ago, increasing our stock 244 per cent. By manufacturing mines at a Government station in lieu of purchasing them a saving of $178,750 has been effected.

"AS TO GUNS.

"The bureau of ordnance has developed a 14-inch gun that will shoot farther, shoot straighter, and hit harder than any gun now in use or known to be designed by a foreign country. Based upon former and current prices in contracts for guns and gun forgings we have saved $280,425.33.

"AS TO POWDER.

"Upon my recommendation, Congress increased the capacity of the navy powder factory at Indian Head. When the extension now under way is completed, the capacity will be nearly doubled. The cost of manufacture has incidentally been reduced 2.7 cents per pound, saving already in the cost of powder since manufactured, $150,000.

"AS TO RADIO.

"Radio has at last been successfully installed on submarines and more than 75 other ships, which either had no radio or whose equipment was obsolete, have been supplied with modern equipment. Three entirely new shore stations have been added to the chain: Balboa (Canal Zone), Great Lakes, Ill., and Tutuila, Samoa.

"AS TO AIR CRAFT.

"The European war has emphasized the value of air craft. The Navy has lagged behind in this instrument of war. Last year I appointed a Board of Aviation. It recommended the utilization of the abandoned navy yard at Pensacola as a training and repair station for aviation, and an Aviation Bureau in the department. This has been done. Upon my earnest recommendation Congress appropriated a million dollars to begin upon an elaborate plan the real development of aviation in the Navy. It also approved my request to pay aviators an increase of 50 per cent, and we are organizing a class of capable aviators. To make immediately effective this feature, three new hydroaeroplanes have just been purchased, which is but the beginning of the work of aviation, now well advanced along the lines of a well considered plan. I regard this as one of the most far-reaching steps taken by the Wilson administration.

"AS TO SAVINGS EFFECTED.

"All this unprecedented increase in the Navy has been secured, too, without large increase in appropriations. How? By avoiding unnecessary expenditure ashore, by reducing the cost of work ashore while maintaining its quality, and reducing appropriations for enlargement of shore stations, by securing real competition, and by economy. During the four years of Taft, $21,928,572 was appropriated by Congress for the public works alone of shore stations. Two naval bills have been passed by the present administration, and they carry together, for the public works of shore stations, a total of $3,920,880. We have greatly reduced expenditures ashore and greatly increased them afloat and the above figures attest the change for the better. When I became Secretary, ships could be built in only two navy yards. We have equipped or are equipping five additional navy yards for the construction of navy craft, and this is being done while at the same time there is a big decrease in appropriations ashore. By securing competition, I saved $1,077,210 in one contract for projectiles. Up to date, by first rejecting all bids and demanding more reasonable figures, I have saved $1,110,084 in the purchase of armor plate, securing lower prices than my predecessor secured. In two other bureaus alone last year, $1,800,000 was saved—more than enough to enable Congress to reappropriate one million of the savings for aviation and the balance for submarines. There has been the same character of savings in other ways—too many items to enumerate. So much for the material and preparation. Of course, we need constantly to increase the ships and armament, but the increase in the past two years, larger than in any previous two years in the history of the country, is an earnest of what will come in the regular and orderly and necessary increase of naval equipment.

"AS TO PERSONNEL.

"But of what worth is a ship without well-trained men? What has the Wilson administration done as to personnel? It is a pleasure to tell you that for the first time in years the enlistment is up to the limit prescribed by law and part of the year we have had a waiting list. Since I became Secretary of the Navy we have increased the enlistment 5,824 men, enabling us to commission fully 20 submarines, 4 battleships, 4 destroyers, 6 gunboats, 6 cruisers, and 3 monitors, increasing the total number of commissioned vessels by 41 over the number commissioned on March 1, 1913. I regard this as a great achievement, particularly since the Navy had not formerly been able to secure enough men to fill the quota. It has been secured, too, without letting down the standard for admission, which has been maintained and even raised. For every recruit accepted five were rejected because they did not come up to our high standard. To what is the increase of our enlistments attributed? The answer is easy: To the establishment of schools, opportunity to see the world, and for promotion afforded enlisted men hitherto denied them. In these two years 13 enlisted men have been appointed as assistant paymasters, 5 as midshipmen at Annapolis, and 12 as ensigns. It is true that prior to the Wilson administration it was possible for an enlisted man to be promoted to be ensign, but in the four years of the Taft administration only 3 were promoted, while in the two years of the Wilson administration 11 have qualified. How does this happen? The new policy of education and assistance was put into operation in 1913. Now every ambitious and aspiring young enlisted man is given special instruction when he desires it. Upon my recommendation, Congress passed an act which gives all the positions of pay clerk to these enlisted men who can qualify. This opens 200 more places to enlisted men. It is true to-day as never before that a boy may enlist in the Navy and by the display of ability be promoted to the grade of Admiral. Not only has the enlistment been increased by 5,824 new recruits, but Congress gave us the best reserve bill any nation ever put upon the statute books. While reenlistments have increased 12 per cent, desertions have decreased 17 per cent. Another incentive to enlistment is the new policy which leaves an open door to young men to retire from the Navy other than through the door of the prison, and likewise the modern methods of treating men who have violated rules.

"ABLE EXPERTS SELECTED.

"With special emphasis, I beg you to ask any well-informed man in or out of the service as to the ability and capacity of the various officers whom I have called as advisors and to the heads of the bureaus. You will find that the man selected in each bureau is recognized, both in our own and foreign navies, as an able expert in his line.

"One word more: For years there has been an unsuccessful insistence that Congress should reestablish the grades of Admiral and Vice Admiral. I earnestly urged the last Congress to create these

positions. It authorized three of each. Now American naval officers, while abroad, will no longer be outranked by officers of nations with insignificant navies.

"I have answered your questions at some length. There are two reasons for the length of my letter:

"1. Because these two years have been epoch-making in the Navy, distinguished by more wise and progressive naval legislation and more practical achievement than any previous like period (thanks chiefly to a patriotic Congress), and

"2. Because certain persons, ignorant of their ignorance, and for selfish partisan reasons, have busied themselves with misrepresenting the true condition of the Navy, thereby causing some good people to fear that the Navy is not now, as in the past, the strong effective right arm of the Republic. All who would learn the truth may be assured that the Navy of 1915 is larger, better equipped, and in better condition than in any previous year, and that the fleet is becoming more efficient with every passing month. 'We shall take leave to be strong upon the sea in the future as in the past,' declared President Wilson in his message to Congress; and in the interest of the self-respecting peace, which is the only peace worth preparing for, it is devoutly to be hoped that this strength may not be questioned by others or endangered from within. The record above outlined shows that what President Wilson promised for the Navy has been fulfilled.

"Sincerely, yours,

"JOSEPHUS DANIELS,
"Secretary of the Navy."

INTERFERENCES WITH AMERICAN TRADE ABROAD.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on October 21, 1915, the Department of State transmitted to our ambassador at London, for presentation to the British secretary for foreign affairs, a lengthy note setting out the attitude of our Government concerning the Order in Council of date March 11, 1915, and referring in more or less detail to impediments to which neutral ships plying to and from our ports have been subjected. It was in the nature of an omnibus protest, embracing, or at least alluding, to whatever controversies were then pending growing out of interferences, or threatened interferences, on the part of Great Britain with ships carrying our commerce, pursuant to or as a part of her war policy and operations. A schedule was attached classifying the various ways in which such ships had been harassed and annoyed—specific instances, the names of the ships and the dates of the incidents being given in illustration. Omitting particulars, this indictment was as follows:

First. Vessels whose cargoes and papers have been of such a character as to require but brief time for examination have been held in British ports, according to this Government's information, for prolonged periods, in some instances for more than a month, and then released without the institution of prize-court proceedings.

Second. Vessels have been held until they have reconsigned their cargoes to a consignee in a neutral country designated by the British Government.

Third. Detentions have been made without evidence amounting to probable cause.

Fourth. Vessels have been held, according to statements of the British Government, because of the manner in which shipments have been consigned.

Fifth. Goods have been seized by the British Government on the ground, as this Government has been informed, that the country to which they were shipped had not prohibited export.

Sixth. The British authorities have repeatedly seized articles classified as contraband, articles classified as conditional contraband, as well as noncontraband goods, shipped to Scandinavian countries, to the Netherlands, and to Italy, then neutral, although the reexportation of such commodities from these countries had been forbidden.

Seventh. Detentions have been made pending assurances that embargoed goods would be allowed to pass through a neutral country to Great Britain's allies.

Eighth. From time to time this Government has been informed of the seizure of cargoes on the ground that consignees have been known to trade with the enemy or because they were suspected of doing so.

Ninth. Vessels have been seized and brought into port and have been required by the British authorities to pay pilotage, harbor, unloading, warehouse, storage, or other dues, costs, and expenses in advance of a judicial determination of the validity of the seizure of vessel or cargo.

Tenth. Detention of vessels proceeding from European ports.

The last count was made more definite by the following recital in the bill of particulars:

The steamer *Neches*, which sailed from Rotterdam to the United States, was brought to London and compelled, in June last, to discharge cargo on the ground, apparently, that the goods originated partly in Belgium. The vessel was detained about a month, and, after having been damaged to the extent of approximately £1,500, as a result of a collision with another vessel while under the control of the British Admiralty, and after having been involved in litigation growing out of such collision, was allowed to proceed.

After the lapse of nearly three months no answer has been received to the communication of our Government which assailed the Order in Council as violative of its sovereignty and the practices of which it complained as lawless and indefensible.

It is quite to the credit of our people that no clamor arose concerning the aggressions of which the note makes mention, and others no less flagrant occurring since it was dispatched, while every effort was being made to exact compliance by the central powers with the laws of nations touching the safety of our citizens traveling the high seas in belligerent ships and to compel reparation for the lives of those lost by the wanton disregard of such laws.

Happily, those differences are in course of adjustment in a way which will leave unimpaired the principle that the lives of travelers on the high seas, sailing in unarmed merchant ships, may not be put in jeopardy by a belligerent whatever may be the emergencies of war. So much at least is saved out of the wreck of the system of international law.

It is scarcely worth debating whether such results as have been achieved were induced by our representations and protests, or whether, as has been querulously advanced, the submarine operations of the offending powers had been rendered ineffective by the activity of their enemies, whose naval successes disposed the former to make a virtue of necessity. It is enough that the principle involved has been acknowledged and is preserved. The public mind may now very well be directed to the controversies pending with Great Britain, growing out of her efforts to reduce her adversaries through her command of the seas, without due regard, as our Government asserts, to the rights of neutrals, the preservation of which has devolved upon us as a duty to civilization which we can not honorably avoid.

AMERICAN MISREPRESENTATION OF AMERICAN PRECEDENTS.

A disposition is noticeable on the part of certain journals of more or less influence to stigmatize any criticism of the acts and policy involved in the pending negotiations with the British foreign office as prompted by sympathy with Germany, and to characterize anyone who might venture modestly to champion the position our State Department has felt obliged to assume as a "hyphenate" willing to embroil our country in war that the cause of another nation may be advanced. These aspersions may be dismissed without comment. They may gain some favorable notice for their authors among those in whose interest they are made. It is inconceivable that any public servant should be deterred from uttering his convictions or from acting in accordance with them in consequence of such comment.

More serious is the persistent assertion on the part of the same class of publications that the aggressions concerning which such vigorous protest has been made are fully justified by the course our Government pursued during the Civil War. This heresy is so inveterate as to defy both history and reason. The inculcation of it is particularly vicious at this time, when, as always in the case of international complications, the Nation ought to give loyal support, if possible, to its authorized representatives.

"Our country, may she always be right, but right or wrong, our country," is a very proper sentiment for an officer of the Navy. It can not be commended as one generally to be harbored, but the patriotic citizen will at least give his country the benefit of the presumption that she is in the right. He may well leave it to her enemies to distort the law and misrepresent the facts to put her in the wrong.

If, in the general sweeping assertion that the course of Great Britain in the present war touching neutral ships is in accordance with practices we ourselves observed or originated, any attempt is made to particularize, it is declared that we blockaded the ports of neutral countries which were gateways for the admission of goods to and the passage of goods from the States of the Confederacy, likewise in a state of blockade, and that our courts devised and our Navy applied the doctrine of "continuous voyage," which, it is assumed, is now being combatted by our Government. For the present it will be sufficient to say that we never did blockade and never pretended to have blockaded any neutral port during the Civil War or at any other time, and no one in authority in this country has questioned the right of Great Britain to apply the doctrine of "continuous voyage" in all its vigor to commerce ostensibly neutral, or intimated the impropriety of her doing so.

A newspaper that goes into the hands of nearly every Member of Congress daily printed a few days since an editorial, from which the following is taken:

"This newspaper has repeatedly pointed out that conditions, as affecting American trading privileges, would be much worse if the London admiralty would apply literally the rules laid down by the United States in Civil War times.

"There has been manifest indisposition at London to go so far as the United States then went. But this mildness has not been appreciated by anti-British agitators, and it is now proposed that the full rigors of

American Civil War procedure be enforced against commerce destined or suspected of being destined to neutrals. If that be done, the blockade will be more effective, and at the same time more easily defended as against American criticism.

"The Northcliffe newspapers are prominent in demanding this change of policy by the British Government. What it means has been set forth in this paper repeatedly. The London Mail now presents the matter from the British viewpoint, thus:

"'The British nation is now face to face with the fact that the so-called blockade of Germany is a sham. The evidence gathered by Basil Clarke and the admissions of Lord Lansdowne supplement each other. If the war is to be won, the blockade must be tightened and made a reality. If the blockade is to be tightened, there is only one way—put the admiralty in charge, let the sailors take the necessary action, and let the foreign office stick to its proper business of explaining the sailors' business to neutral states in soothing and dignified terms.

"'From New York the warning reaches us that fresh protests against the present half-hearted blockade are expected from the United States. If the allies are wise, they will lose no time in putting the blockade on an American basis, so that American legal rulings and precedents may be cited in our behalf. The first step is for Great Britain, France, and Russia jointly to declare a blockade of the entire German coast.

"'The editorial instances the allied submarine activities in the Baltic as removing the greatest difficulty in the path of the blockade and says that the extension of the list of contraband is a matter of extreme urgency.'"

It quotes then, again, from the London paper:

"There is good American precedent for this. In the case of the Confederacy the United States seized all cotton, contending that it was as much munitions of war as powder and ball, for it furnished the chief means of obtaining these indispensables of warfare. The more widely the contraband list is drawn the better, as the American Supreme Court has allowed a cargo when contraband to be seized on suspicion, even though on a neutral ship bound to a neutral port. By taking these steps we place the blockade strictly on a legal footing, and acting on the advice of our best friends, the United States, who for months have been asking in wonder why we do not proclaim a blockade.

"If there must be friction with neutrals—and the sham blockade has generated this as much if not more than the real article would have done—let us make certain that the precedents are on our side. Then we can point out that it is impossible for us to sacrifice our vital legal rights for the sake of neutral powers.

"We can remind critics that the United States in 1861–1865 did not relax the blockade of the South because Lancashire was starving, and we did not ask them to do it. So the British nation is not going to let go. Its very existence is at stake. It is going to insist on a real blockade of Germany and will make short work of its ministers if they do not convert their sham blockade into a real strangle hold."

Then the editorial continues:

"Nothing could be more desirable at this time than that amateurs in international law should inform themselves about blockades and their operation; should learn accurately and in detail the part this Nation has played in making the world's law on this subject. The spectacle of ignorance criticizing that intelligence has not been edifying, nor is it calculated to flatter American vanity."

It is not difficult to discern in this editorial a note of glee that American commerce is to be burdened still further that the ultimate triumph of the allies may be assured. An article in the same paper on the day following that on which the comment quoted appeared contained the following:

"The allies will be following the rules made by the United States in the Civil War and established, long after that war, by arbitral tribunals on behalf of the United States and England. * * * That Britain now intends to extend the blockade to neutral ports, precisely as the United States extended it to Nassau, in the Bahamas, and to Matamoras, in Mexico, during the Civil War, was clearly foreshadowed sometime ago in a dispatch of Sir Edward Grey:

"'If a blockade can only become effective by extending it to neutral commerce passing through neutral ports, such an extension is defensible and in accordance with principles which have met with general acceptance.'"

In the case of the *Peterhoff* (5 Wall., 28) the Supreme Court of the United States asserted that the mouth of the Rio Grande was not included within any proclamation of blockade; that the port of Matamoros never was blockaded; and that this Government could not, while it remained at peace with Mexico, blockade its ports or found any rights upon a claim that they or any of them were in a state of blockade.

As to Nassau, it is sufficient to say that no excuse can be offered for asserting that it was blockaded, or that the United States ever pretended that it was. Our Navy seized various ships bound for that port, carrying cargoes which were, in fact, destined for some port in the Confederate States, not because Nassau was in a state of blockade, but because the ultimate destination of the goods they carried was a blockaded port to which they were to be hurried from Nassau at the first opportunity. The doctrine of "continuous voyage" was applied, and the cargoes held subject to seizure and confiscation equally as though the ships were proceeding direct from Liverpool or London to Charleston or Savannah.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana for information as to whether it was ever the claim on the part of the British Government that there was a blockade of Nassau, or does the claim simply come from some other source than the British Government?

Mr. WALSH. I have never heard from any British source the claim that Nassau was blockaded. That idea apparently originated here.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I think he can safely say that no English law writer has ever suggested that the Government of the United States blockaded a neutral port. That suggestion has come solely from the Tory press of the United States.

Mr. WALSH. The distinction between a seizure of a ship for carrying contraband and for running a blockade is perfectly plain to any ordinary intelligence, and confusion is likely only in the minds of those who will not see. A seizure of contraband can be made because it is such only when it is going into the enemy country, either directly or indirectly. A ship is liable to capture and to confiscation with her cargo for attempting either to enter or to depart from a blockaded port, which must of necessity be an enemy port.

Applying these principles, as to which there was no room for controversy between this country and Great Britain when the present war began, if, indeed, they were not acknowledged by all maritime nations, to the problems that confront us, and it follows that the allies may seize contraband on the high seas consigned to a port of Holland, for instance, but in reality destined for Germany; and that, conceding a blockade of German ports to be maintained, they may (1) capture and confiscate any vessel attempting either to enter or depart from any such port, together with their cargoes of whatever character they may be; and (2) seize any vessel carrying goods to a neutral port and confiscate such part of her cargo as can be shown to be destined for Germany, to which it is to be carried by sea through a blockaded port; in other words, goods destined for Germany that must run the blockade in order to enter that country are subject to confiscation. But a vessel issuing from a port of Holland en route to America is not subject to molestation whatever may be the character of her cargo. England can not blockade the ports of Holland while she remains at peace with that nation as she may those of Germany, with which country she is at war. So far as any obstacle has been placed by the allies upon the passage of dyestuffs, sugar-beet seed, potash, or any goods of German origin through the ports of Holland to this country, the interference has been lawless and in contempt of the neutral nations affected—that nation from whose port the vessel detained sailed, the nation whose flag she bore, and the nation to which the goods she carried were bound.

So noncontraband goods that need pass no blockade in order to enter Germany, consigned to a neutral port from which they are to proceed overland to the enemy country, can not, except in defiance of international law, be held. If there are any articles of commerce passing in trade from this country to Germany not on the contraband lists of the allies, their detention en route is equally lawless. Multitudes of articles are found in such lists, the inclusion of which can be justified by no rule of reason. It would be a service of no mean order if some one would canvass these lists to show, as did the Senator from Georgia a few days ago in the case of cotton and foodstuffs, how plainly such lists violate in many particulars accepted canons of the laws of nations and how often they have been denounced, in principle, by the statesmen, publicists, and jurists of the nations that have issued them. For the present I content myself with directing attention to those aspects of the controversy that involve no disputed questions of fact. I shall assume that every article on the lists of contraband is legitimately and justifiably there. I shall assume that an effective blockade of the North Sea ports of Germany has been maintained and that the Order in Council of March 11 possesses all the virtue of a proclamation of blockade which it is now urged ought to be promulgated.

UNITED STATES NEVER BLOCKADED NEUTRAL PORTS.

I recur to the wholly baseless suggestion, repeated in substance in the heat of debate in this chamber only recently, that the United States is complaining of rules of naval warfare which it developed in the Civil War.

President Lincoln's proclamation of April 19, 1861, declared the intention of the Government "to set on foot a blockade of the ports," not of any neutral State, but of "the States aforesaid" which, as recited in the proclamation, were the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. Subsequently by a proclamation dated April 27, 1861, the blockade was extended to the States of Virginia and North Carolina, which proclamation asserted that "an efficient blockade of the ports of those States will also be established."

Foreign Governments were advised "that it was intended to blockade the whole coast from the Chesapeake Bay to the Rio

Grande." The question presented in the case of the *Peterhoff* was whether the blockade extended to the entire mouth of the Rio Grande, forbidding access to the Mexican port of Matamoros, situated on the right bank of that river opposite Brownsville, in the State of Texas. No such audacious pretension as the assertion of a right to blockade the ports of Mexico generally in order to intercept trade overland between them and the States of the Confederacy was ever made by anyone speaking for the United States. When the so-called Matamoros cases, including the one specifically referred to, came before the Supreme Court, it was claimed, among other reasons advanced in justification of the captures, that the blockade embraced not all the ports of Mexico but that of Matamoros only, because of its situation with reference to the boundary stream. The court in its opinion entered upon an inquiry, to which it was led in view of the contention to which reference has been made, of the right of a belligerent to blockade the mouth of such a stream; and, after reviewing cases on which some reliance was placed, asserted:

"It is sufficient to say that none of them support the doctrine that a belligerent can blockade the mouth of a river occupied on one bank by neutrals with complete rights of navigation."

The court took some pride, doubtless, in being able to add:

"We have no hesitation, therefore, in holding that the mouth of the Rio Grande was not included in the blockade of the ports of the rebel States and that neutral commerce with Matamoros, except in contraband, was entirely free."

No English writer on international law pretends that this Government ever sought to interdict innocent trade through Mexican or other neutral ports as a means of overcoming the Confederacy.

Hall's International Law says:

"During the Civil War the courts of the United States conceded that trade to Matamoros, on the Mexican shore of the Rio Grande, was perfectly lawful."

And Oppenheim, a modern English writer of the very highest authority, in his compendious treatise on international law, refers to the subject in the following language:

"When, in 1863, during the blockade of the coast of the Confederate States, the Federal cruiser *Vanderbilt* captured the vessel *Peterhoff*, destined for Matamoros, on the Mexican shore of the Rio Grande, the American courts released the vessel on the ground that trade with Mexico, which was neutral, could not be prohibited."

The proclamation of President Lincoln under which the blockade of the southern ports was inaugurated speaks for itself, and refutes the claim that any Mexican or other neutral ports were within its terms. If it was to any extent ambiguous as to the port of Matamoros, the Supreme Court had no difficulty in arriving at the conclusion that there was no purpose on the part of the military branch of the Government to violate the established principles of international law by attempting to make it effective to restrain innocent commerce with that port. The contention made in that behalf was rejected by the court not only upon the plain language of the proclamation, but upon a consideration of the authorities, which denied to a belligerent the right to blockade the mouth of a stream which formed the common boundary between the country of its enemy and that of a neutral. The court declared laconically that "Matamoros was not and could not be blockaded."

BLOCKADE OF NEUTRAL PORTS FORBIDDEN BY LAW OF NATIONS.

The principle announced had universal acquiescence from the powers participating in the Naval Conference of 1909, and was expressed tersely in the once celebrated but now contemned London Declaration, as follows:

"ARTICLE 1. A blockade must not extend beyond the ports and coasts belonging to or occupied by the enemy."

The report of the drafting committee has the following comment on this article:

"Blockade, as an operation of war, can be directed by a belligerent only against his adversary. This very simple rule is laid down at the start, but its full scope is apparent only when it is read in connection with article 18."

The article referred to is as follows:

"The blockading forces must not bar access to neutral ports or coasts."

Concerning it the report mentioned says:

"This rule has been thought necessary the better to protect the commercial interests of neutral countries. It completes article 1, according to which a blockade must not extend beyond the ports and coasts of the enemy, which implies that, as it is an operation of war, it must not be directed against a neutral port, in spite of the importance to a belligerent of the part played by that neutral port in supplying his adversary."

These axiomatic declarations of the Conference express in slightly different language the rule on the subject as it was presented by Great Britain in her formal memorandum presented to the assembly. It will be recalled that Sir Edward Grey, in his invitation to the powers, suggested that they "interchange memoranda setting out concisely what they regard as the correct rule of international law" on the points to be considered at the conference.

The subject of "blockade" in the memorandum submitted by him on behalf of the British Government was introduced by the following proposition:

"1. A blockade is an act of war carried on by the warships of a belligerent detailed to prevent access to or departure from a defined part of the enemy's coast."

Not the coast of a *neutral*, but an *enemy's* coast.

It has been advanced in this connection that though the Supreme Court eventually held that the blockade could not be legitimately extended to include Matamoros, the decision did not come until after the war was over, and that meanwhile our naval forces seized all vessels trading to that port upon the assumption that it was in a state of blockade. In other words, it is offered that our Navy during the Civil War ruthlessly disregarded the rights of a friendly neighboring power by blockading its ports, and that we ought not now to complain because of like conduct on the part of the allies through which our trade is injuriously affected. Bad as that logic is, the assumed facts upon which it rests are wanting.

The capture of the *Peterhoff* was made and was justified by the court because the ship was carrying contraband as a part of her cargo destined to Texas. It was submitted to the court whether for this offense the ship, too, should not be condemned. The court held that the captors having found contraband aboard, it was their duty to bring the ship in for adjudication, and accordingly costs were awarded against her, a burden the court felt the less hesitancy about imposing in view of the fact that her captain had, in anticipation of capture, thrown overboard a package believed to contain incriminating papers. The search of the boarding officers having revealed the contraband articles, the vessel was brought before the prize court. It would have been quite unnecessary to examine into the character of her cargo if she was subject, in the opinion of the naval commander who overhauled her, or under any instructions issued to him by his Government, to seizure because her port of destination, Matamoros, was in a state of blockade. In such a case he would have taken her, whatever the nature of her cargo. I repeat, the *Peterhoff* was captured because she was carrying contraband, not because she was atempting to run a blockade to reach the port of Matamoros. It was the duty of counsel to place before the court every consideration of law or fact that, in his judgment, might uphold the seizure and secure the most comprehensive adjudication of condemnation. He advanced that Matamoros was a blockaded port; that was rejected. He advanced that the real destination of the ship was Brownsville—that, in fact, her cargo was to go to that port by lighters and not to Matamoros; that was rejected. He advanced that the noncontraband part of her cargo was to go overland from Matamoros to some point in Texas and therefore should be confiscated; that was rejected.

TRADE WITH ENEMY COUNTRY THROUGH NEUTRAL PORTS, EXCEPT IN CONTRABAND, NOT SUBJECT TO INTERRUPTION.

This leads to the consideration of a feature of the case of transcendant importance at the present juncture. Perhaps no incident of the war has more profoundly stirred the human heart or aroused a keener sense of man's inhumanity to man than the refusal of the allies to allow milk to be introduced into Germany through the ports of Holland for the sustenance of the babes of the countries in arms against them.

Of the legitimacy of efforts to starve the noncombatants of an enemy country in order to drive the authorities into submission or to sue for peace, it is useless to inquire. The reduction of beleagured cities by famine rather than by assault is a method of warfare that may claim the sanction of great age, at least. It is open to suspicious minds, too, to speculate upon whether it can be that the dairy industry of Germany is in such a state of paralysis that milk can not be supplied to meet the requirements of starving babies.

No matter. By what right is anyone in this country forbidden to send milk, if he chooses to do so, to Germany overland through Holland? Milk has not yet been included in any lists of contraband. It would be absurd that it should be, but not much more so than that many of the articles so classified are found in them. Rubber gloves for nurses may be excluded because the material of which they are made is classified as contraband, but milk thus far has been regarded as innocuous as an instrument or equipment of war.

In the *Peterhoff* case the court found it settled by an unbroken line of English authorities that noncontraband goods destined to a neutral port from which they were to be transshipped by land to the enemy country were not subject to

seizure as prize, and having given its assent to the doctrine they announced, declared:

"We must say, therefore, that trade between London and Matamoros, even with intent to supply from Matamoros goods to Texas, violated no blockade, and can not be declared unlawful."

And this declaration was followed by the following announcement of the principles and the duty of the court in the premises:

"Trade with a neutral port in immediate proximity to the territory of one belligerent is certainly very inconvenient to the other. Such trade, with unrestricted inland commerce between such a port and the enemy's territory, impairs undoubtedly, and very seriously impairs, the value of a blockade of the enemy's coast. But in cases such as that now in judgment we administer the public law of nations, and are not at liberty to inquire what is for the particular advantage or disadvantage of our own or another country. We must follow the lights of reason and the lessons of the masters of international jurisprudence."

In this the court but paraphrased the language used by Sir William Scott in 1801 in the case of the *Stert* (4 Rob., 65), Holland being blockaded, goods were sent from Edam, near Amsterdam, by inland transportation to Emden in Hanover, a neighboring State, with which England was at peace, and were captured on the sea en route to London. He released the goods though it was advanced that if such trade were permitted it would defeat, partially at least, the object of the blockade, namely, to cripple the trade of Holland; but he observed—

"If that is the consequence, all that can be said is that it is an unavoidable consequence. It must be imputed to the nature of the thing which will not admit a remedy of this species. The court can not on that ground take upon itself to say that a legal blockade exists where no actual blockade can be applied."

Sir William Scott, afterwards Lord Stowell, before whom most of the prize cases originating during the earlier Napoleonic wars were heard, is justly esteemed at home and abroad as one of the greatest expositors of the law of prize of any age or nation.

He applied the principle to the case of goods going overland from Amsterdam to Rotterdam when, for reasons satisfactory to its Government, his country had blockaded the former port but had not proclaimed a blockade of the latter. These were cases of goods proceeding from a blockaded port to a neutral port for transshipment. He enforced the same principle in the case of goods proceeding from a neutral port to a neutral port for transport by land to the enemy country. In that case the goods were shipped from London to Emden for transshipment to Amsterdam when Holland was under blockade.

Sir Robert Phillimore, who attained a high reputation as a practitioner in prize cases in England and afterwards became a judge of the High Court of Admiralty and a member of the privy council, in his Commentaries upon International Law, expresses the rule of these cases in this brief sentence:

"Trade of a neutral to or from a blockaded country by inland navigation or transportation is lawful."

He supports this statement by reference to the *Peterhoff* case, "in which," he says, "the law is well summed up."

Two principles, concerning which none ventured to cavil even before this war began, may be thus stated:

First. Neutral ports can not be blockaded, from which it follows that goods issuing from them, whatever their character, not destined directly or indirectly to the enemy country can not be interfered with by a belligerent.

Second. Noncontraband goods may freely enter neutral ports though destined for the enemy country by inland transportation, notwithstanding a blockade.

PRINCIPLE OF FREE SHIPS, FREE GOODS VIOLATED BY MARCH ORDER IN COUNCIL.

On March 1, 1915, the British ambassador communicated to the Department of State the purpose of his Government and that of France to "take into port ships carrying goods of presumed enemy destination, ownership, or origin."

It was, accordingly, proposed that any goods proceeding from this country to Germany or Austria, including noncontraband goods, should be seized though routed by a port of Holland by rail to their ultimate destination, in disregard of principle 2.

It was proposed that goods of German origin reaching Amsterdam, for instance, by land transportation and on the sea en route for America for consumption there should be seized in disregard of principle 1.

It was proposed that goods owned by a German or Austrian, wherever they were found on the high seas and in neutral vessels, and wherever they were bound, should be seized. This was in flagrant violation of the principle that "free ships make free goods," to which, after a long and historic struggle, Great Britain acceded by the treaty of Paris, in 1856.

This feature was met by an immediate telegraphic protest from our Government. It would be pleasing to be able to note that in one particular Great Britain had been recalled to an observance of the rules of maritime warfare intended to limit the burdens to which infuriated belligerents might be disposed to subject neutral commerce. For a brief space it appeared that she had been.

In a note dated March 15, 1915, the British foreign office advised our ambassador that the allies "restrict their claim to the stopping of cargoes destined to or coming from the enemy's territory," which, it will be observed, was a disclaimer of a purpose to seize goods simply because they were enemy owned. But this hope was dispelled by the order itself, which bore date March 11, 1915, under which such goods were plainly subjected to the risk of seizure, as will appear from paragraphs 3 and 4 thereof, as follows:

"3. Every merchant vessel (a Dutch vessel, for instance) which sailed from her port of departure (New York, for instance) after the 1st of March, 1915, on her way to a port other than a German port (Rotterdam, for instance), carrying goods with an enemy destination, or with enemy property, may be required to discharge such goods in a British or allied port. Any goods so discharged in a British port shall be placed in the custody of the marshal of the prize court, and, unless they are contraband of war, shall, if not requisitioned for the use of His Majesty, be restored by order of the court upon such terms as the court may in the circumstances deem to be just to the person entitled thereto.

"4. Every merchant vessel (a Dutch vessel, for instance) which sailed from a port other than a German port (Rotterdam, for instance, to New York) after the 1st of March, 1915, having on board goods which are of enemy origin or are enemy property may be required to discharge such goods in a British or allied port. Goods so discharged in a British port shall be placed in the custody of the marshal of the prize court, and if not requisitioned for the use of His Majesty shall be detained or sold under the direction of the prize court. The proceeds of goods so sold shall be paid into court and dealt with in such manner as the court may in the circumstances deem to be just: *Provided*, That no proceeds of sale of such goods shall be paid out of court until the conclusion of peace, except on the application of the proper officer of the Crown unless it be shown that the goods had become neutral property before the issue of this order: *Provided also*, That nothing herein shall prevent the release of neutral property of enemy origin on the application of the proper officer of the Crown."

For convenience of reference, Mr. President, I send to the desk a copy of the order in full, and ask that it may be printed as an appendix to my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WALSH. Earl Grey, moved perhaps by the insensate demand to "put the admiralty in charge" and to "let the foreign office stick to its proper business of explaining the sailor's business to neutral States in soothing and dignified terms," in his note of July 24, 1915, explained this obvious inconsistency between the language of the order and that of his letter transmitting it by saying that enemy ownership would be regarded as evidence of enemy origin or destination, and he indicated that it was a concession that goods in neutral ships owned by enemies of Great Britain were allowed to pass when "enemy ownership would afford no evidence of such origin or destination." The implied threat of seizure of such goods when in the opinion of a zealous naval officer the conclusion of enemy origin or destination is a proper one from the fact of enemy ownership, no doubt operates effectively to keep such goods off the water, so that the principle of "free ships—free goods" has, in principle as well as for practical purposes, gone likewise into the scrap heap.

Just what is to be gained by a formal proclamation of blockade, recently threatened and to be enforced, as has been the Order in Council, against neutral ports as to all goods of "enemy origin or destination," is not clear, unless it be that the prospect of confiscation is looked to further to deter shipments of such goods. It is scarcely to be conceived that an actual blockade of neutral ports is contemplated, since such a course would be tantamount to a declaration of war against all Europe not now in arms.

Commerce has been carried on with neutral countries ever since the order of March 11 was promulgated under the restrictions which would obtain in the case of a blockade of the German ports, with the added burdens referred to, though the penalty of confiscation was not in all cases to be visited upon the offending American citizens who should, in accordance with his indisputable rights under the laws of nations, attempt to bring his goods out of Germany or send thither noncontraband articles through a neutral port. He might or might not, in the discretion of the prize court, when it should in its own good time get around to his case, award him compensation on the basis of the English market.

It needs no elucidation that ordinary trade could not be carried on under such conditions. Some individuals might care to take the chances with respect to goods of limited quantity which, for special reasons, they might desire inordinately to get through. Others who would not scruple to engage in contraband trade might be tempted to try it on no small scale, but the aggregate volume of business that would be or that has been carried on is small compared with the volume that would have been developed had a way been found to give to international

law more than an academic character. Even before the promulgation of the Order in Council of March 11, when commerce with Germany in everything not contraband was theoretically free, it was found possible to paralyze it. How this was accomplished in the case of cotton, without even declaring it contraband, has been told you. Copper was not declared conditional contraband until September 21, 1914, or absolute contraband until October 29, 1914, all but three months after the war began, but no copper had meanwhile gone to Germany.

No particularization is necessary to impress upon the mind the seriousness of the denial of our right to import freely through neutral ports goods originating in Germany or Austria. The textile manufacturer has made himself heard in consequence of interferences with shipments of dyestuffs; the cotton farmer appreciates, if no one else does, what it is to be without potash fertilizer; the sugar-beet grower will scarcely be convinced of the superior excellence of Montana beet seed until time shall have demonstrated it. The seriousness of the interruptions in our export trade, for which justification is claimed under the March Order in Council, has had less consideration, very likely, because so few articles of consequence were nominally free to pass to Germany even before it was promulgated. Phosphate rock, however, is a commodity that was overlooked in the preparation of the allies' lists of contraband. It is an important commercial product of the States of Florida, Tennessee, and South Carolina. Deposits of very great extent and value are known to exist in several of the Rocky Mountain States, but only a relatively small quantity from those fields has yet gone into the channels of commerce. We exported this product to the value of $9,996,558 in 1913. Seventy-eight per cent of the total production comes from the State of Florida and a little more than the yield of that State normally goes abroad, Germany being our best customer. At least one-half of all we have been accustomed to ship across the sea was absorbed by that country, finding its way either through its ports or those of adjacent countries.

During the first 10 months of 1915 we contrived to get $7,450 worth into Germany, or rather so much left our ports for Germany, as against $2,701,105 worth for a like period during 1913, while the shipments to the Netherlands fell more than 50 per cent and Belgium took nothing, though her normal importation annually amounts to nearly a million dollars.

On June 8, 1915, the American steamship *F. J. Lisman*, New York to Rotterdam, was brought into the port of London and 1,000 barrels of phosphate removed from her for disposition by the prize court. It will be borne in mind that phosphate is not contraband, either absolute or conditional. The seizure must find whatever justification it can have in the Order of March 11, it being claimed, doubtless, that the ultimate destination of this portion of the cargo was Germany, to which it was to go by inland transportation from Rotterdam. There is here no disputed question of fact unless it be asserted by the shippers that this particular consignment was for consumption in the Netherlands. If so, inquiry into that phase may be waived and it may be assumed that it was in fact going to Germany.

There is no question, either nebulous or substantial, as to whether phosphate rock is justifiably classed as contraband. It has, as stated, no place in the contraband lists. The case presents squarely the rule of law for which the great name of Lord Stowell stands in England and Chief Justice Chase in this country, from which there has hitherto been "no variableness, neither shadow of turning."

Why can it not be made serviceable to determine whether principles so sanctioned are any longer to exercise any restraining influence upon those nations that appeal to arms? Is it to be believed that no voice will be raised in England for the preservation of the proudest monuments that nation has builded? And which can surpass in symmetry or grandeur those reared by her great judges, the rules by which even the King and the Council were required to render justice to friendly nations and their people? Let us force, if we can, an expression on a concrete case. Our progress will be imperceptible while we debate *en masse* a multitude of principles, many of which permit of prolonged discussion or an aggregation of cases over the facts of many of which there is opportunity for parleying.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. WALSH. With pleasure.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not know whether the Senator stated the registry of the vessel carrying the cargo of phosphate. Was it a British vessel?

Mr. WALSH. It was the *F. J. Lisman*. She is a Danish vessel, I think.

Mr. FLETCHER. A Danish vessel? So long as she was of a neutral registry, there could not be any change in the principle announced?

Mr. WALSH. Not at all.

Mr. FLETCHER. I was not certain but that it was a vessel of British registry.

Mr. WALSH. It is a straight question as to whether that principle of international law is gone.

UNLAWFUL SEIZURE OF MAILS.

No difficulty will be encountered in selecting a characteristic case to test the right of the allies to arrest merchandise coming from Germany to this country through a neutral port to which it was carried overland or, for the matter of that, by sea, but not through a blockaded port. It is understood that there is no pretense that the German ports on the Baltic are in a state of blockade. The recent seizure of the mails from Denmark to the United States will very well serve the purpose.

At the outset Great Britain assumed the right to open and censor the mails landed at any of her ports, but with a continental destination. This caused the Post Office Department to route such mails, whenever possible, by ships not required to touch at British ports. Recently neutral vessels, carrying the mails both ways, respectively have been haled into some English harbor, the sacks rifled, letters opened and censored, and parcels containing goods of "enemy origin or destination" confiscated. Among the treaties which were the product of the second Hague convention, held in 1907, was one dealing with postal correspondence. It was ratified by the Senate March 12, 1908, and proclaimed February 28, 1910. Great Britain, France, Russia, Italy were all signatories. It is introduced by the two following articles:

ARTICLE I.

"The postal correspondence of neutrals or belligerents, whatever its official or private character may be, found on the high seas on board a neutral or enemy ship is inviolable. If the ship is detained, the correspondence is forwarded by the captor with the least possible delay.

"The provisions of the preceding paragraph do not apply, in case of violation of blockade, to correspondence destined for or proceeding from a blockaded port.

ARTICLE II.

"The inviolability of postal correspondence does not exempt a neutral mail ship from the laws and customs of maritime war as to neutral merchant ships in general. The ship, however, may not be searched, except when absolutely necessary, and then only with as much consideration and expedition as possible."

As indicative of the delicate nature of the task which Earl Grey is heroically endeavoring to discharge of "explaining the sailor's business to neutral States in soothing and dignified terms," it is offered in justification of these particular acts of violence that the second paragraph of article 1, recited, permits the interception of mail from a blockaded port. Munich is not a *blockaded port*, nor is it a *port* at all. It is offered, too, that the parcel post does not fall within the protection of the treaties, but is to be regarded so far as treaty rights are concerned, as ordinary freight. There seems to be much reason in this contention, and few could find fault with the seizure of rubber or other contraband going to Sweden by mail. Shipment of such a commodity by mail would carry a presumption that it was intended for transshipment to and consumption in enemy territory.

But, having in mind the last sentence of article 2, "The ship, however, must not be searched except when absolutely necessary, and then only with as much consideration and expedition as possible," let it be remembered that on the 13th day of December, 1915, the Danish ship *United States*, bound from Copenhagen to this country, was stopped east of the Shetland Islands and taken into Greenock for examination, held five days, and relieved of 930 parcel-post packages and 1,961 small parcels of mail. If it be conceded that immunity can not be claimed for parcels other than first class, the question will remain as to the right to stop matter sent to this country, by mail or otherwise, simply because it came from Germany.

As to first-class matter, the justification must rest upon the flimsy pretext that all mail matter from Germany comes from a blockaded port. This contention and others like it are not puerile; they are fraudulent.

Included in a confidential circular of instructions issued to the British censors, the whole of which is interesting reading, is the following:

"11. Statistics. (1) Particulars are to be exacted from appropriate correspondence and submitted on index cards of all direct shipments to Europe (i. e., shipments from neutral to neutral, including shipments on through bills of lading), whether actual or pending, of the following commodities, viz: Cocoa, cotton, cotton yarn, waste, and thread; fuel oils and lubricating oils; hides, skins, and leather; maize; metals and ores of all kinds; nitrates; oil cakes, including poonac; packers' products (meat, bacon, lard, jus, oleo, or any edible animal

fats); rosin; tanning extracts; wool, and such other articles as may be added from time to time."

It is not difficult to understand that the letters of any American house doing business with a Scandinavian firm which falls under the suspicion of the English authorities are not likely to reach their destination, and neither are the letters started in the other direction between the negotiators. The result is that commerce between our shores and those of the neutral countries of Europe will be conducted with just such persons on the Continent as the British authorities may graciously permit to engage in it. Such a system would be intolerable to a liberty-loving people even though there were no likelihood that the exercise of such despotic power would be abused nor the information thus surreptitiously elicited placed at the disposal of English rivals of American commercial houses. The mere detention of a mail steamer for five days—almost, if not quite, as much time as is required to cross the ocean—puts American trade at a tremendous disadvantage.

The European trader knows that an order to an American house may, and probably will, be detained for an indefinite time while on the way and may not reach its destination at all. The reply must encounter the same risks. He concludes that he will order from an English house, with which he can communicate without delay or interruption, and whose correspondence is passed by the censor in accordance with another regulation guiding him, as follows.

"10. Duties of D. A. C.'s—(a) The D. A. C. should see that the letters supplied to his table are divided before censoring, for the purpose both of removing the correspondence of persons on the privileged and suspect lists, if and so far as this has not been done by the sorters, and also, as far as practicable, of eliminating periodical correspondence between reputable concerns which experience has shown to contain nothing that requires censoring. Such eliminated correspondence should not be opened until the remaining portion of the mail has been disposed of."

PROPOSAL TO RATION NORTHERN EUROPE.

And the end has not yet come. It is now proposed to "ration" the countries of northern Europe, by which is meant that an account is to be taken of the foodstuffs heretofore sent to them, and that when the quantity which they were taking before the war is reached further shipments are to be interdicted. The presumption is to be indulged that any excess would go to the Teutonic countries, and, therefore, be subject to seizure. If in six months any of the Scandinavian countries takes a year's normal supply, one-half of which is allowed to go to Germany, her people may starve the other six months, though our warehouses be bursting with the needed meal and meat ready to go forward when the allies permit.

That they may regulate the amount of flour, corn, pork, or beef which we may sell to any of the neutral countries, upon the principle of blockade and by the application of the presumptions heretofore indulged or by arbitrary acts, concerning which a discreet silence is preserved, does not admit of doubt. The bare fact that copper or meat went to neutral countries in quantities greater than usual has been regarded as sufficient to hold and even to condemn cargoes as having an enemy destination.

In the case of copper, practically every shipment on the ocean was seized and held, ostensibly to await the determination of a prize court as to whether it was not really destined to the enemy country; and then no effort was made to bring the question to trial in the prize court, though the honor of the capturing country stood pledged for a speedy hearing. Justice required no less, as was declared by a great English judge, who denounced a delay of three months in bringing a prize before the court as a disgrace to the jurisprudence of the realm.

Any ship carrying copper was liable to be deflected from her regular course and detained indefinitely. The loss from detention was often greater than the freight on the copper, so that many of the lines declined to carry any such. It was intimated that shipments would be allowed to countries laying an embargo on exports of that commodity, but the seizures went on in respect to those countries that had made it criminal to send it beyond their borders. It was complained that consignments went "to order" the usual way, but suggesting to the suspicious that there was some reason for secrecy. The customs of the trade in times of peace were altered and bills of lading made to the consignees. Still the seizures went on. The British consuls supervised the loading in our ports and the diplomatic representatives attested the shipments, which were accompanied with proofs that the cargo was for consumption in the country to which it was consigned—all upon representations or intimations at least that with these formalities the vessels bearing them would be allowed to proceed unmolested. They were not. Finally the American shippers were approached with a proposition to submit in advance to the British Admiralty all the details of each shipment and to consign only to such persons and such places and in such amounts as should be approved by it, as a condition of exemption from annoying search and detention and the delay incident to the tardy procedure of the prize court. The proposition was indignantly rejected in December, 1914, but by April, 1915, every American exporter had been harried into compliance, and now not a pound of copper leaves our shores except under such a humiliating agreement.

I send a copy of the agreement to the desk and ask that it be printed as an appendix to my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be done, in the absence of objection.

Mr. WALSH. By a campaign conducted on similar lines Great Britain will not have the least difficulty in prescribing just how much foodstuffs we may ship to Norway and who may handle them when they reach there. Three months of it and not a grain exporter in the United States but will be brought to his knees, unless, indeed, something blows up in this country. Those of us who believe that further forbearance but invites new aggressions are taunted with desiring to drive our Nation into war with England. We would, on the contrary, avert war by insisting upon and pursuing a course that must result in a cessation of the unlawful practices that make us in respect to our foreign commerce a subject nation.

THE REMEDY.

What is to be done about it? From many influential sources, and, quite curiously, from those who stand for peace at any price on the one hand and from those who are the special objects of their invective, those bearing intimate relations with the nations supplying themselves with munitions of war from our factories, comes the proposal that with each fresh imposition we should protest but defer further action until after the war, when reparation, money damages, should be demanded and the questions at issue and the amount of the award submitted to arbitration. It is insisted that the offending nations are now beside themselves, maddened with the lust for blood and as incapable of a just consideration of the rights of neutrals as infuriated combatants with murder in their hearts engaged in a pistol duel in the street are regardless of the innocent bystander.

The eminent and much loved senior Senator from Mississippi is one of those who would appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober. Any property loss can be paid for in money, he tells us. Can it? It is quite remarkable that so excellent a lawyer and so keen a reasoner on economic questions should care to take the responsibilty for a statement so fallacious. When a trespass has been committed and there is no likelihood of a repetition of it, the law awards damages as full relief. But when the wrong is continuing, when it has been repeated and the perpetrator threatens to continue his unlawful course, the law regards damages as wholly inadequate relief and awards injunction against a repetition of it. There are injuries so peculiar in character that the law regards money damages as quite inappropriate and inadequate. Indeed the whole domain of equity jurisprudence was developed because the remedies at law, which were by no means confined to the award of damages, were inadequate.

In the relations of nations as in the relations of men, the payment of money damages is frequently but a sorry satisfaction for wrongs inflicted. If a textile manufacturer in this country, who is building up a fine trade in South America or China, orders dyestuffs in Germany that are illegally seized by the allies, he may eventually get the value of his confiscated goods, but if meanwhile he is not able to supply himself elsewhere with dyes and consequently can not meet the orders for his product, how is he to get damages for a ruined business or a profitable line of trade that has passed in consequence of his delinquency to a rival in England? In the remarkable speech delivered in the House of Commons the 10th instant by Walter Runciman, president of the board of trade, in which he declared in a vengeful spirit that though peace came the commercial war against Germany would not abate, he remarked:

"In the case of South America, we have since the war began developed a trade which I hope will continue long after the cessation of hostilities."

Perhaps he might have said no less of the neutral nations of Europe, with which trade and communication is hampered in the manner I have feebly endeavored to portray, filling in only the outlines.

Let us suppose, however, that the textile manufacturer does not himself import his dyestuffs. He is accustomed to buy from a New York importer, whose persistent efforts to get his usual supply have been met with repeated seizures. He may recover damages for his wares seized, but not for the ruin of his business. But the manufacturer can make no claim whatever. How could the Montana sugar-beet grower prove or collect damages because of an unproductive crop attributable to inferior seed which he was obliged to buy? He might be asked why he did

not sow alfalfa. How would the cotton farmer prove the damages he suffered because he was unable to secure the fertilizer best adapted to his land? Perhaps he could have done as well had he planted corn. How is it possible to calculate the aggregate loss to the agriculturists and manufacturers of the country because their business has been more or less affected by the failure to get goods which might have been drawn from the neutral countries, or because of their inability to send thither those of their own production?

Even if the computation could be made with reasonable accuracy, the aggregate would be so stupendous as to forbid negotiations looking to the payment of such damages. Because they are speculative, they could not be computed, though the loss could not be controverted.

Besides, he has considered this subject but superficially, if he has reflected at all on it, who sees in it a mere matter of dollars and cents. Solemn treaties, the express obligations of sovereign nations are involved. Are we to be forced reluctantly to the conclusion that Great Britain and France too consider such as "mere scraps of paper"? Are we to be convinced that interest alone and not honor binds those great nations to such conventions as we have with them? And if we may not rely upon our treaties, when nations are put to stress of what use are they?

The obligation is no less sacred in the case of those implied undertakings arising out of the rules of international law. Webster asserted that—

"every nation, on being received at her own request into the circle of civilized Governments, must understand that she not only attains rights of sovereignty and the dignity of a national character, but that she binds herself also to the strict and faithful observance of all those principles, laws, and usages which have obtained currency among civilized States."

The persistent disregard of those laws and usages by the authorities of one State to the detriment of another is an encroachment upon its sovereignty, just as much as would be the occupation of a portion of its territory.

Acquiescence in such a course marks the country submitting to it as a subject nation.

It has pleased the British foreign office on at least two occasions when complaint has been made of unwarranted aggressions in the pursuit of the policy of the allies to accomplish the economic ruin of their enemies, to attempt to prove by statistics that the commerce of this country has increased since and perhaps because of the war. With profound respect, I venture to assert that the suggestion is wholly irrelevant. It would comport illy with the dignity, and it accords not at all with the spirit of the American people to submit to unwarranted encroachment upon their rights because some pecuniary profit attends a condition with respect to which they have just cause of complaint. I say nothing of the offense of assuming that the rising indignation of our people might be allayed by reference to the material advantage which the war in Europe affords them.

A belligerent can not justify itself for acts violative of our rights to the impoverishment or even the substantial loss of some of our people, because the war it is conducting has resulted in the enrichment of others or even in the improvement of industrial conditions generally.

When I addressed the Senate about a year ago upon a subject closely related to that now being canvassed, copper, an article of export in the production of which Montana has a leading part, was selling upon a limited market for about 10 cents a pound. To-day it commands from 25 to 30. Avarice could demand and could scarcely expect more. Cotton was quoted at from 6 to 7 cents a pound and now sells for more than 12, at least as much as would be looked for in normal times. These two commodities lead our exports in point of value. But if famine prevailed in the copper camps and cotton States, the questions at issue would not be vitally different.

The logic of the situation is plain. If the allies decline to yield to reason, we must cease trading with them. It would be the supremest folly to go to war over the present situation or any that is likely to develop out of it, when a remedy, wholly efficacious, that involves no sacrifice of life, is open to us. War would necessarily involve an embargo, since there could be no traffic with an enemy. Our rights as an independent Nation are at stake and we ought not to hesitate at any monetary or other loss necessary to maintain them. Similar aggressions drove this Nation to the course advocated in the event of the failure of the pending negotiations, during the administration of Thomas Jefferson, a course which eventually drew the warmest encomiums from one of the foremost English writers on international law, Sir Robert Phillimore, heretofore referred to. Commenting on the Orders in Council, issued during the Napoleonic wars, by which all places in France, in the countries of her allies, or any other State which had submitted to the restrictions of her Emperor, were to be considered as blockaded and subject to the restrictions and penalties of blockade, he says:

"In these orders the British Government, in their turn, enunciated a proposition, false in fact and bad in law. It may be some palliation that the measure was retaliatory, but it is not, according to the rules of eternal right and justice, a defense. The truth is that France was the first wrongdoer, Great Britain the second."

Then referring to the Nonintercourse Act, passed by the American Congress in 1809, he added:

"It is to be lamented that this act was not passed earlier, when the first wrong was done by France; but even with this deduction from its merit, it ranks high in the history of nations. It conveyed a just and dignified rebuke both to France and England, and it was worthy of the country which has contributed such valuable materials to the edifice of international law."

The Order in Council of March 11, 1915, is more clearly violative of the rules of "eternal right and justice" than were the orders of January 7 and November 11, 1807, so unsparingly denounced by Phillimore. Even in the wild orgy of that time no English statesman went so far as to proclaim a purpose to seize goods on a neutral ship that had not entered a French port and had no purpose to do so, simply because they had originated in the enemy country or that it was their ultimate destination.

There can be no doubt that merchandise of all kinds will seek entry into Germany through the ports of adjacent neutral countries if the law shall be observed. But how can we tolerate a course of conduct upon the part of the allies violative of our right to trade with a neutral country that they may more successfully carry out their effort to starve Germany?

The Government of the United States might, if it had had the military strength and resources, have posted a force during the Civil War along the left bank of the Rio Grande and thus have prevented all trade between Matamoros or other places in Mexico, and Texas. But it did not, and it had, consequently, no right to arrest innocent goods consigned to a Mexican port but destined for Texas. The allies may lawfully intercept all traffic between Norway and Sweden, on the one hand, and Germany on the other by blockading the Baltic ports, and if they did so they would, under the *Springbok* case, be entitled to seize goods bound for a port of either of those countries, but which are to proceed therefrom to Germany. That is to say, that goods that must pass through a blockaded port to reach their destination may be seized at any point in the voyage. As it is, the Scandinavian countries may sell to Germany while we can not.

It is no fault of ours that the exigencies of the war will not admit of a blockade of the German Baltic ports or that they forbid the circumvallation of Holland.

Mr. President, I speak as an American, actuated, as I hope, by such sentiments as an American ought to harbor. I am conscious of no spirit of hostility toward Great Britain or any of the countries associated with her. I have no desire to see Germany triumph in this war, but we are being daily forced a little further into the position of allies of her enemies. We are being placed more and more in the attitude of sordid or pusillanimous servitude to them or in that of covert abettors of their cause.

I have found myself unable to lend my support to the arguments of those who on yesterday presented here the monster petition praying for the imposition of an embargo on the export of munitions of war. It is unnecessary at this time to review the considerations which impel me to the belief that in the course pursued by the President, touching the subject to which it relates, he has acted the wise and prudent part. The humanitarian impulses which induced multitudes to sign that petition are in the last degree creditable. Others, not a few in number, probably would not have been so profoundly impressed with the wisdom of the course they so stoutly advocate had the Germans been able to command the ocean.

However, against the impassioned appeals of the very best people in America, God-fearing, peace-loving, Christian people, as well as against the bitter protests of the central powers, our Government, in both the executive and legislative branches, has stood firm for the principle of freedom of commerce with the belligerents even in the instruments of death. We have chosen to stand upon our rights to the overwhelming advantage of the allies, taking the position that to change our policy under the circumstances which confront us, except to subserve our own interests, would subject us to the charge of favoritism that would be unneutral in fact, however we might justify such a course under the law. Similarly, attacks have been made because the allies have been permitted freely to negotiate loans in this country with which to carry on the war and to meet the colossal expenditure it entails. In many other respects a strict observance of the duties which international law imposes upon or the exercise of the privileges it permits to neutrals has aroused the resentment of great masses of our own citizens and the hostility of people on the Continent whose good will we have

every reason to cherish and whose friendly regard we enjoyed in the beginning of this devastating war. It would be but reasonable to expect that those who profit by our refusal to swerve from the path of strict neutrality, despite the appeals and protests to which alike a deaf ear has been turned, might be moved to a somewhat tender regard for our rights as neutrals. The more rigid we stand, the more contumelious is the treatment they accord us. The very day that saw the presentation of the great petition referred to, bearing a million signatures, brought news of a set purpose to make even more intolerable the invasion of our right to trade freely with the neutral powers in goods not contraband. If a fixed determination to goad this Nation into retaliatory measures or to try coercion were entertained by the allied powers, it would find quite fitting expression in the course of conduct of which our Government has so respectfully but so forcefully and justly complained. Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad.

For myself, I am convinced that we should not have adjourned last spring before authorizing the President to interdict commercial relations with any of the warring nations whenever, in his judgment, it became impossible to secure, through the diplomatic channels, recognition of and respect for our right to trade with foreign countries pursuant to and in accordance with the accepted principles of international law. I offer a bill, the purpose of which is to invest him with that power.

It is an enormous power to repose in any man, but no American citizen will doubt that it will be exercised with a wise discretion, not impetuously or vindictively, and with an eye single to the honor and the interest of the Nation.

APPENDIX.

ORDER IN COUNCIL.

March 11, 1915.

At the Court of Buckingham Palace, the 11th day of March, 1915. Present, the King's most excellent majesty in council.

Whereas the German Government has issued certain orders which, in violation of the usages of war, purport to declare the waters surrounding the United Kingdom a military area, in which all British and allied merchant vessels will be destroyed, irrespective of the safety of the lives of passengers and crew, and in which neutral shipping will be exposed to similar danger in view of the uncertainties of naval warfare; and

Whereas in a memorandum accompanying the said orders neutrals are warned against intrusting crews, passengers, or goods to British or allied ships;

Whereas such attempts on the part of the enemy give to His Majesty an unquestionable right of retaliation; and

Whereas His Majesty has therefore decided to adopt further measures in order to prevent commodities of any kind from reaching or leaving Germany, though such measures will be enforced without risk to neutral ships or to neutral or noncombatant life and in strict observance of the dictates of humanity; and

Whereas the allies of His Majesty are associated with him in the steps now to be announced for restricting further the commerce of Germany, His Majesty is therefore pleased, by and with the advice of his privy council, to order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

1. No merchant vessel which sailed from her port of departure after the 1st March, 1915, shall be allowed to proceed on her voyage to any German port.

Unless the vessel receives a pass enabling her to proceed to some neutral or allied port to be named in the pass, goods on board any such vessel must be discharged in a British port and placed in the custody of the marshal of the prize court. Goods so discharged, not being contraband of war, shall, if not requisitioned for the use of His Majesty, be restored by order of the court upon such terms as the court may in the circumstances deem to be just, to the person entitled thereto.

2. No merchant vessel which sailed from any German port after the 1st March, 1915, shall be allowed to proceed on her voyage with any goods on board laden at such port.

All goods laden at such port must be discharged in a British or allied port. Goods so discharged in a British port shall be placed in the custody of the marshal of the prize court, and, if not requisitioned for the use of His Majesty, shall be detained or sold under the direction of the prize court. The proceeds of goods so sold shall be paid into court and dealt with in such manner as the court may in the circumstances deem to be just:

Provided, That no proceeds of the sale of such goods shall be paid out of court until the conclusion of peace, except on the application of the proper officer of the Crown, unless it be shown that the goods had become neutral property before the issue of this order.

Provided also, That nothing herein shall prevent the release of neutral property laden at such enemy port on the application of the proper officer of the Crown.

3. Every merchant vessel which sailed from her port of departure after the 1st of March, 1915, on her way to a port other than a German port, carrying goods with an enemy destination, or which are enemy property, may be required to discharge such goods in a British or allied port. Any goods so discharged in a British port shall be placed in the custody of the marshal of the prize court, and, unless they are contraband of war, shall, if not requisitioned for the use of His Majesty, be restored by order of the court, upon such terms as the court may in the circumstances deem to be just to the person entitled thereto.

Provided, That this article shall not apply in any case falling within articles 2 or 4 of this order.

4. Every merchant vessel which sailed from a port other than a German port after the 1st of March, 1915, having on board goods which are of enemy origin or are enemy property may be required to discharge such goods in a British or allied port. Goods so discharged in a British port shall be placed in the custody of the marshal of the prize court, and, if not requisitioned for the use of His Majesty, shall be detained or sold under the direction of the prize court. The proceeds of goods so sold shall be paid into court and dealt with in such manner as the court may in the circumstances deem to be just.

Provided, That no proceeds of sale of such goods shall be paid out of court until the conclusion of peace, except on the application of the proper officer of the Crown, unless it be shown that the goods had become neutral property before the issue of this order.

Provided also, That nothing herein shall prevent the release of neutral property of enemy origin on the application of the proper officer of the Crown.

5. Any person claiming to be interested in, or to have any claim in respect of, any goods (not being contraband of war) placed in the custody of the marshal of the prize court under this order, or in the proceeds of such goods, may forthwith issue a writ in the prize court against the proper officer of the Crown and apply for an order that the goods should be restored to him, or that their proceeds should be paid to him, or for such other order as the circumstances of the case may require.

The practice and procedure of the prize court shall, so far as applicable, be followed mutatis mutandis in any proceedings consequential upon this order.

6. A merchant vessel which has cleared for a neutral port from a British or allied port, or which has been allowed to pass, having an ostensible destination to a neutral port, and proceeds to an enemy port, shall, if captured on any subsequent voyage, be liable to condemnation.

7. Nothing in this order shall be deemed to affect the liability of any vessel or goods to capture or condemnation independently of this order.

8. Nothing in this order shall prevent the relaxation of the provisions of this order in respect of the merchant vessels of any country which declares that no commerce intended for or originating in Germany or belonging to German subjects shall enjoy the protection of its flag.

ALMERIC FITZROY.

APPENDIX B.

COPPER AGREEMENT BETWEEN UNITED STATES EXPORTERS AND BRITISH ADMIRALTY—COPPER FROM UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO NEUTRAL COUNTRIES.

Whilst His Majesty's Government are at present, so far as they are able, preventing any copper from reaching their enemies, they have no desire to interfere in any way with the sales of the United States copper producers to purchasers in neutral countries which are willing to guarantee that the copper which they import is for the consumption of those neutral countries.

If the United States producers would be willing to cooperate, His Majesty's Government will not interfere with their copper shipments to those neutral countries which have placed copper on their prohibition list and whose prohibitions of export are found to be effective.

Whilst His Majesty's Government can not abandon in any way their right to search vessels, they will be quite willing to allow to proceed to its destination all copper which is to be sold only to named consumers, and not to merchants, dealers, or forwarding agents, in such neutral countries as have placed copper and articles manufactured mainly of copper on their list of prohibitive exports, provided that a copy of the contract of sale is sent to the director of the trade division of the Admiralty, and it shall contain a clause to the effect that neither the copper itself nor any of its products shall be exported. Such copper, upon arriving at its destination, shall be put into a warehouse, so that it can not afterwards be declared in transit. The bill of lading must show clearly the name of the actual consumer, or of a recognized London merchant, or the name of a banker who shall be approved by His Majesty's Government.

It is agreed that the undersigned will not export copper to Sweden, Norway, Denmark, or Italy, except in compliance with and subject to the conditions of article 3 hereof, and that it (the undersigned company) will not export copper to other neutral countries, except subject to permit of British Admiralty.

Shipments of copper to Great Britain or her allies may be made without restriction.

All sale contracts for neutral countries to be forwarded to the British Admiralty, either through its London representatives or through His Britannic Majesty's consul at the port of New York.

Shipments of copper against contracts entered into previous to the signing of this agreement and any existing f. o. b. contracts are exempt from its provisions.

* * * * * * *

We will be prepared to conform to the different provisions set forth in the above regulations of the Admiralty as regards shipments of copper from the United States of America to neutral countries, and we assent to the terms of the letter of January 2, 1915, from Richard Webb, director of trade divisions, to Messrs. C. S. Henry & Co. (Ltd.), a copy of which letter, marked "Exhibit A," is attached hereto.

——— (Co.).

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. POMERENE. I desire to suggest a question to the Senator, if I may. I am in entire sympathy with the Senator's protest against interference with our foreign commerce, whether it be by Great Britain or Germany or any of the other belligerents. The Senator has suggested as a possible remedy for these interferences the placing of an embargo on all our commerce with the offending nation. Of course, if that is done, the effect is twofold—one upon the offending nation, the other upon our own citizens, our own commerce, our own manufactures.

Has the Senator taken into consideration what would be the possible attitude of our commercial and manufacturing interests in the event that an embargo was to be placed upon all shipments to the offending nation, and thereby cut off all commerce with that nation?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has considered that. It would obviously be a contest between patriotism and a desire to profit out of the situation, and it is a question as to which would prevail.

Mr. President, it was very properly suggested on the other side of the Chamber the other day that the time has arrived to act. As a basis for that action, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill at this time, and I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana asks unanimous consent to introduce a bill and that it may be read. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The bill (S. 4053) to interdict commercial intercourse between the United States and any foreign country which shall unlawfully interfere with the foreign trade thereof was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the Department of State shall find it impossible to secure from any foreign power satisfactory assurances that it will desist from acts done or threatened, deemed by the said department to be an unlawful interference with the right to carry on trade between the United States and any other country, the President of the United States is hereby authorized to issue a proclamation reciting such condition.

SEC. 2. That after 30 days from the date of issuing such proclamation it shall be unlawful for any person, partnership, or corporation to sell or contract to sell or deliver or contract to deliver to any such nation so mentioned in such proclamation or to purchase or contract to purchase for or on account of any such nation any goods, wares, or merchandise, or pay for any such goods, wares, or merchandise, or to accept money upon deposit or otherwise to be used in payment of any purchase so made.

SEC. 3. That after such period it shall be unlawful for any person, partnership, or corporation to export, sell, or contract to sell, or deliver or contract to deliver, or purchase or contract to purchase, or to procure the delivery of or to transport or contract to transport or to accept for transport any goods, wares, or merchandise, knowing or having reason to believe that such goods, wares, or merchandise are to be exported to any foreign country so named in such proclamation or to any colonies, dependencies thereof, or other territory over which its sovereignty may extend.

SEC. 4. That after such time if any goods, wares, or merchandise shall be put on board any ship, vessel, or other craft, with intention to export the same to any such country so named in such proclamation or to any of the colonies or dependencies thereof or other territory over which its sovereignty may extend, with knowledge had by the master of any such ship, vessel, or other craft, or which he could have secured by the exercise of reasonable diligence, such ship, vessel, or other craft shall be forfeited, and the owner and master thereof shall each pay treble the value of such goods, wares, or merchandise. And the discharge of any goods from any such ship, vessel, or other craft within any such country, colony, dependency, or territory shall be deemed prima facie evidence of knowledge of such intention.

SEC. 5. That all goods, wares, or merchandise sold or contracted to be sold for export or which are in course of transportation to any port for export to any country, colony, dependency, or territory contrary to the provisions of this act shall be forfeited.

SEC. 6. That the United States circuit court for the district in which any ship, vessel, or other craft, or any goods, wares, or merchandise, subject to forfeiture under sections 4 and 5 of this act may be, shall have jurisdiction to entertain suit to enforce such forfeiture and to issue all appropriate writs and orders to seize and hold the same and to make such orders touching the sale or other disposition of the same as may be necessary or proper, or it may direct that the property be held for the use of the United States.

SEC. 7. That any person violating this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $100,000 or by imprisonment for not less than six months nor more than three years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 8. That whenever the President shall become satisfied that any goods, wares, or merchandise exported from the United States to any country not named in any such proclamation are allowed by such country to be reexported to any country so named as offending in such proclamation, he may issue a proclamation reciting such fact, and thereupon all the provisions of this act shall apply to goods to be exported to such country.

SEC. 9. That whenever, after the issuance of any such proclamation, the President shall receive satisfactory assurances from any offending power named therein that it proposes no longer to persist in the acts in consequence of which such proclamation was issued, or whenever in his judgment the public good may so require, he may by proclamation suspend the operation of this act as to any or all countries named therein.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

During the delivery of Mr. WALSH'S speech,

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Montana please suspend for a minute while the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business? It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will proceed.

After the conclusion of Mr. WALSH'S speech,

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I have felt, naturally, the diffidence of a new Member in undertaking to participate in the debate on the pending measure relating to the Philippine Islands. I have listened, with that reverence which must come to one who is new in this Chamber, to the progress of the debate with rather conflicting emotions, until I have finally reached the conclusion that one from Ohio ought at least to give a reason for his vote, that one who comes from the State of him who led in planting our flag in the Philippines, and from the State of him who laid the foundation of our American civilization there, ought at least to voice his protest against the proposed bill.

We are not moved in Ohio by that fear of the greed of the East, as suggested by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], nor is the undercurrent of our dependable thought materially changed by the clamorous call for radical reformation. I think the current of thought in the great Middle West goes unerringly on, uninfluenced by either. Our judgment, as I have seen it attested in Ohio, is that the United States of America has no right and has no reason to extend a benevolent protectorate over the Philippine Islands without control, and I, for one, Mr. President and Senators, mean to vote against the pending bill.

When the Senator from Arkansas, for whom I have conceived a very great respect, introduced his first amendment to the pending measure I confessed I rejoiced. I said at the time: Here is one leader of the dominant party in this country who proposes to carry out a party pledge; and if I believe that we had no right in the Philippine Islands, if I believed that we were denying the Filipinos a God-given right of inalienable liberty, if I had subscribed to the successive platforms of the Democratic Party for the last 16 years, I would unhesitatingly vote for the first amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

There is a very familiar expression, Mr. President, originally uttered by a very distinguished Member of this body long since gone. I think he was at the time troubled with the problem of the resumption of specie payments. In the course of his discussion of the problem in an administrative capacity he uttered that famous dictum, "The way to resume is to resume"; and I want to say that the way to grant Philippine independence is to grant it. If I should use the language sometimes used on the streets, I would say the practical way to grant the Philippine Islands their independence is to "chuck them" and let them work out their own destiny.

When the pending measure of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] was first under discussion in the Senate, the debate took rather a curious turn. I was very much interested in the persistent use of the word "self-government." Well, Mr. President, self-government is one thing and popular self-government is quite another thing. If we mean to grant the Philippine Islands their independence, it is none of our business what kind of government they have. It may well be an autocracy; it may be a despotism; they may prefer a dictatorship; or they may, and most likely will, attempt a republic like that of China, which recently flashed a moment on the firmament of republics as a sort of triumph of rational over dollar diplomacy, and then again faded from the firmament. What business is it of ours if the Filipino people have the inalienable right of independence, what kind of government they may choose to have? We accepted the sponsorship; and if that is binding we have no right to set them adrift. If it is not binding, the majority in this Chamber ought to vote unanimously to set them adrift at the earliest possible day; and I warn you, Senators on the opposite side of the House, that you are breeding trouble for the United States of America every day you delay doing so under the promises of the Democratic Party.

I have heard the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], and other distinguished Senators on the other side of the House, say that this great question ought to be discussed without reference to partisan or political bias. Why, sirs, when we assumed the sponsorship for government in the Philippine Islands, there was no partisanship involved, and the first platform of the party at that time responsible for the conduct of public affairs, and which took upon itself the administration, the preservation of peace, the leading of the Filipinos in the right path, there was no consideration of politics. There never would have been any partisanship, and the question pending before this body to-day would never have been raised if the party now in power had not made its paramount issue of expansion and imperialism in 1900. The movement in the Philippine Islands is not only the echo of that enunciation in 1900 on the part of the party now in power, but of each succeeding declaration of that party every fourth year since then.

But, Mr. President, the question now on the amendment pending is not one on the character of government in the Philippine Islands; it is not what sort of a basic law or fundamental govern-

ment we shall prescribe for them; it has come to be the great question of Philippine independence, and I am opposed to it, Mr. President, for two striking reasons. In the first place, the granting of Philippine independence changes the policy of the Government of the United States of America from the very beginning. In the second place, it alters a policy of the United States of America for the last 17 years, under which we have made the most magnificent contribution to the history of unselfish nationality or the unselfishness of nations that has ever been written.

There is this to say of the United States of America: We are the first Nation on the face of the earth that ever unsheathed the sword on behalf of suffering humanity. We did that in Cuba in 1898. Perhaps some one will question the statement. I grant that Congress in making its declaration of war had more in mind an act of revenge for the destruction of the battleship *Maine;* but the great, kindly soul that was at the head of this Republic at that time put it on a higher plane. He disavowed any intention of the acquirement of territory, and literally went to war for humanity's sake. Then, out of the fortunes of that war, we acquired the Philippine Islands.

Whatever else may be said—and it has been wonderfully emphasized in this debate—our work in the Philippine Islands in education, in sanitation, in elevation and civilization has been the most magnificent contribution of a nation's unselfishness ever recorded in the history of the world. If it be true that in 17 years we have schooled the Filipino people until they are quite fit for self-government, then we have made more advance for that people in 17 years than they acquired in three centuries under the Spanish occupation. But this splendid achievement, Mr. President, has been lost sight of in the debate in this Chamber amid a lot of fine phrases about "inalienable right" and "God-given liberty" and "government without the consent of the governed" until I have come to the conclusion that the bronze statues of American Indians that make ornate some portions of this Capitol would turn their stoical stares to sardonic smiles if they could only know.

Why, we have never heretofore been seriously concerned about the "consent of the governed." We have not been speaking of it in a century and a third of American progress. There has been much recalling of the spirit of the American founding fathers. Mr. President, the man who likens the Philippine situation to that of the American colonies can find no real analogy. Independence was not the inspiration of the War of the Revolution. Nationality was not the impelling force back of the War of the Revolution. It was the means of the preservation of independence when once we had achieved it. Note the difference, if you please. There is no ground for outcry about oppression in the Philippines. We were grieving against the mother country because of unjust taxation; we were grieving because of a denial of our participation in the commerce of the world. In the Philippine case, if the debates on this floor have stated the facts, we have not only kept aloof from unjust taxation, but we have been prodigal in the expenditure of Federal funds in their behalf.

Mr. President, I somehow believe that the destiny of this new-world Republic was written by an Infinite hand in the consciousness of some Divine purpose. I can explain to myself our phenomenal progress in no other way. I can not understand our very victory for independence itself unless some Master hand was directing, yet we have lost sight of that important fact in much of the discussion on this floor.

Why, Mr. President and Senators, the American Republic never before gave a thought to the "consent of the governed"; never gave a thought to the violation of "inalienable rights"; did not give much serious thought to the threatened overturning of our form of republic when we made the Louisiana Purchase; and yet Thomas Jefferson, the distinguished leader of his party, revered to this day, made the Louisiana Purchase with the most astounding assumption of authority ever exercised; and he thereby gave to the American Union that vast territory which added 13 States to the jewels in the crown of an expanding Nation. I am glad he did it; and I should like to divert for a moment for the entertainment, if not for the information, of Senators to read a paragraph published in the January number of the Century Magazine, in the article by Helen Nicolay on the growth of the American Republic. Speaking of the Louisiana Purchase—no, not of the Louisiana Purchase, but solely of the purchase of the city of New Orleans, not the vast territory which was an empire in itself—she recites as follows:

> There was a tremendous outcry. It was not only undemocratic, but ruinous both in money and policy. The United States already owned too much territory. Every added inch increased the danger of our unwieldy Republic breaking into pieces. Besides, and this Jefferson's political opponents emphasized with undoubted relish, what had become of the strict construction of the Constitution about which the Republicans were forever parading before they came into power? Proposing to buy a foreign city was a greater liberty than Federalists had ever dreamed of taking with the sacred document.

I might read on further, but what I have read is enough to illustrate my point.

There is another striking incident. From the same grantor the courageous fathers bought the territory of Florida. Nobody worried about the violation of "inalienable rights"; nobody asked about "the consent of the governed"; and when insurrection arose in Florida, good old Andrew Jackson put his determined foot thereon, and not only did he not ask for "the consent of the governed," but he picked up some 4,000 rebellious inhabitants of that territory and transplanted them from the sunshine of Florida to the shady groves of Arkansas; and so on, Mr. President and Senators, with every step of this expanded Nation.

Nobody was concerned about the violation of rights when we made the Gadsden Purchase; nobody worried about inalienable liberties when we secured that cession from Mexico that gave us that splendid territory of the West. We have never been concerned about these things until finally a political party's promise with relation to the Philippines has come to the point where it is put to the test. If we are concerned, Mr. President, about these things, I want to ask, Why not let us be consistent? I have heard nothing about the danger of colonial possessions except as to the Philippines; I have heard no question about rights in the splendid territory we have in the mid-Pacific known as the Hawaiian Islands. Nobody has raised this question of rights or of righteousness in the case of Alaska or of other territories; and Porto Rico, which is peculiarly like the case of the Philippine Islands, has never once been mentioned, to my knowledge, in this discussion.

The Porto Rican case may well be referred to for a moment. It does not happen that there has been any political discussion with reference to the island of Porto Rico. Just an echo, if you please, of politics rather than patriotism reached the islands, and there was for a time a restlessness and a determination to be free from American occupation; but that has passed away, and the progress in Porto Rico is a most gratifying thing for an American to point to. I should like to say on this floor that I hope to see the day when we can grant citizenship to the people of the island of Porto Rico and bring them into still closer relations with the United States.

I was very much interested in the discussion of the Senator from Arkansas relating to the impossibility of developing a fit citizenship from such a race. Why, Mr. President, his own tribute to the Empire of Japan is the answer to his statement. I have a notion, Senators, that under the uplifting influence of American civilization any of the members of the human race can be brought up to a stature that befits them for American citizenship. We have the proof at home. Without any disparagement of any class of those who come to this land from the downtrodden nations of the Old World, I have myself been the witness of those who come here and hold their heads erect, breathing in the atmosphere of American liberty and opportunity; and while the influence does not always bring the parent to the full stature that becomes American citizenship, it is invariably true that the next generation is a step higher in the human scale and finds its place fittingly into citizenship and participation in the affairs of the United States of America.

The whole history of the American Nation, Mr. President and Senators, is written about the covenant of our nationality. I do not want to refer to the Civil War except in passing to say that it would never have been fought had there not been a covenant of nationality, which is involved in this very question raised here to-day. Nobody to-day questions our American nationality, none raises a voice against it, none seeks separation therefrom except a very small number of people in the Philippine Islands, who, I believe, Mr. President, are very much more anxious to exploit than to exalt the great mass of people in those islands.

I said, Mr. President, that the covenant of nationality lead to the great Civil War. There is a strange significance to me in the fact that our sovereignty in the Philippines was instituted by that admirable, that kind, that loving, that sympathetic American who first revealed the reconsecration of the South to the concord of American Union. It is significant because it affirms what I believe to be the course of our American destiny. Those of you who knew him, those of you who lived—as you all did—in his time, know that there was nothing selfish, there was nothing oppressive, there was nothing crushing about William McKinley, and no Government under him and no Government of ours devoted to his memory could have such an influence.

Mr. President, the debate on the Philippine bill has served to develop the infinite difficulty of making an honorable retirement. It has been interesting to me to note that the proposition of the Senator from Arkansas, which seemed to me to be so practical in carrying out the policy of his party, has been so modified that the time was first extended from two to four or five years, and, if I understood the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] correctly in the debate yesterday, finally to nine years.

It is significant to me that no proposition presented to this Assembly strikes directly at the question; and I tell you, Mr. President and Senators, that we ought to grant the Philippine Islands their independence or we ought to quit talking about it, either in this Chamber or on the stump in political campaigns.

I think it is impossible for us to honorably withdraw. I think it is impossible, first, because of our obligations to the Filipino people themselves. I should dislike to believe that this great Nation, so much interested in the last quarter of a century in uplift work, so deeply interested in the uplifting of a downtrodden people that our unfortunate Mexican policy of "watchful waiting" was founded on such a design. I should dislike to think that we are anxious to cast the Philippines adrift because of the mere fact, if you please, that they would endanger us or add to our responsibilities in time of war. I want to go on record as saying, Senators, that if war ever comes with the empire of the Orient, it will not be because of the Philippine Islands; it will be in spite of them; and, while I am not much of a military authority, I venture to make the assertion that the Philippines will serve as a fitting outpost to warn this mainland of impending danger.

In the next place, without going further into the discussion, I think we can not retire because of the obligations to ourselves and to the other nations of the earth. I do not wish to discuss, Mr. President, this question from what seems to be a selfish viewpoint, but one can not be in this Chamber without catching the aspirations of the American people. I know what is in our hearts. It is in every official message; somehow or other, it is the desire of every patriotic American. Here is a Nation with limitless resources; here is a Nation excelling in genius; here is a Nation unmatched in industry; and everything that is proposed in this body is designed to aid and encourage the widening of American influence and make us a dominant commercial and industrial nation. Well, if that be true, I want to ask what field, other than South America, offers greater attractions than the Orient? And if we are to go into the Orient for an expansion of commerce and trade, I fancy that the possession of these rich islands, the Philippine Archipelago, will be very much to our advantage.

Mr. President, there is another phase of this subject which I desire to touch upon, and then I shall not detain the Senate longer. There is not only the viewpoint of our covenant to the world and to civilization, but at this particular moment this reversal of the American policy, to my mind, would be the most unfortunate thing that could happen to the United States of America. I do not want it said that this great Nation, aspiring to a place in the councils of the world, that this great Nation, which to-day is the only one whose voice is heard above the din of conflict in a continental war, is so miserably afraid that it wants to cast aside some of its possessions to avoid some of the dangers of war. I had rather stand erect as an American and be unafraid, and particularly at this time when, in some way or other, most unfortunately, Americanism is very much derided in the Old World. Contempt is shown for it in Mexico; disregard is shown for American rights on the seas. Why not, Mr. President, reassert ourselves, not only confident in the possession of the territory which is righteously ours, but make it ornate with an assertion of Americanism that is befitting so great a Nation.

Mr. President, I have been very much interested in another phase of this subject. Much has been said in the current debates relating to the dangers of colonial possessions. I venture to make reply that there is not an instance in history where a colonial possession proved unfortunate to the mother power, if I may call it so, where the national heart was right.

I may cite two instances. No power on the face of the earth ever rose to such sublime glory as the Republic of Rome; and the Republic of Rome came to its glory through its colonial possessions, in every one of which the citizenship was proud to claim the Roman connection. It drove the Republic on, unfailingly and unflinchingly, until that time came when the Empire succeeded the Republic and Rome became rotten at heart. Then her colonies became a menace.

There has been cited here more than once the gratification of Great Britain in dealing with her colonies. I had much rather refer this body to the beautiful example of Holland and the Netherland colonies. That little kingdom of Europe, with its colonial possessions, has been able to maintain a commerce that might reasonably be the envy of any other nation on the face of the earth. But I make bold to say that any nation which is right at heart may possess colonies in great confidence, and bestow the blessings of the civilization which that nation has attained; and in my judgment, Senators, this Nation need not be afraid of the Philippine Islands. We must be afraid of ourselves at home.

One more phase. I do not believe that it disparages the citizenship of the Philippine Islands to question their capacity for self-government. I am not always sure that we have that capacity ourselves in these boasted United States. But whether we have or not, the Filipino people have been accustomed to our spirit of civilization for only 17 years. I grant that the islands have their college graduates; I grant that they have their brave men, their brilliant leaders; but Manila is not the Philippine Islands. I grant, Mr. President, that there are 600,000 children in the schools of the islands, rollicking in a laughter that is the echo of our own in these United States, and walking in the light of opening opportunity. But 600,000 in the schools out of a population of 8,000,000 is a mighty poor guarantee of a dependable autonomy. Before we think of such a thing, let us not only have 600,000 children in the schools of the Philippine Islands; but, under American education and occupation and sponsorship, let us have 2,000,000 Philippine children in the schools. Then the pathway will open for a higher civilization, and with it a devotion to the Nation that led the way.

Mr. President, in the determination of this question of Philippine independence, we do one of two things: We determine to call in the outposts and narrow, if we can, the influences of American civilization to our own shores; or we determine to go courageously and unfalteringly on, spreading our boasted American civilization throughout the world.

I have sometimes wondered what the impelling influence has been. I know very well that a nation leading in civilization and in that uplifting work which contributes to the weal of humanity can no more limit its influence to its territorial or coast-bound sphere than can the man who stands high in his community, and has the character and the attributes that make him an influence in the activities of the world.

Mr. President, we have boasted heretofore that we have seemingly founded the ideal Republic. I do not know whether we have or not. A century and a third is only a very little while in the history of the world. But we have seemingly founded the first dependable popular self-government on the face of the earth, because the fathers had the inspiration to write civil liberty into our organic law.

It seems to me, if it has been our privilege and our boast that we have established and developed the best popular Government on the face of the earth, that we ought to go on with the same thought that impelled Him who brought a plan of salvation to the earth. Rather than confine it to the limitations of the Holy Land alone, He gathered His disciples about Him and said, "Go ye and preach the gospel to all the nations of the earth."

Let us stop and think before we alter the policy of these United States. Let us not think about the selfish side of commerce and industry alone. Let us ask ourselves if the time has not come when it is befitting to return a vigorous, persistent, conscience-founded, determined Americanism; and clad in our convictions of conscientiousness and righteousness let us go on, Mr. President and Senators, in our efforts to fulfill the destinies of what I believe to be the best republic on earth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER].

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I propose to offer the amendment now. I have modified the amendment, as follows:

On line 5, strike out "whenever" and insert in lieu thereof "so soon as."

On line 6, strike out "be permanent and."

On line 10, strike out "in perpetuity."

I will ask the Secretary to read the amendment, which I offer as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment as modified.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill, as a substitute, the following:

The President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to indicate to the great powers of the world the desire of this Govern-

ment to extend to the Philippine Islands and the Philippine people full and complete independence so soon as it shall be warranted in the belief that such independence will be respected by the other powers of the world. The President is further authorized and requested to secure from such other powers such agreements as will insure the independence of said islands, and when such agreements have been made he shall forthwith direct a convention to be held in such islands for the purpose of adopting a constitution providing for a republican form of government; and as soon as such constitution has been adopted and officers have been elected and a government inaugurated thereunder he shall, by proclamation, declare such islands and the people thereof to be a free and independent state, with all the powers of complete sovereignty.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] was kind enough to inform me the other day that I was probably mistaken in the assumption that there was anything of a partisan character either in the bill or in the offered amendments. But scarcely had the Senator finished that statement when the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], in his very clear argument, admitted that he had dragged a plank of the Democratic platform into the particular amendment which he offered, and for which I am offering this substitute.

The Senator from Arkansas has tied to the tail of his amendment that plank in the Democratic platform which declared in favor of a coaling station in the Philippine Islands. Now, I put the question directly to the Senator from Arkansas as to what use we would put that coaling station to or what benefit we would derive from it in case we granted independence to the islands? I have waited very patiently, Mr. President, for an answer to that question.

I also ask the Senator from Arkansas this question: Is there not an inconsistency between a declaration that we shall grant independence to the Philippine Islands and a declaration that we shall maintain a coaling station and a naval base at such islands? Does not the very necessity of maintaining a coaling station or a naval base require such control over the islands as will secure to us for all time such a naval base? Or, putting it in another way, suppose that the Philippine Islands should grant to us, as the purchase price of their freedom, for any indefinite time, a naval base on those islands, and the very next day after she is free from our control, being perhaps a little pressed for funds, Japan should come to her rescue and say: "We will furnish you the necessary funds for conducting your government, and in return for the payment of that we kindly ask you to give us a naval base and a coaling station." Do you imagine for a single moment that she would be likely to refuse such a request as that? Why should she refuse? The moment that she is out of our control, that moment she is more directly under the influence of this great Nippon Government than that of any other Government in the world. So that instead of granting independence, instead of unloosing all ties which bind that country to the United States, you are in the same act binding us by another agreement to maintain the integrity and the independence of the islands not for a period of eight or nine years, but as long as we hold a naval base in those islands.

It seems to me that the two propositions in the amendment are absolutely inconsistent, Mr. President.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question along the line he is now arguing?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. Have not we the same menace that we have heard about to our country from a military standpoint and a naval standpoint if we keep a coaling station or any kind of a military base there that we would have if we kept the whole islands? In other words, if we have a naval base or a coaling station and it is taken away from us, our people would never consent to that any more than they would consent to taking the whole islands. So that we do not relieve ourselves at all of the menace in the matter, do we, by giving up the islands and at the same time holding a naval base and a coaling station?

Mr. McCUMBER. Why, Mr. President, we increase the menace, because in case of war with any other country the first act of the enemy would be to strike at our coaling station or our naval base in the Pacific.

Mr. KENYON. The coaling station might be easier to capture; but I think the Senator will agree with me that the American people would never permit one foot of territory to be taken away from them by hostile force.

Mr. McCUMBER. Why, Mr. President, if we maintain a naval base in the Philippine Islands, we must maintain a sufficient force of Navy and Army to protect that base, not only as against insurrection in the Philippine Islands, not only as against any danger within the islands themselves, but also as against any danger outside of the islands; and that would require just as large a naval force as it would to protect the whole islands. There can be no possible escape from that proposition.

I am sorry the Senator from Arkansas has absented himself, because I desired a vote upon this amendment in order that we may very speedily arrive at a conclusion as to just exactly what is wanted on the other side with reference to this bill.

The Senator from Arkansas yesterday indulged in quite a few stories to exemplify his position. Let me call his attention to another one which he did not mention yesterday.

The Senator has undoubtedly read of the Irish trooper who had been riding upon a rather fractious mule. The mule was rearing and tearing around, but Jerry was still able to maintain himself in the saddle. Finally the mule struck forward with one of his hind feet and got his foot caught in the stirrup. Jerry immediately began to scramble down, with the remark, "Begorrah, if you are going to get on, I will be getting off." [Laughter.]

Are you not somewhat in the same position with reference to your amendment? When the Filipino people begin to get into the saddle themselves, is it not time for us to be getting off? Or, putting it in another way, are we not safer in the saddle with both feet in the stirrups than we would be with one foot on the ground and the other tied to the stirrup?

I think that when we provide for a naval base in an entirely independent country in Asiatic waters we are putting ourselves in a decidedly dangerous position; and I think the Senator agrees with me that we must maintain the same power to protect our naval base and to shield the islands against an attack which would threaten that base that we would have to maintain in order to protect the islands under our control.

Then the Senator has failed, so far, to give us any valid reason or purpose for a naval base on the Asiatic side as long as we have no possessions there that we must defend.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I can not exactly see the connection between a bucking mule and a naval base, but I can say to the Senator that so far as I am concerned I have about the same experience with the one that I have with the other.

The naval-base business need not give anybody any difficulty, because the naval base would not be attacked until the sovereignty of the islands was attacked. Then it would be simply a question as to where would be the most appropriate place to direct our defense or counterassault.

There is nothing about a naval base that requires a governmental establishment and an Army to protect it. It is one of the places of convenience and may be abandoned without dishonor, and may be taken without overcoming the nation that undertakes to maintain it.

In determining the relative importance of the different possessions of a country at war, naval bases cut mighty little figure, especially at distant points. They are not altogether intended for war. They have other collateral purposes in connection with commerce to prevent a good many things short of war.

So far as a naval base in the Philippine Islands is concerned, I can not conceive that the United States would ever want to maintain one, because our object in getting out of there would be entirely contrary to the purpose of maintaining one for defensive purposes.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is what I wanted the Senator to say.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. We want to get out of there because we do not want to defend or be attacked in that quarter of the globe. There is nothing there to justify the assumption of any such risk.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is exactly what I wanted the Senator to say—that there is no object whatever in attaching to his amendment this naval-base proposition that is borrowed from the platform of his own party. The Senator can see no harm in it, according to his own argument, nor does he see any use for it. On this side some of us, as already indicated, can see some harm, and we can see no use for it on the face of the earth; and in the latter proposition we agree with the Senator.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I will call the Senator's attention to the fact that I have modified the amendment so as to make it optional with the President as to whether or not he shall, in the time of negotiation, provide for the retention of a site for a naval base. I think that when he comes to look into the situation as it will exist after we withdraw he will readily reach the conclusion that there is not the slightest necessity for doing any such thing.

Mr. McCUMBER. Why should we put in the bill a provision to leave optional with the President something which we admit is of no value, and has really no place in a bill to grant independence to the Philippine Islands?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I said the other day, and I think I may appropriately repeat it now, that all legislation is in some degree a matter of compromise. If there were nobody to be consulted except the Senator from North Dakota and myself, I think we could arrange the naval-base proposition much quicker by leaving it out.

Mr. McCUMBER. And I think we would arrange it about right, Mr. President, too. We would probably get rid of the Philippine Islands once and for all time, and in a proper way.

The Senator, I think, did not hold to his usual inclination to be perfectly fair when he stated that the amendment which I had offered asked the permission of foreign governments before we should grant independence to the Philippine Islands. There is no permission asked in this amendment. This amendment simply declares to all of the countries of the world that the Philippine Islands are now possessions of the United States, and that the United States is willing to grant them independence, but that the United States is not willing to grant them independence unless the United States feels assured that the world will recognize such independence. We are not asking permission to grant them their freedom. We are simply asking other countries to enter into an agreement that that which we do grant shall be respected by them at a time when we would no longer be in a position to insist upon it. To-day we are in such a position because we possess the islands.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I am wholly unable to discover the difference in ultimate meaning between the two statements made by the Senator, one ascribed to me and the other made by himself. As I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota, the action of the President in releasing the Philippine Islands from the further control of the United States would be predicated upon the previous ascertainment of the willingness of other countries to respect the sovereignty of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. McCUMBER. If we use the word "respect" instead of "consent," that is a different proposition. They are not consenting that we shall free the islands from our control, but are entering into an agreement that under no circumstances will they interfere with their independence.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. My purpose is to withdraw American sovereignty over those islands whether foreign governments will consent to respect their independence or not. I am entirely willing to continue for five years the existing control there, which I think carries with it a suggestion to foreign nations that they will respect it for that length of time. At the end of that time I am not particularly concerned from a national standpoint as to what becomes of them.

Mr. McCUMBER. I can see a difference between the views of the Senator and myself. The Senator's view, placing it in simple, plain language, is that after a certain number of years, four or five, he does not care particularly what becomes of the Philippines, whether they are made independent or whether they are taken possession of by Japan. He rather inclines to the position that they would be better off under Japanese control than they would if left to their own independence.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. Just one moment. My view is that what we want and what the Filipino people want is independence. They are not asking that they shall be transferred from depedence on this country to a dependence upon some other country, but they are asking that they have their independence of any and all countries; and that is what I want to see before we ever let go of them.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. An independence that can not maintain itself is not much of an independence. If we are to follow them up, either by making contracts on their behalf or by a perpetual guaranty on our own, they would not enjoy independence. They would simply be a dependency of this country. We would give them the right to embroil us in difficulties without having the right to prevent them from doing so where our interest was involved.

I give a rather more comprehensive meaning to the word "independence" than the Senator does. I think when we are out of there, after having afforded a reasonable opportunity to those people to prepare for the new responsibilities that will rest upon them, we have done everything we ought to do. Then it is a question of "root, hog, or die."

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; but it is a question, Mr. President, as to whether we have done all that we should do. I am frank in saying that I think we should go further; that we should secure an agreement from those nations who would be most likely to threaten the independence of the Philippine Islands after we have ceased our control over them that they may still retain their independence.

Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of pleasure to the address just made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING]. I think he touched a responsive chord in the heart of every American citizen when he said that we wish to press our civilization onward and upward; but I think there is a limit to our right to press it. There is a vast difference between expanding upon this side of the hemisphere, between purchasing and making part of our domain a territory adjoining us, peopled by a white race, and pressing our control over into Asiatic waters and seizing upon a people of an entirely different race, with little or no Caucasian blood in their veins.

They have their civilization; we have ours. They are not consistent in all respects with each other. Alaska is a part of North America and its southern extremity but a few miles from our northern border. The Gadsden Purchase and Texas and Florida were all countries contiguous to the United States, populated with the same kind of people. They were not Malays; they were not negroes. I for one am not in favor of adding to the color question any further than we must deal with it right here in our own country.

I am not questioning the power of the United States to hold those islands. I am not asking that we free our control over them through any fear of our ability to protect them. A country of 100,000,000 population at the present time and with opportunities to expand manyfold over in the next few years need not be afraid in the long run of any nation upon the face of the earth, and, I might almost add, though all the nations upon the face of the earth combined against us.

It is not through fear, Mr. President; it is through what I conceive to be the better policy of the United States to keep out of Asiatic territory, to expand our governmental influence only upon this side of the ocean and in this hemisphere and with people of our own character and inheritance.

Now, the Senator from Ohio says it does not make any difference to us after we have released the Philippines whether their government becomes republican, monarchical, or autocratic. That may be true; but I think we should start them off with the American ideal of government. My amendment simply indicates that we shall start them right with a republican form of government, give them our ideals and our conviction as to the character of a government that should be maintained, and then if they wish of their own volition to change that, of course they have the right as an independent nation to do so.

Mr. President, I have discussed simply and clearly, first, whether we want to let go of the Philippine Islands before we know what will become of them; secondly, whether we wish to adopt an easy, sure method of maintaining their independence; and, thirdly, whether we should start them among the nations of the world as a republic. My amendment gives them that opportunity. It can be voted up or voted down. It expresses my own views. I hope we shall not turn these islands loose with no agreement to safeguard their independence.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, there have been four principal arguments used by the proponents of this Philippine measure to support their position. One is that we have bound ourselves by a promise to give the Filipinos their independence. Another is that the Philippine Islands are a financial burden to us. The third is that the Philippine Islands are a military weakness, and the fourth is the sentimental argument that a government constituted as our own should not hold sovereignty over an alien people.

I have heretofore discussed the question of how far we were bound by any promise that has been made in regard to Philippine independence. I now want to discuss for a few minutes the question whether the Philippine Islands are a commercial asset to us or are a financial burden.

I enter into the discussion of that question at this point in the consideration of the bill because there is no statement which has been oftener made by those who favor independence than that the Philippine Islands are costing us annually anywhere from $25,000,000 to $50,000,000.

In discussing this measure I have not heretofore discussed the financial value of those islands, because, although I believe that they are a great commercial benefit to us, I have not felt that under the consideration in which we entered those islands their commercial relation was an important and controlling reason for our conduct on this measure. We are bound by much more important reasons, in my opinion, in regard to our policy in those islands. It was declared in the most formal way by the Congress of the United States that the object of our being there was for the purpose of uplifting and civilizing the Filipino people. If that was our motive and our purpose, it is not consistent with that purpose that we should weigh in the balance

on either side our commercial relations to the Philippines; and at this moment I do not advance the argument which I am about to make because I consider it should control or even largely influence the Senate in deciding this legislation. I consider it now because I think the statements which have been frequently made that the islands are a financial burden are entirely erroneous, and it is misleading to let them pass unchallenged.

The first appearance of that argument in a formal statement was in the report which was made by the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs in the House in introducing a Philippine bill in the Sixty-third Congress. He there stated that there were 17,370 soldiers in the Philippine Islands, and that the cost of maintaining them was $1,500 a soldier. Of those soldiers, only 12,277 were Americans, the balance, some 5,000, being natives, who were paid and organized on an entirely different basis from the American Army. But without separating the two classes of soldiers, he took this estimate of $1,500, multiplied the entire number of 17,370 by it, and arrived at a result of $26,000,000, which he claimed to be the cost of the military occupation of the islands.

He then assumed that the Philippines must have largely increased the cost of the Navy. Without bothering himself to give any analysis of this he apparently assumed that it was another $25,000,000 or so. Therefore, he arrived at the position that by giving up the Philippine Islands we would save the United States $50,000,000 annually.

One of the first subjects which the Philippine Committee of the Senate took under consideration in their study of conditions in the islands was this question of the annual cost of the islands to the United States. They asked Gen. McIntyre, the head of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, to make a careful report upon that subject. They gave him instructions to make his report as complete and accurate as possible. Gen. McIntyre made such a report, which is on page 666 of the hearings before that committee. It gives the figures in considerable detail, and as all the information that there was at the disposal of anybody was available for Gen. McIntyre on account of his position in control of those islands it must be regarded as the most definite statement we have. His report was that for the last 12 years the average annual expenditures of this Government, caused by the occupation of the islands, had been nine and a half million dollars, and that for the year 1914 the expenditures were $7,700,000.

This amount is as careful an estimate as can be made of the increased cost of the American soldiers that have been in the Philippines, over and above what it would have cost if they were in the United States. It is in some items excessive. For instance, it includes the entire cost of barracks in the Philippines on the ground that if our soldiers are withdrawn that expenditure would be useless. But if these soldiers had been in the United States we would probably have had to make some increased expenditures over what have been made for that purpose at home. The acceptance of this amount as the cost of our Philippine occupation is based on the theory that the size of our Army has not been increased by having these soldiers quartered there. This theory the advocates of a high cost for the Philippines do not accept. To meet their views it is necessary to add to it the cost of maintaining 12,000 soldiers at home. The General Board of the Army have recently figured that the total cost of maintaining a United States soldier, including all overhead expenses and averaging the cost of such soldiers whether at home or abroad, is $1,000 per man. If this Philippine occupation has caused an increase in the Army equal to the number of soldiers quartered there, we must add to Gen. McIntyre's estimate a thousand dollars for each of the 12,000 men in the Philippines, or a total of $12,000,000. This would make the outside possible cost of our military occupation $19,700,000.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that that has been the case. I do not think that there has been any increase in our Army on account of our maintenance of the Philippines. But if there has been, then the amount that would cover that increase is the figure which I have given.

These gentlemen then want to add to those figures something for the maintenance of the Navy, on the ground that we have a larger Navy to-day than we would have had if we had not the care of those islands to look out for. I certainly am not able to give my assent to that proposition. I do not believe that our Navy is any larger to-day than it would have been if we did not have the responsibility of those islands; and certainly in the light of the present movement in this country to very largely increase our Army and to very largely increase our Navy, the policy of preparedness in favor of which the President is now making speeches in different parts of the United States, it does not seem to me that we can claim that either the Army or the Navy was increased on account of our possession of those islands; but if they have been, it is a fortunate result.

Mr. President, this is the amount that we have spent under the conditions as they have existed. If the world had not been in its present disturbed condition and if this movement had not been made for the independence of the islands, which has come about on account of the control of the Government by the Democratic Party, and produced a more or less disturbed condition among the inhabitants of the islands, we would probably not have needed as many as 12,000 soldiers in the islands. I have no doubt, and in this I am simply stating what military men have told me—what Gen. McIntyre has said—that we could easily maintain our power and our sovereignty there with one-half the number of soldiers we have had there in the last few years. As a matter of fact, Spain for several years maintained her sovereignty with from 1,000 to 2,000 soldiers, and England has less than 2,500 in Bermuda and the West Indies.

If that is true, it is manifest, then, that when we look forward to the future the cost of the islands may reasonably be expected to continually diminish.

That, Mr. President, is the cost of the islands as I see it. On the other side of the ledger to balance our expenditures we have the benefit from the commerce of those islands. That commerce has grown enormously. Before we took possession of the islands we had practically no exports to the Philippines. They were $60,000 in 1892, and the highest for the seven years preceding our occupation was $162,000. They have now grown by rapid steps to the enormous total of $28,500,000, and in that $28,500,000 are comprised products of practically every kind of industry in the United States. They are the products of the farm, the products of the manufacture, and the products of the mine. So the returns are widely distributed among our people.

It has occurred to me to try to discover what is the value of $28,500,000 of exports to the United States or to any country. I approach my statement in regard to that question with a great deal of diffidence. I have searched everywhere that I thought the information might be obtained to find some discussion in the literature of economics on the question of the exact commercial value of a given amount of exports. I have had the authorities in the Congressional Library try to find something that bore on this point, but they have not succeeded. I have therefore had to fall back upon my own analysis of that problem.

The views at which I have arrived, however, are fortified by discussion with several Senators whose minds naturally incline to the consideration of that kind of a subject, and I have discussed it with two men outside of Congress who may be regarded as financial experts.

The statements I shall make about it, I will say, are, so far as I know, agreed to by all the gentlemen with whom I have discussed it. The conclusion at which I have arrived is that the value of $28,500,000 of exports to any country is practically $28,500,000.

It is generally admitted in considering that question that the profit of capital in the commercial transaction of selling its products to the Philippine Islands is a benefit to this country. It might perhaps be assumed that that would amount to 6 or 10 per cent of the value of those exports.

But we must also admit that the wages of labor are equally as profitable to a country as the wages of capital. The employment of our labor is just as necessary as to find employment for our capital. Therefore the amounts that are paid to labor, which, on the average, I believe, in this country are about 30 per cent of its products, will also have to be reckoned as a direct benefit.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LIPPITT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LEWIS. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island to evolve from his point of view a thought which I think would be very interesting. I believe he has given as much thought as any Senator on this floor touching the question of labor and products in the Philippine Islands. It is this: The Senator has been in favor of a protective tariff. I take it the Senator is still, for his very copious and complete speeches have shown that he favors the continuance of the protective system to the United States of America. Now, I ask the Senator would he favor the enforcement of a protective system against the island of Hawaii, and, again, would he favor——

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I shall have to ask the Senator to excuse me.

Mr. LEWIS. The Senator did not catch my query, if he will just let me finish. I take it he would not favor the advancement

of a protective tariff against Hawaii in favor of the United States. Therefore I assume he would not as against the Philippine Islands. Therefore I ask the Senator as follows: If we hold the Philippines and the American manufacturer carried his machinery to the Philippine Islands and educated the Filipinos into the method of production, would he not be able to so produce for the islands that he could send goods back, compete with the American labor and overrun the American market by virtue of the cheapness of labor in the Philippines and of our inability to put a tariff against our own possessions?

Mr. LIPPITT. I am going to ask the Senator from Illinois to excuse me from now entering into a discussion of the protective tariff. That is a question on which the Senator very well knows a great many arguments on both sides can be evolved. I am now discussing a definite commercial question which has a bearing, as I think, upon the discussion of the question that is immediately before the Senate. It is rather an involved one, and I should like to continue my analysis of it, if the Senator will allow me not to be diverted at this moment.

Mr. LEWIS. I misapprehended what the Senator was addressing his argument to.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LIPPITT. I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to the fact that he is arguing from the standpoint of commercial advantage upon the theory that if these exports from the United States are not made to the Philippine people when they are under our Government they will not be made at all.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator from Colorado will excuse me, I am not arguing it at present on any basis except that of trying to discover what is the proper value to be given to a certain number of dollars of export trade. If I can establish successfully the theory to which I have myself come in regard to that value, we can then discuss the subsidiary questions in connection with it.

First, I should like, if the Senator will allow me, to continue to give my reasons for supposing that the value of exports amounting to $28,000,000 is $28,000,000.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well.

Mr. LIPPITT. When I have finished that I will be glad, if the Senator wishes, to discuss with him whether we would retain the full amount of our exports in case we did not own the islands, which I understand is his proposition.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The assumption which the Senator makes is that we will lose all that commerce, whereas my theory is that if you treat those people fairly, if you give them their independence, you will get more from them than you get now.

Mr. LIPPITT. I will discuss that question when I have finished the particular matter I was considering when interrupted.

I had then suggested to the Senate that the profits of capital and wages of labor directly employed in articles exported were a benefit to the exporting country. It is also true, it seems to me, that in addition to this direct employment of capital and labor there is also an indirect employment in the production of articles that serve as the raw materials to the particular products that are exported which is equally beneficial. For instance, if you should take boots and shoes, on the basis of the statements which I have been making, the capital and the labor employed in their manufacture are directly benefited. But boots and shoes are made out of leather. The leather is produced upon the ranches. If there is not a market for those boots and shoes so that we are not able to manufacture in this country the amount that we are exporting, it is manifest that the ranchman and the tanner will not have a market for their leather.

Also, all the transportation interests of this country, which is our largest industry, find additional employment in taking these articles from the farm to the mill and from the manufactory to the coast on their way to the foreign country. In the same way, if you take an article from the farm, if you take wheat or flour, which are also exported to the Philippines in very considerable quantities; if you take lumber, which is exported; if you take mineral oil or crude oil, which is exported, not only is the man who produces that particular article, and the labor involved in it, benefited by the transaction, but all the subsidiary industries that enter into the production of those articles are benefited.

Therefore, analyzing this subject in this way, the conclusion which I have come to in regard to it is that the cash measure of the value of the export trade of any country—not our own in particular, not this particular trade, but of any foreign trade—is substantially 100 per cent of its value. It is quite possible that some one who may investigate this subject and think of it more deeply and longer than I have been able to do will find exceptions to be taken to that statement, but I think they will ultimately come somewhere near that conclusion.

If I am correct in this assumption, we have on the debit side of our Philippine occupation for the year 1914, as a commercial proposition, a cost of $7,700,000 on one theory or $19,700,000 on another theory, and we have to our credit a trade whose value was $28,500,000; which means a financial benefit in one case of $20,800,000 annually or in the other of $8,800,000, either of which is a very comfortable addition to our national resources, and as the years go by will make a substantial return to offset to some extent the large expenditures we have made in the past.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LIPPITT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. The only exception I can think of would be raw material that may be imported into the country and the cash from this country that goes out; but, barring that, I can not see but what the Senator is absolutely correct. Taking the importations of raw materials into consideration, I doubt very much whether it could possibly at any time exceed 5 per cent of the amount. So I think the Senator from Rhode Island is perfectly safe in saying that at least 95 per cent of all the exports from this country to the Philippine Islands is of direct benefit to the people of the United States and of the commerce of this country.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah for his very clear statement in approval of my views, and the suggestion of the exception which he makes seems to me very well taken. I have no doubt there will be found, on a careful analysis of this subject, other small items to which my theory would not exactly apply, but I think it is substantially correct.

Mr. President, we have another test of the value to a country of foreign exports. From the earliest date in history a market for exports has been persistently sought by the statesmen of every great nation.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] a few moments ago referred to the trade of Rome. The statement he made is quite true. It was to capture the trade of a rival commercial city that made Rome declare that Carthage must be destroyed. To come down to more recent times, it was to discover new channels for trade to the Indies that sent Columbus across the western ocean and resulted in the discovery of this country; it was to extend her trade that the great mariners of England, Raleigh and Drake, and their associates, scoured the seven seas and planted the flag of England wherever they hoped there would be a profitable market for trade. England in recent years has maintained her navy largely to police the channels of trade between herself and the great colonies which she has established; and it has been the constant flow of wealth from those colonies that has been the chief source of her financial strength and which makes her the commanding figure that she is in the world to-day.

For the benefits of their trade France has taken Algiers and Tunis, and within a few years has gone to the verge of war with Germany for the trade of Morocco. Italy, only a few years ago, went to war with Turkey for the possession of the trade of Tripoli. The export trade which France has with these African colonies amounts to $140,000,000 a year; and so great does she consider its value to be that she maintains 130,000 soldiers in those Provinces to guard it, and makes annual appropriations from her own exchequer of more than $20,000,000 to augment their local revenues.

Within very recent years Japan has taken Korea as a result of a great war, and is developing it for the purpose of benefiting her foreign trade.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LIPPITT. I yield.

Mr. WEEKS. I think the Senator from Rhode Island is quite sound in the statements he has made and in the conclusions that he is drawing, but perhaps he has overlooked one instance which demonstrates the correctness of his theory. As I recall the figures, in 1895 we had a trade with the island of Madagascar of $500,000. That year France took over the island, and the next year our trade with the island amounted to only

$11,000; it was practically eliminated, the trade going to the mother country, France.

Mr. LIPPITT. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his very pertinent illustration.

I was just speaking about Korea and Japan taking it over for the purposes of its trade. In 1904, before the Japanese-Russian War, when Japan had no control of that country, the exports of Japan to Korea were $5,880,000; in 1914 those exports had grown to $19,800,000; in other words, in 10 years Japan had increased her trade with Korea by the sum of about $13,000,000. I have not been able to ascertain how many soldiers Japan has in Korea to control that country, but the direct appropriations from the Japanese treasury to the finances of Korea in one year, the year 1913, were $6,175,000; in other words, Japan thought the trade of Korea so valuable that she paid by direct money appropriations, in addition to all the expense that she must be put to on account of her army, a sum that was equal to one-half the total cash value of the increase in exports which she had obtained on account of her occupation of that country.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. LIPPITT. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator from Rhode Island justify the occupation of Korea by Japan?

Mr. LIPPITT. I have not discussed that subject. I was merely talking about what she was willing to pay for her trade and trying to illustrate the importance of foreign trade to a nation. I am not entering into any of the moral considerations as to what ought or ought not influence them.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand, then, the Senator from Rhode Island does not mean that in order to enlarge our trade we ought to enter upon aggressive warfare in countries that can not resist us.

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not know whether or not the Senator from Iowa happened to be here at the time I began my remarks, but I then distinctly stated that I had not considered that the commercial benefit that might come to us from our relations to the Philippines ought to be a controlling influence in the consideration of the question; that I was considering it simply from another standpoint.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know the Senator has given this matter a great deal of thought, and, diverting him a moment to what we may call the moral considerations, I ask, Why should not one nation conquer another in order to acquire the trade of that other or any other advantage that may flow from the conquest? Why should not a strong nation take a weak one, if it believes that it can at once enlarge its trade and confer benefits or advantages upon the captured or conquered people?

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, it has been the practice of the world as far back as history goes to pursue that course.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator think we ought to continue that course and that the world ought to continue that course?

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Iowa that there is nobody on this floor who more strongly disapproves of war for the purposes he has described, or for other purposes of aggression, than do I; I would much rather join the Senator in a movement to get universal peace than universal trade by conquest.

Mr. CUMMINS. Then, if we were not in possession of the Philippine Islands, the Senator from Rhode Island would not advocate taking possession of them by force?

Mr. LIPPITT. That is, for the purposes of their trade.

Mr. CUMMINS. Or for any purpose?

Mr. LIPPITT. Well, Mr. President, I think that if we were not in possession of the Philippine Islands I should be very glad.

Mr. CUMMINS. Then the Senator—I ask because I want fully to understand his position—is of the opinion that we ought to remain in possession of the Philippines because our accidental or unintended occupation of the islands has created some obligation upon our part that we have not yet fulfilled?

Mr. LIPPITT. That is substantially true. It is not an indefinite obligation, in my opinion, though; it is an obligation that has been distinctly expressed and formulated by the United States Congress and by the President of the United States, acting in his capacity originally as Commander in Chief of the forces of the United States.

Mr. CUMMINS. Just one other question. Would the Senator from Rhode Island favor a representation to the people of the Philippine Islands that we expect they will ultimately become a State in the Union and entitled to all the privileges and rights of citizens of a State in the Union?

Mr. LIPPITT. I would not, Mr. President.

Mr. CUMMINS. Will the Senator from Rhode Island say why not?

Mr. LIPPITT. I would rather not discuss that phase, if the Senator will allow me, just at this minute, because the subject I was discussing is so entirely different from it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I realize that my question is not pertinent to the discussion which the Senator from Rhode Island is now carrying on.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LIPPITT. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether he believes we would have much trade with the Filipino people if we should deny rights to them which they believed belonged to them?

Mr. LIPPITT. I did not quite catch the drift of the Senator's question.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I want to ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether he believes that we would have much trade with the Philippine people if we were to deny to them rights to which they believe they are entitled? The Senator says that he does not believe in ever giving them statehood. If that is the case, and we, under our form of government, recognize that those people are entitled at some time to statehood, is it possible that the Senator thinks that we could have good trade relations with the Philippine people if we were to deny them rights to which they believe they are entitled?

Mr. LIPPITT. In the first place, Mr. President, I do not think the Filipino people consider that they have such rights or would want to exercise those rights if they had them, for the information which I have, and which I believe is correct, about those islands is that while there is a small political party who have made a great outcry in regard to independence, nothing in the world would be so distasteful to them as to have the United States Congress to-day pass a joint resolution that on the 1st day of next July our forces would be withdrawn from those islands and that they would be given this thing about which the Senator from Colorado talks of their wanting so strongly.

Now, let me go further than that in answer to the Senator's question. I have answered the question several times on the floor of the Senate within the last two weeks, and I really am reluctant to continually discuss the same subject and to make the same answer; but the conditions between us and the Philippine people are such that we are responsible for the maintenance of order and for the development of those people. Whether it was right or wrong, we went into the Philippine Islands without the consent of those people, without the consent of the Government of those people, which was then the Kingdom of Spain. We destroyed the Government which had lasted there, and which was substantially satisfactory, for three centuries, and we substituted in place of it the Government of the United States. We can not leave those islands without leaving a stain on the history of this country until we leave them in such a condition that the maintenance of order will be probable, at least, if not certain.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I do not want to be further diverted into a discussion of this point; but the question which the Senator from Colorado asked me a few moments ago, if he cares to repeat it, I shall be very glad to take up with him now; that is, the question whether or not we would retain the Philippine commerce, of whose value I have been trying to make some estimate, in case we abandon the government of the islands. I think that was the question which the Senator asked.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; my question was whether or not we should retain that trade if we should refuse to the Filipinos rights which they believe they possess according to our form of government.

Mr. LIPPITT. That was the question the Senator just asked, but not more than 5 or 10 minutes ago he asked me the question whether I thought, if we withdrew our government from the Philippine Islands, we would lose this trade. If the Senator cares to hear an answer to that question now, I will be glad to make it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No. My position was that the Senator was assuming all the way through, in regard to the benefit that was coming to this country, that we would lose all of that trade if we did not keep the islands, whereas, in my judgment, we shall gain by giving independence to the islands.

Mr. LIPPITT. That was exactly the question which I thought the Senator had asked me, and I will say to the Senator, in reply to that question, that I not only think we would lose the trade of those islands, but I am almost certain we would lose it in such case. The only way we obtain trade with the

Philippine Islands at the present time is by reason of the fact that we have a preferential tariff there. Exports from this country go there without being subject to any import duties. Articles exported there by any other nation in the world are subject to a duty. So, we have that advantage so long as we retain the sovereignty of these islands; we have the preference of trade with those people. If they become an independent people, they must stand in the same relation to us that they stand in toward every other nation in the world. They can not make treaties giving special preferences to us in regard to such important matters as the trade of their islands without incurring the enmity of other nations who are not treated equally as well. It is only common sense, therefore, to suppose that our trade would at least be very materially diminished; and I venture to say that if those islands should be taken over by Japan our trade with the Philippines would not only be materially diminished but would be practically destroyed.

Sir, before the Russian-Japanese War we had a very large trade with Manchuria. That trade has almost disappeared. For the commodities formerly sent there by the United States have been substituted the products of Japan. I do not blame her for trying to find a market for the products of her people and her capital. It was for these purposes, I think, largely that she went to war, and she is enjoying those benefits as a result of the victory she won.

The fact is, Mr. President, in regard to the trade of the Philippine Islands that not only has it mounted in a very few years from nothing to the sum of $28,500,000—which is a very considerable sum of money—but the trade of that country has only been scratched. The Philippines have most abundant resources, as testified to by many people who have examined into that subject.

In the short period of five years, I think, we have increased our export trade to the Philippines from $10,000,000 to $28,500,000, and it is a very reasonable supposition that in another 15 years, if the present relations between us and the Philippine Islands continue, we might have an export trade of $50,000,000 with those islands. I want to say that, in my opinion, the day that we announce that we are going to sever our connection with the Philippines the trade of those islands will be recognized by the statesmen who control the destinies of every other great commercial nation in this world as one of the great prizes open for their attainment. Methods of obtaining it will be a matter of constant discussion in the councils of every nation that wants to expand its commerce, and that includes all the great nations of the world. They will look with the greatest astonishment upon this Nation, which at one minute is discussing the expenditure of $50,000,000 for shipping, to be run, as it is admitted, at a loss, for the purpose of establishing foreign trade, while the next minute it deliberately turns around and abandons a trade which it already has established and the future prospects of which are so fair. Nothing can be more inconsistent than the position Senators on the other side of this Chamber now take in regard to the Philippines and that which they took for two long months a year ago in this Chamber, in connection with another measure, on the ground that they wanted to develop the foreign commerce of the United States.

Mr. President, there is another argument to which I desire to refer, namely, the argument that the possession of the Philippine Islands is a military weakness. I do not believe that it can be successfully denied that our occupation of the Philippines does expose us somewhat to foreign attack. It exposes us to foreign complications exactly in the same way as any part of the three and a half billion dollars—I think that is the figure now—of our exports exposes us to the same thing. We can not as a nation enter into the markets of the world, with our products without also assuming responsibility in regard to them. I think that the Philippines to some extent open us to attack exactly in the same way as the possession of Porto Rico does, as our relations with Cuba do, as the Hawaiian Island and Guam expose us to attack; but I do not believe that the American Nation is so timid that it wants to allow that circumstance to exercise a controlling influence in determining its course with regard to this question.

I will say, sir, that in the hearings that were held upon this subject that very question was asked of the Secretary of War, Mr. Garrison. His reply was that from a military standpoint we would be better off without the Philippines. Then he goes on to say:

> For instance, I think any one of Great Britain's outlying islands is a liability to her, because it is more difficult to defend, of course, than home territory and it is at any time likely to require defense. There is not any question about that. That would not alter my notion about what we should do. I think we should do what we promised, and what we have held out, regardless of the consequences to ourselves.

In the remarks which the President of the United States made yesterday he expressed very much the same idea that the Secretary of War expressed a year ago. He said:

> The hard, ugly fact is that it—
>
> Referring to the world—
>
> will heed us only if it is certainly known that our obligations to ourselves and our ideals can and will be met to the utmost and without delay should anyone seek to embarrass their fulfillment or to make it impossible.

That is the position which the head of the party to which Senators on the other side belong has committed himself within 24 hours; it is the position to which the Secretary of War has also committed himself. So that we have the Commander in Chief and his highest military adviser believing that it is not the proper policy of this country to be influenced by the mere threat of a disturbance.

Mr. President, it is a very curious thing in history that the Philippine Islands have been the only nation in the Orient, or so far as I know in any other part of the world, that has been made the subject of two great humanitarian propagandas. Three centuries ago Spain undertook to Christianize the people of those islands. In those days the dissemination of the Christian religion was one of the great and noble purposes of many of the Governments of Europe. I am aware that the methods they employed were not always those that we would approve of to-day, but they, nevertheless, were inspired by a belief that in what they were doing they were advancing the higher purposes of humanity. I want to read to you what the King of Spain, Philip, after whom the islands were named, said in regard to that question. Originally those islands were looked to as possessing abundant supplies of precious metals. I read from Taylor's report upon the Philippine insurrection:

> An early contemporary writer says that when it was reported to the King that the Philippines were not rich in gold and pearls and that their occupation might be a source of expense rather than of profit, he answered, "That is not a matter of moment; I am an instrument of Divine providence; the main thing is the conversion of the kingdom of Luzon, and God has predestined me for that end, having chosen me as King for that purpose, and, since he has intrusted so glorious a work to me and my crown, I shall hold the island of Luzon, even though by so doing I exhaust my treasury.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator who said that?

Mr. LIPPITT. Philip, the King of Spain.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Philip II?

Mr. LIPPITT. Yes; Philip II.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator will permit me, my recollection is that the sort of Christianity that Philip II would carry would not do the Filipinos very much good.

Mr. LIPPITT. I admit that, according to our light, that is true; but nevertheless the introduction of Christianity to the other nations of the world was at that time one of the high and noble objects of the people of Europe. We may or may not approve of it, but the thought that inspired the words of the King of Spain was regarded in that age as one of its ennobling aspirations, and the courageous persistence with which he and his successors continued the work to which they had devoted themselves resulted in entire success. Through all the Orient the only people who are subject to the influences of Christianity are the Filipino people.

Now, it so happens, Mr. President, that after the lapse of three centuries another great nation, the United States, has undertaken in the Philippine Islands to introduce what it believes is one of the worthy purposes of our age. It has undertaken in the most solemn way and by the most binding promises to teach those people the art of self-government.

The King of Spain believed in his mission, and would not be hindered in its fulfillment by fear of the consequences. We have elected to take his place in the control of these people, and declared our purpose to be their elevation, as he believed his was. I do not think we will shine in comparison with Spain if, when we have undertaken such a project, the mere thought that it may involve us in some difficulties is enough to make us abandon our purposes. If our action is controlled by that consideration, I do not think this Nation will be very proud of it in future years.

Mr. President, in considering this question of independence for the Philippines there is one rather important matter that has not been mentioned in the debate upon this subject. It is the question of the financial ability of the Philippines to run their government. The success of a modern government largely depends upon the revenues which are at its disposal. The Philippine people at the best are not a rich people. Their total revenues to-day amount to only $15,000,000—not more than the cost of a single battleship. Of that $15,000,000 not over a million and a half to two millions are available for what we may call public works—for works of permanent benefit in those islands. If the

protection of the United States is withdrawn from them, it is manifest that they will have to take into consideration not merely their protection from foreign powers, but, what is more important and will perhaps be more difficult, the maintenance of order within their own territory.

The great service which the United States Government is now rendering them is that it insures domestic tranquillity. If we withdraw our protection, it means that the money they now have available for improvements, and even more, will have to be devoted to the primary purpose of every government—the maintenance of order. It certainly means much heavier taxation. The great service which the United States Government is performing for the Filipino people is in relieving them from that responsibility. The maintenance of order is so fundamental in the duties of every government, and particularly of one whose people are situated as are the Filipinos, that the thought has constantly occurred to me in the consideration of this subject: "What is going to happen to them in case we withdraw our protection?"

All my consideration of my position on this subject ultimately comes back to the consideration of that question: What will be the conditions in those islands, for whose domestic order we are responsible, if they are left to their own resources? In connection with my thought on that subject I want to read the statement that has been made upon it by Mr. Dean Worcester.

Of all the Americans who have had connection with those islands none have been more devoted to the interests of the Filipino people than Mr. Worcester. The work he has done there has received the highest praise from the men who were associated with him in the government; and now that a new régime has come to the islands, his successor in the department of the interior has put into his report of this year praise as pronounced as that of any of the men of his own political faith. No American in the islands has ever had such intimate knowledge of the so-called wild people or un-Christian people of the islands as has Mr. Worcester, and if there is any man who is entitled to speak with authority on the subject of the Filipino people's independence of the United States it is Mr. Worcester.

He was asked what would happen there with complete independence, and his answer is so concise and complete that I desire to take this opportunity of putting it into the RECORD. I am reading from page 302 of the Senate hearings:

> I think that what would happen would be that there would be a quarrel for offices in the first instance; that elections would soon become farcical; that within a comparatively short time the different political factions would become so at outs with each other that armed violations of public order would result; that we would soon have a state of bloodshed and anarchy, and that not very long after complete independence had been granted there would occur aggressions against foreigners owing to the disturbance of the public order; that these aggressions would be of such a nature as to justify foreign intervention and would be made the basis for such intervention; and that the islands would be taken possession of by some foreign power or powers beyond the peradventure of a doubt.

The thought that continually comes to me in regard to the future of these people is, if the picture which is there painted by Mr. Worcester should come true, how much of the responsibility for it would rest upon my shoulders if I voted to-day to give them their independence in what I consider their present unprepared condition?

I am aware that Mr. Worcester is merely a single individual. I am aware that however intimate his connection has been with the islands and with their people, he is as much subject to error as other human beings. But I can not shut my eyes, sir, to the possibility of what he says being true. If it should so happen that after we had withdrawn from the islands such conditions as now prevail in Mexico occurred there—if murder and oppression and robbery of the natives should prevail, such as prevails in Mexico—if murder and robbery and other worse crimes were perpetrated upon the American citizens there, would not the responsibility for that rest upon my shoulders if I voted to-day to take away from those people the protection that America is giving them?

I can not help believing, sir, that the Senators on the other side of this Chamber who are thinking of voting for immediate independence—and I particularly think, sir, of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who leads in that policy—ought to think in the most serious manner of the direct, personal responsibility that, in my judgment, will rest upon their shoulders if these unfortunate conditions should prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the further pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I do not know that there is any possibility of proceeding much further to-day with the bill. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island, however, whether it is possible to have a unanimous-consent agreement that beginning on Tuesday all speeches shall be limited to 10 minutes?

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, the thought that occurs to me in regard to that question is that there as so many amendments here, and I do not know how many Senators on this side wish to discuss them further; that without consultation with them I should not personally care to express an opinion upon that point. I think, however, that the Senate is very close to a vote on this subject, and I thought perhaps it would seem wise to the Senator in charge of the bill to suggest that the legislative day of Tuesday should be continued for the purpose of arriving at a vote. It seems to me that if the discussion of the bill were then made continuous it would not be long before the discussion would be exhausted, and in the natural course of events a vote would be obtained.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I think it is not possible to secure an adequate attendance here and to get prompt action as long as the time of the Senate is taken with lengthy speeches. Inasmuch as the merits of the whole bill have been discussed by all those who intend to discuss them now, except one or two who can come in to-morrow, it seems to me that if we can limit the speeches to 10 minutes we can get action much more effectively, and we can in that way secure a good attendance of Senators.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senator that I think to-morrow all the long speeches will be concluded. With the exception of one or two Senators, I know of no one who intends to make any lengthy remarks, and they are not very lengthy. Why not leave it until they are through and then see if we can make the agreement to-morrow?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I can not hear the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I have just suggested to the Senator from Nebraska that he should not try to get an agreement to-day on the question of the length of speeches to be delivered; that to-morrow, no doubt, most of the lengthy speeches will be over, and there will be more Senators in the Chamber than there are at this time. It would be much better to ask for a unanimous-consent agreement at that time than at this late hour of the day.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I should be very glad to see the arrangement made that is suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island, for I have no disposition to delay a vote. I should not be willing, however, to consent to the agreement proposed by the Senator from Nebraska, for I have some observations to make upon an amendment that I will offer in due time. I could not agree to a limitation of debate to 10 minutes until I at least have said what I want to say.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. For that reason, in making my request, I omitted Saturday and Monday, and have phrased it so that it would apply only to Tuesday.

Mr. CUMMINS. But I do not know what will be before the Senate on Saturday and Monday. I do not know how completely other matters may take up the time of the Senate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will let the matter go over until to-morrow, then, but I give notice that I shall make the request again.

I now ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

INTERNATIONAL HIGH COMMISSION.

Mr. STONE. By the consent of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 8235) to provide for the maintenance of the United States section of the International High Commission, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill be read first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the appointment of the nine delegates by the Secretary of the Treasury to represent the United States in the proceedings of the International High Commission to be held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, during the year 1916, in accordance with the action of the First Pan American Financial Conference held in Washington during the year 1915, pursuant to the provisions of an act of Congress, approved March 4, 1915, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916," be, and the same is hereby, approved and confirmed; such delegates shall be known as the United States Section of the International High Commission and shall cooperate with the other sections of the commission in taking action upon the recommendations of the First Pan American Financial Conference; and the President is authorized to fill any vacancies that may occur in the United States section of said international commission.

For the purpose of meeting such actual and necessary expenses on the part of the United States section of the commission as may arise from its work and investigations, or as may be incidental to its attendance at the meeting of the said International High Commission, the

sum of $40,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, to be immediately available, and to remain available until expended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After three minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 29, 1916, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 28, 1916.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Louis D. Brandeis, of Massachusetts, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice Joseph Rucker Lamar, deceased.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Charles M. Sleeper, of South Berwick, Me., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Me., in place of Willis T. Emmons, whose term of office expires by limitation on February 29, 1916.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

First Lieut. Wylie T. Conway, Sixth Infantry, to be captain from January 18, 1916, vice Maj. James J. Mayes, judge advocate, who resigned his commission as captain of Infantry only, January 17, 1916.

Second Lieut. James L. Frink, Third Infantry, to be first lieutenant from January 18, 1916, vice First Lieut. Wylie T. Conway, Sixth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edmund R. Andrews, Thirteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from January 21, 1916, vice First Lieut. Harry S. Malone, Sixteenth Infantry, who died January 20, 1916.

Second Lieut. Joseph A. Rogers, Twentieth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from January 22, 1916, vice First Lieut. Luther Felker, Sixteenth Infantry, retired from active service January 21, 1916.

POSTMASTERS.

COLORADO.

Henry V. Fluke to be postmaster at Eads, Colo. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

IOWA.

Bezle I. Dee to be postmaster at Akron, Iowa, in place of Minnie A. Muhs, resigned.

MICHIGAN.

Fred O'Melay to be postmaster at Hillsdale, Mich., in place of S. B. Frankhauser. Incumbent's commision expired January 15, 1916.

MISSISSIPPI.

Hubbard E. McClurg to be postmaster at Ruleville, Miss., in place of H. E. McClurg. Incumbent's commission expires February 19, 1916.

NEBRASKA.

Louis H. Deaver to be postmaster at Cody, Nebr. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

August Dickenman to be postmaster at Talmage, Nebr. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

George C. Fox to be postmaster at Bayard, Nebr., in place of Francis Wisner, deceased.

Grover C. Hoback to be postmaster at Nehawka, Nebr. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

H. P. Wilson to be postmaster at Geneva, Nebr., in place of Hattie A. Little. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1915.

NEW YORK.

John G. Armsby to be postmaster at Petersburg, N. Y., in place of Hiram J. Moses. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1915.

Arthur C. Dunning to be postmaster at Yorktown Heights, N. Y., in place of N. I. Mekeel. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1915.

Clarence M. Graves to be postmaster at Champlain, N. Y., in place of T. H. Dickinson. Incumbent's commission expires February 7, 1916.

Dennis P. Hayes to be postmaster at Tupper Lake, N. Y., in place of Ernest A. Drew. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1916.

Thomas R. McGinley to be postmaster at Stapleton, N. Y., in place of Frederick Rohde. Incumbent's commission expired May 16, 1915.

Asa G. Neff to be postmaster at Downsville, N. Y., in place of Archie Campbell, resigned.

William G. Phippin to be postmaster at Red Creek, N. Y., in place of Orson F. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1915.

Emil J. Trimpin to be postmaster at Prince Bay, N. Y., in place of U. G. Sprague. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1916.

George B. Van Valkenburgh to be postmaster at Catskill, N. Y., in place of Lucius R. Doty. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1916.

NORTH CAROLINA.

J. J. Farriss to be postmaster at High Point, N. C., in place of W. G. Bradshaw, deceased.

OHIO.

Frederic C. Betts to be postmaster at Williamsport, Ohio. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

F. B. Biggert to be postmaster at West Jefferson, Ohio, in place of John H. Bidwell. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1916.

O. C. Reynolds to be postmaster at Peebles, Ohio, in place of Cary A. Watts. Incumbent's commission expires February 15, 1916.

Thomas N. Swearingen to be postmaster at Winchester, Ohio, in place of Thomas E. de Bruin. Incumbent's commission expires February 15, 1916.

OKLAHOMA.

Charles M. Hirt to be postmaster at Pawhuska, Okla., in place of W. E. McGuire. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1916.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Michael C. Bermingham to be postmaster at Blossburg, Pa., in place of George D. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1916.

William Critchfield to be postmaster at Herminie, Pa., in place of Shepherd M. Lash, removed.

J. L. Davis to be postmaster at Cherry Tree, Pa., in place of J. G. Sechler. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

PORTO RICO.

Carlos F. Torregrosa to be postmaster at Aguadilla, P. R., in place of C. F. Torregrosa. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

William L. Blackmon to be postmaster at Kershaw, S. C., in place of Martin Cauthen. Incumbent's commission expires February 21, 1916.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Otto Engelbrecht to be postmaster at Elkton, S. Dak., in place of Henry Heintz. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1915.

TEXAS.

Searcy B. Boulware to be postmaster at Hempstead, Tex., in place of T. O. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1915.

WEST VIRGINIA.

G. A. Porter to be postmaster at Kenova, W. Va., in place of Albert G. Holt. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1916.

M. J. Wilson to be postmaster at Milton, W. Va., in place of J. A. Justice. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1916.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 28, 1916.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be probational second lieutenants, with rank from January 12, 1916.

Gilbert Dudley Fish.
George Mayo.
Paul Theodore Bock.
Charles Otis Boynton.

Arthur Peter von Deesten.
Edward Nelson Whitney.

POSTMASTERS.

MINNESOTA.

C. M. Anderson, Baudette.
John A. Timpane, Waterville.

NEW YORK.

Fay W. Amidon, Hilton.
Warren C. Brady, Brushton.
Walter F. Brown, Remsen.
Antoine N. Burton, Keeseville.
Henry J. Griffin, Bombay.
E. J. Hanratta, Watervliet.
Hans C. Hansen, Fishers Island.
Ernest D. Joslin, Voorheesville.
Thomas O'Brien, Carmel.
John W. Rose, Arlington.
George W. Runyon, Spring Valley.
Scott B. Smith, Warrensburg.
Ezra H. Welling, Monroe.

VERMONT.

John L. Welsh, Proctor.

WISCONSIN.

Alois Goebel, Mount Horeb.
J. E. Hennig, Princeton.
Carrie Kautsky, Colby.
Herman Kronschnabl, Dorchester.
John H. Levis, Black River Falls.
F. A. Lonsdorf, Athens.
P. J. Love, Coleman.
Joseph Marx, Hilbert.
Otto J. Melcher, Wantoma.
Frank Mischo, Wabeno.
Andrew J. Osborne, Barron.
Henry Pattison, Durand.
Alfred W. Puchner, Edgar.
George I. Richmond, Lodi.
F. C. Schliesman, Cambria.
W. D. Schultz, Stanley.
Henry R. Schumann, Kohler.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *January 28, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art love, rich in grace, plenteous in mercy, pour out upon us Thy blessing. We confess our ignorance, and pray for wisdom; our weakness, and pray for strength; our selfishness, and pray for nobility of soul, that we may reach the ideals which in our better moments we long for. Increase our faith and confidence in Thee, in ourselves, and in our fellow men, that we may answer conscientiously the call of the now, and pass on at the appointed time, unperturbed. In the spirit of the Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal, I may address the House for 40 minutes on the subject of a tariff commission.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman that there are already two speeches set for to-morrow, that of Mr. HENRY, of Texas, for 30 minutes, and that of Mr. Foss, of Illinois, for 40 minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Subject to the orders already made, of course.

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. BORLAND. Forty minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, immediately following the remarks of Mr. Foss, of Illinois, he be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes on the subject of a tariff board or commission. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the Indian appropriation bill is likely to be in to-day or not.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think it will be in to-day.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Texas expects, then, to go into general debate on it to-morrow?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I have not consulted the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], the minority leader on our committee, on the subject of whether we will take it up to-morrow or not.

The SPEAKER. This request of the gentleman from Missouri is subject to that.

Mr. MANN. Yes; I so understand; but if we are going into general debate to-morrow it would be better to have the speech made during general debate on the bill.

Mr. BORLAND. If that is agreed upon, all right; but I would like to have the order made now, and we can arrange that later.

Mr. MANN. If we get up the Indian appropriation bill, the gentleman will take his time then?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes. I would be perfectly willing to do that; but, pending that, I would like to have it arranged for now.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that both the Post Office appropriation bill and the Indian appropriation bill were ordered to be reported yesterday.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my request be allowed now, pending the determination of the question of general debate on the Indian appropriation bill, which may be arranged for later. I would like to have the order made now as a pending order.

Mr. GARNER rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit a request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. But before that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] asks unanimous consent that the order be made now to allow him to have 40 minutes after the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] concludes to-morrow, subject to the conditions——

Mr. MANN. He makes that request?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes. If the Indian bill is in the House for general debate, I am willing to take the time then, but I would like to have the order made now anyway.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] asks unanimous consent that the order be made now to allow him 40 minutes to-morrow at the conclusion of the address of Mr. Foss, and if the Indian appropriation bill is taken up he will transfer the order so as to use the time during general debate on that bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] be allowed to address the House for one hour at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that his colleague Mr. DIES be permitted at this time to address the House for one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is Private Calendar Day and pension bills have the preference. I have talked with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and with some other Members on the floor who desire to take part in the general debate, including the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], the ranking member of the committee on the minority side of the House. We have agreed about general debate, and we will submit it to the House all in one proposition, if that is satisfactory to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARNER. That is satisfactory provided my colleague [Mr. DIES] gets his hour. If the gentleman from Missouri will make his request so that my colleague from Texas will get his hour it will be entirely satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. Let us hear what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] has to suggest.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar. I do not know what bill will be called up on the Private Calendar, but pending that I will ask unanimous consent that two hours and a half be given to general debate, one hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and one-half of the remainder to be controlled by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] and one-half by myself.

Mr. DICKINSON rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. DICKINSON. I rise, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] to with-

hold his request until I can make a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I yield, Mr. Speaker, for that purpose.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a memorandum by Mr. Franklin H. Lane, answering the question, "Why does the Democratic Party deserve the continued confidence of the country?" and showing that the Democratic Party has made good under the administration of President Wilson.

Mr. MANN. I shall not object, Mr. Speaker, but it will take a good many such articles to convince the people of the country. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to printing this essay by Secretary Lane defending the administration?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] will yield to me, I wish to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by Mr. Paul Warburg, of the Federal Reserve Board, defending our financial system.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an article or speech by Mr. Warburg. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by placing in the RECORD an argument in behalf of Federal aid for roads in the public domain.

The SPEAKER. Who wrote it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The argument is my own and that of a constituent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing certain remarks of his own and of other people on the question of the Government furnishing aid for the building of roads.

Mr. MANN. When did we pass the good-roads bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This relates to roads on the public domain, in the forest reserves.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman would have authority under the general leave.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I doubt it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I should like to modify my request and ask for three hours' general debate—one hour to be occupied by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and one hour each to be controlled by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] and myself; and inasmuch as the rules would not otherwise permit it, I ask that the general debate be permitted upon any subject and not confined to the bill.

Mr. MANN. As though we were in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. As though we were in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar, and pending that motion he asks unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to three hours——

Mr. MANN. On the first bill.

The SPEAKER. On the first bill; one hour to go to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], and the other two hours to be divided equally between the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, that arrangement will be satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. And that the debate be on any subject that any gentleman desires.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to have the gentleman modify his request so as to give 40 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH].

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. That to be included in the three hours?

Mr. MANN. No; in addition to that.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. In addition to that. I am willing to modify the request to that extent, to make the time 3 hours and 40 minutes, the 40 minutes to go to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH].

The SPEAKER. Then the request is changed to 3 hours and 40 minutes, 1 hour to be used by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], 40 minutes by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH], and the other 2 hours to be equally divided between the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar, in order under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] will take the chair. The Chair is informed that the gentleman from New York declines on the ground of the pressure of other public business, and the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] will take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of considering bills on the Private Calendar. The Clerk will report the first bill.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. The first bill printed on the calendar is not the one entitled to preference to-day. I ask to call up House bill 10037, the omnibus pension bill.

PENSIONS.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 10037) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-one Members present—a quorum. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, this is a time for plain speech, for truthful and candid statement. The question we are called upon to determine is vastly more vital to the American people than the political fortunes of any man or political party. This question rises high above the riot for party advantage and the noisy clamor of men for place and power. It goes to the very foundation of our institutions and affects every man, woman, and child in the Government. The question, briefly stated, is this: Shall the Government of the United States reverse its policy with regard to militarism? Is the danger from without sufficiently great and apparent to justify us in creating a danger within in the form of a large standing Army and a ponderous American Navy? President Wilson told us that it was a nonpartisan question, and I shall treat it as such.

This great Republic was established by the victory of the citizen soldiery of the thirteen Colonies against the standing army of England. In all the hundred and forty years since our independence we have relied upon the citizen to come forward and defend his country in time of peril. He has always responded, and has always borne the flag of victory. Our fathers who founded this free Government and maintained it against every foe were of one mind against a large standing army. Foes from without they had met and vanquished, they had no dread of invasion; but they had learned the lesson of all history that the spirit of liberty, equality, and free government could not live in the military atmosphere. Before we reverse this policy of antimilitarism, under which we have builded so wisely and so wonderfully, let the people be shown the danger from without which is to be met by taking to our bosom the internal danger of an overgrown military and naval establishment.

Those who seek to frighten this Nation into military and naval extravagance have been driven to the absurd and unpatriotic task of belittling the volunteer soldier upon whom we have always relied for the defense of our country in time of war, and discrediting the American Navy, which in gallantry and efficiency is the greatest in the world, and which in point of defensive strength is second only to that of England. In order to bully and stampede the people into the expenditure of vast treasure, they have pictured our country as being hopelessly and helplessly unprepared to meet an enemy.

THE VOLUNTEER SOLDIER.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take up the time of Congress in defense of the volunteer soldier. His place in history is secure. No war for liberty was ever won without him. As a citizen

home builder he erects the State in times of peace, and as the citizen soldier he protects the State in times of war.

Those who seek to build up a large military establishment in times of peace constantly din it in our ears that the great victories of the world have been won by regular soldiers, professional fighters, as it were. The very contrary is true. The great wars of ancient and modern times have been largely, almost entirely, waged by volunteer forces. The early wars of the Greek Republics were waged by volunteer soldiers against the regular soldiers of the Persian Empire, and the victory was with liberty against barbarism and despotism. After the disastrous defeat at Cannæ it was the Roman farmers, volunteer soldiers, who rallied to the standard and finally won the victory.

In the civil war between Charles the first and Parliament the standing army of England was small, but what there was of it was with Charles, and they were most ingloriously defeated at Marston Moor, and driven to hopeless ruin at Naseby.

In our Revolutionary War the struggle for freedom was fought and won solely by volunteer soldiers. Have the advocates of a large standing Army forgotten that the early battles of our Revolutionary struggles—Lexington and Concord Bridge—were won against British regulars by the volunteer farmer soldiers of Massachusetts? Have they never read Emerson's stirring lines?—

By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Here once the embatti'd farmers stood,
And fired the shot heard round the world.

At the Battle of Bunker Hill the British regular army under Lord Howe was defeated by the Colonial volunteers under Warren, Prescott, and Putnam.

When the British regular army under Burgoyne invaded New York they were thoroughly routed and compelled to surrender to the militia volunteers of New York and New England under command of Gens. Gates, Schuyler, and Arnold.

One of the most decisive battles of the Revolutionary War was that of Kings Mountain. The patriot volunteers routed and destroyed the British forces composed of regular soldiers.

It is well known that the brilliant victories of the French in the early stages of the French Revolution were won by volunteer soldiers against the regular soldiers, the standing armies, of Prussia, Austria, and Russia.

In our own War of 1812 the one decisive victory won by our forces on land was the Battle of New Orleans, when, with an inferior force of militiamen under command of Gen. Andrew Jackson, a militia general, the British regular soldiers were disastrously defeated. The British general was a brother-in-law of Wellington and the British soldiers, of superior numbers, were seasoned troops of the regular army. They were met by inferior numbers of raw militiamen and disastrously defeated.

The 700 Texas soldiers who destroyed the regular army of Santa Ana at San Jacinto and achieved Texas independence were volunteers—farmers, lawyers, doctors, and merchants.

The American soldiers who won the Mexican War of 1847 were volunteers. In a message to Congress at the close of the Mexican War, President Polk recorded his estimate of the citizen soldier and uselessness of a standing army in this country. He said:

One of the most important results of the war into which we were recently forced with a neighboring nation is the demonstration it has afforded of the military strength of our country. Before the late War with Mexico European and other foreign powers entertained imperfect and erroneous views of our physical strength as a Nation and of our ability to prosecute war, and especially a war waged out of our own country. They saw that our standing army on the peace establishment did not exceed 10,000 men. Accustomed themselves to maintain in peace large standing armies for the protection of thrones against their own subjects, as well as against foreign enemies, they had not conceived that it was possible for a nation without such an army well disciplined and of long service to wage war successfully. They held in low repute our militia, and were far from regarding them as an effective force, unless it might be for temporary defensive operations when invaded on our soil. The events of the late War with Mexico have not only undeceived them, but have removed erroneous impressions which prevailed to some extent even among a portion of our own countrymen. That war has demonstrated that upon the breaking out of hostilities not anticipated, and for which no previous preparation had been made, a voluntary army of citizen soldiers equal to veteran troops, and in numbers equal to any emergency, can in a short period be brought into the field. Unlike what would have occurred in any other country, we were under no necessity of resorting to draft or conscriptions. On the contrary, such was the number of volunteers who patriotically tendered their services that the chief difficulty was in making selections and determining who should be disappointed and compelled to remain at home.

The splendid feats of arms of the Civil War were achieved by the volunteer soldiery. At the Battle of Bull Run there was 1,464 soldiers of the Regular Army on the Union side, and they shared in the rout and flight of the Union forces that went down to defeat before the volunteers under Beauregard and Jackson. The victorious Army of the Potomac was a volunteer Army, as was the Army of Northern Virginia. Gen. Joe Hooker, a brave commander of the Army of the Potomac, in his testimony before the committee on the conduct of the war in 1863, said—

that the Army of Northern Virginia was never surpassed as an army in ancient or modern times.

There was not a regular soldier in it. The flower of the South was in that body of "incomparable infantry, that array of bright muskets and tattered uniforms, that army which, as Swinton said, "carried the revolt on its bayonets and which in all its vital parts died only with its annihilation at Appomattox." Every soldiers of it was a volunteer.

The most hopeless and desperate charge made on either side during the Civil War was that of Humphrey's division of the Army of the Potomac at Marye Heights, Va. That division was composed exclusively of volunteer soldiers.

What volunteers can accomplish when they are interested in their cause and know for what they fight can be gathered from the history of the Boer War, where the Dutch Burgers of the South African Republics in battle after battle defeated the regular soldiers of the British Army when they were often outnumbered four to one and always more than two to one.

Such, Mr. Chairman, is a brief historical reference to the feats of arms of volunteer soldiers of the past. As long as this Nation is worth dying for men from all the walks of life will rush to the flag in time of war. Our peace soldiers of the standing Army always have been and will continue to be our national police force, who serve their country for a sufficient sum of cash, but they never have been and may never be relied upon to be our reliance in time of war. That sacred duty rests with the volunteer soldier, and we can safely depend upon him.

The advocates of a large standing army have been driven from pillar to post in the vain search for excuses, and some of them have cited the Mexican troubles as a reason. This Mexican excuse for a large army would be treated as humorous if it did not emanate from exalted sources, and even so it must mark and illustrate the very limit to which great men can be driven in the advocacy of an untenable position. President Polk did not experience any difficulty in handling the Mexican situation at a time when our standing army was only 10,000 men. President Grant reduced the standing army to 25,000 men without regard to the disturbances in Mexico, and our Mexican boundary was just the same extent then as now. President Wilson experienced no difficulty in landing the Army at Vera Cruz, and Gen. Funston has repeatedly stated that he did not need or desire a larger force on the Texas border. We have 129,000 trained militia soldiers who are available to the President, under the terms of the Constitution, to enforce the laws, suppress insurrection, and repel invasion. We also have a large force of regular soldiers, some fifteen or twenty thousand, quartered upon the people of the Philippine Islands, which could be used if needed on the Texas-Mexican border. We have in reserve to-day a million modern rifles and 300,000,000 rounds of ammunition, and whenever the President needs men to shoulder these rifles to enforce the law, suppress insurrection, or repel invasion they will come forward as they have always done in every period of our history. Finally, the Mexicans get their supplies of guns and ammunition from the United States, and the President can quickly render them harmless by putting an embargo upon the shipment of arms and ammunition to Mexico.

So much in answer to those who endeavor to teach the American people that a great standing army must be maintained in time of peace to insure the national safety in time of war.

SLANDERERS OF OUR NAVY.

I come now to answer those who feel it incumbent upon them to decry and slander our Navy and coast defenses in furtherance of the campaign to alarm the American people into a reversal of our policy of antimilitarism. Why, let me inquire, do these superheated patriots find it necessary to underrate and libel our means of national defense? The answer is apparent. If our coast defenses and our Navy are what we have built them to be, no foreign enemy can land upon our shores. And unless the American people can be made to believe that the country is in danger they will not burden themselves and endanger the safety of civil supremacy by maintaining in time of peace a large army and colossal navy. This same agitation was in progress a year ago, although it had not assumed the large and violent proportions of the present. Congress was in session, and the committees of both the House and Senate conducted investigations into the state of our defenses. Let it be kept in mind that I am quoting from testimony taken a year ago. We have spent $200,000,000 on our coast defenses in recent years, and in a rigid examination, Gen. Weaver, Chief of Coast Defenses, testified in this hearing a year ago that our fortifications were

ample and the most efficient in the world. In summing up his testimony Gen. Weaver says:

I have been a close student of the whole subject, naturally, for a number of years, and I know of no fortifications in the world, so far as my reading, observation, and knowledge goes, that compare favorably in efficiency with ours (p. 77, Hearings before the Fortifications Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee).

Within the past few weeks Gen. Weaver has reiterated his testimony given a year ago.

Gen. Nelson A. Miles, in a statement the other day, testified to the strength and efficiency of our coast fortifications. He said:

Having had much to do with placing and construction of our fortifications and inspecting every one along the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts, as well as having had an opportunity of seeing all the great armies of the world and many of their strongest fortifications, including the Dardanelles, I am prepared to say that our coasts are as well defended as the coasts of any country, with the same class of high-power guns and heavy projectiles, and I have no sympathy for the misrepresentations that have been made in the effect to mislead the public. Our Nation is composed of sovereign citizens who appreciate their independence and realize the difference between their condition and that of the millions of men now mere subjects of some despotism and used as food for powder.

It has been said by the critics of our naval strength that our Navy lacks auxiliary vessels. Admiral Blue, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, in his testimony a year ago said:

I believe I am correct in stating that we have now more auxiliary vessels in the Navy than any other nation maintains in times of peace (p. 40, Hearings before House Naval Affairs Committee).

Another criticism of the Navy, which has appeared in all the eastern papers and many elsewhere, is that our Navy is deficient in submarine strength. Admiral Fletcher, commander of our fleet, testified before the House Naval Affairs Committee, and as to submarines he said:

I should think it would be reasonable precaution to provide a few more submarines, considering our extensive coast line in the Atlantic and in the Pacific. Yet I will say that, compared to other nations, we are well provided with submarines to-day (p. 520).

In a further statement the admiral said:

I think a reasonable increase of submarines, 8 or 10, or something in that vicinity, would be a proper increase.

The Secretary of the Navy, speaking for the administration, had requested Congress to provide eight new submarines. On the heels of Admiral Fletcher's statement that we needed 8 or 10, and Secretary Daniel's request for 8 new submarines, Congress appropriated for 18 submarines, which was 8 or 10 more than Admiral Fletcher said we needed.

In the effort to frighten honest, peace-loving people the statement has been glaringly flung across the headlines that the German submarines would come to our shores, destroy our cities, sink our battleships, and do divers and sundry other frightful things. The fact is that the American Navy contains more than twice as many submarines as the German Navy, and what is more the German submarines could not operate against our coasts, because the Germans have no base of supplies from which to operate them on our coast. Such is the testimony of Admiral Badger, member of the Naval General Board and the predecessor of Admiral Fletcher as commander of the Atlantic Fleet, at page 504 of the hearings.

I have heard the defamers of our Navy say over and over again that our warships were not ready for war, that many of them were in dry dock, many out of commission, and none in prime condition. Asked as to these calumnies, Admiral Fletcher testified as follows:

I would say in an emergency some vessels are ready to-day; some would be ready to-morrow; but I would say that all of them could be ready within a week (p. 561 of the hearings).

And finally, in this testimony which Admiral Fletcher gave before the committee a year ago, he said that—

England is the only nation on earth that has a navy we could not successfully resist.

In a report made recently, Admiral Fletcher tells us that our Navy is 15 per cent stronger now than it was a year ago, and that in accuracy of gunfire it has improved 30 per cent in the past year.

Testifying last year as to the progress of the Navy, Secretary Daniels said:

The Navy program has been upgrade all the time. The Navy is getting better every year. The present Congress gave three dreadnaughts and we have 7,000 more trained men in the Navy than a year ago (p. 597 of the hearings).

Following that testimony of the Secretary, Congress made the largest appropriation for the Navy in the entire history of the country, $150,000,000 being appropriated.

Those who are engaged in the unpatriotic task of underrating the strength of the American Navy should have a care. The people are likely to demand to know how the money has been spent. A reference to the 1916 edition of the Navy Yearbook, page 535, discloses that we have spent more money in recent years on our Navy than has been spent by both Germany and Japan. Those who cry down our naval strength may prove too much.

More money was appropriated for new construction in the Navy in the first two years of President Wilson's administration than was appropriated in the entire four years of Taft or in any four years of Roosevelt, and at this time there is 50 per cent more construction in progress for the Navy than at any period since the Civil War.

We have five times as many officers and men in the Navy to-day as we had at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War.

LET THE TRUTH BE TOLD.

Public opinion must settle this question in the end, and there can be no public opinion of the question until the public know the truth.

The metropolitan newspapers and magazines, with few exceptions, have declined to state both sides of the question. The effort seems to have been to stampede the public into hasty action. Out with the truth. No great question like this can be determined without the facts.

One of the tricks of the organs and advocates of naval waste is to compare the American Navy with the German Navy without advising the country that a part of the German Navy has been destroyed in the present war. For instance, they credit the German Navy with nine armored cruisers, when it is a proven fact that six of these armored cruisers have been destroyed. See Navy Yearbook, page 537.

In a statement compiled at my request by the Bureau of Naval Intelligence on January 5, 1916, it is shown that up to that date the German Navy had lost 82 war vessels. True, these ships were not—with the exception of the *Goeben*, sold to Turkey—the first-line vessels of the German Navy, but every one of them was valuable war craft and had entered into every calculation as to the comparative strength of the German Navy. This is but one of the many tricks being played upon the public. Volumes would be required to refute them all.

OUR GROWING ARMY.

At the beginning of the Civil War the standing Army consisted of 10,000 men. During the progress of that war it grew to large proportions, but after the close of the war President Grant reduced the Regular Army to 25,000 men, and so it stood until the outbreak of the Spanish-American War. Since this last war the standing Army has been increased, under first one pretext and another, until it now numbers something over 100,000 men. Large increases are proposed at the present session of Congress.

COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE.

It has never been possible to recruit the standing Army to its full authorized strength, for the reason that the young men of the country will not go into the Army. Of those who join many become dissatisfied and refuse to serve out their terms of enlistment. The reason for this is manifest. Our country is at peace, and no one feels it to be his patriotic duty to join the Regular Army as a private soldier where the most difficult feats awaiting the private consist in drill and drudgery.

If our boys will not join the Army of their own free will and accord, how is this great Army to be provided? The answer of our Army officers, with one voice, is compulsion. That is what they call universal service. But call it what you will, it means that when an American youth arrives at a certain age, say 18, he is compelled to join the Army, in time of peace. That system exists in every nation of Europe, excepting England, and has existed for a great period of time. Without compulsory military service no nation was ever able to maintain a large standing army in time of peace. The United States is no exception to the rule. That is the direction we are headed for, and every young man's mother should begin to ask herself if she is ready to send her son into the uniformed idleness of the standing Army. In Europe, even in peace times, it is said that every laborer has a soldier on his back, because, after all, some one must feed and clothe all these soldiers. Are our farmers, laborers, men in all the walks of life, ready to increase their burdens by taking each a soldier upon his back?

Our fathers were afraid of the influence and effect of a standing army. They dreaded the military spirit. Among the standard works upon free government may be mentioned De Tocqueville's Democracy in America. He was a profound student of government in the Old World, and in about 1845 he came to America to study our system. Would you like to know what he thought and said of this question? Here are some pertinent quotations from his writings. They contain food for thought. De Tocqueville, in his standard work, Democracy in America, which has been quoted from and approved in every country where the people aspire to free government, makes the follow-

ing significant references to military men and the military spirit:

All men of military genius are fond of centralization, which increases their strength; and all men of centralizing genius are fond of war, which compels nations to combine all their powers in the hands of the government.

Among democratic nations, the man who becomes an officer severs all the ties which bound him to civil life; he leaves it forever; he has no interest to resume it. His true country is the army, since he owes all he has to the rank he has attained in it; he therefore follows the fortunes of the army, rises or sinks with it, and henceforward directs all his hopes to that quarter only. As the wants of an officer are distinct from those of the country, he may perhaps ardently desire war or labor to bring about a revolution, at the very moment the nation is most desirous of stability and peace.

After all, and in spite of all precautions, a large army amid a democratic people will always be a source of great danger; the most effectual means of diminishing that danger would be to reduce the army, but this is a remedy which all nations have it not in their power to use.

All the ambitious spirits of a democratic army are consequently desirous of war, because war make vacancies and warrants the violation of that law of seniority which is the sole privilege natural to democracy.

A thousand circumstances independent of the will of man concur to facilitate the maintenance of a democratic republic in the United States. The Americans have no neighbors, and consequently they have no great wars or financial crises or inroads or conquests to dread; they require neither great taxes nor great armies nor great generals; and they have nothing to fear from a scourge which is more formidable to republics than all these evils combined, namely, military glory.

It was George Washington in his Farewell Address who said:

Cultivate peace and harmony with all nations. * * * Overgrown military establishments are, under any form of government, inauspicious to liberty, and are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty.

The wise and prudent Benjamin Franklin supplied this prudent suggestion as to armies:

An army is a devouring monster, and when you have raised it you have, in order to subsist it, not only the fair charges of pay, clothing, provision, arms, and ammunition, with numberless other contingent and just charges to answer and satisfy, but you have all the additional knavish charges of the numerous tribe of contractors to defray, with those of every other dealer who furnishes the articles wanted for your army, and takes advantage of that want to demand exorbitant prices.

Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, offered this substitute for war:

War is not the best engine for us to resort to. Nature has given us one in our commerce which, if properly managed, will be a better instrument for obliging the interested nations of Europe to treat us with justice.

Those who espouse the five-year program do so in the face of the Constitution, which provides that the Congress shall have power—

to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years.

Mr. Chairman, I have no fault to find with the Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], for having changed his mind on this question of military and naval extravagance. A year ago the Republican leader threw the great weight of his opposition against excessive appropriations for these purposes. He then led the fight against the large proposed increase in the naval and military bills. I regret, of course, that he has gone over to the other side; but when a man concludes that his opinions are erroneous it is his duty to change, and I always admire the courage of gentlemen who can stand up and make the manly admission that they have been wrong. It is my opinion that Mr. MANN was right a year ago when he said on the floor of the House, in opposing the increase of appropriations for the Navy:

Now, when we make a reasonable provision for war, that is all we ought to be expected to do. It would be foolish, it seems to me, for any country to spend all its resources in preparing for war and neglect other things which are much more important.

That statement is peculiarly forceful when we take into consideration the fact that at the present time we are spending more than two-thirds of all the revenues of Government upon wars of the past and in preparation for prospective wars. Indeed, we not only spend more money on account of war than any other nation spends in time of peace, but we spend a greater per cent of our revenues for these purposes than any other nation.

Neither do I complain at President Wilson's change of mind in regard to this preparedness question. The President thrilled me with his speech to Congress a year ago, and I applauded his statements to the echo. I regret that I can not applaud all that he now says in opposition to what he then said. Mr. Chairman, it is an easy and a pleasant thing for a Democratic Congressman to stand with the Democratic President and it is difficult and dangerous to oppose him. And yet I can not forget that 300,000 people have placed me upon the watch tower and that I have neither a moral or political right to consult my own convenience or safety in dealing with those vital public questions which affect the well-being of my constituents and my country. I still adhere to those opinions and principles announced by the President a year ago, and while I freely concede his right to change his mind I steadfastly assert my right to keep my opinions, so long as they appear to me to be based upon wisdom. A year ago, in an address to Congress, President Wilson said:

We are at peace with all the world. No one who speaks counsel based on fact and candid interpretation of realities can say that there is reason to fear that from any quarter our independence or integrity of our territory is threatened. * * * We have never had, and while we retain our present principles and ideals we never shall have, a large standing army. * * * The country has been misinformed. We have not been negligent of the national defense. * * * But I turn away from the subject. It is not new. There is no new need to discuss it. We shall not alter our attitude toward it because some amongst us are nervous and excited. * * *

I believed those words of the President were true a year ago, and I have had no occasion to alter my belief.

FROM WHAT SOURCE DOES DANGER THREATEN US?

Every strong nation on earth except the United States is in war to-day. The world has never before witnessed anything to equal the immensity, the horror, the waste, and the devastation of this war. The trenches across France and Russia alone are nearly 2,000 miles in length. Twenty million men are engaged in deadly combat. Three million men have already been killed outright. Many million more are crippled for life. More millions are herded in concentration camps as prisoners of war. Millions of those compelled to live in damp, cold trenches or as prisoners of war will come out of it physically unfit for either war or work. The war has already cost fabulous billions and the nations are mortgaged almost to the limit. And yet we are told that some one or more of those nations meditate war with the powerful United States, the wealthiest and most powerful nation in the world. Could England and her allies go to war with us now? No. They are dependent on us for munitions of war, cotton, wheat, meat, and money. If the allied powers were to go to war with us to-morrow, their case in Europe would at once become hopeless. They know that to be true. We know it. It is so apparent that no thoughtful man can doubt or deny it. But suppose we become involved in war with Germany? Well, suppose the case. Japan has been in war with Germany for nearly two years. Have you heard of German soldiers invading Japan or Japanese soldiers invading Germany? Certainly not. The German Navy is bottled up. Her very ports are blockaded.

If we were now at war with Germany she could not send a single man or a single warship against us. The high seas are completely closed to her. If we were at war with Germany, would we send our Navy to Europe? Certainly not. England, France, and Italy have more than three times the Navy of Germany, and they are unable to get at the German Navy, because it is behind the land batteries and mine fields. Would we send any soldiers over there? Of course not. Japan has sent neither warships nor soldiers. The allies are amply supplied with both. Then, in the event of war with Germany, what would we do? Simply give financial aid to the allies; nothing more. And when the general peace of Europe came we would make terms along with the balance. There would be riots here and there on the part of those who were not in favor of such a war, business and prosperity would suffer, there would be much unemployment, and at the end of it we would be saddled with billions of national debt and higher taxes. Simply that, and nothing more. But when the war in Europe is over, even though we keep out of it, will not Germany immediately thereafter attack us? My answer to that is that no nation is likely ever to attack us without cause, and my hope is that we will always be too sensible of our might, justice, and manhood ever to provoke war with any nation. Germany, along with the balance of the nations at war, is being literally ruined by the war. There is scarcely a home in Germany where the inmates do not mourn the death of a member of the household. The end is not yet. Every day war claims its thousands. The very earth reeks with the decaying bodies of men—married men, single men—the very hope and flower of European manhood.

When this unspeakable cataclysm is over, there will be crêpe on every door knob in Europe. Around every fireside there will be an empty chair. The benches in every public park will be filled with crippled men. Every hospital and insane asylum will be filled with the victims of the carnage. And yet we are told that just as soon as the war is over the survivors will say good-bye to their wives, mothers, sisters, children, or sweethearts and sail for America to begin war all over again. Was ever a more preposterous proposition held up before the American people?

NO INVASION OF THE UNITED STATES.

I am glad the President said in a speech the other day that he took no stock in the statement that our country is in danger of invasion. With that out of the way what is all the scare

about? Some of the fright has been produced by the dealers in war munitions, some by sensational journals and magazines, some by the moving-picture campaign, some by Army and Navy officers who want promotion, and some by the Teddy Roosevelts, who are never truly happy unless they can see blood and bellow like a bull at a slaughter pen. The munition makers are reaping a harvest of gold out of manufacturing the instruments of death. They know their business is likely to play out when the European war is over, and they are fertilizing American soil with a view to another harvest.

NO MORE PROFITS IN WAR PREPARATION.

Mr. Chairman, I have always been opposed to Government ownership where it could be avoided, but I am prepared to make an exception in the building of a navy and the manufacture of munitions of war. We will never get rid of the war cry until we take the profits out of making and building for war. Upon the very best authority I am able to state that there are concerns in the United States making a million dollars a day out of the manufacture of war munitions. Bethlehem Steel stock has gone up from almost nothing to $500 a share. So it has been with many of them. Human nature is weak. We must not tempt men. They are prone to praise the bridge that carries them over. They are likely to cry "wolf" for the purpose of inducing us to buy a gun. The profits must come out of this traffic in killing machines, at least in every case where the Government is the purchaser. The Government must make its own instruments of preparedness.

QUIT PROPHESYING WAR.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe we are in danger of war. If our prophets would quit talking war and prophesying war the danger would be even more remote. I have often heard men who ought to know make the statement that President McKinley was pushed into the Spanish-American War by those who were continually talking and prophesying war and seeking political advantage. The American people do not want war. President Wilson has done much to keep us out of it. We are all grateful to him that he has led us along the paths of peace. We owe it to ourselves and to the President to aid him in preserving the peace, and we can best do that by drying up the mouthy jingoes who seem intent upon bringing on a war for others to fight. It often happens that Fido brings on a dog fight which he does not remain to see finished.

OUR POSITION.

None of us oppose preparedness. We all want a strong Navy. We want the Government to go right along in a normal way improving the Navy in the future as in the past. Just now we have $200,000,000 worth of warships appropriated for and under construction. We are willing to go forward in the great work of building up the Navy. We think our fortifications are the best in the world, but if the officers in charge of them will tell us that more men and more powerful guns are needed, we will join in the movement to supply them. But we are not to be swept off our feet by baseless rumor and unsupported clamor for huge additional appropriations. We are not for peace at any price. The safety and honor of the Nation is as dear to us as to those lion-tongued lip warriors who question our courage and patriotism. We simply refuse to be bullied into embarking the Nation into what we feel and believe to be the beginning of militarism.

WHO IS TO PAY THE BILL?

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen in this Chamber say they are in favor of building the greatest Navy in the world, and organizing an Army of a million men, but they become strangely silent when asked about raising the ultimate billions to pay the bill.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the gentleman from Texas that I favor a tax on incomes to supply any additional sums appropriated for these purposes. Wealth should bear its fair proportion of these burdens.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] is right, as he usually is.

Taxation for any purpose levied upon consumption is unfair and unjust. Why should men pay taxes in proportion to what they eat and wear and use? The amount of a man's taxes should correspond to the amount of wealth he owns and not the amount of clothes he wears or food he eats. If we appropriate additional sums for the Army and Navy we should raise the additional revenues by a tax upon wealth, by a graduated inheritance tax, by an increased graduated income tax, to the end that men shall pay taxes upon what they own in proportion to that ownership. Moreover, it is my firm belief that if we will take the profit out of the business of preparing nations to war and lay the taxes upon wealth we will hear less of this cry of "Havoc, let slip the dogs of war."

THE DANGER OF MILITARISM.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I wish to warn my colleagues and the country against the military spirit which will inevitably follow in the wake of a large military and naval establishment. The spirit of liberty, fraternity, and equality, those exalted principles upon which our Republic rests, will not long survive a rampant spirit of militarism once we allow the soldier to outrank the citizen. It has been so in all the ages of the world. Once we commit this Government to that fatal folly we can not hope to escape the fate of nations gone before. Let us set our faces against these world-old fallacies as our fathers before us did. These theories which the founders discarded as incompatible with the existence of free government have in all time drenched nations in blood, extinguished liberty and equality, and left mankind no refuge but the sword and the scepter. Have we forgotten the traditions and the history of America? We have reached our present great national stature without a large standing Army. We have won our way to the very mountain top without the danger of its presence. May I render into prose the lines of Taylor and Kipling:

> Have we forgot! Does a Roman lust for war profane our ancient holy things? Are we to trample into dust all the lessons of the past and be stricken with the rabbles of the Kings, the scarlet rage of gun and sword? Have mercy on Thy people, Lord; be with us yet, lest we forget; lest we forget!

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the war in Europe in the field commenced, I believe, a year ago the last of July, 1914, or the 1st of August. It was like a flash of lightning out of the clear sky. There may have been those who actually foresaw what was then actually coming, though it is very easy to prophesy in advance upon either side of a question and then claim that you are right if one of your prophecies comes true. Certainly to this country the war was unexpected. I think also that we generally believed—I know that I did—that it would not last long. Modern wars within the last 50 years, or since we have acquired in the world the modern methods of warfare, usually have not lasted long. We not only hoped, but we believed that it would soon be over. I doubt whether a single Member of this House at that time expected the European war to last as long as a year; yet it is still going on, with more determination on each side now than when it commenced, and, so far as I can see, with no prospect of peace. When two great forces are at war as they are now it is always to the advantage of one side or the other to involve other countries in the struggle.

When the war in Europe broke out I took occasion in a few words in this House to say that there would be many temptations for us to enter the war or to take sides, and that it was our duty always to remember that we were standing for the American people and ought under all circumstances to be and remain strictly neutral, with sympathy on neither side. [Applause.]

I do not know whether I have changed my mind since a year ago or not, though I would not be ashamed to change my mind, because consistency is one of those things which bother me the least. But I do know that the situation in the world has changed in the last year; I do know that the events of the last year have so modified the facts that one may at least realize the truth to-day. The trouble with some of these patriotic, sincere, honest, and misguided lingerers in the past is that they never learn an event until it is ancient history. [Applause on the Republican side.] We do not believe, or I do not believe, in a great standing Army. I do not believe in the permanent necessity for a great Navy, but I believe that a country like ours, which refuses to consider the situation of to-day because of the needs of the past, has no real right to remain at peace and will not be able to.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] seems to find great amusement in the fact that I reached certain conclusions apart from the clamor, away in the quiet of garden work. It will be in the quiet of the fields, Mr. Chairman, in the quiet of the homes, in the quiet of the work throughout the country that the patriotic people of the country will make up their minds, will determine the course which we will pursue; and if the gentleman from Texas has a garden and will return to its quiet and think up to date, instead of living in the past, there may be hope even for him. Mr. Chairman, we have a great duty to perform. We must determine, because we are in a position where determination must be made, either that we will do nothing, upon the chance that Providence will protect us or that there is no danger, or that there is a possibility of danger, and if so, then prepare to protect ourselves and our country against it. [Applause on the Republican side.] And while the President of the United States, who ought to know more about the actual situation than

any Member of this House, is going around the country to state the case on his side, it were more becoming for the Members of his party in this House to at least await his statement before abusing him as talking "idiotically," as the gentleman from Texas said this morning. [Applause.] If the crisis exists, we must rise to the occasion. If there be no crisis, and we so decide, there is no reason why we should do anything. I am not afraid. The American people are not afraid. They know no fear; but, as reasonable beings, if they are wise, they view the situation as it is, and so viewing it, as it seems to me, with the possibilities of danger which lurk in the future, we will meet the situation, rise to our responsibilities, and put this Nation in a position where it may protect itself against any foreign foe. [Applause.]

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], who has been granted 40 minutes, to consume that time now.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced the following resolution:

Resolved, That the House instruct the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department to investigate at its earliest convenience the purposes and probable results of the proposed motorization of the rural mail service.

I was led to introduce this resolution because of the complaints which had been made to me by patrons of rural mail routes in my own district, and because of complaints which have been brought to my attention by Members of Congress from the State of Ohio on this side of the Chamber protesting against the reorganization of rural mail routes by the introduction of motor-vehicle rural routes in the State of Ohio. The complaints have been so numerous, so frequent, and so vigorous that with the assistance and cooperation of the minority members of the Ohio delegation I have attempted a careful investigation of the general situation in regard to the Rural Free Delivery Service in my district and the State of Ohio, and especially the effect of the introduction of motor-vehicle routes upon the efficiency of the service. I have also given some attention to the probable reasons for the change from horse-drawn vehicles to motor vehicles.

The mail service, urban and rural, is the most important service the Government renders the people. The rural mail service has brought the rural communities in immediate touch with the cities and has been a good thing, not only for the farmers and residents of rural communities but for the country at large. The farmer receiving daily mail service is able to keep in touch with what is going on in the world. He becomes thoroughly informed through his daily newspaper as to current events. He is able to familiarize himself with the market quotations on his produce, the things he has to sell, and the things he has to buy. I am sure, from my investigations, that the rural service is appreciated by the farmers and the residents of rural communities. Any policy, therefore, which will in the slightest degree reduce the efficiency of this service, especially on the claim of economy, will meet with prompt and vigorous resentment from them.

The development of the rural service has of necessity been gradual. Road conditions have had a great deal to do with preventing the service from being made complete; but every action of Congress and every policy of the Post Office Department as it relates to this service should be progressive and inaugurated with a view to extending the service, and no action should be taken or any policy inaugurated that will in the slightest degree curtail the service. Mail should be delivered daily to every rural family at the nearest point on the highway on which they live, and the service should be extended with that end in view. I am opposed to the mile rule or the half-mile rule or any other rule which requires patrons to go for their mail beyond the nearest point on their highway. If the service is to be complete, as it should be, everyone should be treated alike, and the way to treat all alike, the road conditions permitting, is to serve everybody daily at the nearest point on the highway on which they live.

On June 3, 1915, I received a letter from the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General in which he stated that he was engaged in a "readjustment of the Rural Delivery Service in several States of the country where uneconomical conditions prevail."

After receiving this letter I attended meetings of the rural carriers in every county of my district, questioned them in regard to the service, and requested through newspapers information from patrons generally in regard to the rural mail service in the sixteenth congressional district. My investigations developed the fact that by a number of minor extensions of the service in the sixteenth congressional district the service would be made entirely satisfactory to the public, and, in view of the fact that the changes required to make the service satisfactory were few, I became convinced that by the addition of a few more carriers and with very little additional expense the service in the sixteenth congressional district could be made very near complete and entirely satisfactory.

I was very particular to observe in my trips through the district and in my conversations with rural carriers the kind of men who are rendering this service for the Government, and I was impressed with the fact that they are for the most part high-grade men, interested in the welfare of the service; that they take great interest in their work and are willing to go out of their way to make the rural-mail service on their routes satisfactory. In the sixteenth congressional district and throughout the State of Ohio the rural carriers are organized, and hold frequent meetings where the discussions are open, and there is an exchange of views and experiences which can not but be beneficial, not only to the carriers themselves, but to the service at large. In this connection, however, I desire to say that I noted one thing, and that was a feeling of uncertainty on the part of rural carriers as to the attitude of the department at Washington in regard to them and the future of their service. At that time I felt strongly that this was wrong; that there should be a better understanding between the carriers and the department. All will agree that strict discipline should be maintained in order that the best possible service may be rendered by post-office employees, yet at the same time the employees should feel that if they do render satisfactory service that such service will be appreciated by the department.

MOTORIZING OF ROUTES.

Some time in November, 1915, there appeared in one of our local newspapers an announcement that the rural routes in Stark County would be motorized, and that an examination would be held for the purpose of providing an eligible list from which appointments would be made. I wrote the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General a letter under date of November 27, advising him that in my judgment any attempt to establish motor routes generally in the sixteenth congressional district would prove very unsatisfactory and unsuccessful, and would create a great deal of dissatisfaction among the patrons, because the road conditions at this time in my district are such as to make motor routes impractical for more than a few months in the year. Motor routes may be practical some time in the future, but they are not practical in my district now.

In reply to that letter I received a letter from the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General in which he states that the department did not have under consideration at that time a revision of the service in the counties of my district.

The rumors of changes in the service still being persistent in my district, I called on the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General in person and he informed me that there were changes contemplated, and that he would write me about them. A few days later I received a letter from him in which he informed me that the department proposed a reorganization of the rural-delivery service in Stark County—my district—effective April 1, 1916, and I quote the following from the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General's letter:

In Stark County there are in operation at the present time 53 rural routes, aggregating 1,279.2 miles, costing $62,976 per annum. Under the revision there will be 39 horse-vehicle routes, aggregating 1,069.3 miles, and 4 motor-vehicle routes, involving 218.9 miles; this combined service costing $53,664 per annum. Not only will a greater mileage be covered and a saving of $9,312 per annum be effected, but service will be extended to 82 families not now supplied. It may be stated that in order to admit an arrangement which will reach these 82 families, it will be necessary for 64 of the patrons to move their boxes a short distance, but very few roads have been omitted, and in no case has a route been withdrawn from a highway where it is apparent that a hardship would be imposed.

It is apparent from my correspondence with the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General that the dominant purpose of the department is to economize, and on the face of the statement of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General himself, 64 of the patrons on the routes affected in Stark County will be compelled to move their boxes, and that a number of highways have been omitted that have been heretofore covered, so this amounts to a curtailment of service, at least to the extent that I have mentioned. The fact that he claims that 82 families who are not now supplied will be supplied under the new arrangement does not justify, in my judgment, the changes of the mail boxes of 64 patrons, and the omitting of highways heretofore covered.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes.

Mr. BURKE. In corroboration of the gentleman's statement I desire to say that the department undertook to revise and consolidate the rural routes in my district, consisting of six counties, and by doing so it was proposed to throw out of employment 21 carriers. They added new accommodations for 302 families but discommoded 304 families who had had the mail

delivered at their doors since the rural carrier system was first established. I protested vigorously against any such reform and economy at the expense of efficiency.

Mr. McCULLOCH. An extension of the service should contemplate the service to all of these people at the nearest point on the highway on which they live. If there were no other purposes in this change than to economize, I would still be opposed to any economy that in the slightest degree reduces the efficiency of the service or curtails it. The Government should not economize in that way. Such economy is false economy and I do not believe the people will stand, neither ought they to stand, for a curtailment of their mail service under any claim that a few dollars are being saved to the Government by so doing. There are other ways of economizing without taking away from the people the direct benefits that result from adequate mail service. I am opposed to the readjustment of rural mail routes by motorization of rural routes in the sixteenth district of Ohio, and throughout the State of Ohio, as being carried on by the department, for the following reasons—and my views in this connection have the approval of every Member of Congress from Ohio on this side of the Chamber:

First. Because the road conditions in the sixteenth district and the State of Ohio generally are such as to make motor service, except on a few highways, impractical for more than a few months of the year. I favor motor routes where they are practical, but the 50 or 60 mile routes the department is inaugurating are only practical where year-round service is possible, and year-round service is only possible where roads are improved. The question is entirely one of roads, and the roads in the sixteenth district and the State of Ohio generally are not sufficiently improved for year-round automobile service. Some of them, even under the most favorable conditions, do not permit automobile travel except for a few months in the year.

There can be no doubt that automobile rural routes will come. It is only a question of time. When you build a house, you build the foundation first—not the roof—and improvements of roads is the foundation of automobile mail service, and it should not be attempted except on improved roads. I voted for the Shackleford good-roads bill passed by the House some days ago, because I believe in Federal aid for good roads, and I stand ready to support any other bill which has for its purpose the improvement of roads; but I am opposed to the Post Office Department experimenting in the sixteenth district and the State of Ohio with impractical schemes to the detriment of farmers and rural communities under the guise of effecting economy.

The department, according to information I have received personally from the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General himself, has worked out a scheme of combination service—motor service part of the year, with an auxiliary arrangement for other vehicle service when the roads are bad. They establish a 50 or 60 mile motor route over roads that are improved and roads that are unimproved, and by what they call an "auxiliary service" they expect to take care of the mail service on these 50 or 60 mile routes when the roads are bad. This scheme has proven to be unsatisfactory and impractical in almost every place where it has been tried, and it has been tried in a number of different States. The reason for the failure of this plan should be apparent to everyone. The motor vehicle may do the work satisfactorily on a 50 or 60 mile route when the roads are good, but when the roads are bad it is impossible to use motor vehicles over the unimproved roads of the route.

Under the plan of the department when the roads are bad the carrier may employ a substitute, but it is impossible to apportion the motor route between the two men so as to render efficient service, for the reason that motor service for the most part covers a continuous route for its entire length, and to divide such a route so that the regular carrier will start out in one direction and the substitute or auxiliary carrier in the other direction so as to cover the entire route would necessitate the retrace of, in most instances, the full portion covered by each man. Thus if the route is a 50-mile route, such an arrangement involves actual travel of 50 or more miles daily for both the regular carrier and his assistant, which is a physical impossibility with a horse-drawn vehicle, and where it has been attempted has brought about complaints and dissatisfaction, to which I will hereafter refer.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Has there been any motor carrier or carriage in the gentleman's district up to date, so that he could ascertain whether it could be done as the Fourth Assistant indicates?

Mr. McCULLOCH. No; there has been no route put into operation in my district.

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman will permit me to say it, there has been in my own district, and we have fairly good roads, and there has been considerable complaint upon the ground that it can not possibly be effective, even with the shorter route. I have a letter to that effect since yesterday.

Mr. McCULLOCH. That seems to be the general impression and that seems to be the result in half a dozen States throughout this country where they have attempted to inaugurate and put in force this motor-vehicle service.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I do.

Mr. KELLEY. Does the gentleman know whether or not this new policy which has been inaugurated in some States has been abandoned and a return made to the old system?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I do not know that to be true, although I have heard rumors that the department may take such action.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I think it has been stated here that one of the States—for example, Georgia——

Mr. McCULLOCH. It may be.

Mr. FESS (continuing). Has had some modification.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I might say to the gentleman, however, that the purpose of this resolution and the purpose of my remarks to-day and the reason for the interest of the Ohio delegation is that we hope to save the State of Ohio from the distressing experience that has been gone through by the people of other States, and that is why we are taking up this matter now.

Mr. SWEET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I will.

Mr. SWEET. Has the gentleman ever asked for any inspectors in his district?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I have taken the matter up with the department and I have protested against the change. I have been advised they are going to go through with it.

The test of the efficiency of such a route is when the roads are bad, and it is when the roads are bad and the farmers are confined to their homes by inclement weather that they desire regular mail service most.

I am informed that when it was determined to motorize the rural service that postmasters were requested to send in maps on which they noted improved roads and unimproved roads which were in fair condition in the counties where the reorganizations were to be made. The postmasters were requested to furnish the department information as to how many months in the year, in their opinion, the unimproved roads on the maps would be fit for motor service, and the postmasters made their guesses as to how many months in the year the unimproved roads would be passable by a motor vehicle. It was pointed out to me by the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General that some of the unimproved roads in Stark County were regarded by postmasters as being available for motor service for as many as nine months a year. Of course the postmasters were not in a position to say what the seasons might be. One season might be very wet and roads be impassable by motor vehicle for a much greater length of time than in another year, so that the opinions of the postmasters, to say the least, were only guesses.

With this information, which in some instances, as I understand, was supplemented by reports of inspectors, the department at Washington worked out on paper these motor routes, and in order to keep them on improved highways and unimproved highways which the postmasters thought would be available for motor service for the most months of the year, they were compelled to and did cut off all other highways, and the patrons on the highways which were cut off will be compelled to come up to the paved roads or the unimproved highways which in the opinion of the postmasters will stand motor service or go to town for their mail.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I do.

Mr. FESS. Do I understand that the plan that the gentleman has suggested is to unite two of the routes now where horses are used and make one route, and then only employ a motor in the months of good weather and the horses in the months of bad weather?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Well, that is practically correct.

Mr. FESS. Now, take these roads or take the roads in my county, and, as I say, we have fairly good roads, and it is known as a good county road; how many months in the year, in the gentleman's judgment, could a motor be used to deliver the mail regularly?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I think that depends upon the year. Now, in some years, when the seasons are wet, they could not use a motor vehicle for as long a time as they could when it

is a dry season, but I would say not to exceed on the average seven months.

Mr. FESS. Well, now——

Mr. McCULLOCH. I think our postmasters in Stark County report some unimproved roads that they claim can be used for nine months, but I think that is too long a time.

Mr. FESS. Suppose that a man who has a route would employ a substitute. Is there any time in the year when the motor could not make any part of that route? That is, would he have to have a horse in addition to the motor?

Mr. McCULLOCH. He certainly would, or else he would have to hire one, or his substitute would have to have one, because there would be months in the year when the motor vehicle could not cover the entire route. He may go over a paved or improved road with a motor vehicle all the time, but he could not go over the unimproved roads all the time.

Mr. FESS. Where does the economy come in if a man who is owning a motor has to own a horse and vehicle and either employ another man or own two horses?

Mr. McCULLOCH. The only place where the economy would come in is that they are attempting to throw the burden on the carrier who can not carry the burden. And I will present a letter during the course of my remarks which shows conclusively that no man can meet these requirements and will not meet them.

Mr. FESS. What is the effect on the service?

Mr. McCULLOCH. A demoralization of the service, absolutely.

Mr. FESS. That is what will happen in my county.

Mr. McCULLOCH. For instance, suppose the route is between Washington and Baltimore. The carrier on his regular route would circuit around and reach Baltimore. After he reaches Baltimore, he would come back on the other side or down a paved road. Now, when the roads are bad he must employ a man to work, say, the unimproved highways, and he works the paved roads. He gets to Baltimore, and so does the other carrier, but they have both got to come back to Washington. So they both have to retrace, and if it is a 50-mile route these two men have to travel 100 miles, because you can not work out a motor route that is not circuitous; it has got to be that way.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I do.

Mr. FESS. When I was before the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General on this same matter he told me that the routes that he had in view were not passable the year round. He drew before me a map and he said, "Here is your highway map, and these are marked macadam roads," and you could not tell the difference between a bad and a good road, whether one had been built and worn out, while they are marked macadam roads. How much information can the Post Office Department get down here with simple maps and take that as their guide?

Mr. McCULLOCH. They can not get sufficient information to make the service as it ought to be, and it will result, as it has resulted everywhere, disastrously.

Mr. FESS. With that as their guide, it certainly means nothing, does it?

Mr. McCULLOCH. It does not mean anything, except an unsatisfactory service.

Mr. FESS. It does not in reference to the map he showed me of my own county, because I have been over the roads, and yet they are marked macadam, while they are not passable throughout the bad months of the year.

Mr. McCULLOCH. In other words, the motor service is a silk-stocking service, only available for the patron on the paved roads or the unimproved roads, as designated, and the patron who is not so fortunately situated is either cut off or required to go a long distance for his mail.

The motor service has also resulted in a process of consolidation which has changed in a large number of instances the mailing address of patrons. The farmer residing near a town where his business affairs are conducted suddenly finds himself getting his mail over a route originating at a town miles away, with the resultant confusion and unsatisfactory service which result from such a general tearing up of the mail service.

Second. I am opposed to this reorganization because wherever the attempt has been made to inaugurate this motor service it has proven a failure, and I have introduced this resolution in order that the people of the State of Ohio may be saved from the distressing experiences that the people of the States of Georgia, Iowa, Michigan, California, Illinois, Indiana, Florida, Texas, Kansas, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, South Dakota, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts have gone through by reason of this so-called readjustment of the rural mail service.

Mr. FESS. May I ask if you have made an investigation which justifies you in making the statement in reference to these various States?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I have examined newspaper reports from every State that I have named, which reports indicate that the service is unsatisfactory. Of course, that is as far as my investigation has gone. But every report that I have had, and I have had a report from every State that I have named, every newspaper report that I have before me or have seen has been one condemning the service.

Mr. DOWELL. I would like to suggest that the gentleman include the service also in the State of Iowa, where it has been practically destroyed by the system inaugurated by the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I have named Iowa.

And before I state my third reason for being opposed to this readjustment I desire to insert in the RECORD some of the editorials and newspaper articles which have been brought to my attention in regard to motor service in other States.

[Articles appear at close of the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio.]

The complaints and protests set out in the articles which I have inserted in the RECORD should convince Congress, if not the department, that, at least, this is a subject or matter that should be investigated by Congress, and we trust—and I speak for the Republican Members of Congress from Ohio—that an investigation will result in the department's desisting from inaugurating a policy in the State of Ohio which has been so disastrous in other States.

My third reason for opposing this motorization of rural mail routes is that the direct charge has been made that it is being done for political purposes, and that the civil service is being prostituted for the purpose of serving the political purposes of those who are inaugurating this motor service. I am not in a position to say that this is true, and I do not make the charge; but the fact that the charge has been repeatedly made, which is a most serious charge, should result in an investigation.

The purpose of the civil service is to divorce the Government service to which it applies from politics and political manipulations. Every person who has advocated reform in the civil service in recent years has pointed to the Post Office Department as an example of efficiency in the public service resulting from civil service; and whatever of efficiency has resulted from the civil service as it has been applied in the Post Office Department has resulted because of the fact that it has been strictly free from politics, as it should be. The civil service, in order to be an effective instrument in developing efficiency in the public service, must be, like Cæsar's wife, above reproach; and just as soon as it is used for political purposes it should be abandoned and we should return to the spoils system, so that political manipulating may be done in the open and not under cover.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to his colleague?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I will.

Mr. SWITZER. In this proposed motorization scheme how are the carriers to be selected? Are they going to transfer from the present rural horse-carrier service, or is there to be a new eligible list?

Mr. McCULLOCH. According to the ruling of the department it must be a new eligible list. They are not, according to the rule of the department, subject to transfer.

Mr. SWITZER. What becomes of the two present rural carriers that are substituted for?

Mr. McCULLOCH. They are notified that their services are no longer required, and they are out of the service unless they take an examination; and they are not subject to transfer to motor routes, as I shall hereafter set out clearly.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Certainly.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would like to say to my colleague that I believe the Members on the Democratic side of the House are just as much opposed to this innovation as the Members on the Republican side. I do not hear so much on your side as I do on my own side, but I do know that Democrats are complaining very bitterly against this innovation, and I want to say that I am personally opposed to it.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I want to say in that connection that my purpose in referring to it is that there may be an investigation. This charge has been made, and the fact that it has been made should interest the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber

in having it investigated, and I shall so state a little further on in my remarks.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman permit me another interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to his colleague?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I presume that the speaker had me in mind when he spoke about the charge as to its being for political purposes. I made that charge openly before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. It is in the hearings, and I stated my reasons why. While it is true the Democratic Members from the rural districts, I think, are generally opposed to this, yet I can not find any reason why the department is pushing it and in the manner which they have done it, except that it is creating vacancies, and the vacancies are not to be filled by transfer. That is a very suspicious thing to me, and I made the charge, and I am willing to stand by what I said.

Mr. McCULLOCH. In connection with the remarks of my colleague from Ohio [Mr. FESS] I desire to say that I did have in mind his direct charge, but I also had in mind the fact that in going through these newspaper articles, almost without exception, that charge is made; and I had in mind, further, the situation in Georgia. I knew what had been done there. The Democrats are affected. Now, if this is the situation——

Mr. ASHBROOK. And they are complaining.

Mr. McCULLOCH. They are complaining; and since that is so, the gentlemen on the other side ought to join with us in getting the investigation.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I will.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not true that the carriers that have been relieved from the service by reason of extending the routes are not transferred to the service on another route, and that they are let out of employment?

Mr. McCULLOCH. They are notified that their services are no longer required. That is true of cases that came under my observation.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Did you ever find any authority for these changes being made?

Mr. McCULLOCH. To what changes do you refer?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The rural-route changes made by the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General. Where did he find his authority to make them?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I suppose he is acting under the direction of the Postmaster General.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Where does the Postmaster General find his authority?

Mr. McCULLOCH. It is my understanding that the Postmaster General has supervision of the mail service, rural and otherwise, and so I suppose he is the responsible party. And he is a part of this administration. It is directly traceable to his department. There is no doubt about that, if that is what the gentleman meant.

The charge has been made that the motorization of rural routes is a scheme on the part of certain officials in the Post Office Department to eliminate from the service certain employees because of their political affiliations. I could not conceive that this could be true, but in the face of persistent rumors and charges and the presentation of facts tending to substantiate the truth of the statement that had been made in this regard and because it is of importance to the people of this country to have the civil service free from politics and political manipulations, would seem to me to be reason sufficient for Congress to investigate the charges. The gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber as well as the Post Office Department should welcome such an investigation if there is no truth in the charge. In this connection I desire to call to the attention of the House one case which is one of many instances that have been brought to my attention, and which tends to substantiate to my mind this charge, that readjustments in the Postal Service are being used as a cloak to cover political manipulations.

I do not say that they are all being made that way. It may be that the postmasters are responsible. It may be that it is not the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, and then it may be his policy. But where there is so much smoke there must be some fire, and there is a lot of smoke. A rural carrier in my district who has been in the service some 10 or 12 years, who is now in the prime of life, who has an enviable record as a rural carrier, who is physically and mentally able to discharge his duties efficiently, and who, by reason of his years of experience, has become a high-class, efficient employee in the Government service, came to my office in Canton and advised me that he had been notified that after a certain date his services would no longer be required as rural carrier as his route would be absorbed by a motor route. He then asked that he be transferred to the motor route, and he was informed that under the ruling of the department the rural carriers using horse-drawn vehicles were not eligible to be transferred to motor-vehicle routes. It seemed to me inconceivable that a carrier who had spent 12 years in the service, who had a perfect official record, who was in every way competent to discharge his duties, so far as the prompt and accurate delivery of the mail was concerned, should be eligible to render this service if he rode in a horse-drawn vehicle, but would be ineligible if he rode in a motor vehicle, and I wrote the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General a letter, of which the following is a copy, requesting information on this subject:

HON. JAMES I. BLAKSLEE,
Fourth Assistant Postmaster General,
Post Office Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL: Inclosed copy of article that appeared in the Canton Repository to-day in regard to the changes that are contemplated in the rural districts of Stark County. I am informed that the notice being sent out of the examination referred to in the article states that present carriers are not eligible for this appointment unless they take examination. I am at a loss to understand why it is required that carriers in the service should take an examination in order to be eligible for this appointment.

As I understand, persons in the civil service should be eligible for transfer, and it would seem to me that this is one of the cases where persons in the service should be eligible for transfer. I would therefore appreciate very much information in regard to the proposed changes and advice as to the reason for requiring present carriers to take the examination rather than permitting them to be eligible for transfer.

Assuring you that I shall appreciate information on this subject, I am,
Sincerely, yours,

ROSCOE C. McCULLOCH.

He answered me under date of November 17, as follows:

HON. ROSCOE C. McCULLOCH,
Canton, Ohio.

MY DEAR MR. McCULLOCH: In reply to your inquiry of November 11, I beg to state that inasmuch as the compensation allowed for service over a motor-vehicle route is materially greater than that allowed for service over a route permitting delivery otherwise than by motor vehicle, the department considers it inadvisable to fill the position of carrier for motor-vehicle route by transfer.

Attention is invited to the statement in section 2 of the inclosed pamphlet to the effect that it is not permissible under the competitive requirements of the law to make certification from a register to a position with a materially higher compensation than that for which such register was established.

Rural carriers desiring to become eligible for appointment as carriers for motor-vehicle routes should take the prescribed examination. A carrier on the ordinary rural route who desires to take the examination for the motor-vehicle route is given a credit of one-half per cent of each year's service up to six years, and the maximum age limit is waived in his behalf.

Sincerely, yours,

J. K. PICKETT,
Acting Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman again yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to his colleague?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I do.

Mr. FESS. Does that mean that promotion is never except when you promote from one type to a similar type, and from one salary to an equal salary? You can not promote from a lower salary to a higher salary, or you can not promote from a horse-drawn vehicle to a motor vehicle? It that the ruling?

Mr. McCULLOCH. You can not transfer from a horse-drawn vehicle route to a motor-vehicle route.

Mr. FESS. And you can not be promoted from the lower position to a higher. Is that it?

Mr. McCULLOCH. It must be, if the position of running a motor route is higher than running a horse-drawn vehicle route.

Mr. FESS. Would that be a promotion, to go from one thing to another, if there is no change whatever in the salary or otherwise?

Mr. McCULLOCH. It would be an increase in the salary, more than anything else, apparently, but it would be the same service. But it is not a real increase of salary. Under the rulings and requirements it is more expensive for a carrier to operate a motor route than to operate his regular route, so that it is not an increase of compensation at all, and will not so work out.

Mr. FESS. If you will allow me to interrupt you on the other point you made, I will state that the instruction given in our country was that the examination was to be held at 9 o'clock, and the request was made that it be not placed at the time the rural carriers should be employed, because they could not take it. The inference is that by not changing it there is no use for the rural carriers to take the examination, because they are not eligible to the new places. In other words, you thereby proceed to create one vacancy, and that vacancy to be filled by somebody not yet in the service.

Mr. McCULLOCH. That seems to be the situation.

After I received this letter I sent for the carrier, and I asked him his politics, and he told me he is a Republican. This one

case alone convinced me that there is something deeper in the minds of those who, under the name of reorganization, are tearing the mail service in this country to pieces than a desire either to economize or to increase the efficiency of the service. So far as I am personally concerned, since we have the civil service and not the spoils system, I do not care whether the majority of rural carriers in this country are Republicans or Democrats, so long as they render efficient service and keep out of politics, and I do not believe that the people of this country are willing that under the guise of the civil service, and using it as a cloak, politics should be played in the mail service.

Even though the department should be acquitted of the charge that politics are being played in reorganizing this service, it is apparent that their work has been a failure, that the reorganization is impractical, has resulted in dissatisfied patrons, and in the end will not effect the economy they claim.

I desire to read a letter which was brought to my attention this week in regard to the impracticability of the reorganization:

———, *Ohio, January 23, 1916.*

I just want to bother you a little, as I do not expect to have occasion to do so much oftener. Yesterday, January 22, was the "big day" for some "poor devils" in ——— County, Ohio, for it was yesterday that over 150 applicants crowded the examining headquarters in ———, Ohio, in order that they might have a chance to drop some money for this country of ours, or more especially the Post Office part of it. Strange, however, was the fact that there were only 3 carriers (rural) and 1 substitute out of the 30 carriers in our county that took the examination. Two of these three carriers have never driven a motor car, and hence do not know what they are about; and the third one is an old soldier from our office who at first told us he would not have the job, but finally changed his mind, thinking that he and his son, who is the substitute, can operate the route between them for a while at least, if either secures the appointment. I have been in the service for 14 years and have traveled nearly every road in ——— County, and I think I know what is possible and what is not. I have used an auto for four years and have used three different machines; that is, I wore them out. I am still driving a Ford, but I ought not to do so, as the roads are nearly gone. For the lack of proper attention our roads are getting worse instead of better. For instance, a road that was regarded as a good country road a few years ago is to-day a very poor road, because being close to a large city automobiles and trucks of every weight and description are pounding them to pieces, and when they become impassable, then they stay away; but the rural carrier must go just the same. I understand that two routes are to operate from ———, Ohio, one 52 miles and the other 56 miles; one pays $1,708 and the other $1,604; both are 11-month routes. It can not be done and done right. Nothing but a Ford will even approach the job, and figuring from past experience and expense I find that the cost is going to be almost prohibitive. Gasoline here sells for 21 cents per gallon. It will take at least 6 gallons for a 50-mile route, which will amount to $31.50 per month for gasoline. Lubricating oil will cost $7.50 per month at least, which totals $39 per month. Tires for a Ford will cost $45 for each 30 days, which will bring it up to $84 per month for expense. Our roads will wear out a Ford truck on a 50-mile-a-day trip in about a year, or allow for a two-year life of the machine and figure the original cost at $500 and allow a fair price for it at the end of two years, say, $200, will mean a depreciating cost of $12 or more per month, thus bringing the total cost per month up to $96. Deduct that from $142, which is the highest salary to be paid here, will leave $46 per month from which a substitute must be paid and horses must be hired and auto repairs must be made, as I have made no allowance for repairs in my previous figures. I can not see how a man can clear $1 per day, so I don't want the job. So much for expense item. Now, about the work. The schedule for our routes here provides to leave office at 8 a. m., return at 3 p. m. I have been wondering who is going to do all the "real work" and when it is going to be done. Let me explain: Our mail can not reach here before 7.30 a. m. because of traction facilities, and it takes me from 7.30 to 9 a. m. to work my mail for a 26-mile route, as I have the smallest route from point of business done and number of boxes served. All the other carriers (and there are four of us here) handle from 12,000 to 15,000 pieces per month, while I handle about 10,000 pieces only, hence it takes longer to work their route and will be impossible to get started before 10.30 or 11 a. m. My best running time on the route with an auto is three hours, and I have a local reputation for speeding. The other carrier take from four and one-half to five and one-half hours running time, hence I figure the best any man can do is eight hours for running time, and at the same time serve from 350 to 500 families and transact the business necessary. On bad days, such as rain, mud, or snow, it will take from 9 to 10 hours "on the road," hence the carriers stand to work from 10 to 14 hours per day. These figures are for good luck daily, and do not allow for tire or motor trouble. I am in a way connected with the local Ford agency, and teach the operation, care, and construction of this and other machines to purchasers after my hours of labor on the route, and I think I nearly know the strong parts and the weak parts of any machine that can be operated on a rural route nearly as well as any post-office inspector or post-office official. Therefore, with these facts before me and with the knowledge of the work, I decline to submit myself to such an unholy sacrifice. Unless the Post Office Committee makes it possible to retain the present routes, "we are out of it."

The following statement is along the same line:

Actual experience of a mail carrier with automobile over a route of 24 miles demonstrates that no more than 7½ miles per hour can be made and good service rendered; at the above rate it will require seven hours to cover a 50-mile route. This gives him one hour to "stick" his mail.

Experience with an automobile over a 24-mile route for 10 consecutive months (the machine being new at the beginning of the 10 months) resulted in the expense of $300 for tires, gasoline, oils, and repairs, besides a depreciation in value of the machine estimated at $200. Expense for horse-drawn vehicle for the remaining two months (for bad road conditions) was $60, making a total of $560 for a 24-mile route; double this trip and it will be $1,120, following the above average for 24 miles.

The following article from the Evening Item, of Richmond, Ind., dated January 21, 1916, gives some idea of the situation in one community where the motor service is being tried:

"WE WANT LITTLE RED WAGON BACK," SLOGAN—ALL OVER WAYNE COUNTY FARMERS ARE CIRCULATING PETITIONS AND VOICING INDIGNANT PROTEST AGAINST NEW MOTORIZED MAIL-DELIVERY SYSTEM—DEMAND A RETURN TO OLD SYSTEM, UNDER WHICH THEY GOT THEIR MAIL ON TIME AND EVERY DAY.

"We want the little red wagon back" is the most popular song in Wayne County to-day. It is the slogan of the organized demand by Wayne County farmers for the reestablishment in this county, in as short a time as possible, of the old horse and wagon service, which gave universal satisfaction to the families it served for a decade or more.

The motorized rural route service has been condemned by hundreds of farmers; its ultimate success, as predicted by post-office men, is scoffed at, and only the old service and the strict civil-service conditions under which it was conducted will satisfy the demand that has grown up in this county.

It is confidently believed that unless the farmers of Wayne County get a satisfactory mail service, like that in effect here until this year, there will be a near uprising. The sentiment among the farmers is strong and it is being freely voiced. Petitions are being circulated all over the county, in which farmers are calling for the reestablishment of the old service, and, together with the demands that already have been expressed by scores of farmers and signed petitions, the vote against the motorized service and in favor of the "little red wagon" is rolling up to threatening proportions.

That the policy followed by the Post Office Department in this whole matter has been destructive should be apparent to everybody, and Congress should act to protect the people and insure to them, so far as it is possible to do so, adequate mail service.

In the face of thousands of protests from all over the country I am informed the Post Office Department remains firm in its attitude that its reorganization of the Rural Mail Service shall be carried out. If the department persists in this reorganization scheme, it will be only a matter of time until every district in the country will be affected. If the scheme is impractical, as the overwhelming proof would indicate, it should be stopped. The people are entitled to relief through Congress, and they will look to their Representatives in this body to protect them in their rights.

On behalf, therefore, of the Republican Members of Congress from the State of Ohio I ask that an investigation be made by the proper committee of Congress of this situation to the end that the one direct service which the Government renders the people in the transportation and delivery of their mail shall not be impaired.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I do.

Mr. DOWELL. Was the service in the gentleman's district and in the State of Ohio satisfactory and efficient before the proposed change was made?

Mr. McCULLOCH. At the beginning of my remarks I stated that I had made a thorough investigation of the service, and I found that by making a few minor extensions or changes, that would require but little expense, comparatively, the service could be made entirely satisfactory to the public.

Mr. DOWELL. The purpose, then, of the resolution is to secure sufficient evidence and facts to place before the Congress and the department to restore and reinstate the former routes and the former service?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes; and such extensions as may be necessary to make the service as complete as possible.

I submit the following as a part of my remarks:

CALIFORNIA.

That the department's reorganization of the mail service in the State of California was unsatisfactory to patrons is clearly shown by the articles and resolutions which I herewith submit and desire printed in the RECORD, summarized as follows:

(1) Article appearing in the Sebastopol (Cal.) Times in December.

(2) A further editorial appearing in the same issue of the above publication.

(3) Article appearing under date of December 23 in the San Martin (Cal.) Despatch.

(4) Article appearing under date of November 19 in the Fresno (Cal.) Morning Republican.

(5) Article appearing in a December issue of the Watsonville (Cal.) Daily.

(6) Article appearing under date of July 11 in the Fresno (Cal.) Morning Republican.

(7) Article appearing in the Union Labor Journal, of Bakersfield (Cal.), issue of July 7.

(8) Article appearing in the Bakersfield Echo.

The Sebastopol (Cal.) Times publishes the following news story:

Post Office Inspector Frank Hare arrived yesterday morning in compliance with a request from Postmaster Gallagher to go over the rural route and receive a practical demonstration of what the carrier has to do. He went out with Grant Wren on route 3, as rerouted, the inspector recognizing only the department's new routing which went into effect on the 1st of the month. They left on schedule time and returned at 9.15—three hours and a quarter late. The day was somewhat disagreeable, but the evening was comparatively light. The mail also was much lighter than usual or he would have experienced what it means to come in at 11 o'clock, wet, cold, and hungry after six hours of groping along the roadside in the dense murk of Erebus. As it was, he was quite ready for supper on arrival.

Tuesday morning Postmaster Gallagher took the situation by the horns, feeling that it devolved upon him to get the mail to the patrons, and reestablished the old schedule by sending Arthur P. Sweetnam out on route 4 on his own responsibility. For three days the patrons had the satisfaction of receiving their mail on regular time. With the arrival of the inspector this arrangement was again upset, and what the outcome will be, no doubt, depends on his report. The carriers on routes 1 and 2 returned about the same time as the carrier on route 3. Postmaster Gallagher will insist on his going over all three routes so that he will know exactly what each one has to contend with. Inspector Hare did not state last evening whether he would go out again this morning. He is on the verge of illness, suffering from an attack of grippe, and may conclude that he has seen enough to satisfy him of the impossibility of making the new routes and arriving on the schedule time of 6 o'clock.

In the same issue of the same publication this editorial appeared:

In its attempt to reform the Rural Postal Service the Post Office Department seems to be working on paper theory rather than practical knowledge. The whole country has been thrown into greater or less confusion by the effort to make a standard route instead of a standard service, for it is not alone Sebastopol and Sonoma County that is affected, but every State in the Union.

Officials have sat in their offices and rerouted the entire Rural Mail Service without taking into consideration the character of the country, whether it was mountain, valley, or prairie, and without consideration of roads or climatic conditions. It would seem that with a large force of inspectors at its command, together with every postmaster in the country to draw on for detailed information, the department should have been able to know what it could and what it could not do, but it appears these most reliable and willing sources of information have been wholly ignored.

It is quite possible that retrenchment may be necessary, but it is not to be effected by placing impossible requirements upon the rural carriers. There is grave suspicion that Fourth Assistant Postmaster General Blakslee is possessed of an upper story of solid ivory instead of a cranium filled with gray matter; but, of course, it would not be the part of wisdom or politeness to make any such diagnosis without a full knowledge of the facts, but he has the symptoms.

In the meantime, while the mail service is badly shot to pieces, the Post Office Department has the doubtful pleasure of being swamped by protests that do not wait to be carried by mail, but go by wire and by wireless.

The patrons of the rural routes out of Sebastopol appreciate the efforts and will stand by Postmaster Gallagher in restoring the former service while laboring with the department for its reestablishment.

The San Martin (Cal.) Dispatch of December 23 says:

After years of struggle with adverse circumstances, San Martin had just emerged into the bright light of prosperity when along comes an order from the Post Office Department stating that on March 1, 1916, the rural service will be discontinued and her rural people hereafter served from Gilroy and Morgan Hill. This order will affect adversely village and country alike. On the extreme end of 50-mile routes from either of the towns above named means rotten service at all times and oftentimes during the winter no service at all, as no carrier can make the 50-mile run between 11 o'clock a. m. and dark over muddy country roads. Ranchers taking daily morning papers will not get them until well toward evening and evening papers about 28 hours after issue, Saturday and Sunday papers the next Monday afternoon. Under present conditions our ranchers call at the San Martin post office and get these papers Saturday evening and Sunday morning. But under the new economic conditions their papers will be either in Morgan Hill or Gilroy, effectually barred by distance. This miserable service will deter settlers from coming here, thus crippling the growth of the town.

Again, taking away the 115 rural families from our local post office will so reduce the receipts of that institution as to eventually lead to its discontinuance, thus leaving the merchants, artisans, real estate dealers, and citizens in general but one uncertain mail per day instead of the four now enjoyed. The railroad commission can prevent railroads from discontinuing a service once established, but the Post Office Department, regardless of destruction to business enterprise, rides roughshod over the vested rights of the people.

The last resort will be the coming election, but an effort should be made to stay this destructive order by a vigorous protest to the department through Representative HAYES and Senator PHELAN. This protest is now in the hands of R. F. Fullington. Sign it and let us, if possible, prevent the threatened calamity.

The Fresno (Cal.) Morning Republican of November 19 says:

Inauguration of the new motor rural-delivery routes for Fresno County has been postponed from December 1 to January 17, according to instructions received in a telegram from the acting Fourth Assistant Postmaster General at Washington, D. C., to Postmaster Earle Hughes yesterday.

Postmaster Hughes has been busy for several weeks making investigations of the proposed routes. He then took up the matter of postponement with the Washington authorities, on the grounds that the installation of the service December 1 would be impracticable.

A few of the rural residents who will not receive their mail until afternoon as result of the new service have complained to Congressman DENVER S. CHURCH. Upon his return to Washington for the next session of Congress, Congressman CHURCH will request the post-office inspectors who have full charge of the arrangement to make a more detailed survey of the field before the system is put into operation.

Postmaster Hughes asked for the postponement for several reasons. The difficulty of putting the scheme into operation at a time when Christmas mails begin to get heavy was one. He also pointed out the impossibility of getting drivers for the routes when the examination is held November 27. The men would not want the routes temporarily, he said. He desired to wait until the eligible register was determined as a result of the civil-service examination.

"Not enough consideration has been given to the planning of these routes," Hughes said yesterday. "Some are too heavy for the 50-mile run. In many places the boxes have not been placed conveniently for the drivers.

"The territory will be increased on all the routes and will be covered by the motor cars for less expense. Ten carriers are now employed from the Fresno office, at a cost of $1,200 a year each, or $12,000 a year, and under the new system 120 miles will be added and the expense will be only $10,500.

"While the arrangements of these routes are wholly in the hands of the post-office officials, and are in no way connected with politics, Congressman CHURCH will ask an investigation to make sure there will be no discriminations. A month and a half will be had to straighten out the kinks after the selection of the carrier is determined."

The following was taken from a recent issue of a Watsonville (Cal.) daily:

The proposed consolidation of the rural post-office routes in this valley and the substitution of automobiles for wagons after January 3 is not meeting with general approval in this valley. The change means that the patrons of the free rural delivery will in some cases not receive their mail until late in the afternoon, and during the winter months it will be still later than in summer before the deliveries are finished. The new routes will mean that the automobiles must cover a radius of from 50 to 60 miles where 20 or 30 miles are now traversed.

In the San Andreas, Calabasas, Larkin Valley, Eureka Canyon, Browns Valley, Carneros, Prunedale, and Hall districts of this valley the roads are not any too good in winter, and while a horse and wagon can plod through the mud with difficulty, yet an automobile will have a still harder job to get through the slush. The new system might work out in a first-class manner in some sections of the State, but those opposed to the change do not believe it will be a success in this valley.

That three motor-vehicle routes will succeed the present five rural routes operating out of the Watsonville post office is the present plan of the United States Post Office Department, according to advices received here in the past few days. The new order will go into effect on January 3 unless further changes are announced, and the ruling means that the present system will be done away with.

The present routes are as follows: No. 1, Green Valley, College Road, and Casserly section; No. 2, Hall district, Elkhorn section, Pajaro; No. 3, San Andreas and Calabasas; No. 4, Carneros and Prunedale; No. 5, Coralitos. The proposed order will combine routes Nos. 1 and 3 into one automobile route, leaving route No. 2 alone for the present, and combine routes Nos. 4 and 5. The present rural-route carriers are Charles Peckham, Henry Trafton, James Cox, L. Mansfield, and E. L. Bradley, and under the new system, while all can take the civil-service examinations for the new positions, yet the new ruling means that at least two of them will be out of employment after January 3.

While the present carriers cover a radius of perhaps 25 miles, the new carriers will travel from 50 to 60 miles. At present the carriers leave the post office at 11.15 o'clock and return from 3 o'clock to 6. Under the new system it is expected that the carriers will not return before 6 o'clock p. m. at the least, and perhaps later.

The Government is extending automobile delivery into the rural sections throughout the country, and the San Joaquin Valley post offices nearly all have automobile carriers where there are two or more rural routes. The objection to the system is, for one thing, that the patrons will not receive their mail until later in the afternoon, especially in the winter months, when the wet roads will prevent any reasonable speed on the part of the automobiles.

While the carriers will cover more territory and have longer hours, yet they will receive no more compensation than the present carriers do. The carriers must also furnish their own automobiles.

Here is an echo from California—dissatisfaction—the same old story. It is taken from the Fresno (Cal.) Morning Republican of July 11:

Efforts of Postmaster C. M. Burnett to have changes made in the two new rural routes which are to replace the three existing routes on August 2 have failed up to the present. There is considerable dissatisfaction over the routing of the new delivery service. Route A will serve practically the same territory now served by routes 1 and 2. Route B will take in the territory southwest of Tulare, running within a mile of Waukena and through Corcoran, which towns have post offices. At the same time Oakland Colony, Bliss Colony, and the Woodville country, all tributary to Tulare, are not provided with a rural mail service, although they have been making an effort to get rural delivery for some time. It is believed here that the new routes will eventually be changed to correct this condition.

The Union Labor Journal, of Bakersfield, Cal., prints the following editorial in its issue of July 17—it bears the caption "To the scrap heap":

An earnest protest is being made by the rural carriers from the Bakersfield post office at the order recently issued consolidating the six rural routes from this office into three. The consolidated routes will require the use of an automobile which must be furnished by the carrier. The approximate length of the routes will be 50 miles.

One feature of the new order which gives Uncle Sam the appearance of being a none too considerate employer is that three men will be thrown into the scrap heap of the jobless, and for some of them it means that the door of opportunity to another job will be a rather difficult passage for them to negotiate.

The change will result in a saving of $2,700 per year in the pay of rural carriers from this office. Considering such saving it would seem that Uncle Sam could have afforded to pay for the service a wage commensurate with the pay of other laborers in this section. A wage of $125 per month for the man and the use and upkeep of an automobile would be rather inviting to a great many employers in Bakersfield.

Some of the men will refuse to take the examination for the consolidated jobs because of the smallness of the pay and the amount of labor which the jobs will carry. It is claimed by some of the carriers that it will require 12 hours' work per day to serve some of the routes. Whether such will be true or not we are unable to say, but fears have

been expressed by patrons on some of the routes that the quality of service which has been enjoyed in the past can not be maintained when two routes are made into one.

The R. F. D. News, the rural carriers' organ, places the responsibility for the order largely upon the postmasters in offices where the change is being made. This paper attaches much significance in connection with the change to a confidential form letter issued to the postmasters from the office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, and attaches responsibility to postmasters who recommended such change.

It is said that the Bakersfield office and the Modesto office are the only offices in the San Joaquin Valley where consolidation of routes and establishing of auto service has thus been ordered.

It has been proposed that a petition to Congressman CHURCH be prepared, and that he be asked to use his best endeavors to the end that the order be rescinded.

The idea has ordinarily prevailed that a person who has taken a civil-service examination and has been admitted to the postal service has a job as long as he is able to render adequate service to the Post Office Department. This idea is evidently in error, and civil-service employees in the Postal Service are eligible to consignment to the scrap heap just as are other workmen.

It hardly seems fair to those men who have served the post office so long and faithfully that they should have no seniority over new men in an opportunity to continue in the service. While they are experienced in the service, the presumption is not well founded that such experience will give them a decided advantage over other applicants. Civil-service examinations are never a perfect test of one's ability to perform certain duties. The range of the examination covers a lot of things which are not so vital, and in some features of a civil-service examination most any high-school boy can discount an older man. Those features of an examination which are primarily academic will be much more easily handled by new applicants than by the old men in the service.

All in all, it does not seem that the treatment being given to the rural carriers from the post office is just what we have always expected from Uncle Sam as an employer.

About the same time, the Morning Echo, another Bakersfield (Cal.) newspaper, announced that the consolidation of routes there had been postponed for a month, because the postmaster could obtatin no one to serve the auto routes temporarily, reference to which was made in last week's issue of the News. The Echo says, in part:

The proposed consolidation of six routes into three routes to be served with auto delivery, the carriers keeping up the automobiles as well as supplying their own machines, is shied at by the old carriers, and several persons who have investigated the work gave up after going over the routes a few times.

Each route will cover 50 miles and the number of pieces of mail matter handled averages from 1,200 to 1,500 a day. On each route about 450 different patrons are served.

It is figured that the handling of the mail before taking it out onto the route will require three hours each day. Then in the delivery at least 250 stops daily will be required. That will means cranking a Ford 250 times on each trip, and it is estimated that one minute will be required for each stop and start.

The stopping and starting and the assembling of the mail, it is said, will take up seven hours a day and carriers as well as auto men say that it will be impossible to drive the 50 miles in less than three hours' running time, making the round trip, from beginning to end, take up at least 10 hours, barring accidents of every kind and delays.

Auto men who have figured on the rural route service state that at $125 a month the compensation is so small that a man had better go into the jitney service rather than work for the Government. It is figured that the gasoline, oil, breakages, and depreciation, even for Fords, will amount to 5 cents a mile, bringing the daily cost up to about $3 and affording less than $30 a month for the arduous work and responsibility.

FLORIDA.

That the department's reorganization of the mail service in the State of Florida was unsatisfactory to the patrons is clearly shown by the articles and resolutions which I herewith submit and desire printed in the RECORD, summarized as follows:

(1) Article appearing July 10 in the Miami (Fla.) Daily Metropolis.

(2) Article appearing in the Miami Metropolis of July 15.

On July 10 the Miami (Fla.) Daily Metropolis published the following news story:

Instructions from the Postmaster General have been received by Postmaster F. M. Brown calling for the discontinuance of the two rural routes running out of Miami on August 1 and the formation at that time of one 50-mile rural route. It is the idea of the department to have this single route handle all of the rural service in the vicinity of Miami.

It is believed that the order will bring forth a great deal of criticism and opposition from people who depend upon the rural routes for their postal service. At the present time two routes run out of Miami, one of them, No. 1 route, caring for the people south of the river to Coconut Grove and west of the Everglades, and No. 2 route serving the people north of the river to Lemon City and west to the Everglades. No. 1 route covers 25.85 miles and No. 2 route 25.4 miles.

The order calls for the formation of one 50-mile route known as No. A route. The same order was issued to post offices in different parts of the country in an effort to cut down operating expenses. In some places the order will probably prove a benefit where little mail is carried by the rural routes, but in communities like Miami it will not only work a hardship on the rural carriers but will also prevent an adequate service.

During the winter the two rural carriers in Miami have about all they can do to handle their routes, as the mail is exceptionally heavy. People well acquainted with the conditions say that it will be practically impossible for one man to handle the service. The order provides a salary of $1,500 for the one carrier, an increase of $300 over the salary received by the two carriers now. However, the one carrier will have to cover the 50-mile route and extend proper service to the people. If he finds it impossible for him to do this alone it will be necessary for him to employ an assistant out of his own pocket.

At the present time the people residing on the beach are circulating a petition to have one of the rural routes cover the beach territory. The people over there have no mail service at present, and if the rural routes were sent that way it would add about 14 miles on the trip. Under the late order it would be impossible for the extra mileage to be added onto the new route.

The condition of the rural route service at the present time would permit adding enough mileage to each of the two routes to make them 50-mile routes, according to people who know the conditions.

The Miami (Fla.) Metropolis of July 15 says, editorially:

Strange as it may appear, the Post Office Department is the only enterprise in Dade County which seems to have taken a backward step.

The recent order, effective August 2, consolidating two vehicle delivery routes into one is not giving the unalloyed pleasure here that the Government officials may have expected.

Still there is nothing to do but take the medicine, express an opinion, and watch results. When Uncle Sam writes his prescriptions they are generally imperative, even though hardships are entailed.

The R. F. D. News of July 10, giving a list of 45 motor vehicle routes in effect August 2, includes Miami, and shows that on the one route designated here 547 families will be served with their mail daily. There are more families on this route than any one in the entire list, which includes cities in California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Texas. For instance, at Rankin, Okla., 172 families are on the route. At Cestos, Okla., 139 families are served. The nearest approach to the Miami route in point of number of families served is Arlington, Ga., which has 490. Most of the cities in the list have on their route about half of the number of families assigned to the Miami route.

This discrimination is so palpable that further comparison seems unnecessary. Miami is a growing city, and its size can not even be approximated by consulting antedeluvian Government census reports. Cities like Miami double and treble in population between census enumerations.

GEORGIA.

That the department's reorganization of the mail service in the State of Georgia was unsatisfactory to the patrons is clearly shown by the articles and resolutions which I herewith submit and desire printed in the RECORD, summarized as follows:

(1) Article appearing July 14 in the Daily Tifton Gazette, published at Tifton, Ga.

(2) Article appearing in an August issue of the Tifton (Ga.) Gazette.

(3) Article appearing in a November issue of the Tifton (Ga.) Gazette.

(4) Article appearing in the Cleveland (Ga.) Courier of November 19.

(5) Article appearing in the Ochlochnee (Ga.) Daily Times Enterprise.

(6) Article appearing in a December issue of the Gainesville (Ga.) News.

(7) Article appearing in a December issue of the Macon (Ga.) Daily Telegraph.

(8) Article appearing in an issue of the Savannah (Ga.) Daily News.

(9) Article appearing in the Dahlonega (Ga.) Echo.

The Daily Tifton Gazette, published at Tifton, Ga., in its edition of July 14 prints the following editorial—it speaks for itself:

The people living on rural free delivery mail routes the country over should make a concerted and emphatic protest against the inauguration of the motor-car service.

This pretends to be an improvement on the service; in reality it tends toward inefficiency. It is but another step in the process of cheapening the Postal Service generally and in cutting down the expenditure for rural free delivery in particular.

The system has been heralded all over the country as an extension of the Rural Free Delivery Service and an improvement thereto. It was extensively advertised as such in specials from Washington, published broadcast over the country by newspapers who thought the Post Office Department was dealing fairly with them and that the statements were true. On the contrary, the change is an effort to cut down by one-third the money paid to rural free delivery mail carriers.

As to how the change will work, take the one proposed for Tifton as an illustration: Here the purpose is to abolish two rural free delivery routes and substitute for them one motor route. The two rural routes have a total mileage of a little over 50 miles and the proposed motor route the same. The two rural carriers would receive after July 1, $1,200 each, or a total of $2,400 for the two. The carrier on the motor route is to be paid $1,608. This would be a saving (in one sense of the word) to the department of $800, and that is the sole reason for the change; the service has nothing to do with it.

As it happens, both of these carriers have motor cars. They leave the Tifton post office at 8 a. m. and usually return by noon, so that practically all the people on their routes receive their mail by 12 o'clock. Under the change proposed the motor carrier would go over one of the routes in the morning and the other in the afternoon. Half of the people to be served would have their mail delayed six hours.

Perhaps the idea of the department is that this would make no material difference; but it would. At least one firm doing an extensive business by mail, located 4 miles out of town, has advised that the delay would make it necessary for it to withdraw patronage from the rural route and send in to the post office for its mail.

The change would make the service inefficient, because delays would be unavoidable. No automobile yet made can be expected to run 50 miles a day 6 days in the week and over 300 days in the year without mishap. In event of breakdown the carrier can not leave his mail, so must wait for the chance passer-by. Accidents and consequent delay in the service would be unavoidable.

The time that must be made in order to cover both routes would be conducive to mistakes, probably result in mail being carried by, and otherwise delay the service. The man who drives the motor can not read and assort his mail while doing so. He must do that during

stops. With a long route to serve and a big volume of mail to handle, mistakes would necessarily be more frequent.

Both carriers who will be thrown out of positions here have spent many years in the Rural Free Delivery Service. One of them has carried on his route for nearly a decade and has given the best years of his life to the work. Both have zealously endeavored to perfect their service, with the reasonable expectation of being advanced on merit. Now they are thrown out of their positions and must take their chances with new competitors if they desire to apply for the motor route. Thus two good men and faithful employees are injured, while the man who gets the route will not be benefited, for the pay is pitifully small when the cost of motor and upkeep is considered.

If retrenchment was necessary, the effort at parsinonious cutting of salaries would have something to defend it. But last year and the year before the Post Office Department not only paid expenses but turned a surplus into the Treasury. In other words, it took money from the pockets of the people which it did not need and applied it to defraying other expenses of the Government. This was neither legal nor right.

What is being done at Tifton will soon be done at nearly every post office where there are two or more Rural Free Delivery routes. The time for the people to protest, and especially for the people in the rural districts to protest, against this infringement of their rights is now.

The Daily Tifton (Ga.) Gazette in August published an editorial on the Postal Service saying, in part:

If we may judge from the local conditions, a wave of indignation is rising over the entire country that promises to reach high tide about the time that Congress meets. Whether he deserves it or not, Mr. Burleson has made himself very unpopular in many quarters and especially with the rural voters. Unless he is taken to account for the conduct of his department before the elections next year, the Democratic Party will feel effects of the resentment against him at the polls.

The Tifton (Ga.) Gazette in a recent issue says:

In every well-regulated business concern, seniority, experience, and faithful service command preference and promotion. In fact, many manufacturers, heads of wholesale or retail establishments, railroads, and others have adopted or are adopting systems of promotion based on service and efficiency, and systems of old-age pensions for employees no longer able to work. At one time there was a strong movement for an old-age pension system in the Government service. Under the civil-service law, seniority and efficiency should insure advancement.

Is the Rural Free Delivery Service to be the one branch of the Government service in which the idea on which the civil-service law was conceived is to be set at naught and in which seniority, efficiency, and faithfulness count for nothing?

The rural free delivery mail carriers are probably closer to the great mass of the American people than the employees of any other branch of Government service. Contrary to nearly every other branch, they must not only be prepared for their work by education or training, but must furnish a certain amount of equipment, either mechanical or in live stock, with which to carry on their work. They are also more exposed to the weather with its consequences, and the demands of the service preclude any other employment.

In the revolution of the Rural Mail Service incident to the substitution of long motor routes for the short rural free delivery mail routes, many carriers are being thrown out of employment. In this, so far as we have been able to learn, no regard has been paid to seniority, efficiency, or past faithful service. In many cases men who have served the Government for a decade or more and who have grown so old in the service that no other avocation is readily open to them; who have invested a sum in equipment for their work sufficient to pay for a modest home; these have been summarily dismissed with short notice and no time to prepare themselves for something else, as if they had been unfaithful, incompetent, or dishonest.

Can a Government as great and as rich as ours afford to do this thing? Can such a wrong be perpetrated in the name of progress and economy? Surely the fair-minded American people will not be parties to such an unfair and unjust proceeding?

In the name of justice and fair dealing the rural free delivery carrier is entitled to some assurance that he can hold his job so long as he is faithful and efficient. The civil-service law was enacted to give such assurance to Government employees.

The Cleveland (Ga.) Courier of November 19 says:

Jackson County is to have a general shake-up in Rural Mail Service through the introduction of the substitution of automobiles to take the place of horses. For some time the department has been endeavoring to better conditions and improve the service by combining two routes or more into one and serving the whole by auto. This is impossible on any and all roads in north Georgia that we have ever seen.

We have ever stood for the improvement of the mail service, and if we believed that automobile service could permanently be put into use we would push it with all our might. But there have been many days even during the past summer that automobile service was practically impossible over the roads we have. If the people want better service, or before service can be given them, we must have roads that will not get knee-deep in mud every time it comes a few days rain.

If certain sections of the country have sufficient roads and patronage to warrant this service, then it should be introduced, and that section less fortunate in ronds, wealth, and population given more consideration than they have received by the present service.

Service which is very much needed in this country has been rejected time and again. For instance, that section in this country known as Etris has been exiled from mail service for several years, and every effort made to improve their convenience to mails have proved futile. Rural service has been rejected two or three times, a proposition to serve them by a loop route has been turned down, a proposed star route to run between Porter Springs and Cleveland, which would have served them, has been declared unwarranted and other propositions have also failed.

We think it the duty of the department to give the people a more equal service without lessening the efficiency of the service rather than to undertake an impossibility to better serve some and leave others without any service.

The Daily Times-Enterprise, of Ochlochanee, Ga., on December 3 printed the following:

The post-office authorities at the local office are working under a decided disadvantage with the attempt of the Post Office Department to combine three rural routes into one and have one man carry it. The task is one that is well-nigh impossible, and the service, as a result of the attempt, has become disorganized, and many kicks are being registered each day because of failure to make the time.

Men have been tried whose experience is of some years, others who are experts at running a car over country roads and know mail service, and others who are inexperienced and willing and anxious to make good. It has been a flat failure, and the several who have tried it can not possibly do the work and come out even on the pay that is given.

The motor route is 65½ miles long and is composed of three routes. The figures or estimates of distance and time necessary for each route are as follows: Route No. 1, 26½ miles; average time, 4 hours and 30 minutes. Route No. 3, 23 miles; average time, 4 hours and 40 minutes. Route No. 6, 17 miles; average time, 3 hours. This gives a total mileage of 65½, total time of 12 hours and 10 minutes. The statements show conclusively that it is not feasible and is bound to result in delays and inconveniences that are very discomforting. One of the men who tried the route took the mail himself on all three routes, and he got back to the city after 7 o'clock. This was in dry weather and when the roads were in good condition.

The price paid for this work is $150 per month, a saving to the department of something like $1,300 per year over the old system. Those served by the mail agree that it is a saving that will completely disorganize the service and disgust competent men who want to enter the work.

The Gainesville (Ga.) News recently printed the following editorial:

The efforts of the Post Office Department to motorize the Rural Free-Delivery Mail Service in this section is impracticable. The condition of our public roads will not permit of motor service throughout the year. When winter rains and freezes come, no automobile can traverse a 50-mile route daily; consequently, we fear that to try to force this service at this time will retard rather than further the Rural Mail Service.

Congressman BELL, in speaking of the matter, has well said:

"It is quite apparent to my mind that the proposed motor service in our section of the country means the beginning of the end of our rural free delivery of mail. Under the present system the rural delivery of mail is the greatest blessing the country has had from the Government in a century. It is plain to any reasonable mind that the motor service can not be performed in our section in the winter season, and the result will be a demoralization of the service and an attempt to change it into the old star-route service.

"If the roads and climate conditions made the proposed service practicable the year round, the people would gladly welcome it. Provisions have been made when motor service can not be performed on the 50-mile routes for the carriers to employ a substitute to convey one-half the route by team, and he can not afford to pay more than $750 per annum, which would not compensate a substitute for the service performed, and, of course, he will resign, as will the carrier himself, and we will then face the demoralizing result of the service proposed.

"As the free delivery of their mail is about all the country people of this section get from the Government, it is hoped that the Post Office Department will abandon its efforts to motorize this service, for the reason that it is impractical and will mean the curtailment, if not abandonment, of this service."

The Macon (Ga.) Daily Telegraph prints this:

The opposition developing toward making the rural free delivery routes throughout the State all automobile delivery is pretty well grounded for the time being. It is hardly time yet for such a change. It is just as important that the farmer get his mail as regularly every day as the city man, but the stipulating that the carrier in the rural sections shall cover their routes by automobile, with twice the distance to cover by virtue of that faster mode of transportation, will not do for a while yet. Somebody is guilty of a great deal of stupidity in the Post Office Department.

It may be granted that in most counties in Georgia for 8 or 9 or even 10 months in the year, in some parts an even 12 months, a man in a light car could cover a great deal more territory than a man with a horse and rig, but no matter what the gain in these good-roads months failure a few days during rainy winter weather and through only temporarily built neighborhood roads washing down so that an automobile could not get through would ruin the whole thing. A horse and rig can get through almost any sort of road in almost any sort of weather; an automobile can not promise that. We are not throwing off on Georgia roads, but there are few States in the Union that can stand up to the test the Post Office Department so egregiously proposes to the certain curtailment and detriment of its own service. In a few years Georgia will be ready for all auto routes, but that time is not now; and the people seem to be expressing themselves quite freely to that effect, too.

The following is taken from a recent issue of the Savannah (Ga.) Daily News:

Serious trouble in delivering mail on motor route A, established on September 1 last, is being experienced by post-office officials, and as a result the patrons at Elyod Heights, Vernon View, White Bluff, the Isle of Hope, and other places must call at the post office for their mail.

The post office yesterday found itself without a carrier for the route after struggling two months to make regular deliveries. It has been impossible to secure a temporary carrier to await the appointment of a permanent carrier.

Route A covers 54 miles, has 500 post-office boxes along the way, and serves over 1,500 people. One trip by automobile is required to be made over the route daily. The position pays a salary of $1,500 a year, but still it is going begging.

Yesterday an official of the post office called on local automobile men, asking them to take the place temporarily. All refused. This is said to have been on account of the high price of gasoline.

When the route was established a temporary carrier was placed in charge, but at the end of the first month he gave it up. The second month had the same result. Monday the officials did succeed in getting the mail delivered in that section. Automobile men claim they can not handle the route and make money. Some time ago a civil-service examination for the position was held, but the results have not yet been announced.

The Dahlonega (Ga.) Echo of a few days ago says editorially:

If the proposed plan of the Post Office Department combining two rural free delivery routes into one, to be carried by auto, is put into effect in our section, we see the finish of R. F. D. We also see some fat officeholders looking for new jobs after said failure has taken place.

If some R. F. D. expert can sit on a throne in Washington and map out a plan for rural free delivery in Lumpkin County superior to what we now have, then he can get a better job than he now has. To combine two routes and carry same by auto and cover that entire route the year round in one day is impossible of practical accomplishment.

We may submit quietly, and, again, we may not. It is too near general election time for any man or set of men to play such fool politics. It is too ridiculous to call a political move; it's absolute suicide.

With the railroad crying for more pay for hauling the mail, the express companies fighting parcel post, this move savors of automobile influence. The Postal System of the United States, to my personal knowledge, is superior to that of any other country on the globe, and I can not believe that any well-balanced person would attempt such a foolhardy thing as combining two rural routes and call it either economy or efficiency, for in our section it would mean neither.

Party politics would not be considered one minute as for or against such a move as this. The rural communities are familiar with daily mail service, and will resent with the ballot any effort to tamper with same. Those responsible for this move must remember that they are public servants, and those responsible for such people holding office will be held accountable for their acts.

Lumpkin County will have nothing but the best, and we are so peculiarly located and of such peculiar political taste as to be in a position to demand it.

The Fresno (Cal.) Morning Republican printed this item on November 1 under a Clovis (Cal.) date line:

Yesterday Postmaster Earle Hughes, of Fresno, was in Clovis to cooperate with Mrs. Kate Bell, local postmistress, in eliminating certain motor-route inconsistencies brought about through recent changes of carrier routes in this vicinity.

Owing to the fact that the Washington officials were not familiar with local road conditions, a route from Clovis and one from Fresno were overlapping. This feature was done away with by a change in the routing, at the same time giving better service to people in this section.

The Washington officials will be notified of the necessary change, as the road suggested by the department would have led through the heart of several vineyards.

ILLINOIS.

That the department's reorganization of the mail service in the State of Illinois was unsatisfactory to the patrons is clearly shown in the articles and resolutions which I herewith submit and desire printed in the RECORD, summarized as follows:

(1) Article appearing November 10 in the Daily Journal-Gazette, published at Mattoon, Ill.

(2) Article appearing in the September 16 issue of the Springfield (Ill.) News.

The Daily Journal-Gazette, of Mattoon, Ill., says on November 10:

If the Post Office Service throughout the country is being reduced in efficiency in the same proportion that the Matoon post-office service is there can be little debate about the lack of ability of the "big guns" down at Washington to manage the business of the country to produce the best service for the people. The changes that are being made and that have been made in the handling of business of the Mattoon post office can not be charged up to the people connected with the local office. They are suffering about as much by the changes as are the patrons of the office. The changes that have reduced the efficiency of the service and that will reduce it still more unless the department chiefs get wise to the situation probably follow the visit and inspection of some special representative of the Post Office Department who thinks he has to make recommendations in order to make good with the fellow who is above him in authority and so on up the line. It is not so very long ago that Mattoon had an all-night office. It was a great convenience to the public. The all-night service was cut off, and since then cut after cut has been made until the service has been so reduced that the public is being very, very badly served. Just as an example, a new rule that has been promulgated by somebody higher up than the local post-office authorities makes it necessary if you wish to mail a parcel-post package to go to the general-delivery window, where it is often necessary to stand in line, because of congestion of business, to get the package weighed. After you have found out how much postage it takes to transport the package, you have to go to another window, and if business is rushing you stand in line for an opportunity to purchase the necessary postage. Even now your troubles have not ended, as you have to go to another part of the lobby to find the proper place to deposit the package so that it may start on its journey. It is almost necessary to have a chart in order to find your way. Of course, it may be all O. K. after you have learned the devious route and kept control of your patience and temper, but as one attaché of the local post office remarked: "The system will probably be changed again before the public gets fully acquainted with the present one." Thus it is that the inspectors and efficiency experts hold their jobs while the gentle and trusting public, which pays the bills, gets poor service, and the local post-office employees get the kicks, when in truth they are in no way responsible and are hampered and harassed almost beyond endurance because of the decrees of the numbskulls higher up.

The following editorial, headed "Crippling the rural mail," is taken from the September 16 issue of the Springfield (Ill.) News:

Resentment is growing among farmers all over the country as the result of the curtailment of the rural mail service under the plea of economy.

Routes have been lengthened and consolidated. The number of carriers has been reduced. As a consequence communities that have been getting their mail regularly now get it at uncertain intervals, and often the family mail box is a mile or two from home.

The excellence of the rural mail service has been a great help to the farmer, because it has brought him into close touch with the world. Aside from the telephone, no other factor has had so great an influence in making the farm popular.

The crippling of the service by the Postmaster General therefore is causing genuine alarm.

"I believe a mistake is being made that will not tend either to economy or efficiency," John A. McSparran, master of the State Grange of Pennsylvania, said in discussing the new system. "The lengthening of the routes is not the place to correct the waste, for the length of the route must continue for many years to be dependent upon the distance a horse can travel under average conditions in the time allowed between trains that carry the mail to and from the terminus of the route."

The attempt to substitute the automobile for the horse at this time is foolish, Mr. McSparran says. The state of the roads is not such that an automobile rural service would be possible, except for a few months in the summer.

A recent letter from an Illinois carrier says:

Things are beginning to happen in Illinois. Fred Snyder, from Maple Park, who was with us at Detroit, has had his route consolidated with another, making an auto route of 54 miles. He is the temporary carrier, but don't expect to take the examination.

Don't know how soon they will jar us, but let her come. We are all equipped with shock absorbers.

INDIANA.

That the department's reorganization of the mail service in the State of Indiana was unsatisfactory to the patrons is clearly shown by the articles and resolutions which I herewith submit and desire printed in the RECORD, summarized as follows:

(1) Article appearing in the August 27 issue of the Marion County Mail, published at Indianapolis, Ind.

(2) Article appearing under date of November 19 in the Roann (Ind.) Clarion.

(3) Articles appearing in the Evening Item, of Richmond, Ind., issue of January 21, 1916.

The Marion County Mail, published at Indianapolis, Ind., in its issue of August 27 says:

The action of the Post Office Department in dismissing rural carriers in Marion County without giving the men a fair chance is creating much feeling among the patrons on the rural routes. One well-known farmer was in the Mail office Monday, and stated that the new carrier on one of the routes recently changed was causing all kinds of trouble. He said the report was out that the carrier could not read. He said the old carrier was one of the most courteous of men and very accommodating.

It is said a new scheme is being worked in Marion County in firing the carriers. Instead of sending regular civil-service inspectors, the department orders the Democratic postmaster to send out some one in the office here, and that the scheme is working fine. The suspended carriers report that local men have been doing the investigation and filing the reports against them.

The Mail received this special report from Washington this week:

"Members of Congress declare that complaints they are receiving from both rural carriers and patrons have been more numerous and bitter in the last few months than for years before.

"Rural carriers claim that they have suffered chiefly on two counts, one, that although they are under civil service there have been hundreds of dismissals without just cause, the other that their routes have been lengthened and their work increased, without additional pay. The complaints from patrons of the rural routes are uniformly based upon sweeping reductions in the service.

"The conditions causing these complaints are due to the failure of the Post Office appropriation bill and the consequent necessity for managing the Postal Service under a reenactment of last year's appropriation. The principal changes ordered by the department reducing the carrier force arise, first, by the proposed consolidation of about 1,500 routes 25 miles long into half that number 50 miles long; second, in lengthening the standard routes. It is estimated that more than 2,000 rural carriers have lost their places under these reductions.

"The patrons of the rural routes base their criticisms on the claim that many have had to move their mail boxes at least half a mile from former locations, and they, instead of the carriers, must travel that distance for mail; all these charges cripple the effectiveness of the Parcel Post Service, especially as to perishable goods. There is also a general complaint of curtailment of Rural Free Delivery Service. Mass meetings of patrons have been held in many localities protesting against the demoralization of their service, and they are daily becoming more frequent.

"Reports from associations of rural carriers claim that not only have the men lost their enthusiasm for the service, but through fear of dismissal have resigned. This is largely the result, it is said, of department instructions to have Democratic postmasters instead of civil-service inspectors make confidential reports upon the qualifications of carriers as a basis for reductions. This arrangement has opened the way to rank discrimination in favor of Democratic carriers."

In the changing of rural routes the Post Office has already made the offices at Cumberland, Julietta, Southport, Nora, and Wanamaker so unprofitable that it is hard to get anyone to take care of them. The pay is too small.

The Roann (Ind.) Clarion of November 19 says:

Change in rural mail delivery out of Roann took effect last Monday, following an order some time ago from Postmaster General Burleson, discontinuing route No. 1 out of Roann, one out of Wabash, combining the two into a 50-mile motor route, to be known as route A of Wabash.

In short, the local system, which has proved efficient and satisfactory for 15 years, has been "shot to pieces" for no other reason than that Post Office officials are trying to save money on a system that probably never will be self-supporting.

Economy is all right as long as it does not interfere with efficiency, but as soon as it does it is no longer economy. Mail carriers are unanimously of the opinion that 50-mile routes will never be practical. No doubt they can be covered during the summer, but when winter snows block the roads it certainly will be impossible to traverse 50 miles of them in any kind of automobile.

Following the order for the change in deliveries here, petitions were circulated among the patrons affected by the change, and everyone, it is said, signed the paper protesting against the move. So far, these petitions have been completely ignored by officials.

Farmers living anywhere near Roann have decided to come to the post office for their mail rather than to suffer the inconvenience of a change of address.

The following letter was received late last week from a rural-route patron—he desires his name withheld—at Leominster, Mass.:

The curtailment of the Rural Free Delivery Service, which, I note through the columns of your valuable paper, is quite extensive in the Southern and Western States, has at last struck the New England States, and Massachusetts in particular.

The situation in Worcester County is becoming very grave according to reports from surrounding towns, which I note from an article in the News of November 13 concerning the town of Rutland, Mass., and that the various communities are deeply stirred.

As stated in a previous issue of the News, the route at Pratts Junction, covered for many years by Carrier W. A. Dingley, is suspended and the territory divided between route 1, of Lancaster, which is extended from 24½ to 28 miles. Route 1 from Sterling Junction gets a big slice added to its territory, and route 1 from Leominster is extended from 25 to 30.8 miles.

To enable the Lancaster route to be extended, several miles were taken off and added to the Leominster route, the latter route having a slice of nearly 4 miles cut off and which is taken care of by route 1, of Fitchburg.

Thirty families residing in Leominster, within 2 to 3 miles of the post office, have been obliged to have their mail changed to the Fitchburg post office, which is from 4 to 5 miles distant. On one street thus served 14 patrons living within a half mile of the Leominster City Delivery Service have moved their mail boxes to within the limit of above service, and prefer to walk a short distance, thus getting two deliveries a day rather than have their mail come through Fitchburg.

The town of Ashby is also affected, as will be noted from the following article appearing in the Fitchburg Sentinel:

The revision of the rural-mail delivery service in Worcester County, which has extended the routes becomes effective on November 16, and will affect Fitchburg to some extent, although this city, through adding a part of the territory formerly covered by Leominster, Lunenburg, and Ashby rural carriers, will not lose either of its rural carriers. Ashby, however, is less fortunate and one of the two rural carriers employed in that town will be retired, while the territory of Leominster and Lunenburg men will be extended in other directions, increasing the daily distance to be covered, and other carriers further down the line are to lose their jobs.

While there are claims to the effect that the service is to be systematized and improved, those rural residents who are to find themselves off the regular routes of the carriers after November 16 do not quite see it in that light. These people, however, will not be deprived of the service, as they are permitted to erect mail boxes at the nearest point to their homes on the new routes of the carriers. Fortunately for Fitchburg people, there are few, if any, in this city who will be inconvenienced along those lines.

The following letter is from a citizen of Conrad, Iowa:

I thought I would write a few lines from this neck of the woods. They have made quite a change in the rural routes around here at Union, Liscomb, Allison, and Conrad. They gave No. 1 from here 1 mile and No. 2 4 extra miles. This gives the latter 29 miles. This 4 miles is over by-roads and 1 mile of it has not had a grader on it for 30 years, until mail began going over it. It was graded this fall, late, and then it commenced raining and the farmers began hauling corn over it. It is a fright now. It takes from seven to seven and a half hours to make the route. The carriers don't have time to feed their teams; only stops long enough to water. He has his chores in the morning by lantern and at night by lantern. Eleven to twelve hours a day.

FARMERS DEMAND RETURN TO OLD SERVICE—RURAL ROUTE CHANGES MADE BY INSPECTORS ABSOLUTELY OF NO BENEFIT, SAYS PROF. STARR; DENIES HAVING RESIGNED CARRIER JOB—EVERY NIGHT HIS WORK REQUIRES HIM TO STAY ON DUTY UNTIL 2 OR 3 A. M. SORTING MAIL FOR NEXT DAY'S DELIVERY—DIDN'T CARRY ROUTE THURSDAY BECAUSE HE WAS PHYSICALLY EXHAUSTED—DOESN'T BELIEVE MOTORIZED SERVICE EVER WILL BE AS SUCCESSFUL AS WERE "LITTLE RED WAGONS"—POSTMASTER BECK GREATLY WORRIED OVER SITUATION, HE SAYS.

Failure of the post-office inspectors to afford any real relief in the local rural mails delivery muddle or to offer any hope of adequate relief brought Prof. James C. Starr, carrier on Route D, to decide upon resignation from the service, Thursday. Prof. Starr denied in an interview Thursday evening that he had tendered his resignation to Postmaster C. B. Beck Thursday morning or had thrown his keys on the postmaster's desk, both of which actions he was accredited with in the Thursday evening issue of a local newspaper.

"I have not resigned," said Prof. Starr, "but I think I shall. I went to work at the post office Thursday morning and arranged my mail for distribution, but I was too nearly exhausted, so I gave to Frank Wilson, superintendent of mails, a key to a lock box at Abington, so that a substitute, if they should find any, could unlock the box while he was delivering the mail. I have been up until 2 and 3 o'clock every night since I took the job and was completely exhausted, so I came home and was in bed practically all day. I had to get some sleep.

WILL QUIT UNLESS RELIEF IS GIVEN.

"Unless I can have some assurance that relief will be given, I will quit. The changes the inspectors recommended were really of no benefit. They lengthened my route, if anything, gave me the Abington hills, and increased my number of boxes from 269 practically to 300. They said they had authority only to increase the salaries of the carriers to $1,800 a year, which increase was made known Thursday morning, and to decrease the length of the routes to 50 miles. In the rearrangement, however, the inspectors required the carriers to come back to the post office at noon, and thereby made the routes longer if anything.

"The inspectors also promised in my hearing that they would bring immediate relief to the labor of 'sticking' the mail in the post office. If I had somebody else to 'stick' the mail, I believe I could handle the outside part of the route all right.

"I think I would have been able to get through this bad weather if my substitute, Mr. McMinn, had not become ill of sore throat. That threw all the work back on me. I tried Wednesday the experiment of taking with me a driver for the machine, leaving me merely to put the mail into the boxes. With that arrangement I got back to the office at 5.30 o'clock Wednesday evening.

"After supper I stayed at the post office until 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning alone trying to arrange the mail for Thursday. I went back to the office Thursday morning and arranged more mail, intending to make the trip again, but I was 'all in,' and decided to come home."

NOT NEARLY UP TO LITTLE RED WAGON.

Mr. Starr said he did not believe the motorized rural route system can be made as satisfactory under any conditions as were the horse routes that existed before. He said he believed the new system can be made to work well in the summer time when the roads are good, but that the condition of the roads in the winter is such that the use of the automobile all the time is out of the question.

"I told Mr. Beck," he said, "that I believed if I stayed on I could make the route go in the summer if I lived through the strain that long. As it has been, though, I have been working myself to death and losing money at it. I believe that my expenses for two weeks were greater than my income. I had to hire two horses, two buggies, and my assistant. The gasoline bill for the route was $1 a day, besides the wear on the tires. Mr. Foland, of Route B, has had to purchase a new pair of tires already."

BECK ADMITS WASHINGTON WAS IN TOO BIG A HURRY TO ATTEMPT MOTORIZATION.

Deplorable failure of the motorized Rural Route Service not only in Wayne County, but in other counties where it has been attempted, has struck a hard blow at a pet scheme of Postmaster General Albert Burleson, and the direct cause of the trouble in Wayne County is ascribed to haste in the establishment of a system that post office officials here believe would require a year to establish and the acceptance by the department in too literal a sense of the figures for the time of service made in experimental trips in this county. This is admitted even by Postmaster Charles B. Beck, who made those trips.

Back of the 18 days of messing around in the rural mail delivery in this county is a story of more than eight months of planning in the Post Office Department. When the motorized routes went into service here January 3, with admittedly long routes, their immediate success was anticipated. The consequent disorganization of a mail service that had been considered good brought a resounding wail of dissatisfaction from farmers.

BECK COVERED THE ROUTES IN AUGUST.

In August and September of 1915 Postmaster Beck went out on four Richmond rural routes and covered them by automobile. The first two of these routes were covered in 3 hours and 57 minutes delivering the mail. These were two of the old wagon routes, each covering 28 miles.

The other two routes were a trifle longer, with different kind of roads and territory, but they were covered in 4 hours and 40 minutes. These routes included more than 56 miles.

The number of boxes, the number of miles covered, the average speed at which the machine traveled, and other information about these experimental trips were forwarded to the Post Office Department at Washington by Postmaster Beck, who secured the information through personally accompanying the carriers.

The absolute failure of the carriers to make such time now is blamed on the roads, but Postmaster Beck is wondering how the drivers on those experimental trips managed to do it at all.

Even making good time, J. C. Starr says that the regular carrier can not afford to hold the job. For most of the year, he says, the carrier would find it necessary to employ a helper to carry half the route. The helper, says Starr, gets all the money and the regular carrier gets the complaints.

INSPECTORS DID NOT DO ANY GOOD.

Inspectors sent here to untangle the mess into which the rural service had been plunged lopped off a little here and a little there, and after dividing the routes into two sections of 29 and 21 miles long on the average recommended that this reorganized system go into effect January 18. Some of these routes are declared by the carriers to be actually longer and with more stops than before they were reorganized by the inspectors. J. C. Starr, carrier of route D, asserts that this is true. It was denied by Postmaster Beck.

Not only has route D received poor service with the reorganized routes, but persons on other routes have had the same experience. Poorly routed mail still is a source of trouble, and the mix up in the Richmond post office has resulted in misunderstood and badly mixed-up directions to rural-route families.

Postmaster Beck, with Congressman FINLY H. GRAY, refuses to be saddled with the blame for the initiation of the motorized service here. Mr. Beck does not, however, shift the blame elsewhere, only denying that he suggested it for Wayne County.

CALLED TO WASHINGTON ONE YEAR AGO.

Charles R. Swain and Alexander Garrigus, Indiana post-office inspectors, were called to Washington a year ago. Inspectors from other States were called in until there were 38 of them in Washington. And while there the motorization scheme was mapped out, and they were instructed to furnish information to the department and to work out plans for establishment of such motor service.

One of the first of these motorized counties in Indiana was Tippecanoe. Others were established a few months ago in Kansas. The experience was not satisfactory in Tippecanoe County. But postmasters who attended a convention at Lafayette after the motors went into service there were enthusiastic about the service, Postmaster Beck, who attended that convention, said:

"To-day in Wayne County, where the rural-route families under the old system did have automobile service, they now under motorization have service from a horse-drawn vehicle."

TWO MEN ON EACH OF THREE ROUTES.

On each of three routes out of Richmond to-day there are two men delivering mail, one of them carrying by motor and the other by horse and wagon. On route D, which is described as the worst of the bunch, and where J. C. Starr, the carrier who resigned, says that the service never can be successful, one man is attempting to do the job. Postmaster Beck said to-day that if he had been able to get the men who could do it he would have sent two men out over route D several days ago.

It is with much difficulty that Mr. Beck can be induced to talk about the rural-route situation.

"I've talked too much already," he said. And he has taken strongly to the "closed-door" policy, which he began two weeks ago, and which

aroused the ire of several farmers who called at his office to see him. The closed door was rather tightly shut to-day and it was only after repeated efforts that an entrance could be gained.

At the time Mr. Beck went into office he says he determined upon the open-door policy. He said he wanted the postmaster to be accessible.

NO MORE OPEN-DOOR POLICY FOR BECK.

This spirit has left him. He says that the postmaster of Richmond receives all the knocks in Wayne County and that every complaint about the mail service comes to him. He finds, he says, that his time is taken up too much by persons with trivial troubles. When June, 1918, rolls around Mr. Beck says he is done with public office.

Consequently the closed door to the office of the postmaster. At the time the inspectors were here a week ago, working up the data on which they recommended the reorganization of the service, Mr. Beck said he was forced to close and lock his office door to give privacy to the work of the inspectors. He has decided to continue the policy, however, for his own convenience. Newspapermen only with some difficulty secured an interview with Mr. Beck to-day.

BECK TELLS WHY NO MAIL ON ROUTE—NO NOTICE FROM CARRIER STARR THAT HE WOULD NOT WORK UNTIL THURSDAY, 8 O'CLOCK—NO ONE AVAILABLE TO TAKE HIS JOB—IF BECK HAD OWNED AUTO AND NOT BEEN SO TIRED HE WOULD HAVE CARRIED THE ROUTE HIMSELF.

Failure of J. C. Starr to give notice of his intention not to carry rural route D, serving the southern part of the county, is assigned by Postmaster C. B. Beck as the explanation of why the 300 families of that route did not receive mail service on Thursday. Mr. Starr did not give notice of his final decision to Postmaster Beck, who received his first definite information through Frank Wilson, superintendent of mails.

"When I came into the office about 6.30 o'clock Thursday morning, I spoke to Mr. Starr, the same as I did to the other persons in the office," said Mr. Beck. "He told me he was done and that he wanted to quit.

ADVISED STARR TO "STICK IT OUT."

"I said to him that he did not want to quit right away. He had told me a few days before that he would like to be relieved, but I told him that we had no one to put in his place. I said that he ought to stick it out, that it would finally go all right.

"When we finished talking, he said, 'Well, all right.'

"I was out of the office for a short time, and when I came back I was informed that Starr had quit. Mr. Wilson told me that he had thrown his keys down on the desk and resigned. That was about 8 o'clock, and it was too late then to get a carrier, if one had been available.

"I had worked down here until 10 o'clock the night before. If I had not been so completely worn out and had owned an automobile, I would have carried the route myself."

IOWA.

That the department's reorganization of the mail service in the State of Iowa was unsatisfactory to patrons is clearly shown by the articles and resolutions which I herewith submit and desire printed in the RECORD, summarized as follows:

Article appearing in the Valley City (Iowa) Courier.

Article appearing in the Journal, Sioux City, Iowa.

Article appearing in the Nicholas (Iowa) Courier of September 30.

Article appearing in the October 7 issue of the Davenport (Iowa) Times.

Article appearing in the Glenwood (Iowa) Opinion of November 7.

Article appearing in an issue of the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Republican.

Article appearing under a Clinton date line carried in a November issue of the Marshalltown (Iowa) Times-Republican.

Article appearing in an issue of the Wallace Farmer (Iowa).

Article appearing in the Sentinel-Post of Shenandoah, Iowa, under date of November 19.

Article appearing in an issue of Wallace's Farmer, published at Des Moines, Iowa.

Article appearing in the November 25 issue of the Farmer and Stockman, published at Des Moines, Iowa.

Article appearing in the Des Moines (Iowa) Capital of November 24.

Article appearing in the Des Moines (Iowa) News on November 21.

Article appearing in the Des Moines (Iowa) News on November 12.

The Valley City (Iowa) Courier a few days ago printed the following editorial:

According to the Post Office Department, in a letter sent to Senator KENYON, of Iowa, most of the energies of the department are being expended on creating new rural routes in the South. Arkansas has received 50 new routes; Missouri, 51; Texas, 46; and Oklahoma, 33. Iowa, in the same time, has had but 4. This is the record of the last fiscal year, and it is presumable that no other Northern States fared better than Iowa. There is much complaint all over the country because the present administration has bedevilled the rural route service in the name of false economy, and the clamor is not likely to subside in the North when it becomes known that northern postal service has been butchered to make a southern postal holiday.

The Journal, of Sioux City, Iowa, published the following editorial a few days ago:

If the newspapers elsewhere are recording as much dissatisfaction with the new-fangled rural delivery economy as is finding expression in the newspapers hereabouts, a good many votes are likely to be cast next year on the theory that Postmaster General Burleson is the paramount issue. And it is the observation of this newspaper that voters who vote their sentiments on the Burleson issue will mark their ballots with the idea of putting a new man in charge of the Post Office Department.

Postmaster General Burleson, one gathers, is trying to introduce a higher quality of economy and efficiency in the Rural Delivery Service. Undoubtedly he is trying to economize without impairing the utility of the service. If the chorus of wails echoed in the newspapers tells the truth, such economy as may have been gained has been attained for the most part by impairment of the service. The most radical change introduced has been the substitution of automobiles for horse-drawn vehicles in many localities. The theory is that an automobile ought to cover twice as long a route as the horse. There is bitter complaint that the little old Ford on a rough and muddy road is a snare and a delusion and sure to become more so next winter. And other changes have been made. Some routes have been abolished altogether, amid much gnashing of teeth. Others have been shuffled up and redealt so that one in a half dozen might be dropped. Out of it all has come a vast number of complaints about irregular deliveries, late deliveries, and no deliveries. Along one re-formed route in Iowa the patrons are reported to be boycotting the carrier and wrathfully driving to the nearest post office for their mail.

It may be that the reorganized rural route service will be a model of efficiency and economy four or five years hence. A more interesting question relates to possible conditions in November of next year, when the patrons of the rural routes will be dropping the Australian ballots into the boxes. Present indications are that the wrath of a lot of rural-route residents will still be hot against Burleson at that time.

The Nicholas (Iowa) Courier of September 30 prints the following:

To-morrow Nichols will not have a rural mail route. Theoretically speaking, all farmers living in this section of Pike Township will be getting their mail over the Conesville long-distance rural route. In practice, however, the Conesville mail man will not have very much mail to deliver or collect, for practically every man living on what were Nichols Routes Nos. 1 and 2 have decided not to have their mail changed from Nichols, and if the Post Office Department at Washington wants to pay a carrier $1,800 per year for riding around Pike Township enjoying the scenery let them do it.

A large number of our farmers have come in and rented boxes in town while others are arranging to come to town to get their own mail, and incidentally carrying their neighbors' mail out with them. The neighbors will take turn about in coming to town for mail.

This arrangement on the part of Uncle Sam is only a trial, and if our farmers will stick together there is no doubt but that the plan to carry out these long routes will be a failure. Stick, brothers, stick!

The following editorial is clipped from the October 7 issue of the Davenport (Iowa) Times:

The Post Office Department at Washington is making a number of changes in the rural mail routes in Iowa, and especially in the second Iowa district, that have caused protests from the patrons, for the reason that the changes are considered impractical and detrimental to the good of the service.

Sitting at a desk in Washington with nothing but maps before him is an Assistant Postmaster General, who has been figuring out on paper how certain routes could be changed and consolidated to save a little money. Some post offices are to be abolished. Some routes are to be sent out of other towns. Some people are to be made to walk a mile to get their mail.

It was proposed to abolish the post office at Fruitland. The people there were to be served out of Muscatine and the Fruitland routes were to be abolished. However, Congressman HULL made such a protest in regard to this change that it is understood Fruitland is to be allowed to keep its post office. The importance of the business at Fruitland was not understood at Washington. At Conesville similar changes were proposed. At Moscow it was proposed to cut 10 miles off one route and add it to a Muscatine route and to do away with the Moscow post office. At West Branch one route has been abolished and changes made in the other two.

Congressman HULL has been doing all that possibly could be done to convince the officials of the administration at Washington that these proposed changes are not satisfactory to the patrons, but in view of the desire of Assistant Postmasters General to make a showing of economy, as they think they will be able to do, the department is deaf to most of the protests.

It appears to be lost sight of at Washington that the first consideration in the conduct of the rural mail route should be service to the patrons. The effort to put the rural mail routes on a paying basis and at the same time maintain a satisfactory service is bound to be disappointing. Service appears to be secondary in the Washington officials' view. The long routes operated by auto are bound to break down in the winter, either when the snow is heavy or the bottom drops out of the roads, and then the farmers on these newly planned routes will have to go without their mail. Short routes operated from the smaller post offices, so as to be as close as possible to the people, are much more likely to give regular and satisfactory service.

The Glenwood (Iowa) Opinion of November 7 says:

The cutting down in the rural mail service whereby thousands of Iowa farmers have been deprived of their daily mail, will undoubtedly result in cutting down the vote for one Woodrow Wilson at the November election of 1916.

In a recent issue the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Republican says:

The farmers of Iowa justly are up in arms over the action of President Wilson and Postmaster General Burleson in their radical changing of rural mail routes. Many routes are being cut out and others are being lengthened so that in some cases it is not possible to cover them in a day. Some one sits in his cozy office in Washington, with no personal knowledge of the character of the country, and in an arbitrary manner designates the course of the routes. In one instance in Iowa County the route is fixed to go over the road that long ago was abandoned.

The kick of the people in the country districts is justifiable. Owing to the length of many of the routes, the rural carriers are ordered to leave the central office before the morning mails arrive. The papers of to-day are as a result delivered 24 hours late. So it is with important letters. The farmer to-day wants his market news when it is news. It means much to him to have this information promptly.

One result that has already followed this economy on the part of our Democratic administration is the order of those affected not to have

their mail delivered. They prefer to call for it at the post office, even though at times the inconvenience of doing so is rather burdensome.

This economy on the part of the administration is due to a desire to save some $4,000,000, about one-half the cost of a new battleship. Better omit the battleship and add to the comfort and convenience of those living in country districts.

The rural delivery was inaugurated by Republican Congressmen for the benefit of the farmers. Republican administrations have always supported the service; they have been even ready to extend its usefulness. Next year Democratic congressional candidates will hear from the farmers on this question in a manner that will not be pleasant for them, and in a way that will mean fewer votes for their ambitions.

This news dispatch, under a Clinton date, was published in the Marshalltown (Iowa) Times-Republican:

That the feeling of dissatisfaction over the changes made in the rural mail routes is just as great since the changes have been put into effect as it was before they were made was learned by Congressman HULL. HULL, in a swing through the county by auto, visited 10 towns and met from 25 to 70 people at each town, who added their protests to those of others against the changes made.

The principal reason for complaint was a later service in many cases, the necessity of changing a post-office address which had been established from 10 to 50 years, the greater distance from a mail route, and in some cases getting no service at all.

In many instances farmers can get approximately the same service as formerly, but their mail must be sent to a new address. It goes to a town where they do practically no trading and no shipping. Many of them object seriously to changing an established post-office address, and are going to town after the mail as they did before any rural service was started.

The following article, by a contributor, "L. G. H.," is clipped from a recent issue of Wallace's Farmer, Iowa:

Farmers throughout Iowa, and in many other States, have been holding mass meetings to protest against the changes being made in the Rural Free Delivery Service. After being used to as good service as was possible under the circumstances, they do not propose to see the present efficiency crippled without registering their kick. In an attempt at economy the department has been lengthening certain routes, combining others, and discontinuing some. The general result seems to be poorer service, more inconvenience, and great dissatisfaction on the part of most of the patrons.

At New Providence three routes have been combined into two and at Eldora two routes have been discontinued. These changes are typical of what seems to be a general shake-up. Under the new arrangement, which goes into effect on October 15, a great number of patrons will be off the main route and will have to travel long distances to their boxes.

In their petition to the Postmaster General the people served from the New Providence post office call attention to what they have done to maintain in good condition the roads traveled by the rural-mail carriers. Many of the roads have been graded and graveled, while some of the roads where the carriers did not go and where the travel was light have been neglected. The latter roads are poorly kept in summer and frequently are impassable in winter. The new routing takes a carrier over some of the roads of the latter type and makes his route over the improved portion only incidental. After going to the expense of improving and maintaining reasonably good roads for the carriers, the road supervisors feel aggrieved to see these changes in the routing made, especially when the new arrangement gives less efficient service to a greater number of patrons than was enjoyed under the original routing.

Some of the patrons claim that they would be just as well satisfied to go back to the system in use before the time of Rural Free Delivery as to have delivery under the new arrangement, which makes many of them go a half mile or more for their mail. With a mail box at a considerable distance from one's home the inconvenience of receiving or sending registered and insured mail or parcel post makes the service next to impracticable. It is simply impossible for a carrier to conform to a regular schedule. If a patron wishes to see him, to send a registered letter, buy a money order, or send a parcel-post package, his only course is to take a trip to the nearest point where the carrier passes and wait for him there, possibly for several hours in bad weather. Although mail boxes are protected by the Government, few persons would care to leave the parcel-post package or money for a post-office order exposed to the weather and possible molestation in a box half a mile away from the farm. Neither do they care to have parcels sent to them by post unless they can have their mail box at a reasonable distance from their home.

If any changes are to be made, the patrons feel that such modifications should be in the nature of improvements and not steps backward. After being used to good service, one feels more keenly the lack of it when it comes. Under the new arrangement many patrons who have received their mail from a certain post office for years are shifted to some other post office with poorer train service and connections.

The greatest hardship is expected to come in winter, when roads are in poor condition. Even under the present arrangement, some of the carriers often have trouble in getting through on bad days. Everyone who has lived on a rural route knows what it is to have the carrier miss his trip. Farmers have become accustomed to their daily papers and to getting their letters or packages promptly, and if the carrier does not come, the day's work seems incomplete. Under the new arrangement many claim it will be a physical impossibility for many of the carriers to complete their routes, making the service uncertain, and for many about as inconvenient as it used to be when they had to drive to town for it.

The Sentinel-Post, of Shenandoah, Iowa, on November 19 said, in part:

It is likely that a wave of indignation and protest will issue from Page County when the results of the rural-route changes in the county are learned.

The changes in the routes are not confined to any one town.

Those it affects heard from are greatly aroused and incensed that such important changes should be made without consultation or suggestions from them. Some of the routes have been changed so there is no open road for them to extend over and some of the streams they cross are unbridged. It will work a hardship on the patrons it affects and on the carriers also. It will be impossible for the carriers to make the mileage daily that they will be required to make in order to deliver the mail on the new routes. Some of the routes are 30 miles in length, and none lack much of being that long.

There is no question but that the Postmaster General will be besieged with petitions from the patrons asking that some of the changes be not made.

Postmaster Robinson states that he was not consulted in regard to the changes and knew nothing of them until he received the instructions this morning.

The following editorial appears in a recent issue of Wallace's Farmer, published at Des Moines, Iowa:

For some months past the Post Office Department has been making rather serious changes in the rural routes the United States over, the aim being to make the routes longer and encourage the use of automobiles, which would force farmers to make better roads and would save the Government several million dollars each year. We have no doubt that there are sections of the country, particularly in the Eastern States and wherever roads are such that automobiles are practicable, where this saving can be made without decreasing the efficiency of the rural-route service. When, however, this reform, so called, is applied in the West—or wherever there are no hard-surfaced roads good all the year around—the Post Office Department is bound to get itself into trouble.

In a talk with a high official of this department who is actively interested in this so-called reform it was claimed that farmers are just as well served with this change, with the exception that in many places the farmer might be obliged to walk a quarter of a mile for his mail instead of having it brought to his door. The reason for this would be that he lives on a by-road, and giving him his mail in a box at his door would involve a heavy expense to the Government.

There is very loud complaint coming from farmers in the corn belt, the complaint being that the department has not sufficiently considered the matter, does not seem to be aware that there are months during the year when the automobile is quite useless as a means of transportation, when the farmers themselves do not try to use it, and that planning an automobile rural route means that the farmers will not receive their mail with any regularity and may not receive it for a week at a time.

If the object of the Post Office Department is to save money, there is a way in which it can be saved much more easily and with positive benefit to the farmer. That way is simply to correct the notorious abuses of the second-class mail privilege. The same high official tells us that this costs the Government every year $50,000,000 in excess of the receipts. The utmost that they hope to save by using automobiles instead of wagons is about $6,000,000 a year. While it is trying to save at the spigot by putting the farmers to great inconvenience and practically depriving them of their mail for days at a time, it could more than double the amount of saving simply by putting a clamp on the publishers who are giving their papers away, and paying agents to give them away for them, and thus getting their claws into the treasury of the Post Office Department and compelling it to subsidize a business transaction which has not enough of service in it to stand on its own merits.

No change such as that contemplated and in process should ever be undertaken without a thorough survey, not merely of the geography of the country but of the condition of the roads. We expect to hear protests going up from every Congressman in the corn belt, or at least those parts of it which have not hard roads suitable for automobile service. The Government has voluntarily agreed to deliver the mail at the farmer's door The farmer has the right to insist that this agreement be kept. When the time comes that it can be done by automobile service on a route 50 miles long or more, farmers will rejoice. But until that time the Government should either fulfill its contract or else give up the attempt and let the farmers get their mail at their post office as of old.

The quickest way for the Post Office Department to save money is to correct the abuses of the second-class privilege, which have been tolerated so long that it now fears to attempt to correct them. As long as it carries papers for which the publishers do not receive even the cost of the white paper on which they are printed, and which are thus sold at "merely a nominal price," it should not complain of the cost of fulfilling its contract to deliver these papers at the door of the man who has been so unfortunate as to be put on their lists by hook or by crook.

The Farmer and Stockman, of Des Moines, Iowa, a James W. Pierce publication, of November 25 says:

I have already raised my voice against the injury being done to the Rural Free Delivery Service by combining routes and expecting carriers to cover 50 miles a day in a motor car the year around, an utterly impractical and impossible thing in many sections of the grain belt. Friends in Washington advise me that protests are pouring in from farmers generally, and that the matter will be made one of the big issues on the floor of Congress when that body convenes next month. I sincerely hope the protests will be so many and so loud that the order will be rescinded without delay.

My own position and that of thousands of farmers is well voiced by a farmer friend who writes to me, following the reading of my recent article, entitled "Impairing the Rural Free Delivery Service":

"Can it be possible that the postal authorities are so dumb or indifferent to the best interests of the people that they would willingly and knowingly do that which, if persisted in permanently, will ruin the Rural Free Delivery Service? It has taken time and money to bring the service to the high point of efficiency which it has attained. Then why destroy it without a shadow of a reasonable excuse? The authorities must certainly know that no carrier can cover a 50-mile route daily the entire year. Were I a rural free delivery carrier and my route was 50 miles long I would certainly refuse to carry the mail any longer, and I would be justified in so doing. The people should give the authorities to understand that a deal of that kind is absolutely and positively intolerable. You are on the right track; stay on it. I wish you every success."

I am delighted, indeed, to have such strong indorsement from such a representative farmer as I know the writer, Mr. W. M. Shaver, to be. I am delighted, moreover, that we who have united to protest against this matter have such a strong champion in Congress as one of the new Members from Iowa, Mr. RAMSEYER, is proving himself to be. Here are a few extracts from the vigorous letter he has sent the Postmaster General on this subject:

"The farmer in the Middle West is a business man and is as much in need of and entitled to his daily mail as is the merchant or manufacturer in the city. The daily market reports are a greater necessity to the average farmer than is any class of mail delivered to the retail merchants of our cities and towns.

"Iowa stands lowest in the percentage of illiteracy of any State in the Union. There is no illiteracy among Iowa farmers, and they devote more time each day to reading daily papers and magazines and take a keener interest in what they read than does the urban population.

"In regard to the automobile service and doubling the mileage of carriers contemplated by your department, I beg to advise you that we do not have the gravel and sand roads like they do have in some of the States. In Iowa we have dirt roads, which get muddy when it rains, and automobiles can not run in Iowa mud. It is the experience of rural carriers in Iowa, who have owned automobiles a number of years, that they can use them only about 100 days in the year. By your contemplated automobile service, over half of the time the farmers will either be deprived of their daily mail or receive poorer service than they have heretofore received.

"The farmers strongly resent your department's policy in curtailing the rural-route mail service; they are convinced not only that they need the mail delivered to them daily, but that they are entitled to such service. Furthermore, in this controversy, the farmers are exhibiting a determination that they are going to have their free rural-delivery service not curtailed, not only when the roads are good, but that they are going to have it extended until every farmer receives that daily service, rain or shine."

I feel like saying, "Hurrah for Congressman RAMSEYER!" May he never give up until he has gained his point. He has the farmers not only of his home State but of the country generally behind him, as one man. You and I must write our Congressmen, and must protest in the most vigorous language at our command, against something that will seriously and permanently impair a service the value of which to farmers can hardly be computed.

The Des Moines (Iowa) Capital of November 24 says:

Postmaster General Burleson will have a hard time convincing the Iowa delegation in Congress that he was justified in changing the rural mail delivery routes of the State. The storm of protest that has been aroused in every community where the new routes are effective is going to make itself heard in Washington and some one will be forced to do a lot of explaining.

Blunder No. 1 was made when the department neglected to send their men here to personally investigate the situation. One trip over a few of the rural routes would have convinced an inspector that Iowa roads are not to be reckoned with on paper. They possess an originality at certain seasons of the year which defies the best-made plans of Burleson or his assistants. There is a limit to the number of miles a mail carrier can travel in a day and that limit must be based upon mud and not upon asphalt or gravel.

The changing of the post-office address to a town 10 or 15 miles distant, as was done in a number of cases, is a hard blow to the farmer. It is almost equivalent to an order from the Government that he change his church and his circle of friends. It is also inconvenient, as many times rural residents get mail at the post office that comes in after the carriers leave.

The chief cause of complaint, and one which will be hard to explain away, is the loss of delivery where the carrier is unable to cover the long route that the Government has mapped out for him. This is happening time and again, according to reports from over the State. Rural delivery of mail was a novelty a few years ago. To-day it is as much of a necessity as the telephone.

The Post Office Department says it is attempting to economize. We have never advocated reducing the high cost of living by doing without sugar in our coffee.

Mr. Buireson has stirred up a hornets' nest in Iowa.

The Des Moines (Iowa) News on November 21 printed this:

Fifty letters reached the News Saturday protesting against changes made in rural routes. In the last few days more than 200 persons have written they are dissatisfied with the new scheme for delivering mail.

The chief complaints are these:

Many rural-route patrons who formerly received their mail before noon each day are now getting it from one to three days late.

Nearly all those affected have to travel from a quarter of a mile to three miles to get their mail.

Carriers will be unable to make their routes when roads are muddy because of bad roads they will have to travel, the condition of the roads not having been taken into consideration, farmers say, by inspectors who mapped out routes.

The Des Moines (Iowa) News of November 12 featured the following news story on its front page:

It is probable that the maiden speech of Congressman C. C. DOWELL, when he gets down to Washington in a couple of weeks, will have to do with the wonderful system of rerouting Iowa rural free delivery mail carriers in Postmaster General Burleson's new plan of economy. DOWELL is literally swamped with letters and petitions of protest over the change.

"I never saw anything that met with such general protest," says the Congressman. "It is practically universal among farmers. It is not politics, as it includes Democrats, Republicans, Populists, Prohibitionists, and Socialists alike."

Among the points of the seventh district from which DOWELL has received kicks are Norwalk, Prole, Ackworth, Indianola, Cumming, Orilla, Dallas Center, Waukee, Lacona, Nevada, Ames, St. Charles, New Virginia, and Ankeny.

"I haven't received a petition yet in which it wasn't stated that every man approached, whether on the new or old route, had signed the protest.

"The chief argument against the change is that apparently no consideration was given to the condition of the roads over which is laid out the new route. It does seem to me that with a body of efficiency experts from the Washington department sitting here at the local post office for the last six weeks—on full pay—at least a topographical map of the State might have been consulted. Instead the changes were ordered from Washington, where they have no more idea of Iowa hills and mud roads than a man in the moon.

"I have yet to hear of a single instance where a new route was inspected before the change was ordered.

"In some cases I found that the local postmaster had been consulted, his recommendations absolutely ignored, and then the word was passed down from the department that the change was made on the proposal of the local office.

"Iowa farmers are anxious to get their mail, and get it regularly, and they are as much entitled to that privilege as though they were living in the city. With that in view, they have spent considerable money and donated labor to perfect the roads over which the rural routes passed. Now these road improvements are absolutely ignored. At Dallas Center $5,000 was spent in making a good road, passable the year round, and now the new route touches it only to cross over it.

"Changing rural routes in Washington for States where they have hard surfaced roads may be all right, but it doesn't work in Iowa. Ten years from now, when we have more generally hard-surfaced roads and graded down our hills, it might be done.

"Apparently the chief idea has been to double up two horse drawn routes of an average of 24 miles into one of 48 miles covered by automobile. That is a fine theory, but it won't work during about four months of the year when it is all a team of horses can do to plow through the mud roads. Iowa isn't ready yet for routes longer than can be covered with horses in muddy weather.

"The result will be that for a very considerable part of the year farmers will not only be unable to get their mail, but to secure merchandise by parcel post, which they have recently learned to use very extensively. Up until the time of the changes farmers knew when they could order an article from town by letter or by telephone and just when it would be delivered. There's no way of telling that now. In fact, in many instances their trading points have been completely changed.

"For instance, at Orilla a route that completely encircled the town has been transferred to Cumming, so that the Cumming carrier now completes a circle about Orilla. There is a progressive group of business men at the latter place who have fitted up a sort of free clubroom for their farmer customers. They are actually grieved over the change, and a mass meeting protesting the change has been held.

"They say this is being done for economy's sake. That isn't the case, at least at St. Charles, where four routes have been revamped so that it now costs $6 a month more than it did before; the same number of patrons served and general protests all around.

"The first petition I received I immediately forwarded to the Post Office Department at Washington, receiving in return a very nice little letter. When I sent the next letter I received identically the same letter, with the exception that the name had been changed. Evidently these kicks are coming in on them pretty thick and they are using a form circular reply. So I have decided to wait until I get down to Washington.

"No; I am not making any speeches; not just yet."

The following is taken from a recent issue of the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald:

What the economists have done to keep down the big deficit in the national finances is to slaughter the Rural Free Delivery Service to which the farmers and city business men of the Nation have long been accustomed. What they have done to that valuable service in Kent and Ottawa Counties is sufficient to raise a yell here that is reaching the skies.

To-day no man knows whether he is to receive mail by the means he has long been accustomed to or not. He doesn't know whether he can go out to his front gate and get the mail from the old familiar box or whether, if he is to get it at all, he must place that box a mile or so away from his home and tramp over there daily if he would get his mail.

He no longer knows whether he will get his mail in the forenoon, as has for years been his custom, or whether he will get it along toward evening; and in many a case he is now assured he will not get it at all, because the route has been suspended entirely.

He no longer knows if it will be possible for him to get his mail from the town in which he has been accustomed to do his trading or whether it will not go to a town many miles farther away from his home than the old center.

More than all this, many a man living on a rural route to-day is not getting his mail. Why? Because persons sending mail to him don't know how to address him. He doesn't know how to tell them to address him. More than all that, the postmasters themselves do not know how to tell anybody where to send mail nor where to get it. The rural free delivery has been so messed up that no man knows now where he lives, and the worst is he can't find out.

In cutting out many routes an attempt has been made to include at least a portion of these routes in some other route. The result is that many a rural route carrier has in his possession a long list of names of persons of whom he never before heard. He doesn't know what roads they live on nor what their homes look like when he sees them. He doesn't know how to lay out his route so as to reach these homes, and many a man is getting no mail as a result.

Take this mess as a fair sample: One route out of Grandsville has been discontinued and given to Jenison; one route out of Jenison has been discontinued and given to Hudsonville; the only route out of Allendale is abandoned and given to Hudsonville; and one route out of Hudsonville has been discontinued. Here are parts of Kent and Ottawa Counties all mixed up in such manner that nobody knows where he lives.

The Grand Rapids office has lost 2 routes, having now but 12 instead of 14 routes. The Holland post office has lost 2 routes, having now only 10 instead of 12.

At Rockford things were generally mixed up, and the people there sent a man to Washington to make protest. So well did he protest that he managed to save the four routes leading out of that office, but in the rearrangement eight families living about 2½ miles out of the city lost their free delivery altogether. John Hammer, Clare Zimmerman, Joseph Carpenter, F. H. Stewart, W. Simpson, and three others are the ones who are left out in the cold.

At Cedar Springs things change so fast the postmaster can't keep track of the changes. A few days ago orders came to discontinue one route; the necessary rearrangement was made. With Monday came an order to discontinue still another route. So now nobody knows where anybody lives.

Lowell has lost 1 route, Cannonsburg has lost 1, Harvard has lost 1, Alpine has lost 1, Belmont has lost 1, Conklin, in Ottawa County, has lost 1, Ravenna has lost 1, McCords has lost 1, Coopersville has lost 1.

Every day others are being discontinued, rearranged, and mussed up. Many can no longer receive their mail at their doors as formerly. Many can not get it at all, while some must walk a mile or two to a corner where the mail is delivered. It is like returning to the old days with them. It's all gone wrong.

Here is just a sample of what the mess means. Take the Grand Rapids Herald as an example, and this is typical of many other business houses doing business with farmers on the rural routes. When the changes were ordered postmasters sent in notices. In many instances the postmasters frankly declared they didn't just know how papers should hereafter be addressed to reach certain subscribers. Immedi-

ately subscribers began to complain that they had not received their papers.

It took a few days to correct the mailing lists in accordance with instructions. This was done promptly. The new lists were sent one day. Next day came word that more changes had been made and that the newly prepared lists were useless. The necessary corrections were again made and the lists set all over again. Now comes word that still more changes have been made and again the circulation department is busy trying to make the necessary new corrections. Meantime there is great difficulty in getting the papers to the men who ought to have them.

And so it is with other business houses. All are having their troubles, and many a farmer is wondering why he is not receiving his mail, why the piece of harness he ordered and wants right now has failed to arrive. It is all because the rural routes in Kent and Ottawa Counties have already been so confused that no man can tell much about them. Other counties will get this same confusion as fast as the Democratic Postmaster General can issue the orders to ruin the Rural Delivery Service.

KANSAS.

That the department's reorganization of the mail service in the State of Kansas was unsatisfactory to the patrons is clearly shown by the articles and resolutions which I herewith submit and desired printed in the RECORD, summarized as follows:

(1) Article appearing in the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle, issue of November 14.

The Wichita (Kans.) Eagle on November 14 printed the following news story:

Of vital interest to every farmer in the Southwest is the attitude of the Post Office Department at Washington toward western rural mail routes, and in the recently adopted policy of Postmaster Burleson a large number of farmers see before them a step back toward pioneer days, when they received mail something like once or twice a week, and war could be declared and a battle fought before they heard of it.

The new policy is this lengthening of rural mail routes, or the consolidation of two into one with an automobile carrier. To many this policy might seem a sign of advancement, but to a large number it has its discounts, because in the Southwest, as in any country, there are muddy times when it is impossible to drive through the country in an automobile. A few rural mail routes in Oklahoma have been consolidated, making one long route covered by auto where before there were two covered by horse and wagons. On these routes, it is claimed, mail service is not reliable, and that often the farmer gets mail but twice a week.

The average western farmer has been trained to read the news every day. He no longer can do without his daily newspaper, but a daily newspaper is perishable goods—it must be new to be news. Twice or three times a week mail service won't be sufficient.

At Derby the experiment of consolidating two rural routes into one long one, giving the route to one carrier, who must have an automobile, is to be tried. Already farmers on the routes affected are complaining of what they fear will be in store for them. A number of complaints are said to have been made at the local post office and reported from there to the department at Washington.

The importance of the change may be realized were one to consider the entire country suddenly cut off from mail service all but two or three days in the week. What would then happen in the entire Southwest will happen on the consolidated mail route when stormy weather prevents the automobile carrier from making his trip.

Rural mail carriers on an average route receive $1,200 a year. The carriers on the consolidated and lengthened routes will receive $1,800 a year, with the privilege of employing a substitute in rainy or muddy weather when teams must be used. Two months of the year are all that is permitted to the consolidated carrier, it is reported, for the employment of a substitute. If roads are impassable for more than two months in the year, somebody will have to do without their mail, it is figured.

Farmers in the Southwest are awakening to the possible curtailment of mail luxuries that they have been enjoying and are asking for relief or that something be done to safeguard their mail services.

MASSACHUSETTS.

That the department's reorganization of the mail service in the State of Massachusetts was unsatisfactory to patrons in the State of Massachusetts is clearly shown by the articles and resolutions which I herewith submit, summarized as follows:

(1) Article appearing in a December issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Daily Telegram.

(2) Article appearing November 16 in the Worcester (Mass.) Daily Telegram.

(3) Article appearing under date of November 24 in the Fall River (Mass.) Evening News.

(4) Letter written under date of December 15 by Aaron C. Dowse to Representative WILLIAM H. CARTER, as published in Rural Free Delivery News.

The Worcester (Mass.) Daily Telegram has recently published the following:

LANCASTER, *November 11.*

A petition has been circulated and signatures secured protesting against the rearrangement of the rural free-delivery route that serves the public from Lancaster post office.

Under an order received by the postmaster, which is ordered to go into effect Tuesday, November 16, that part of rural free-delivery route No. 1, known as the Neck Road, which is just outside of the village, will be discontinued as a rural route, and persons living on that road will be obliged to go to the post office for their mail. The post-office authorities say this was done to enable them to add to the Lancaster carrier a part of the route that starts from Pratts Junction.

The rest of the Pratts Junction route is to be added to the routes starting from the Leominster office. One route will be discontinued entirely. There are about 20 families on that part of the Lancaster route which it is proposed to abolish. They hope to be able to have the authorities in Washington rescind their order depriving them of rural service. The petition went forward to Washington to-day.

On November 16 the Worcester (Mass.) Telegraph printed the following:

Congressman SAMUEL E. WINSLOW has received another letter from Fourth Assistant Postmaster General Blakslee, in answer to a letter he sent to the Post Office Department the latter part of last week protesting over the conditions in Millbury in connection with the now very incomplete rural free delivery service in the town.

The vicinity in which conditions are particularly bad is in Sutton, the mail on that service being sent out from the Millbury post office.

In his letter of yesterday to Mr. WINSLOW, Mr. Blakslee states that, according to information in the hands of the department, there will be but seven former patrons of the service who might have to change the location of their mail boxes.

In another paragraph in this letter he admits that four of the former patrons of the service will in all probability lose the service altogether. But he states that they can not be reached without the carrier retracing his route, and this is something the department can not allow.

To understand the protest that the patrons of the rural free delivery service in Sutton are making it will be necessary to state that for 50 years the town had two deliveries of mail each day.

Fifty years ago Sutton had a post office and the mail came from Millbury as it does to-day. In the old days there was a stage coach line from Millbury to Sutton, and this coach made two trips daily, and the driver had the contract also to carry the mail between the two points.

At the start of the rural free delivery, however, the post office in Sutton was abolished, and at that time people were satisfied to have it so, as they thought that the service would be better than the old order of things.

Under the service, until the order of last week went into effect, Sutton has had two deliveries and two collections daily, and this was the case even in the old stage-coach days.

Under the new order of the department Sutton will get but one delivery and one collection per day. A large part of the patrons will not receive their mail until late in the afternoon.

Many of the residents of Sutton are business men who are in business in both Worcester and Millbury, and under the old order they could get their morning mail before leaving for their places of business; now, in many cases, they will not receive their mail until their return to their homes at the close of the day, in many cases causing a great inconvenience.

At the close of his letter Mr. Blakslee states that he will see if in any case there is any undue hardship imposed on the patrons of the service. The department has refused to suspend the new order until an investigation can be made, as Mr. Winslow asked in his last letter to the department.

The protest of Sutton to the Post Office Department lays stress on the fact that conditions now are worse than they have been since before the Civil War times.

The following was written by John J. Marriman, Washington correspondent of the Boston Herald, and was published on December 2:

The most heartily disliked man in political Washington to-day is Postmaster General Burleson. Democrats and Republicans alike join in flaying him for his arbitrary and, as many say, foolhardy reorganization of the rural mail service.

Until recently the standard rural route was 24 miles and the maximum salary $1,100. Two years ago Congress voted to pay rural carriers a maximum salary of $1,200. When it is considered that these rural-mail distributors purchase and pay for the upkeep on all their equipment, it will readily appear that $1,200 is not exactly a bonanza.

Soon after Congress raised the pay of the rural deliveryman Postmaster General Burleson undertook to establish arbitrarily what the maximum route should be, adding to the existing 24-mile standard other regulations concerning the weight of mail and the number of pieces which must be carried to qualify for the maximum salary.

Congress took cognizance of Mr. Burleson's usurpation of the legislative function and spanked him by including in a joint resolution, passed at the last session, a particular section voting the $1,200 maximum salary to rural carriers covering the standard route regardless of the Postmaster General's supplementary requirements.

But Mr. Burleson, of Texas, was not to be feazed in the least by such an inconsequential annoyance as Congress. He found in the old law, which had been continued, a few words authorizing the payment of a maximum salary of $1,800 to carriers covering routes of 50 miles or more. The fact that this section was intended to apply in new territory where automobile service was practicable did not trouble him. As soon as Congress had adjourned the Post Office Department, through Fourth Assistant General Blakslee, began either a chastisement of Congress or an economy program—the real intent is the subject of much conjecture—and proceeded to extend the existing routes from 24 miles up to 30 and more, according to two plans credited to the fertile genius of Mr. Blakslee.

The first plan, called the retrenchment or prevention of retracing plan, applied to routes covered by horse-drawn vehicles. It combined routes, eliminated routes, and, as far as possible, prevented the passage of carriers over the same ground. The second plan inaugurated automobile service and also combined old routes to make new motor routes, some times 50 miles long.

Both plans read well and they have saved the Government money, but the patrons of the rural mail service have paid in serious inconvenience for the economy. From all sections of the country, from Democrats and Republicans, complaints of this new rural service now pour into Washington. Up in Stow, Mass., a carrier who had been in the service for 15 years, who owned his own special equipment and had a perfect record, threatened to resign when his route was extended to 30 miles because of the impossibility of completing it during the winter season. When the matter was brought to the attention of the department the official word came, "Resignations will not interfere with department plans."

In Maynard a carrier starts at 11 a. m., works until 7 p. m., and then fails by 4 miles of completing his route. He drives back to Maynard, some 4 or 5 miles, and when he arrives finds all outgoing mail trains departed, so that collections have to hold over until the next day. Down in Westport the New Bedford evening papers do not arrive until the evening of the day following publication. The Sherborn post office, according to the department's original plan, was abolished and the post-office address of town officials changed to Framingham.

These few cases are but typical of hundreds of others reported from all parts of the country. Farmers depending upon the receipt of newspapers and crop reports to market their goods advantageously receive

their mail too late to be of value. Perishable goods sent by parcel post remain out in the sun 8 or 10 hours or are detained overnight before they can be dispatched.

The attitude of the rural sections toward Postmaster General Burleson's "economy-without-efficiency" management is forcibly, if not elegantly, expressed through constant and bitterly caustic criticisms universally appearing in the rural press.

A Senator completely in touch with the situation declared to-day that 95 per cent of Congress, regardless of party, was opposed to the reorganization.

It would seem as though Mr. Burleson, the reputed master politician, has overstepped all reasonable limits and sacrificed party interests for the sake of "showing" Congress. But Congress is quite a meal for even Mr. Burleson. It now looks as though the rural service situation, combined with the railway pay fight, will precipitate one of the bitterest contests in the history of postal legislation.

The following is taken from the Fall River (Mass.) Evening News of November 24:

Bitter opposition has developed to the plan of reorganizing the rural free-delivery system in towns and villages in the vicinity of this city and New Bedford, and as a result the Democratic administration in Washington is coming in for a severe arraignment. Like a bolt out of a clear sky, orders were received by parties affected, on Monday morning, whereby some of the rural carriers—some of them under civil service—are to be deprived of their positions after November 30. Routes are to be changed so that patrons will not receive their mail until a day later than at present, and carriers who were fortunate enough to retain their routes are to have additional work with no mention of extra recompense. A system which has been followed out successfully for 16 years with practically no complaint is to be thrown into a condition for upheaval and disruption.

Following a meeting of rural-delivery patrons in South Westport Tuesday evening, at which Congressman WILLIAM S. GREENE presided and Congressman JOSEPH WALSH, of New Bedford, was one of the principal speakers, the following telegram was sent to Postmaster General Burleson in Washington by Congressman GREENE:

"Citizens of the district I represent, in mass meeting assembled at South Westport, are bitterly opposed to orders that have been issued overthrowing the rural-delivery service. They and constituents elsewhere ask that the date named when orders shall be effective be postponed until an investigation can be made. In many cases important business interests will be seriously affected by the proposed changes. I shall be in Washington on December 2 and desire to confer with you upon the vital questions involved."

Congressman WALSH, of New Bedford, spoke upon the demoralizing effect of the recent orders and was followed by about a dozen speakers, all of whom scored the proposed changes severely.

It was pointed out by the various speakers that the business of raising young chicks has been established in South Westport, and considerable business has been done in the poultry and egg line. Improved plants have been constructed, and with the opening of the Parcel Post Service the farmers and poultry dealers were given the opportunity to carry on an extensive business. Under the present system of rural delivery one section of the town receives its mail in the morning and the other section in the evening, thus enabling the people to receive their orders by mail and fill the orders for distribution in the morning mail. It was stated that if the present system of delivery is revamped the service formerly given from Westport will be transferred to the head of Westport post office and lines will be changed so that the whole thing will be in a demoralized condition. Evening papers will not be received until they are a day old, and men in the poultry business will be from one to two days behind in their business transactions by mail.

If the proposed changes go into effect, it was pointed out that a substitute carrier in South Westport, a woman, will sever her connection with the service as the result of the drastic orders.

Congressman GREENE said that if additions are made to some of the routes no mortal horse would be able to cover the distance required in a day. The limit at present is 24 miles a day, and the carriers would be obliged to secure automobiles to cover their routes. He also said that carriers who already have automobiles and those whose routes have been taken away from them find themselves with automobiles on their hands and no salaries.

That the citizens of Somerset are stirred up to white heat over the recent orders from the Postmaster General to abolish the office of Rural Free Delivery Carrier Benjamin C. Gibbs is putting it mildly. Already several letters and telegrams have been sent to Congressman WILLIAM S. GREENE and the department at Washington protesting against the orders. A call for a public protest meeting is also being talked of.

On December 15, Aaron C. Dowse, chairman of the board of selectmen at Sherborn, Mass., sent the following letter to the office of Representative WILLIAM H. CARTER, Massachusetts, in Washington:

I have read copies of the two letters written to you by Hon. J. L. Blakslee, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, and it is quite apparent that the official in question misunderstands the conditions that control and the situation that obtains at the present time in Sherborn.

In his letter of November 6 he writes of a "more systematic arrangement," and declares that there is no reason to believe "that the patrons will be seriously inconvenienced thereby." My answer is that our people are seriously inconvenienced. Facts outweigh theories, and we who receive the mail under the present very "systematic (?) arrangement" are daily witnesses to the truth of my statement. He further asserts that "according to reports only three families will be required to relocate their boxes," referring to those on Pleasant Street, who for the first time in 13 years are thus inconvenienced. How about the families on Bullard Street? Was there a report on that street? The statement that "with the exception of families residing on the road between Western Avenue and Sherborn post office all will receive direct service through the latter office without having to change their post-office address" sounds queer and very inaccurate to the residents of Main Street, north of Dowse's corner, and the residents of Everett Street, more than 15 families in all, who are put into the Framingham office and must change their post-office address from Sherborn to Framingham. A mile only from the local post office, on the principal street, and in the most populous part of the town they can not now get their evening mail at the local office. It is very evident that the "reports" received by the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General were misleading, to say the least. "In view of the foregoing facts and in the absence of any evidence" he refused to postpone inaugurating the new arrangements. I think I have shown that the foregoing are not "facts," and I ask how evidence could be presented.

When the route, now mutilated, was arranged (some of it when Senator JOHN W. WEEKS was our Representative in Congress), our people were consulted, our conditions carefully studied, and our wishes considered. So far as I am able to ascertain, not a citizen of Sherborn was consulted before the present plan was outlined. Without our knowledge the arrangements were made, a peremptory order for the change was issued, and we are then refused a postponement because we have not presented "evidence," although we did file protests signed by nearly every citizen of Sherborn. If one of the inspectors will confer with our people we'll produce the evidence.

"It is not the department's purpose to injure or curtail the rural service," he continues. The service in Sherborn has been injured and has been curtailed. He asks "for suggestions looking to the establishment of additional service in your [Mr. CARTER'S] territory now without such service." My suggestion is that he give—restore—that service to the residents of Pleasant and Bullard Streets in Sherborn.

In his letter of November 15 he says: "The main objection against the discontinuance of the route arises through an assumption that the action presaged the discontinuance of the post office in Sherborn," and declares that certain mail gathered by the carrier is to be delivered uncanceled at the Sherborn office; but he forgets that by the present arrangement all the Everett Street mail, much on Main Street, and all collected after leaving the office on return from Farm Road, goes to Framingham. To kill by starvation is a slower process than to kill by the bullet, but none the less cruel and none the less sure.

Maple Street is also Framinghamized. On that street resides the secretary of our board of selectmen. All our town letterheads, etc., bear the imprint Sherborn. It is important that we get both the morning and evening mail. We don't propose to change our town name or town literature to Framingham. The result is that our secretary and other residents on Maple Street forego their rural delivery and get their mail at the local office. And still we are assured that no one "outside of three families" is inconvenienced. Our case is different from those cities in the Boston postal district. There the mail is addressed not to Boston, but to the particular city—Malden, Everett, Newton, as the case may be. The city does not lose its civic individuality.

It is to be presumed that the department having in charge the United States mails desires to secure and encourage the largest possible efficiency, and that the quickest possible delivery of mail marks a large part of that efficiency. The convenience, satisfaction, and accommodation of mail recipients constitutes the real test. By that test the efficiency of our rural-mail delivery has been impaired 50 per cent. The primitive is reinstalled and the modern is relegated to the scrap heap. Because our mail carrier desired to give us the best possible service, he purchased an automobile and was able to reduce the time in going over the route one-half. For this enterprise he is punished, or so it seems to us. We now have a one-horse cart delivery and the accompanying schedule shows how the Post Office Department has slowed up its service. I notice that in the South the carrier routes are being motorized, and the department has been sharply criticized therefor, the roads there being bad. Putting auto delivery on bad roads in the South and West and displacing that same delivery in Massachusetts, where the roads are good, seems a bit strange to the uninitiated.

But that isn't all. The department has, so far as our mail service is considered, cut the town in two. It has halved it right on its main street and its most populous village only a mile distant from the office. It prevents these people thus Framinghamized from getting their evening mail at the office, and it is now impossible to get mail until the next day—the Boston evening paper and the near-by papers that contain our local news.

Now contrast the present delivery with the former. Bear in mind that I am in no way criticizing the carrier, Mr. Hollis. He has been given a route altogether too long and has had placed on his shoulders a burden too great for any man. He does the best he can. If the patrons suffer, the fault is not his, but the authority that imposed the task upon him. Take note also that the schedule is a fair-weather schedule; what it will be during the winter storms and spring thaws I hate to contemplate. The delivery begins late, and lateness is multiplied by lateness with every mile covered. In this schedule I am naming only a few recipients at different points on the route; of course, all intervening points show a corresponding difference in time between the old and new schedule.

Our last morning mail arrives at our local office at 8.30 a. m. Mr. Goulding left the office at 9 a. m. Mr. Hollis leaves at 10.30 a. m. He would leave it at even a later hour but for the fact that our local postmistress routes and bundles the mail, which I understand is really not a part of her official duty. As it is, the mail remains in the office two hours after arrival before the carrier takes it from the office.

The first stop is at the house of Norman B. Douglass, who is within a half minute's walk of the station where the mail arrives, and half a mile distant from the post office; the mail which he sees leave the station at 8.25 a. m. he now receives by carrier at 10.45 a. m. Mr. Goulding delivered it at 9.10 a. m. My own mail (Lake Street) I previously received at 9.45 a. m.; now at 11 to 11.15 a. m. Note also that Mr. Goulding before coming down Lake Street had to cover Main and Everett Streets to the Natick line, now set off to the Framingham route. Oscar H. Howe, at the extreme south of Sherborn, previously received his mail at 10.45 a. m.; now at 12.05 p. m. Milo F. Campbell, on South Main Street, a mile from the local office, previously received mail at 11 a. m.; now at 12.30 p. m. Rev. H. E. Bray, on Farm Road, half a mile from local office, previously received mail at 10 a. m.; now at 1 p. m. James F. Leland, southwest Sherborn, previously received his mail at 11.45 a. m.; now at 3 p. m. I am told that his son mounts his bicycle in the morning, goes 5 miles to the Framingham High School, attends all the sessions of that school, returns home, and arrives there before his parents receive their morning mail. Take another case, Mr. Leslie Philbrook, on Western Avenue—and all along that avenue are in like condition. He is less than a mile from Framingham, from which point our carrier makes his start in the morning. Previously he received his mail at 11 to 11.15 a. m.; now he gets it at 4 p. m. And this illustrates pointedly how little consideration the planners of the present "systematic arrangement" gave to the convenience and needs of mail recipients. Mr. Philbrook's interests are naturally with Framingham, it being his nearest population center. Now, he is put into a Sherborn route and people whose interests are in Sherborn—or Natick as a population center—are put in the Framingham route. Had the department deliberately planned to perfect a system entirely out of consonance with the people's interests, it could not have done it more effectively than in the existing arrangement.

Is this the service which we, a live town, less than 25 miles from Boston, are entitled to?

I inclose schedule in tabulated form, showing time of past and present mail delivery by carrier. I also inclose a sketch showing how the town is cut in two. At Dowse's corner the two routes almost interlock.

I am not criticizing efforts at economy, although I think the Post Office Department is the last branch of our Government where penuriousness should be practiced. "There is that scattereth and maketh rich and there is that withholdeth more than is meet that tendeth to poverty," particularly in the Postal Service.

I believe an arrangement could have been made—had our people been consulted—whereby Mr. Goulding, leaving the local office immediately after the arrival of the last morning mail, could have covered all of Sherborn except the distinctive village at north Sherborn; could have given quicker service than we are now getting, and enable us to preserve our civic entirety to which our history as a township—incorporated 240 years ago—entitles us.

Mr. Blakslee in a recent address said: "I concede that there may be some errors; there may be some inaccuracies; there may be some instances where better arrangements could have been made; and here and now I emphatically state that, given time, all such inaccuracies will be corrected and that nowhere, when substantial representation shall be made showing conclusively that the department has been in error, will there be one day's delay in a correction thereof." We await the correction, pointing to his statement in regard to the few obliged to change post-office address as a specific error.

In conclusion, speaking as a citizen, as chairman of the board of selectmen, as representative to the legislature from this district, and voicing the unanimous sentiment of our people, I pronounce the present arrangement unsatisfactory, impairing the efficiency of our carrier service full 50 per cent. We hope you may be able to convince the department that our citizens are not querulous faultfinders, but have a substantial grievance, and one that should be remedied without "one day's delay." It may be the department inherited, as Mr. Blakslee says, "a system that would have wrecked any business house." It is equally true any business house impairing its service as the department has impaired it in Sherborn would be "on the rocks" in 60 days. We ask for no "special privilege," but only what the Postmaster General says it is his object to accomplish, "efficiency in the operation of the Postal Service."

MICHIGAN.

That the department's reorganization of the mail service in the State of Michigan was unsatisfactory to patrons is clearly shown by the articles and resolutions which I herewith submit and desire printed in the RECORD, summarized as follows:

(1) Article appearing in the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram.

(2) Letter to the Detroit Times by Ami Whitney, of Quincy, Mich.

(3) Article appearing in the Flint (Mich.) Daily Journal, issue June 24.

(4) Article appearing in the Flint (Mich.) Daily Journal June 22.

(5) Article appearing in the Owosso Argus in June, 1915.

(6) Article appearing in the Flint Daily Journal June 28.

(7) Article "Farms and its affairs," page edited by J. H. Brown in the Battle Creek Inquirer.

(8) Article appearing in the Grand Rapids Herald of December 28.

(9) Article appearing in the Mount Clemens Monitory September 24.

(10) Article appearing on September 22 in the News-Palladin, of Benton Harbor, Mich.

(11) Article appearing in the November 16 issue of the Grand Rapids Herald.

(12) Article appearing in November, 1915, in the Grand Rapids Herald.

(13) Additional editorial printed in the Grand Rapids Herald the same month.

(14) Article appearing in the issue of December 2 of the Lenox Standard.

(15) Editorial published in a Michigan daily (Herald).

And in the same issue the Daily Telegram says again:

The principal trouble with the people of Lenawee County, who have been complaining over poor rural mail service since the latest order of the Postmaster General went into effect, appears to have its source in the fact that many of them have to walk distances varying from 300 feet to half a mile for the mail which, before the order, was delivered at their doors.

Telephone interviews with practically every postmaster in the county has developed information leading one to believe that the most serious thing the Postal Department at Washington has committed has been that of inconveniencing its rural patrons. Were Michigan farmers so unfortunately situated as some of their less lucky brothers in other States they would be thankful for the opportunity to walk only half a mile for daily mail service. Once accustomed to the service which was enjoyed in this county before the order went into effect, however, it is a hard matter to take a step backward, particularly when that step means inconvenience which is not rewarded by any better service.

Some carriers have been laid off, some have had their routes lengthened, others have had their mileage diminished, and all the offices, without exception, report some change in their rural organization, due to the new system which has been in effect just 10 days.

One carrier, Mr. Norcross, was laid off at the Adrian office. His district covered that part of the county northwest of the city in the vicinity of Wolf Creek, and it is now covered by routes Nos. 1 and 2 from Adrian and one route from Clayton.

Route No. 1 is extended 2 miles, and No. 2 is increased a like distance. No. 3 gets a 7-mile boost. No. 5 gets 4 miles and No. 6 gets 5 miles. No. 7 is the only route out of Adrian which remains unchanged, while No. 8 has 7 miles added to it.

Palmyra carriers have a total of 8 miles saddled to their daily travels, one carrier taking over 4 miles formerly served from Jasper and the other taking a like distance from the Deerfield office.

At Tipton, from where the protests came in the largest numbers and in the loudest manner, one entire route is taken away. The postmaster said this week that the territory of the discontinued route is being covered by carriers out of Adrian over worse roads than those which could be traversed by the Tipton carrier.

The Tipton postmaster stated that the majority are coming directly to the office at Tipton for their mail.

Two routes at Clayton were altered, one being shortened two miles and the other increased 6 miles. The 2 miles taken from the first carrier embraced a stretch of road 1 mile in length on which the carrier had to double back. The stretch has been abandoned, and the people living on it march to the corner if they want their daily paper.

A. F. Gardner, of Jasper, No. 2, was unfortunate enough to have a route which the department considered should be eliminated, and so one out of Jasper now serves 200 people, whereas before the 15th of this month the two routes served 300 people. The other hundred do the Edward Payson Weston stunt daily to the crossroads.

Hudson, No. 1, loses quite a distance, 8 miles being handed to the man from Addison. Hudson gains 2 miles, however, from Pittsford, outside the county.

Six miles are taken from Morenci, No. 3, and the salary of the carrier is also reduced. No. 2 is extended to the town line at Fairfield, and the Canandaigua territory, formerly served from Morenci, is taken over by Hudson. "Great confusion is resulting from these changes," said the postmaster at Morenci.

An increase of 12 miles is noted at Blissfield, where the carriers take over business from Riga, Jasper, and Deerfield. The postmaster at Blissfield does not consider the changes beneficial at all, and expressed a hope for further reorganization which might result in better service and more efficient and accommodating delivery to rural patrons.

Ami Whitney, of Quincy, Mich., contributes the following letter to the columns of the Detroit Times under date of June 25:

In the Times of June 17, under the heading "Uncle Sam is extending his business and lowering rates," you say: "Uncle Sam's little old Post Office Department continues to plug away increasing the efficiency of its service, doing more things and doing them better than ever before." Now, Mr. Editor, will you allow me a little space in regard to the "increasing efficiency of its service"?

In the writer's neighborhood are eight farmhouses. The owners of these houses and farms are all good farmers and up to June 15 and for 15 years or more before that have had free rural mail delivery at their homes. A few days before June 15 we get notice that we would have to move our mail boxes to the four corners, east or west, as we might be located from the corners, or we would not get any mail, making it necessary for these people to travel from one-fourth to one-half mile, and some of them more, for their mail. Now, then, Mr. Editor, is that "increasing the efficiency of the service"? Why should our neighbor over yonder in sight have his mail brought to his door? Eight of us have to go from one-fourth to one-half mile or more for ours. If that is "increasing efficiency," we don't know what inefficiency would mean, and we are kicking. Do you blame us?

I suppose there are thousands of other farmers in the same fix that we are, and this under a Democratic administration that believes, or pretends to believe, that the people should rule. Our motto is, "The greatest good to the greatest number and free rural mail delivery to every house on every road in the country." I said we are kicking, and we are going to keep on kicking, and if it is necessary to get what now belongs to us will help to put Mr. Burleson out of the Post Office Department next year.

The Flint (Mich.) Daily Journal in its issue of June 24 prints the following news letter from the town of Fenton:

Postmaster F. H. Chaplin this morning received notification from the Post Office Department at Washington of important changes to be made in the Rural Free Delivery Service, effective July 1, whereby Fenton loses one rural carrier and the patronage of 20 miles of rural route.

One change brings the cement plants south of here under the Linden post office and the Linden carrier, Daniel Pomeroy, will deliver mail within 1 mile of here. Other patronage goes to the Grand Blanc office. W. D. Clark, who has been the carrier on route No. 5, has been discharged. In point of efficiency and the satisfaction given patrons, Clark was considered one of the best rural carriers Fenton ever had. The other four routes, with the exception of that covered by Sanford Avery, are increased to 30 miles and the salaries to $1,200 a year. Avery, the oldest carrier in point of years, will cover 21 miles at a salary of $1,000.

General dissatisfaction is being expressed at the change. Persons who all their lives have been receiving their mail at Fenton now get it either through Linden or Grand Blanc. The cement plants are placed in a puzzling position. They say that all their business is done through the Fenton post office and that it is impossible to change. If their mail is still sent to Fenton it must be forwarded to Linden and will not be delivered until after 5 o'clock the next day, after the offices are closed.

Farmers are objecting, because where heretofore the mail has been placed in boxes in front of their homes they will now have to go a quarter or half a mile to the nearest corner where the carrier will stop.

The same paper on June 22 printed the following letter from Clio:

Postmaster James J. Jones and the four rural-mail carriers out of this village were greatly surprised to receive official notification from the Post Office Department at Washington to the effect that the rural routes of this village had been extended so that they now reach to the corporation limits of Mount Morris. Each route was increased from 4 to 5 miles in length so that the average length of the routes is approximately 30 miles. Two of the carriers received a substantial increase in salary so that all the carriers are now receiving the same salary per annum.

It is believed here that the two rural carriers out of Mount Morris have been relieved of their routes through the shake-up which is to take place July 1. By lengthening the routes of this village it reasoned that the north route of Mount Morris is usurped by local carriers, while the south route has been taken over by Flint carriers. According to the routes as outlined by the Postal Department, many of the patrons will have to go half a mile to get their mail, as side routes which are

not thickly populated will not be covered after July 1. The extension in mileage will add approximately 200 families to the patrons of the local office, but as the routes extend to within half a mile of Mount Morris, it is doubtful whether the patronage there will be very large.

WE PROTEST AGAINST SERVICE MUTILATION.

Apropos of the recent mass meeting—June 19—Corunna, protesting against rural route changes in that locality, the Owosso Argus, in a recent issue, says:

Reports from Washington state that the protests made by the rural mail patrons of Michigan will be given consideration. The protests were made as a result of the rerouting of the routes in Shiawassee and other counties in Michigan.

Officers of the Post Office Department are reported as saying that the routes will be changed in some instances, if it can be proved to their satisfaction that the present routing is not better. It is said that charges of politics such as made at the protest meeting in Shiawassee County have hurt the cause of the protestants. The Post Office Department declares that a cry of politics is always one of the first to be raised when any change is made from the old order.

Nothing directly has been heard by the members of the Shiawassee committee regarding its protest.

The Flint (Mich.) Daily Journal in a later issue, June 28, says:

The centering of rural free delivery routes on the larger cities is the object of a new ruling of the Post Office Department, which takes effect in Genesee County Thursday. By this ruling a tenth route is to be added to the nine already in operation from the Flint post office, while all over the county routes are to be consolidated and in many cases carriers dropped from the service in order that the remaining men shall cover beats approximately 30 miles in length. Salaries are standardized at $1,200 a year, except in a few instances.

The new order adds in the neighborhood of 300 families to the number already served by the Flint office, while the patronage of the smaller post offices throughout the county is correspondingly decreased. Then, too, there are a number of patrons added who were not reached by the rural service heretofore.

The chief purpose of the centralization scheme, as explained by Postmaster Baker, is to bring farmers who live in the vicinity of the larger cities under the "local zone" of the Parcel Post System, thereby reducing the rates to be paid for the delivery of farm produce directly from producer to consumer, and bringing such produce directly into the city without the necessity of transferring it at another office. It is expected also that the new ruling will cut down the expenses of the rural free delivery.

While considerable objection has arisen from some of the village post offices throughout the county, particularly at Fenton, where a peculiar situation has developed, local officials are of the opinion that the change can be effected with but little confusion. Some of the rural communities report that patrons are objecting to the change because in a number of instances the mail is deposited in boxes at the nearest corner for persons who are not directly on the route, instead of being delivered at their doors as formerly. There are but few such cases on routes originating at the Flint office, according to Postmaster Baker, while there are several instances where persons who formerly had to travel some distance to get their mail now have it delivered at their doors.

In forming the new routes, Postmaster Baker has notified all patrons that their mail boxes must be marked with the name and a number which will be supplied by the carrier. This is to aid substitutes who may be called upon to cover the routes, and unless the regulation is complied with the carriers will refuse to deliver mail.

To aid in the readjustment the postmaster has notified all patrons of the routes leading from Flint of their new addresses, asking them to notify their correspondents and publishers of newspaper and periodicals for which they subscribe of the new address, giving their present addresses also.

In regard to the situation at Fenton, where the change has put the cement plants on the Linden routes, although they are just outside of Fenton, much to the inconvenience of the factory men, Postmaster Baker is of the opinion that some sort of arrangement may be made whereby the companies may continue to get their mail from the Fenton office.

The Linden (Mich.) Leader printed the following item in its issue of July 2:

A number of our farmers are indignant over the changing of the rural-route system in this part of the county, which change was made by somebody that we think has qualified for membership in the bonehead club.

Our three carriers are to make about 5 to 10 miles farther each day. Some have increased in patrons, while others have lost.

Our carriers go within a mile or so of the following towns, Gaines, Durand, Swartz Creek, Grand Blanc, and Fenton, which, we think, is needless, as some other carriers come about the same distance from Linden, and we lose some good patrons that do their trading here. But more will get their mail from Gaines, which means that the Parcel Post System is no good to them, for the Linden merchants used to send numerous articles to them as their orders were telephoned in. This will be a loss to the Government in this one town. What must it mean in the same circumstances throughout the whole United States?

It used to be that when a route was laid out a man was sent here to look the ground over, but now they change it entirely down at Washington, and we must abide by it. Who runs this Government, the people or the politicians?

Some politicians will find out who elected them to office in the next campaign. We don't blame our President Wilson for this, any more than we would blame our principal of our high school if a couple of children got into a fight on the way home from school. We think the circumstances are similar.

The Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Republican on July 6 published the following news item from the town of Rowley:

Democratic economy isn't relished by the farmers of Buchanan County, nor by the rural mail carriers of this vicinity. Heretofore there have been three rural mail carriers from this place, but recently an order went into effect reducing the number to two. The farmers living on a part of the former route now have to walk a mile for their mail, instead of having it delivered at their doors. Some of them decline to do this, and they go to town for it once or twice a week, as they used to do in the old days before there was any rural free delivery.

There have been several indignation meetings, and some petitions have been sent to Washington. But that has had no effect. The Democratic administration is getting the country further into debt every day, owing to the failure of the Democratic tariff to provide sufficient revenue to run the Government. Consequently rural free delivery now exists in name only.

Still other reductions are to go into effect the 1st of August. Instead of having two rural free delivery mail carriers, the Government intends to have but one. He is to have an automobile, and he is expected to cover all the territory now covered by two mail carriers.

He can do this in fine weather, but in rainy weather and in winter weather he will have to hire a substitute to drive half his route with a team, while he himself drives the other half. He will receive $1,800 a year, and pay his substitute from this. The two mail carriers now get $1,200 a year, making a total of $2,400. When there were three the total was $3,600, which is just twice as much as the Government will be paying after August 1.

The "Farm and its Affairs" page, edited by J. H. Brown, in the Battle Creek (Mich.) Inquirer:

Scores of farmers have spoken to us about the recent changes in rural mail delivery and asked if something could not be done by the clubs and granges to ask the Post Office Department to stop cutting off and changing so many routes.

It would do little good at the present time to kick about the changes. The Postmaster General is trying to reduce expenses in some way and is taking it out of the farmers and rural mail carriers instead of reducing his own salary. Really, it is all right to lop off expenses in the Rural Delivery Service where practical, but we fear a mistake is being made in this wholesale changing and slashing.

The plan of increasing a route several miles where an automobile is to be used is all right from spring to late fall, but it will be impossible to keep up this kind of delivery in southern Michigan during the cold winter months, with snow knee deep in some of the roads.

Lots of farmers will be obliged to go without their mail regularly and others will be obliged to go to the post office as in the old days before the service was organized. All three routes out of Galesburg have been discontinued. Several farmers within sight of that village will have to have their post-office address changed to Kalamazoo, 10 or 12 miles away, and even the daily papers will be another day older when they finally arrive at the farmers' doors.

Experiments are all right, but we think the Postmaster General is making some of them backward this summer.

The only thing to do is to wait until Congress convenes next December. Then there will be a mighty big kick brought in by scores of Senators and Representatives from their farmer constituents from one end of the country to the other. The Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads will have their hands full for a while, and we are of the opinion that Mr. Burleson's head will swim before he gets through with this rural route changing job.

We are interested in this matter because it was in our old farm home near Climax that rural mail delivery was started in Michigan. We helped lay out the first route and published in the Michigan Farmer the following week a full front-page map showing both the routes traveled by L. A. Clark and Willis Lawrence. These routes have not been materially changed during these 18 years of service. Now a portion of one of the Galesburg routes has been given over to a Climax carrier.

Of course, with better roads the automobile can be used for about eight months in the year, but no dependence can be made on automobiles for rural delivery in the wintertime in this section of the country.

The Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of December 28, says:

The Herald continues to receive letters in condemnation of recent rural free delivery changes in western and northern Michigan. Many of these letters come from men who are in some way connected with the Postal Service and who therefore dare not give their names for publication lest the penalty be the addition of further unbearable conditions in which to work. Nevertheless these letters are eloquent in continuing demonstration of the fact that rural free delivery efficiency is being serious impaired and that rural free delivery carriers are being subjected to impositions which are as unjust as they are undeserved. For example, we quote the following from a letter received to-day:

"It seems to be in order for we common people to give our experiences through the columns of your paper as to the economic effect of the tearing up of the old rural routes and the rerouting of them. The two routes out of ——— did not escape. At the big meeting of postmasters in Saginaw our local agent for the Government felt it best to add 4 miles of the heaviest mail and worst roads of No. 2 mail route to No. 1 route, giving the old gentleman, who had all he could handle and who has been so faithful for 14 years as a carrier, a dose that he can not manage in the snowy winter months. The change took effect December 1. The carrier did his work faithfully up to that time. It is said the Government sent his check for the month of November, but, for some economic reason, the postmaster says he was ordered to hold it until notified to turn it over to the carrier. What is the trouble with things? Must the cry for economy come out of we common people who work and earn what we are supposed to get? Will some one answer?"

Rural free delivery routes throughout Michigan generally have always been just as long as they could be made with any sense of humane justice to carriers or horses, and certainly just as big a burden upon carriers as efficient service could permit. The new arrangement of routes is in many instances more than carrier or horse can stand, particularly in the winter months, when our country roads are heavy and our snows are deep. When such conditions are created, rural free delivery efficiency must suffer. It is absurd and costly "economy" which undermines "efficiency."

The rural free delivery should never be permitted to take a backward step. On the contrary, every rural free delivery change should be in the direction of progress and efficiency. Nothing is more vital to farm convenience than adequate, prompt, and satisfactory mail connections. This is the function of the rural free delivery. When the Post Office Department interferes with this function it runs squarely counter to the communal welfare. We suspect that this proposition will play an important part in the great nation-wide electoral referendum which will be taken next fall when the people of the country are given their quadrennial opportunity to exercise a voice in National Government.

The Mount Clemens (Mich.) Monitor printed the following article in its news columns on September 24:

Burleson and his crowd of factotums at Washington have conferred upon the people of Macomb County a general disturbance of the mail serv-

fice, which will be ineffective October 1. It is a bird of an arrangement.

The routes are all increased to approximately 30 miles. Anybody who knows anything at all, knows that a 30-mile route in this county is an impossibility. With good roads and weather a man with a horse or an automobile could "negotiate" such a route. No horse could get anywhere near serving such a route with bad roads.

In Mount Clemens the routes in a general way are thus: No. 1, 29.52 miles, enlarged from Washington and Utica; No. 2, 29.88 miles, enlarged from Washington; No. 3, 29.90 miles, takes 4 miles out of New Baltimore; No. 4, 29.60 miles, takes out of Roseville; No. 5, 30 miles, takes out of Roseville; No. 6, 29.63 miles; No. 7, 25.90 miles. Nos. 6 and 7 are rearrangements of routes out of the city, No. 7 also taking out of Warren. In all about 100 families are taken from other offices and given to Mount Clemens.

The Roseville carrier is transferred to Halfway, and Roseville loses her route. At Halfway, William Kissell, Republican, is fired.

Utica loses route No. 4, and George M. MacGuill, Republican, is bounced. The office may lose enough to back to fourth class. Romeo loses route No. 4, and William Scott, Republican, is bounced. Washington holds her two routes, greatly lengthened. No reduction at Lenox and Richmond, but routes are lengthened. No carriers let out at New Haven, but about 4 miles added to each route. Warren loses one routes, B. M. Newberry, Republican, fired, and other routes extended. New Baltimore loses one route and Frank Bacon, Republican, is fired. Other route extended. Memphis loses one of three routes, and W. G. Barnard, Republican, is fired. We do not hear that Armada loses, although routes are extended.

The News-Palladin, of Benton Harbor, Mich., printed the following news story on September 22:

Rural route patrons served by the Benton Harbor post office are coming to the front with remonstrance petitions against the operation of the new order of the Post Office Department which, effctive October 1, cuts two routes from the local office.

Nearly every route of the city's six has forwarded protests to Postmaster Campmell, Congressman HAMILTON, and post-office officials.

Patrons are unanimous in voicing their sentiments against the change. Among the other reasons cited for protest in the new order is against the civil-service doctrine which holds that length of service shall be given preference. In this instance Carriers Wallis and Phares, two of the veterans of the local department, are to be removed and younger men retained.

Following are given a few of the reasons as cited by one very familiar with the service, relative to the unfavorable results that will be worked by the operation of the new program: An increase in mileage traveled for each carrier from 5 to 10 miles. An increase in weight of 800 to 1,000 pounds per month. An increase in pieces of mail of about 50 per cent. An increase in expense to each carrier of from $150 to $200 per year. An increase of time put in by each carrier of from two to three hours per day; a consequent decrease of wages for extra time and equipment of about $300 per year. Many miles of poor crossroads substituted for stone roads. An almost impossible regular service in the wintertime, with carriers returning after dark at best. Service withdrawn from many patrons served for years; other patrons required to get mail from other offices, causing delays. Delays on outgoing mail, consequently crippling Parcel Post Service. Sacrifices service of country patrons, without similar effect on city deliveries. Deprives men of positions who have given years of service to the Government. Cuts out automobile service on most of the routes. Gives Benton Harbor same number of routes as village of Coloma.

It is stated that rural-route patrons expect the aid of the city, chamber of commerce, and all other bodies in their effort to change the plan of the department.

It is possible that resolutions will be forwarded to the chamber and city council asking for such aid.

The Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of November 16 says:

One Grand Rapids man, who is in a position to know whereof he speaks, yet who can not allow his name to be made public in this connection, frankly commented yesterday upon the folly of rural mail route procedure as now going on in Kent County. Here are some of the points he made:

"The change of rural routes as proposed by the Post Office Department is a joke.

"Take, for instance, route 12, which under the old system is out of Reeds Lake; the shift puts this route over on the west side, out of Station A, serving patrons west of Grand Rapids instead of east. Many business men in and out of Grand Rapids have this and other route lists. They will address people around Reeds Lake who were formerly on this route at rural route 12. The mail wil go to route 12 on the west side first and will then be resent to Reeds Lake, which makes a delay of probably one day in delivery. Merchants use the same mailing lists for six years and longer. In time trace of the people who lived along the old rural route 12, out of Reeds Lake, will be lost by the new rural route 12 carrier and Station A postmaster, and these letters will go to the dead-letter office through no fault of either the sender or addressee.

"When rural-route lists first were made out by the Post Office Department you could go to the post office and get the names. Now, unless you are an officer of the law seeking a criminal, you are not allowed access to the lists. Business men who wish to reach prospective patrons in their territory through the mails can not get these lists of persons living along rural routes unless they buy them from men who go to the trouble of driving over the routes and indexing all residents. This means they may be forced to pay an exorbitant price for these lists which should be open to them the same as the city directory is open to the public.

"They talk about the postal deficit. No wonder there is a deficit. In a private business, if the overhead expense was eating up the profits as it is in the Post Office Department, the business man would seek more business to cut down the deficiency. Does the Post Office do that? If it did it would open its lists to the business men, thereby assuming more business. In this way the department could help materially in making the parcel-post plan pay.

"Closing these lists to the public will make a difference of from 10 to 33⅓ per cent in rural-route business, I believe.

"The average number of families on a rural route is about 125. Average pay of rural-route carriers is $1,200. How many farmers do you suppose would pay $10 a year to have their mail delivered? Then why not let the business man stand part of the expense by allowing him the use of these lists so that he will send more mail and therefore increase your revenue?

"If the Post Office would do business efficiently, even rural routes would pay profits.

"Changing of these routes in many cases is absolutely foolish. These changes may increase the efficiency of the carrier, but at the same time they decrease the value of the route to its patrons. Farmers living near a town and doing their trading there in many cases will receive their mail over routes starting from a town much farther distant. Take the case of the people around Martin in Allegan County. One route starts from Martin and there is a post-office station there, but another route from Plainwell passes directly through the center of the town of Martin, serving many people there. Farmers living a few rods from the Martin station will receive their mail from Plainwell, 9 miles away.

"A business man in Grand Rapids has taken the trouble to go over the old routes and compile a list of residents. The routes are now so changed that his list is of no value, yet he is not allowed access to the post-office list.

"Rural-route lists, made out years ago, are still being used by many business houses. As a result much mail comes addressed to persons who have moved or to dead people. This results in mail piling up for the postmaster. If the present lists were open to the public, these old ones would be thrown away. The present system favors the advertising man, who takes the trouble to get up a list and can then charge his own price."

The same paper printed this a day or so later:

Some of the more glaring impossibilities in the proposed rerouting of Kent County's rural mail service are being corrected. One or two of the absurdities to which the Herald gave some editorial attention last week have been remedied. Postmaster Hogadone, of Grand Rapids, who is bearing the brunt of the effort to bring some semblance of reason and service out of the proposed economies and curtailments, is struggling brave-heartedly with his task and is making some progress. This is slightly encouraging. And it should be encouraging to other farmers who find the rerouting plans outrageously impossible. All who have a complaint to make should make it now, while the pot is still boiling.

Ventilate your troubles, farmers!

Let the postmaster and the public know the nature and the extent of whatever embarrassment the new rural free delivery curtailment and rearrangement in Kent County will bring you.

Don't bank on it too strongly; but there is some slight possibility of relief for the more aggravated cases.

Of course, no amount of tinkering can keep Kent's rural free delivery efficiency up to previous measure under the new economy plan of things. There must be no expectation of any such miracle. We must settle down to a general acceptance of the bitter fact that the rural free delivery is going to suffer for a year or two. And pity 'tis 'tis true, true.

But if we holler loud enough, perhaps, we can at least escape a maximum of inconvenience and embarrassment and depreciated service.

And here is another editorial from the Herald:

The more we hear of rural free delivery rerouting plans in Kent County the more evident becomes the unescapable conclusion that a serious blow is being leveled at rural mail-dellvery efficiency. Heretofore a rural mail route has been about 24 miles. This is a long, hard pull day in and day out. It is pretty nearly the maximum strain upon man and horse when winter intrenches for a three months' Michigan stay. Now it is proposed to make the routes 30 miles. Economy is the purpose. If the Government was on the verge of bankruptcy we would expect the Government to economize accordingly. But the Government is not on the verge of bankruptcy. It would not even be hard up if any common sense were displayed in our fiscal policies. And certainly we are not so hard up that the American farmer and the rural free delivery carrier must be penalized.

The Herald wants to hear from more rural free delivery residents who are in mail trouble. The best possible means to minimize this trouble is to make the trouble known. Tell the Herald and the postmaster and the public your story. Farmers who have had their mail at their instances walk from one-quarter of a mile to a mile away in order to be served. Many farmers will be unable to receive their mail better than every other day during the winter under new arrangements. Farmers living within a short distance from a town which is their natural trading center will now be served from some other town which is comparatively remote and unhandy and impossible as a trading center.

This is a serious business. It is serious for the farmers themselves, because good mail service is a business necessity on the farm these days. It is serious for the carriers, because there is a limit to endurance. It is serious to the entire county—the city included—because any blow at rural mail efficiency will find its reflection in troubles that will in one way and another come home to all of us. The least that the farmers should do is to be very prompt and very emphatic in making their protests heard.

The Lenox (Mich.) Standard in its issue of December 2 says:

Protests against the recent revision of the rural mail routes are being heard on all sides, as the service has been rendered unsatisfactory. Routes have been increased in length to approximately 30 miles, sufficient for a man and horse in good weather and on good roads, but out of the question at the season now approaching. The increase in mileage decreased the number of carriers, without regard to length of service, veterans being dropped from the lists promiscuously and young men employed. Congressman S. W. BEAKES, of Ann Arbor, is framing a bill which will be introduced as soon as Congress convenes. If it becomes a law the Post Office Department will be required to deliver mail at the gate of every farmhouse, providing access is given to it over good roads.

This editorial was taken from a recent issue of a Michigan daily from Ada, Mich., by a route patron:

The Herald sincerely hopes that the rural free-delivery rerouting in Michigan will work to the advantage of the service. But the physical burdens which are to be thrown upon carriers and their horses are such that it is improbable that the forthcoming winter's demonstration will prove anything other than that the rearrangements are vitally hostile to even passably acceptable rural mail service.

For example—and it is but one example out of many that are available—we are advised of one Michigan instance where three routes have been consolidated into two, with the result that the two new routes are

each in excess of 30 miles in length, and each entirely beyond the physical capacity of a carrier and horse to serve daily in the winter time. Even as the routes originally existed, one of the three routes (where there are now but two) was 26 miles in length, and it was all the carrier could do to cover his ground. The carrier on this 26-mile route has always had to work a long day even in the fairest weather. At some times he has been forced to labor far into the night to cover his route. In the worst weather he has frequently been forced to make a portion of his trip on foot. What possible chance for his existence would a carrier have if 4 more miles were added to such a route; and what more inhuman burden could be put upon a horse; and under these latter conditions what chance has the rural free-delivery patron for continuous and satisfactory service?

After a rural carrier has toiled for years, faithfully serving his patrons under conditions that were frequently exhausting, it seems to the Herald that he has earned something better than summary discharge in the name of impossible "economy." One such carrier, for example, after 30 years in the Postal Service and after nearly 6 years of continuous satisfactory service on a particularly trying route, has been discharged with just 12 days' notice.

Another carrier, whose name can not be given because of the penalty which lese majeste involves at present, comments to the Herald (in private protest against the new burden put upon him) as follows:

"I believe I know as much about what a man and horse ought to stand as a correspondence-school department clerk with a map of our county before him."

Certainly it is an axiom that a rural free-delivery carrier can not be efficient if he is overburdened. Inefficient service can not disguise itself in the name of "economy."

The new plans that are now being worked out for Michigan are a serious menace to the welfare of rural free delivery as we see it. If the contrary can possibly come true, however, we shall thank Heaven for the miracle.

The problem is a serious one for farmers and rural-route residents. If they like the new arrangements, let them say so. If they do not, let them be equally assertive, because no iniquity can stand against persistent publicity. The Herald wants to hear from the people on these rerouted routes.

MINNESOTA.

That the department's reorganization of the mail service in the State of Minnesota was unsatisfactory to the patrons is clearly shown by the articles and resolutions which I herewith submit and desire printed in the RECORD, summarized as follows:

(1) Announcement carried under date of August 10 in the Anoka (Minn.) Herald.

(2) Article appearing under date of December 1 in the Litchfield (Minn.) Independent.

(3) Article appearing in the Saturday Review (Litchfield, Minn.) shortly after the above article appeared.

(4) Article appearing under date of August 19, in the Ortanville (Minn.) Journal.

The Anoka (Minn.) Herald of August 10 makes the following announcement:

Orders from the office of the Postmaster General were received at the various post offices in Anoka County Saturday which worked havoc in the splendid Rural Mail Service which has been built up in the county during the past ten years or more.

So far as is known, no inspector has visited the county to examine the routes and the needs of the people whom they serve. The order seems to be the result of a pin-headed effort at the department in Washington to cripple the service here in order to reduce the carrier force and show a paper saving in expense at the cost of the taxpayers' discomfort.

The Herald learns that four of the rural routes leaving the Anoka post office have been materially increased in length—from 5 to 6 miles each. Route No. 1 has been lengthened 5 miles. Joseph Clark is carrier. Route No. 2 has been extended 5 miles. Route No. 3, Forest Hunter carrier, has been changed very largely. * * * This route may possibly be handled in the summer, but in the winter can not be on account of a part of the road being abandoned in the winter from lack of travel and much snow. In making this change the department deprived Crooked Lake of Free Delivery Service.

Route No. 4, served by Archie Lang, has also been changed. Route No. 5, carried by James Green, has not yet been disturbed. In St. Francis, route No. 2, carried by Harry Miner, has been transferred to Isanti; route No. 1, by Albert Steinke, transferred to Bethel; and route No. 3, John Emmons, appears to have been discontinued. From Constance there are two routes: Route No. 1, carried by Oel Wold, and route No. 2, carried by Sam Severson. These have been increased. Carrier Laughlin's route from Fridley seems to have been discontinued.

There are 14 routes in Anoka County. Nearly all are affected and all to the detriment, apparently, of the people served.

The objection from the patrons will be vigorous, but whether of any use is a question.

The new arrangement goes into effect on August 16—next Monday—too short a time in which to bring pressure to bear upon the department and the individual responsible for the unfortunate change.

The Newcastle (Pa.) Herald printed the following editorial in its issue of August 11:

Postmaster General Burleson has denied with some heat the charge that rural free delivery was being restricted or that extensions were made where they are made at the expense of the carriers. The murmuring which has pursued the order reestablishing a number of routes, with the result of cutting out some thousands of carriers, has brought a rejoinder from the head of the department. He has come to the front with the suggestion that what he has done has been in the interest of efficiency and economy.

In the first place he declares that "retraces" have been eliminated; that all overlapping of routes has been cut out; and that each route has been made to bear the maximum. This has produced such a saving, he says, that a large number of carriers have been dispensed with, while the saving has made possible a big extension in the services where the extension has seemed to be needed.

Mr. Burleson's statement is a virtual admission that the economy practiced in his department is at the expense of the underpaid mail carriers. It is an admission that what has been achieved in the way of increasing the service without increasing the cost has been brought about by laying a heavier burden upon the backs of those whom we might call the day laborers of the Post Office Service.

The general managers and the thousand and one high-salaried officers with their brass cuspidors and mahogany furniture are still on the job at Washington with no suggestion from Mr. Burleson that they shorten their golf hours and increase the hours of service. With the increase of cost of government at Washington growing at the rate of $1,000,000 a week and the levy of a war tax upon the citizens of the country to pay for the official extravagances of the administration it is ironical to suggest the niggardly, petty, and foolhardy economy which has been put in force by Burleson, adding burdens upon already overworked shoulders and eliminating from service some to whom the employment was a prime necessity. Such grotesque and fanciful economies perform no good for the people, nor will the people be deceived by them while at the same time there proceeds waste which is so obvious and so flagrant.

The following appeared in a recent issue of the Troy (Pa.) Gazette-Register:

The Democratic administration at Washington would go far and seek long for campaign material which could be used to better advantage by its adversaries than the unreasonable demands which it is making upon the rural mail carriers. Here in Troy the carriers are not getting in from their routes until 7 o'clock, and it is the middle of August with roads in fairly good condition. What will the hour be in winter? Not earlier, certainly, than 8.30 to 9. Talk about an eight-hour day for Government employees, there's nothing to it so far as the rural carriers are concerned under the present administration. Then, too, it fired a lot of perfectly good men without cause on two weeks' notice; men who had been long in the service and were ill-prepared to undertake the readjustment forced upon them by the loss of their jobs. No reputable business house discharges good men without cause on so short notice, nor should the Government.

On December 1, the Litchfield (Minn.) Independent published this item:

Anoka has an auto rural free delivery route—length, 55 miles; pay, $1,800 per year. He takes the place of two carriers, at $1,200 each—a saving of $600. The auto carrier can easily make a trip twice as long as the ordinary route, and the intention is to put in these double routes as fast as it can be done, as a measure of economy.

A few days later the Saturday Review, another Litchfield publication, printed this communication:

EDITOR SATURDAY REVIEW: The last issue of the Independent contains a short editorial commenting upon the establishment of rural routes twice the length of the ordinary route, mentioning the one laid out in Anoka as an example of what can be done.

The Independent man says that "The auto carrier can easily make a trip twice as long as the ordinary route." If Mr. Peterson had ever left the beaten path from his print shop to the post office during the winter and spring seasons in this Northwest he would know, as everyone knows who will give one moment's thought to the matter, that such automobile routes are absolutely impracticable in the Northwest. Perhaps the Independent man can, by reason of his farseeing and unsound logic, tell us what sort of service the rural population will get when the routes are doubled in length. An auto can be used a part of the time in the Northwest—for six or eight months; but what of the rest of the year? Some people are so party blind that they will overstep the bounds of consistency in their frantic endeavors to show their approval of any old action their favorite party or party appointees may take on public matters.

The Independent has at various times shown its profound lack of knowledge of rural-route work and the growth of the rural service. A year ago at the close of the holiday season the editor stated that "even" the rural routes supplied a large portion of the holiday mail.

A MEEKER COUNTY CARRIER.

The Ortonville (Minn.) Journal, August 19, prints this editorial:

The Postmaster General has promulgated a move to use automobiles on rural routes and then double up the routes. Offices that now have six routes will maintain three, and where there are three they will undoubtedly all be consolidated into one route, one carrier serving all the patrons of the office with an auto.

This may mean a saving to the department, but it will mean the throwing out of employment of thousands that have no other means of support, and the money thus saved, in a political way, will go toward the creation of another new office, perhaps inspector of carrier autos, or something else just as foolish, in order to give some string-pulling politician a job, and the patrons of the various offices will not receive the service they are getting to-day, for there will be many stormy days, and days when the roads are bad, that the machines can not operate, and the farmers' mail will lie in the office.

Under the present system, the carriers go, regardless of weather conditions, and they all have a tender spot in the hearts of the people. A howl should go up from all parts of the country against this move, as no possible good can come from it for the people at large.

The Osseo (Minn.) Review of November 24 says:

Somebody made a fearful blunder. No preparation was made for routing the carriers from Anoka who took the routes away from Osseo. The carriers are confused. They are new in the mail service. They do not seem to realize their responsibility. They seem to have no definite route and do not sort their mail according to any system, and deliver it on the route in a haphazard way. On the route east of the Osseo-Anoka road and toward the river the carrier has been within a mile of Osseo at 7.30 in the evening.

It is generally supposed that when a rural carrier falls through any cause to cover his route before dark he must take the shortest route to his post office and reach it in the shortest possible time.

The change has been in effect now for a week. In some cases people have reported that they have received mail but a couple of times; in some cases some mail every day, but most of that belonging to neighbors. If a mail carrier can't learn his route in a week he will never learn it.

Ed Koenig claims to have received no first-class mail since the change up to Saturday night—four days. Fred Wolter, no mail in four days than that of his neighbors. Nick Aubart takes two daily papers

but received none for four days. While standing in the office the writer heard John Aubart inquire if the rural delivery had been discontinued. He thought so, because he had received no mail for five days. "Well, if that is going to be the outcome of the change I will rent a box in the post office here, for I am in town two or three times a week," said Mr. Aubart. Mrs. M. H. Bennet is very much dissatisfied. She receives mail, but mainly that of her neighbors. Then the telephone is resorted to to notify those who have mail left at her house or in her box.

Then the Peterson boys, P. S. and T. L., arrive at the post office. "We don't want to register a kick, but would like to know what has become of our mail, as we have not received any since the change was made." This was several days after the change. Gabe Zimmerman received some mail but it was not his own. C. W. Purdham received one paper in four days. E. I. Cropley missed mail the 16th and 17th, the carrier being told by a neighbor where he lived. Ole T. Berg has received no Scandinavian papers and talks strongly of getting his mail in Minneapolis. Paul Schmidt received no mail for several days, and the carrier did not take the mail left in the box, so Mrs. Schmidt had to drive to Osseo to mail her letters. Mrs. Schmidt lives 2 miles from Osseo.

Joseph Leger and J. C. Staige had no mail up to Saturday, and Leo Wolter came in Saturday and asked if they are yet having rural-delivery service or if his part of Hennepin County had been abandoned. H. H. A. Schmidt came into this office Tuesday this week and stated that out of about 13 papers he takes he only received 2 last week. The Osseo Review went into the hands of the carrier Thursday morning and he did not get it until Saturday evening. This is almost criminal. Mr. Schmidt lives only 3 miles from the post office here, and to think of it taking nearly three days for the local paper to reach him is most damnable. The Review wants to ask the Anoka postmaster what becomes of this mail?

From the part of the route above mentioned east of the Osseo-Anoka Road, 23 people are now getting their mail from the Osseo post office, refusing to have it delivered by any one from Anoka. About 10 more are talking strongly of moving their boxes over on Osseo route No. 1. If they do this, it will take 33 boxes from this route, nearly half that was on old route No. 6.

The people in general say they are not going to stand for everybody handling their mail, nor are they going to stand for it being left at schoolhouses or with children to care for. They say the old routes were satisfactory, the old carriers were always accurate, and everybody was thoroughly satisfied. All say, give us back what we had in the same way we had it.

Several days before these complaints were registered the following petition was sent (November 15) to Washington from Osseo:

OSSEO, MINN., *November 15, 1915.*

Hon. ALBERT BURLESON,
Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In writing this letter to you we wish to advise that we have called a meeting of "protest" regarding the change of mail service affecting the routes Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 6 out of Osseo, and changes made in routes Nos. 4, 5, and 1, and are setting forth our reasons in this letter why the present standard and satisfaction should be maintained:

1. All mail will be 24 hours late for all patrons and 46 hours late for the greater part of patrons on three routes.

2. Ninety-six per cent of the people affected by change in routes do all their business in Osseo and not in Anoka.

3. Thirty families that receive their mail at the door and are cut out from service, and all families on any route will not receive any better service from proposed change.

4. Shippers of cattle and sheep receiving notices of shipment would receive their mail from Anoka, going via St. Cloud, Minn., and same would be delivered to Osseo three days late, and this affects the greater part of three routes.

We therefore ask you to give this matter careful consideration, a matter which vitally concerns patrons in a thickly settled community, and which change will result in nothing but dissatisfaction, and hope to see you restore the former good service.

Yours, very truly,

THE OSSEO FARMERS' CLUB,
B. V. DIBB, *President.*
H. W. GRAY, *Secretary.*

The club appointed P. Rougier, B. V. Dibb, and John Schrieber as a committee to go with other club committees from here, Robbinsdale, Hopkins, and St. Louis Park to see State and county committeemen, Congressmen, and Representatives, besides holding an audience with Gov. Hammond, in hopes of holding up the change until proper facts and business data can be secured, showing clearly the inadvisability of making this change.

It appears from all the information obtainable that this change, which let out the two oldest carriers out of Osseo, has created a hatred toward the guilty parties that will be felt for a long time to come.

OHIO.

That the department's reorganization of the mail service in the State of Ohio was unsatisfactory to patrons is clearly shown by the articles and resolutions which I herewith submit and desire printed in the RECORD, summarized as follows:

(1) Article appearing in the Ohio State Journal, of Columbus, Ohio, under date of December 30.

A Washington dispatch under date of December 30 to the Ohio State Journal, of Columbus, Ohio, says:

Protests against the Post Office Department plans to motorize the Rural Delivery Service in Ohio are being received by all of the Ohio Members of Congress whose districts are affected. Representative SIMEON D. FESS will add his personal protest when he returns from Ohio to that of numerous constituents.

Objections in the proposed changes which the reorganization would make in Greene, Madison, and Warren Counties are being expressed in strong language in letters received there. It is feared that under the reorganization Yellow Springs, the home of Representative FESS, would lose all its rural routes. Other protests come from Spring Valley, Greene County, based on the supposition that under the reorganization all rural routes in the county would radiate from Xenia.

OKLAHOMA.

That the department's reorganization of the mail service in the State of Oklahoma was unsatisfactory to the patrons is clearly shown by the articles and resolutions which I herewith submit and desire printed in the RECORD, summarized as follows:

(1) Article appearing in the Lahoma (Okla.) Sun.

(2) Article appearing under date of November 18 in the McClain County News, Blanchard, Okla.

(3) Article appearing in the Kiel (Okla.) Record.

(4) Article appearing in the Drummond (Okla.) Messenger.

(5) Article appearing in the Okeene Leader.

(6) Article appearing in the Perry (Okla.) Republic August 26.

The Lahoma (Okla.) Sun in a recent issue published the following:

As was predicted when the change to automobiles was made in the Rural Mail Service, there is a great deal of dissatisfaction all over the country. The change in the routes has the same effect elsewhere that it has here, and is causing many patrons to get their mail one day late besides other inconveniences.

The change was doubtless made with good intentions, but there has never been a more serious blunder by our Postal Department. Our Rural Mail Service has been the greatest service which our Government has performed for the farmers, and that service has now been badly crippled.

Now is the time to cause the authorities to feel the weight of public opinion, and the way to do this is to bring all possible influence to bear on the Government. Those who are dissatisfied with the present service should take pains to let their sentiments be known. A personal letter or a petition to your Congressman or Senator is a very efficient way to do this. Now that Congress is in session, both Congressmen and Senators are being deluged with protests, and everyone who desires a resumption of the former service should let their wishes be known.

The McClain County News, published at Blanchard, Okla., on November 18, published this:

Postmaster General Burleson's scheme to consolidate rural routes goes merrily on. We have heard much kicking on the combining of routes. The department claims it is saving money, but the test is not satisfactory to the people.

The farmers were getting good service, but it was too good to suit the politicians. The carriers were getting only a living out of their work, and after a year's work serving a consolidated route they will be in debt, and when this kind of service falls through it will be a blotch on the business ability of the administration for the Republicans and Socialists to hold up to ridicule.

Several routes have already blown up, but the people generally have not been told about it. It will all come out in the next presidential campaign. President Wilson is more than likely innocent of the bungle, but in a campaign the Chief Magistrate generally has to bear the burden of his subordinate's mistakes. We hope the Democratic managers will call a halt before this goes any further. A good way to help save the day at the next election would be to have A. S. Burleson resign.

The town of Washington may not appreciate losing a rural route and a good family. Congressmen sometimes win on election day by their ability to secure a Federal building, but a rural route is worth a Federal building every three years. There is no bragging about it being done where it hits.

There will be a so-called civil-service examination at Purcell on December 11, to determine the eligibles for motor-vehicle routes out of Byars and Purcell.

We think an examination in this case and on all consolidated routes is uncalled for and an injustice to the carriers who are already in the civil service.

This item was taken from the Kiel (Okla.) Record of a few days ago:

For the past several days there has been no mail taken on the rural routes out of the Kiel post office. The postmaster received orders to consolidate routes Nos. 1 and 2 and place same as motor route A and have one man make the route. The postmaster has used his every effort to secure some one who would take the position, but can not. The route would be 58 miles long, and would be a money-losing proposition at the salary offered. A petition has been circulated and signed by nearly every patron of this office, asking the Postmaster General to change the routes back as they formerly were.

The Drummond (Okla.) Messenger published the following in a recent issue:

A petition is being circulated among those on the rural mail route out of Drummond, but now from Enid, to change to the former route. For three days last week there was no mail delivered on this route, and the petition states that since August 1 the services have been very unsatisfactory and each day the mail is delivered at different hours, if at all, and each day a part of the mail is carried by or put in the wrong boxes. On September 14, 15, and 16 there was no mail delivered at all to patrons from Drummond office. Because of the service seemingly being worse each day the patrons desire to change. The petition is left at the Gregg store.

The Okeene Leader, Blaine County, Okla., published the following as a news item about 10 days ago:

Last Tuesday morning the rural mail carriers out of Okeene refused to make their routes. Since the department ordered the routes consolidated they have been served by temporary carriers appointed by the postmaster, who, after trying the long routes for some time, have decided that they could not make them on the stated salary. The postmaster being unable to secure carriers, the patrons are without the daily visit of the mail man.

The Perry (Okla.) Republic on August 26 printed the following:

The failure of the Democrats to pass the Post Office appropriation bill in the last Congress has shamefully crippled the rural free delivery service.

Members of Congress declare that complaints they are receiving from both rural carriers and patrons have been more numerous and bitter in the last few months than for years before.

Rural carriers claim that they have suffered chiefly on two counts—one, that, although they are under civil service, there have been hundreds of dismissals without just cause; the other, that their routes have been lengthened and their work increased without additional pay.

The complaints from patrons of the rural routes are uniformly based upon sweeping reductions in the service.

The conditions causing these complaints are due to the failure of the Post Office appropriation bill and the consequent necessity for managing the Postal Service under a reenactment of last year's appropriation.

The principal changes ordered by the department reducing the carrier force arose first by the proposed consolidation of about 1,500 routes 25 miles long into half that number 50 miles long; second, in lengthening the standard routes and still further reducing the carrier force; third, by making one carrier serve two routes on alternate days and dropping the extra carrier. It is estimated that more than 2,000 rural carriers have lost their places under these reductions.

The patrons of the rural routes base their criticisms, first, on the claim that many have had to move their mail boxes at least a half mile from their former locations, and they, instead of the carriers, must travel that distance for mail; second, that instead of getting mail six times a week they receive it only every other day; third, all these changes cripple the effectiveness of the parcel-post service, especially as to perishable goods. There is also a general complaint of the curtailment of the rural free delivery service.

Mass meetings of patrons have been held in many localities protesting against the demoralization of their service and are daily becoming more frequent.

PENNSYLVANIA.

That the department's reorganization of the mail service in the State of Pennsylvania was unsatisfactory to patrons is clearly shown by the articles and resolutions which I herewith submit and desire printed in the RECORD, summarized as follows:

(1) Report of the committee on resolutions of the Ponoma Grange, No. 23, Bradford County, Pa., passed on May 27 and 28, 1915.

(2) Article appearing in the Cannonsburg (Pa.) Daily Notes in its issue of October 4.

(3) Article appearing in the Easton (Pa.) Free Press.

(4) Article appearing in the Washington (Pa.) News October 28, 1915.

(5) Article appearing in the Gazette-Times of Pittsburgh, Pa., under date of December 22, 1915.

(6) Articles appearing in the Daily Notes, published at Cannonsburg, Pa., on November 26, 27, and 29.

(7) Article appearing in the Pennsylvania Farmer, published at Philadelphia, in its issue of January 1, 1916.

On May 27 and 28 last the Bradford County (Pa.) Pomona Grange, No. 23, Patrons of Husbandry, held its one hundred and forty-seventh quarterly session at New Albany, Pa. Here is what its resolutions committee reported. The report was unanimously adopted:

Whereas the Rural Free Delivery Service, which was established in Bradford County more than 14 years ago, and since has been extended to nearly all its accessible portions, and has afforded to its patrons great benefits not previously enjoyed by them, and has proved very satisfactory in every particular; and

Whereas changes made in the service by the Post Office Department, whereby some routes have been curtailed, some extended too far for efficient service, and others abolished entirely, have resulted in an impaired and inefficient service; and

Whereas it is reported that other changes are contemplated by the department which, if made, will seriously hamper and injure the service: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Pomona Grange, No. 23, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bradford County, Pa., now assembled, That any curtailment, extension, or abolishment of this service which impairs its efficiency or deprives its patrons of its privileges will be regarded by this body as a backward step in our mail service and one that will do its members and the public at large incalculable harm, for it will be an abridgment and deprivation of rights and benefits which in many ways have been of inestimable benefit. The service as now operated is the growth and product of 14 years and use, and is satisfactory and successful, and any radical changes should be carefully considered and not adopted until after an inspection of the route by a competent official.

For these reasons we hereby enter our most earnest protest against any further mutilation of a service which has proved so great an educative force and benefit to all the people whom it serves.

A New Albany newspaper, commenting on this resolution, says:

The resolution created tense interest and after a general discussion was adopted, and the secretary was instructed to send copies to the Postmaster General, the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, the United States Senators from this State, and the Representative in Congress from this congressional district.

The Canonsburg (Pa.) Daily Notes, in its issue of October 4, says:

The people of the Canonsburg district and of the entire county are encouraged with regard to the matter of reestablishment of the Rural Mail Service to the condition in which it was found before the change made a few months since went into effect. In the Canonsburg district the people are signing petitions to the department at Washington, and these will be forwarded inside of a few days. At the same time news comes from Washington to the effect that an efficient inspector will be in Washington County inside of a few days, and that he will make a close inspection of the routes as they were and as they now are, of the service as it was and as it is, and that he will recommend such changes as the facts may warrant.

This is encouraging. It is now, we take it, up to the people along the different rural lines in the county to speak to the department, not only by means of the petitions which are being signed but also by letter and by word of mouth to the inspector when he comes, and let it be known that the service as it now is is unsatisfactory, and to ask for the restoration of the service to the condition which it was in before the changes were made.

It is certainly true that the rural service in the Canonsburg district was changed for the worse and not for the better. The people are dissatisfied. They want the service restored to what it was. They are petitioning to that effect. Let them continue to speak through petitions and letters, and let them also arrange to meet the inspector when he comes into the district and make their wishes known to him. He will, we feel assured, give due consideration to the patrons of the lines. The Notes feels that the people along the rural lines can get what they want if only they will work wisely, energetically, and persistently.

The Easton (Pa.) Free Press, in a recent issue, says:

Farmer John A. McSparran, worthy master of the State Grange of Pennsylvania, does not approve of the attempts of Postmaster General Burleson to economize at the expense of efficiency in the Rural Delivery Service. McSparran has personal knowledge of the needs of farmers in the way of mail service and also knows a few things about the distance a horse can travel. In both respects he has the advantage of the Postmaster General, whose experience for 14 years was in Congress, where he never served on the Post Office Committee, and for 11 years prior thereto in legal offices in Texas.

In a recent signed article discussing orders for the extension of rural routes, McSparran points out that longer routes will mean that carriers will reach town late in the evening, too late for outgoing trains, and as a result the letter written by the farmer the night before must lie over until the following day before it is put on the train.

The Pennsylvania Granger also asserts that, judging by experience, a horse can not stand a 30-mile trip every other day unless he makes the trip at too slow a pace to suit the farmer who wants and is entitled to reasonably good mail service.

The Washington (Pa.) News of October 28 says:

There will be no improvement of the rural route delivery system in Washington County this year, and in all probability not until it is accomplished under a Republican administration. All the promises and pledges given by the postal authorities, both here and at the National Capital, of an early "inquiry" that would result in correcting the multitudinous faults developed under the recent crippling of the rural route system is nothing more than poppycock. True, an "investigation" may be made, but the News desires to go on record here and now as predicting that the "inquiry" will accomplish just about what the Redfield inquiry into the *Eastland* disaster accomplished and what all other inquiries made by the administration have resulted in to date—"whitewashes," pure and simple. That's it exactly. Absolutely nothing will be accomplished. The investigator may hear complaints, of which there will be plenty, and give suave and polite assurances of "doing everything in his power to correct conditions," and that will be the end of it. He will come to Washington at the public expense, kill a little time making a bluff at earning his salary, and return to the Capital, make his "report," and nothing more will ever be heard of the matter.

If there is anyone who is inclined to believe that there may be some remedial action taken, we offer the word of James I. Blakslee, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, for final proof to the contrary. Mr. Blakslee, who exercises jurisdiction over the rural route system, in an address before the convention of first and second class postmasters, recently held at Washington, referred specifically to the situation in Washington County.

"There are only 99 boxes in Washington County," he said, "where people who are served by rural routes are inconvenienced, and this does not represent a total of more than 247 patrons. The changes made last summer reduced the cost of rural mail service in Washington County several hundred dollars."

It is evident what Mr. Blakslee's ideas are relative to the Washington County situation. He is both peevish and pronounced in his attitude. Obviously he has more faith in the source of his information than Washington and Washington County people have, since he doesn't know so much about the inability of the source to tell a thing truthfully when he tries.

It is also quite evident that Mr. Blakslee has been grossly misinformed as to the extent of the hardships the curtailing of the rural system here has imposed. He does not know, apparently, that it will be a physical impossibility to expect a carrier to cover, under winter conditions, the whole territory in a single day embraced by some of the readjusted routes. Yes; there are a whole lot of things Mr. Blakslee doesn't know about the local situation, and which, for the good of certain "deserving Democrats" we might name, he doesn't want to know.

The Gazette-Times, of Pittsburgh, Pa., printed this news item under a State College date line of December 22:

Lengthening the rural mail routes in this State has cost the grangers $8,000,000 and greatly added to the inconvenience of farm life, it is charged in two resolutions offered to-day at the annual session of the Pennsylvania State Grange. It was declared that the Federal Post Office Department stretched 20-mile routes to 50 miles, to the detriment of both carrier and patrons. The grangers want the routes shortened, so that the rural residents can be served with mail as they were before the readjustment.

The chief complaint came from the master of Oxford Grange, No. 67, of Chester County, and his grievance was supported by H. S. Rankin, master of Pomona Grange, No. 16, of Washington County.

The National Stockman and Farmer, of Pittsburgh, Pa., quoting in its issue of January 1 from the address of Grange Master John R. McSparron at the forty-third annual convention of the Pennsylvania State Grange at State College, Pa., recently says in part:

The developments of the last year with regard to the delivery of county mail can hardly be looked upon by grangers with satisfaction. The introduction into the proposition of the question of making it pay expenses can hardly be agreed to, as the development heretofore has not paid, but no one complains, because it is service and not revenue that the Post Office Department was established to furnish. We are firmly of the opinion that the system that will render the best service must be based upon the distance and speed that a horse can travel in the time allowed. We are confident that the 20-mile route, with

corresponding salary, is the wise basis for all seasons; then if the carrier wants to use an auto when conditions are favorable let him do so, and when an auto can not go, the horse can still render the service efficiently.

The Pennsylvania Farmer, published at Philadelphia, in its issue of January 1 says:

It is said that where there is smoke there must be fire, and the almost universal complaint on the part of the rural people about the service they are receiving from the rural delivery routes since the changes have been made by the department indicate that there must be something radically wrong. The lengthening and rerouting of the routes was said to be done in the interest of economy, but if this is achieved at the expense of efficiency it is a mighty unsatisfactory kind of economy. Country people have a right to kick at the result, and they should place their kicks where they will count most. It took years of effort on their part to establish rural delivery, a service that was long past due when it was instituted, and if the officials think they can safely withdraw it or cripple it they will find their mistake. We understand many farmers are cut off entirely; others compelled to go long distances to a box, and in many instances the trip is made so long as to make it almost impossible for the carrier to make it in time to deliver mail to outgoing trains. Nothing has done more to improve country life and link it to the life of the world than rural mail delivery, and what is needed and just is extension of its service, not curtailment. The Government is making great pretensions—in fact, is rendering good service—in other directions for the benefit of agriculture and the improvement of rural life, but let it not forget that they who are living the life out on the farms of our land and raising the food for the millions have other interests in life than tilling the soil and raising bigger crops. Let there be no hypocrisy in this work, neither underestimation of the character and force of the people who live out on the farms. Since economy is needed in order to meet the Treasury's needs, let there be a reduction in the size of the pork barrel and a more serious questioning whether intelligence, good service, and justice are not quite as important in the schemes of "preparedness" as armies and battleships.

The Daily Notes, published at Canonsburg, Pa., printed the following editorials, respectively, on November 26, 27, and 29:

The Post Office Department, not content with discontinuing one of the five rural mail routes from Canonsburg, which was done the past summer, has now ordered that a second route be discontinued at the close of the present month. Beginning with December there will be only three rural routes from the Canonsburg post office. At one time there were six.

Why the Post Office Department is taking this action is not known here, but it is said the movement is in the interest of economy. It certainly is not in the interest of efficiency or in the interest of the people residing in the Canonsburg community. As a result of the change, many people who make Canonsburg their trading center will be greatly inconvenienced. Their mail will be delivered from other towns.

Moreover, there is hardly a business concern in Greater Canonsburg that will not be to a more or less extent a loser by the change in the rural mail service. The Canonsburg business district, already circumscribed, is made even more so by the changes in the mail routes. To reach a party residing only 4 or 5 miles from here a letter must first be sent to Washington, Hickory, or Venetia, and will require at least 24 hours, and in many instances 30 hours, to reach its destination. The rural mail service at Canonsburg is rapidly becoming a joke.

The chamber of commerce will be in session to-night. The body should by all means take some action looking to a restoration of the rural mail service to what formerly it was. The discontinuing of two routes within a short period means less business at the local post office; it means less business for Canonsburg firms; it means a crippled mail service and one that will cause great inconvenience to many families in the community.

Let the chamber of commerce consider the matter to-night and take what action is deemed best to restore the mail service to what it formerly was. There is higher authority at Washington than Inspector Knight, who recently made a hurried trip to this county to inform the people what would not be done.

Let the chamber of commerce act.

A satisfactory rural mail service is necessary to the business success of the town. Merchants, bankers, real estate men, are you going to sit still and see the trade of the town injured by cheap politicians at Washington, D. C., who must do something to show that they are necessary? Why not arouse yourselves and act through your chamber of commerce? Now is the time to act—not three months from now. Let the chamber of commerce at its meeting this evening indorse the movement for a restoration of our free rural mail delivery to what it was in the days before it was tinkered with, and let it instruct the civic department of the chamber to take up this work and push it.

Is it not discouraging to all friends of progress that 15 years after the rural mail service was established in the Canonsburg district that the service is very decidedly poorer than it was when first established? It certainly is. We talk about "progress along all lines," but in the case of rural mail delivery the progress is that of the crab—backward instead of forward. Is not that something to be ashamed of, and is it not time for the community, town, and country to wake up and make a united push to have the service restored to what it was 15 years ago? We can do it; but we can not do it by keeping quiet, by sitting around sucking our thumbs and supposing that we have no rights except what some little two-by-four Post Office Department inspector sees fit to dole out to us. The time has come to don our fighting clothes and to go to it.

We hear of one who says in discussing the question of the rural mail service that the American people are asking too much of the Post Office Department in these days. But who owns the Post Office Department and who pays the expenses of conducting it? Why, the people, of course; and this being so, the people have the right to have the kind of service they desire. The post-office business is the people's business. It belongs to them, and not to the officials who for the time have charge of it. They are the people's hired men, and they should conduct business as their employers wish it conducted or get down and out.

Looks as though Canonsburg had been the goat in the rearranging of the rural mail service in Washington County. Are the people going to stand for it? It is up to them. They do not have to. They can have the former efficient and satisfactory service restored in spite of the two-by-four inspectors if they will assert themselves. There is no doubt about it. But lying down and keeping quiet will not get anywhere.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

That the department's reorganization of the mail service in the State of South Dakota was unsatisfactory to patrons is clearly shown by the article which I herewith submit and desire printed in the RECORD, summarized as follows:

(1) Article appearing in the Sisseton (S. Dak.) Weekly Standard. The Standard in a recent issue says:

Postmaster General Burleson's lack of horse sense in the management of his department is causing much dissatisfaction on rural routes, and Congressmen are receiving so many complaints that an effort will be made during the present session of Congress to define just how the routes shall be operated, and, further, to limit the powers of the head of the Postal Department. Ever since he stepped into office it has been evident that Burleson is a visionary theorist, without proper knowledge of the needs of the service or conditions under which service is to be rendered. His latest scheme is to double the length of the rural routes and require carriers to provide themselves with automobiles. This plan no doubt appears fine to a man basking in the sunshine of Washington, where road conditions are the very best the year round, but think of that sort of service out here, where roads are often drifted full of snow for four months of the year and impassable for weeks at a time during a wet summer. A fine mail service our farmers would have under this automobile plan!

TEXAS.

That the department's reorganization of the mail service in the State of Texas was unsatisfactory to the patrons is clearly shown by the articles and resolutions which I herewith submit and desire printed in the RECORD, summarized as follows:

(1) Article appearing in the Farmers' Fireside Bulletin, of Arlington, Tex., issue of November 10.

The Farmers' Fireside Bulletin, of Arlington, Tex., publishes this in its issue of November 10:

Farmers' Fireside Bulletin has a copy of the organ or the Rural Letter Carriers' Association of the United States in which scores of letters from farmers in every part of the country served by rural carriers are protesting against the new measure of the Post Office Department in displacing from two to three horse-drawn vehicles with one motor vehicle in an attempt to work economy in delivering mail to rural routes. In these articles farmers, from Iowa to Ohio and from the Lakes to the Gulf, protest, asserting that such merging not only will cause a ruthless loss to carriers who are let out with large investment of useless horses and vehicles on hand, but that the new service is proving very unsatisfactory in almost every particular. Of course Farmers' Fireside Bulletin knows nothing about this matter, but surely the farmers along such routes do know. And it seems there is almost a unanimous objection on their part.

Now, as a rural mail service was inaugurated after a hard fight by farmers themselves, and is ostensibly for their benefit, they should be better judges than even the Postmaster General and all his assistants in Washington. Anyway, Farmers' Fireside Bulletin's columns are open to this important discussion. The following from a Farmers' Union local is a case in point:

"Whereas there is an effort being made to have rural route No. 1 from Newport discontinued and motor route from Jacksboro established in its place; and

"Whereas we know from long residence in this country that conditions of the roads on account of their rough, rocky condition, unbridged streams, and having to cross the West Fork of Trinity River twice, said river being uncrossable often for a week or more at a time on account of high water and muddy bottoms, would make service by motor vehicle impossible much of the time and unreliable all of the time; and

"Whereas the rural service by horse-drawn vehicles has always been satisfactory to patrons of this route and, we believe, all others; and

"Whereas the rural service by horse-drawn vehicles has furnished the rural citizens a market for millions of dollars' worth of their products—namely, horses, hogs, poultry, eggs, grain, hay, etc.—and by the establishment of motor routes this will be taken from them and given to the oil producers and motor manufacturers; and

"Whereas all parties being served by this and all other routes, to our knowledge, are satisfied with the present service: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, By the Antioch Local No. 344 of the Farmers' Union, that we ask our Congressmen and Senators to protest and to file a vigorous protest with the Post Office Department against further action along this line.

J. P. KENNEDY, *President*.
T. C. HOM, *Secretary*.

WISCONSIN.

That the department's reorganization of the mail service in the State of Wisconsin was unsatisfactory to patrons is clearly shown by the article which I herewith submit and desire printed in the RECORD, summarized as follows:

(1) Article appearing in the Milwaukee Ledger.

The Milwaukee Ledger, in a recent Sunday issue, makes the following observation:

The program of the Post Office Department to motorize the Rural Free Delivery Service is, according to Members of the Congress who are here, to be vigorously opposed when the Congress reconvenes. It doesn't appeal to some of them.

The rural carriers throughout the country are seeking the support of Members of the Congress for a campaign against the proposed change in the service. Their opposition comes from the fact that wherever an automobile service is established carriers are displaced. In Indiana, for instance, only one county, Tippecanoe, has been placed under automobile service. This new service, which will go into effect September 1 in this county, will require 22 carriers.

The county is now covered by 36 routes. Under the new arrangement 14 carriers with automobiles will do the service now performed by 36 carriers. If this county, it is pointed out, is a safe guide, and it is regarded as a representative county, 61 per cent of the rural carriers in Indiana will lose their places when the automobile service shall become complete throughout the State. The same ratio of loss of places would, of course, extend throughout the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. And I shall yield him some time also if he desires it.

The CHAIRMAN. How much?

Mr. LANGLEY. I will decide how much when it becomes necessary.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, as the omnibus pension bill is now under consideration I felt this to be an appropriate time to submit a few observations with reference to the committee in charge of this bill. I am not now a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, but I served on that committee in the Sixty-second Congress, and I claim to know something about the workings of the committee and to know something of the unjust criticisms that have been hurled at the committee from time to time by a few Members on the floor of this House; and I for one, Mr. Chairman, feel that Members of the House other than members of the Committee on Invalid Pensions should make the defense to which they feel the committee is entitled.

During my five years' service in this House I have heard attack after attack made upon the floor of the House by a few gentlemen who oppose the passage of private pension bills. I have heard the charge of pork hurled at the committee, and as one who has served on the committee I want to say that I do not believe that there is a committee of this House or in any other legislative body that is fairer in its procedure than is the Committee on Invalid Pensions of this House. [Applause.]

Then we hear some complaints of a private nature that reflect upon this committee and other committees of this House, and I shall refer to one of those complaints, which is contained in a letter written by the secretary to one of the most prominent Members of this House and one of the most prominent Republicans in the United States. I want to say, first, that I make no charge against the Member himself unless he refuses, by his silence or otherwise, to disclaim responsibility for the letter which I shall read; but a Member is, of course, responsible for his office; he is responsible for the official acts of his secretary until he publicly disclaims responsibility for such acts. The letter to which I refer was written to a pensioner who is an applicant for an increase of pension, and who had formerly resided in my district; and, amazed as he was at the conditions which, according to this letter, existed here in the National Congress under Democratic régime, he appealed to me, through a friend of his in my district, to assist him, if possible, in securing for him the relief to which he felt he was entitled. The letter to which I refer, as I say, went from the office of one of the most prominent Members on the minority side of the House, a man who bears the distinction of having occupied the position of chairman of the Republican national campaign committee. I would perhaps have overlooked the proposition had it not been for the fact that I had been informed indirectly that similar statements were going from the offices of other Republican Members. And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that if a secret campaign of this kind has been organized and is being conducted by any Member or Members of this House, or by their secretaries, it ought to be exposed. I refer to secretaries especially for this reason: That the man next in responsibility to the Member himself with the constituency of a district is the secretary, who is supposed, when he places his signature to an official letter, to voice the sentiments of his Member, and if Members are permitting their secretaries to misinform the people the country should be advised of that fact. If secretaries are, without the knowledge and consent of their Members, abusing their liberties and giving to the country statements that are not correct, the country, and especially their Members, should know it, so that their efforts may be curbed by their Members and disregarded by the country.

The letter to which I refer went from the office of the honorable gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY], who, as we all know, is one of the most prominent men in this body, and prominent in his party throughout the country [applause], and is as follows:

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 28, 1915.

Mr. JOHN WHITINGTON, *Royal, Ill.*

DEAR MR. WHITINGTON: Your very kind letter of December 22 with reference to special pension bill addressed to Mr. MCKINLEY has been received in his absence.

Mr. MCKINLEY, as you know, will be pleased to introduce a bill for you, but the conditions down here are anything but favorable, and there is absolutely no chance of getting a bill passed. In the first place, all committees are in control of southern Democracy. They are trying to economize by refusing the meritorious claims of soldiers and giving absolutely no consideration to their bills. Of course the southern soldiers do not receive pensions, and these southern Democrats are not very enthusiastic about giving any help. I am sure he will gladly introduce this bill for you, but I can not say it will pass. I know that you will appreciate his position in this matter as we know you have a meritorious case and one he would like to help, but at this time it is an impossibility.

Wishing you a happy New Year and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours, very truly, C. A. WILLOUGHBY,
Secretary.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I said, if this secretary was voicing the sentiments of his Member the people of his district should know it and should read some figures to which I shall refer in a few minutes. If the secretary was abusing the privileges extended to and the confidence reposed in him as secretary to a Member, his Member should say so, so that the people of his district and the country may know that he is not responsible for such statements, which he must know are untrue and misleading, as I will show by data which I have collected from the records. I have taken the pains to make an investigation of the work of the Invalid Pensions Committee in the Sixty-third Congress that I might be able to correctly inform the House and the country as to the attitude of that committee toward the soldiers. From this letter and from other reports that have come to me to the effect that the same character of statements are being made to soldiers in other congressional districts it is apparent that a secret and well-organized campaign may be in progress to aid the Members making them and their party in the coming election. If it be true that they are conducting under cover a campaign of that character for political advantages, it is only further evidence that they have no issue on which they dare to stand before the people in the campaign soon to come, and in the absence of an issue on which to stand are driven to the extremity of a campaign of secret deceptions which will not stand the test of public investigation.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. FIELDS. I yield.

Mr. LANGLEY. I observe that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY] is not in the Chamber. I desire to inquire if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY] knew that my colleague was going to read this particular letter emanating from his office?

Mr. FIELDS. I thank my colleague for calling my attention to that. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I felt it but just to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY] to apprise him of the action that I was about to take, and upon my arrival at my office this morning I called the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY] and told him that if I could get the time this afternoon I would reply to a statement that had gone out from his office. Since the convening of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY] has been on the floor and talked with me about the matter.

Mr. LANGLEY. Pardon me, the point I desire to inquire about is this: Did the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY] know that my colleague was going to read this particular letter, and does he know the contents of the letter?

Mr. FIELDS. We discussed, as I understood it, the contents of the letter a few minutes ago. I do not recall that we discussed the name of the recipient of the letter, but we discussed the substance of the letter in a general way.

Mr. LANGLEY. Pardon me just one minute more. I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY] was under the impression that an entirely different letter than the one just read would be discussed by my colleague and that he did not know that this letter was to be read.

Mr. FIELDS. Well, then, I suppose the gentleman from Illinois must have in his files copies of other letters that are subject to criticism, as it seems to have been his impression or belief that I would reply to a letter different from the one just read. I am sorry that he did not remain.

Mr. LANGLEY. I am, too.

Mr. FIELDS. I do not want to be unfair with the gentleman from Illinois, and am not unfair with him, for I notified him that I would reply to a certain statement which had emanated from his office, and he should have remained in the Chamber to hear it read.

Mr. LANGLEY. I am sure that my colleague does not mean to be unfair. I do not wish to infer that at all.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, when I was interrupted I was saying that I have made some investigation, in fact a very thorough investigation, of the work of the Invalid Pensions Committee during the Sixty-third Congress. During that Congress the personnel of the committee consisted of 10 Democrats and 6 Republicans. I first attempted to ascertain the attitude of the majority members of the committee toward the minority mem-

bers, and I want to say that no man who reads the figures which I shall present can charge that the majority members of the committee were unfair to the minority. The 10 Democrats who constituted the personnel of the majority secured the passage of 147 private bills, or an average of 14.7 bills to the member. The minority members of the committee, who were six in number, secured the passage of 134 private bills, or an average of 22⅓ bills to the member. You will understand that the figures 14.7 and 22⅓ represent the average. Some of the members who have large soldier constituencies secured a greater number of bills than others who have but few soldiers in their districts. For instance, one Democratic member of the committee, from a district which has but few, if any, pensioners, did not secure the passage of a single bill, and another Democratic member from a similar district secured the passage of only one bill. Only a part of the Democratic members of the committee came from districts which have a large number of pensioners, while all of the Republican members represent districts of that character. That is why the average to the minority is greater than the average to the majority members of the committee. Some of the majority members secured the passage of more bills than did some of the minority members. From the best estimate that I can make, the number of bills secured by each member of the committee, both majority and minority, fairly represents the whole number of pensioners in their respective districts.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LOUD. What was the average of the rest of the membership of the House?

Mr. FIELDS. I will get that later. Now I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. What does the gentleman mean by a member of the committee securing the passage of a large number of bills? Does the gentleman mean the bills which members of the committee introduced?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman mean to say that members of the committee got—how many bills apiece?

Mr. FIELDS. The Democratic Members got an average of 14.7 bills each.

Mr. MANN. Each Democratic member secured the passage of bills pensioning 14 different persons?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes, sir; 14 different persons, or an average of 14 and a fraction. I am speaking of the average. As I said a moment ago, some members got more than others owing to the character of the districts from which they came.

Mr. LOUD. From the Southern States?

Mr. FIELDS. From all the States, but principally from the New England, Northern, and Western States; and the Republican members got 22 apiece.

Mr. MANN. That is, members of the committee?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes, sir; members of the committee.

Mr. MANN. How many did the Members of the House get?

Mr. FIELDS. I am coming to that next.

Mr. LOUD. That is what I asked—they got less than half of that.

Mr. FIELDS. I will explain that point to the gentleman, if he will just wait until I can reach it. I have stated what the average was for the members of the committee. Now, if I may have the attention of the gentleman who interrupted me a while ago, I am coming to the point to which he and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] referred; that is, the number of bills secured by other Members of the House. And I want to say before I go into these figures that if the Invalid Pensions Committee had an expert mathematician to hold the balance of equality, or to figure out a fair distribution in pension legislation, he could not have beaten the work which this committee has done.

The Sixty-third Congress was composed of 435 Members. The Republicans and Progressives numbered 144, or 33.1 per cent of the total membership of that Congress.

Three hundred and five Members secured the passage of private pension bills during the Sixty-third Congress, that being 70.11 per cent of the total membership of the House. Of the 305 Members who secured the passage of private bills 106, or 34.75 per cent, were of the minority, a gain for them over their relative strength in the total membership of the House of 1.65 per cent.

There were 2,316 private pension bills passed by the House during the Sixty-third Congress. Of that number 774, or 33.41 per cent, went to the minority Members, which was a gain of thirty-one one-hundredths of 1 per cent over their relative strength in the total membership of the House.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SLOAN. I have not been one of the critics of this committee; but would not the basis of comparison of distribution be better if we take the old soldiers of the various districts, and base the comparison upon the number for each district, than a distribution to the Members of the House such as the gentleman has made? I will ask the gentleman if he has made a comparison on the basis of the old soldiers in the various districts rather than the Members of Congress in this House, and has he it for presentation here?

Mr. FIELDS. I have made some estimates, and will reach that point immediately.

Now, answering the suggestion which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LOUD] made a few moments ago that other Members of the House had not fared as well as members of the committee had, I will say that if we compare the average number of bills secured by each member of the committee with the average for each Member of the House, why, the members of the committee have the best of it. But that is not a fair comparison, for we must bear in mind that many of the districts have practically no pensioners, while others have a great many, running in some instances into the thousands; and we must also bear in mind that most of the members of the committee came from districts which have a large number of pensioners. Only six members of the committee, four Democrats and two Republicans, came from southern districts, and three of those districts happen to have a very large number of Civil War soldiers, and the Members from those three districts secured the passage of a great many more bills than the other three from the South, whose districts have practically no pensioners. And in further answer to the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LOUD] that the average number of bills secured by members of the committee is greater than the average number secured by other Members, I want to say that I can point out many individual Members who secured more bills than the average number of either the majority or minority members of the committee. These men, of course, came from districts where there is a large number of pensioners, while other Members from districts with only a small number of pensioners have secured the passage of only a few bills, and these facts are conclusive evidence that the committee did not base its apportionment of bills upon the number of Members in the committee or in the House, but upon the number of soldiers throughout the country, and their needs as shown by the evidence submitted in support of their claims. This explanation, I think, also answers the question of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

And in this connection I desire to say that the passage of any bill depends first upon the evidence submitted in support of it. A special examiner is detailed from the Pension Bureau, who examines the evidence submitted in a case before the case is considered by the committee, and his approval or disapproval of the case is placed upon it and goes on to the committee. There may be some districts, and doubtless there are, that have not received as many special bills as other districts with no greater number of pensioners on account of the failure of the claimants from such districts to make, or the failure of the Member to present to the committee, evidence sufficient to establish the merit of their claims for special act. I have been informed, and I think reliably informed, that one Member introduced about 700 private pension bills during the last session of Congress, but submitted evidence in only five cases. This Member knew as well as I know, and as well as every Member of this House knows, that it was necessary for him to produce evidence in support of a bill in order to secure its consideration. Then why did he introduce the 695 bills in support of which he submitted no evidence? Was it to deceive those soldiers for whom he introduced those bills. Evidently it was, for I have been informed, indirectly, though I think reliably, that that same Member is writing the pensioners of his district during this session that it is useless for him to introduce bills for them for the reason that this Democratic Congress will not consider them. I note, however, that that gentleman secured the passage of each of the five bills for which he submitted evidence. If he had the evidence to warrant the passage of other bills, and did not submit it, it was his fault and not the fault of the committee that he did not secure the passage of more bills. Or if he failed to advise the claimants as to the evidence required in support of their bills, thereby causing their failure to furnish it, he is likewise to blame for the fact that more of his soldier constituents did not receive consideration at the hands of Congress. But that gentleman knew when he introduced 700 private pension bills that he could not secure the passage of all of them, or even the passage of one-tenth of them. So, why did he pursue such a deceptive course with the old soldiers of his district, and why is he now resorting to the further deception of writing them that he can not secure the passage of their bills because this

Democratic Congress is hostile toward them, when he knows, and the country knows, and the soldier knows, that this Congress, since it became Democratic, has been more liberal to the soldier than it has ever heretofore been? The answer is clear. It is a plan of deception for political purposes; but I feel quite sure that that gentleman and all others engaged in this campaign with him will learn before the campaign is over that the soldiers of our country can not be deceived in the manner that they are attempting. I want to say, however, in justice to the minority as a whole, that I do not believe that such tactics as those to which I have referred, which is nothing more than peanut politics, are resorted to by all, or by a majority of the minority Members, or are approved by a majority of them.

Mr. LOUD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. LOUD. I wanted to know the average number of cases considered for other Congressmen than those on the committee.

Mr. FIELDS. I have already referred to that. I will give it more fully, if I can have the time.

Mr. LOUD. That is a very important matter to us.

Mr. FIELDS. I have this information. It would be 2,035 bills, distributed among 281 Members. I can give the names of Members, if gentlemen prefer.

Mr. KINKAID. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Certainly.

Mr. KINKAID. Has the gentleman the number of bills that were passed for each minority member of the committee as well as the majority?

Mr. FIELDS. I have.

Mr. KINKAID. Will the gentleman state the number passed for the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID]?

Mr. FIELDS. I am proud to say that my amiable friend from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] made a very creditable showing for his district. I find that he secured the passage of 14 bills. I shall not take the time to read the names of all the Members who secured the passage of bills, but I notice that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Ainey, secured during the Sixty-third Congress the passage of 13 bills; Mr. AUSTIN, of Tennessee, 9 bills; Mr. ANTHONY, of Kansas, 16 bills; Mr. CRAMTON, of Michigan, 19 bills; Mr. FAIRCHILD, of New York, 17 bills; Mr. SELLS, of Tennessee, 18 bills; Mr. FESS, of Ohio, 13 bills; Mr. French, of Idaho, 14 bills; Mr. J. M. C. SMITH, of Michigan, 13 bills; Mr. Lafferty, of Oregon, 17 bills; Mr. MCKENZIE, of Illinois, 10 bills. I mention these partly for the purpose of showing that the bills which were passed were distributed throughout the country, and not confined to any one section; and I want to say in this connection that 109 of the 2,213 bills which were passed during the Sixty-third Congress went to the State of Illinois, which was 4.9 per cent of the total number passed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I understand that charges have been made in some southern sections by southern Republican Members that they could not secure for their soldier constituents any consideration at the hands of this Congress. If soldiers in the southern districts are receiving letters of that kind, I want to call their attention to the fact that the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. SELLS, a Republican Member, coming from a southern Republican district, secured the passage of 18 private bills.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I understand one of the points that the gentleman is seeking to make is that members of the committee fare much better than other Members of the House. Does the gentleman think that the 18 bills of Mr. SELLS and the 17 that Mr. FAIRCHILD secured was a gross discrimination against them?

Mr. FIELDS. I am making no such contention as the gentleman states; he wholly misunderstands me. I say that it has been fair. I believe that the committee has been fair in every particular and that it has been fair to every section of the country, giving each section recognition in proportion to the number of soldiers it contains, and giving first consideration to those soldiers who were in the greatest need of assistance, as shown by the proof submitted.

Mr. CRAMTON. As a minority member of the committee, I entirely indorse that statement.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Has the gentleman the number of pensioners in each of these congressional districts?

Mr. FIELDS. I have the number of pensioners in each State, but not in each congressional district.

Mr. DOWELL. Can not the gentleman put that in the RECORD?

Mr. FIELDS. I do not have it.

Mr. DOWELL. Is there any way of ascertaining the number of pensioners in each congressional district?

Mr. LANGLEY. It can be gotten from the Pension Office.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman have in the RECORD the number of pensioners in each congressional district when he prints his remarks?

Mr. FIELDS. If I can get it without difficulty before I print, I will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I will.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I want to say that by giving the number of bills passed for each member of the committee it might mislead by being out of proportion in this way: For instance, in the District of Columbia there are 16 Grand Army posts and 1,600 soldiers. All these private pension bills for that District are charged to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FIELDS. I have observed that fact, and have not charged those bills to the chairman in my calculations, but only those coming from his district.

Now, Mr. Chairman, standing further on my contention that the committee has been fair, I want to say that the men who come from the districts that seem to have the most pensioners have, as a rule, secured the passage of the most bills.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does not the gentleman think that that is proper—that an additional allotment ought to come to those Representatives of districts where the old soldiers are the greatest in number?

Mr. FIELDS. Absolutely so, for I believe that pension bills should be passed in the interest of the soldiers and not in the interest of Members of Congress.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me to say "Amen" at that point?

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes; for a question; but I have not much time.

Mr. HARRISON. How many bills, if the gentleman has the data, did my amiable friend from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] get in the Sixty-third Congress?

Mr. FIELDS. I want to say that my colleague from Kentucky comes from one of the largest soldier districts in the country, and that he received as many private bills as any other Member in the Sixty-third Congress. He has a large soldier constituency, and his constituency were not discriminated against by this Democratic committee simply because they happened to be so unfortunate as to have a Republican Representative. [Laughter.]

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I can not yield further, for my time will not permit. So, Mr. Chairman, it is plain to see that a fairer distribution could not be made than was made by this committee in the pensions bills that were passed during the Sixty-third Congress; and in addition to what this committee did in the Sixty-third Congress for the old soldiers, there are other benefits that the soldiers have received from that committee and this Congress since it went under the control of the Democratic Party. When the control of this House passed from the Republicans to the Democrats at the opening of the Sixty-second Congress, that honored veteran, Gen. SHERWOOD, who has seen the horrors and tasted the bitterness of the Civil War, was placed at the head of the Invalid Pensions Committee, and from his brain and ability, coupled with his love for and devotion to his comrades, emanated the bill which bears his name. That bill was favorably reported by a Democratic committee and passed by a Democratic House. It was then passed by a Republican Senate after it was stripped by Senate amendments of some of the benefits which it was designed to extend to the soldiers, and in its amended form it became a law. But amended as it was, it extended under its first year's operation relief to 376,782 Civil War soldiers to the amount of $20,800,000, or an average annual increase of more than $55 to each of the number thus benefited.

And now, Mr. Chairman, in the face of the figures which I have given, and the facts to which I have referred, it comes with poor grace from any Member of this House or any citizen of this country, be he from the East, West, North, or South, to say that the survivors of the Civil War have not and can not receive justice at the hands of this Democratic Congress. Such a statement is without foundation, and should be challenged and disproved whenever and wherever made. And I submit these observations as a challenge to, and a refutation of, the unfounded and unwarranted accusations to which I have previously referred, and I say now and here that any reports of like character that may come to me in the future will receive the same attention that I have given to these. I meet and answer these charges, not for the purpose of making a personal attack

upon any one, but in justice to the truth, in justice to my party, and in justice to the soldiers of the country whom they seek to evade and deceive. I would be untrue to my convictions, untrue to my party, and untrue to the soldiers of my district and the country if I permitted the perpetration of such evasions and deceptions without raising my voice against them. I take this position, not because I admire personal conflict or enjoy participation in it, but because I believe that the man who has served his country in time of need is entitled to fair treatment and correct statements from the Representatives of the people or those connected with them, and it is gratifying to me to know that my party takes the same position, which is evidenced by the fair and liberal pension legislation which has emanated from this House since it went under Democratic control.

This legislation, which is the most liberal to the old soldier of any legislation that has ever been passed by the Congress of the United States, bears evidence of another fact of which the American people should be proud, which is, that any bitterness that may have lingered for a time in the hearts of the American people as a result of the Civil War is no longer harbored to any noticeable extent, but, to the contrary, we as a united people glory in the preservation of the Union, and cherish the memory of those who gave their lives that the Union might live and show our appreciation of those who survived the conflict. We may say, and truly say, that those who survived and returned to their homes and families, which was only a remnant of the number engaged in the struggle, were fortunate indeed. But they, Mr. Chairman, were not as fortunate as the country which could call them its own. Not as fortunate as the Union which they and their fallen comrades had preserved, for their remaining days were shortened by the ravages of war which they endured, while the Union was made secure and everlasting by the efforts which they extended and the burdens which they bore. Ah, no; they were not as fortunate as the Government which they reared to the highest pedestal of national honor by their undying faith and never-failing devotion. Not as fortunate as the ship of state which they fearlessly manned across an ocean of blood under a tempest of terror and death. Not as fortunate as we who come after them to enjoy the blessings of peace which they purchased for us at an incalculable price; and, Mr. Chairman, in voicing these sentiments I speak not as the son or grandson of a Union soldier, but, to the contrary, I speak as one whose ancestors were of southern stock, southern sympathies, and were southern soldiers in the great conflict. My grandfather was born in the Southland, followed the flag of the Confederacy, and died a captive in a northern prison. He and those with whom he served and died gave their fortunes and their lives as a sacrifice for the principles which they believed to be right, and I honor their memory for the noble and manly courage they displayed. It was not their love for conflict that brought upon the country the great struggle. They were victims of fate. Fate had thrust upon the country a question which antedated the birth of the Republic, upon which the North and the South honestly differed. That difference grew to such proportions as the years came and went that it eventually became irreconcilable, and the same fate that had forced the unfortunate question upon the country forced the breach which resulted in armed conflict; and the men of the South on the one side and the men of the North on the other took up their arms in a spirt of willingness to battle and to die, if need be, in defense of a principle which they believed to be right. The greatest evidence of their honesty of purpose, their love for principle, and their fidelity to duty on both sides was their duration under all the horrors that can attend warfare. But I shall not refer further to those horrors or the days through which they were endured. I will not recall their gloomy forms, but will say to them:

May the sorrows which thy presence brought
Be buried ne'er to rise again,
And the deepest affections of the Nation's heart
Rest alike on northern and southern men.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yeld three minutes more to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to yield that to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. LANGLEY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I simply want those three minutes to read to the committee the following article appearing in a paper called the New York Call, of January 23, 1916, entitled "Pork and Preparedness":

PORK AND "PREPAREDNESS."

A Florida Representative named CLARK has just made a most sincere and impassioned address in the Congress in the interests of "pork"—not the literal stockyards product, but the meat on which State Caesars feed—the graft that is derived from congressional appropriations for local post offices and other Federal buildings, dredging of creeks and waterways, and other activities that drain the National Treasury and bring money and employment to the various States. His position was that not one cent of public money should be devoted to "preparedness" until all the "pork" available for distribution has been extracted from the Treasury. Then, if any was left over, the militarists might have it.

Mr. CLARK magnanimously stated that he was seeking nothing for himself; that every town and hamlet in his district had its public building. But there were still many other places which had been left without their proper ration of "pork," and he stood for their "rights" in the matter unalterably. It was the first thing needful that this should be attended to; the rest could come afterward.

As the New York Herald puts it, "His singleness of purpose in the matter of congressional pork leads him to a heroic disregard of subterfuge." But, curiously enough, the Herald does not commend him therefor; it mocks him, instead.

If the "preparedness" advocates would only show the same "heroic disregard of subterfuge," and openly proclaim that they were after the same kind of pork, only through a different channel and on a different pretext; that they were spokesmen of groups who eagerly desired profits through the manufacture of war munitions, just as the others wanted them through the erection of post offices and the dredging of creeks; in such case Congress would know exactly where it was and what it was there for, and could proceed on its business with perfect smoothness and efficiency.

But, no! These "preparedness" fellows must have subterfuge; they must pretend that they are animated solely by patriotic aspirations and the sense of national danger; they must leave the impression that there is no pork in their demands; that they hate the nasty stuff, anyway, and wouldn't touch it on any consideration.

And CLARK, from Florida, knows they are lying, and they know that he knows they are lying, and they know it themselves, all around.

It is very creditable to him, but it is not wise. He is an unsophisticated creature, who imagines that because he can afford to tell the truth all others can afford it also. And the real reason they condemn him is because they understand that his method, if universally adopted, would infallibly lead to the abolition of all "pork"—a desideratum that can only be generally secured by "a heroic regard for subterfuge," to slightly paraphrase the expression of the Herald.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, the earnestness with which we hear one side or the other in this European war discussed by many gentlemen on the floor reminds me of a story I heard the other day of a saloon keeper in New York City, who made a remark about "these confounded Belgians who started this war." He said that they made him tired. Some one standing by him remonstrated and said, "How do you make it out that the Belgians started the war? You are the first one to give us that information." The saloon keeper replied, "Well, I have some Englishmen and some Germans and some French and some Italians for customers, but I have no Belgians."

Mr. Chairman, in what I propose to say I shall have no customers, but I want to discuss for a few moments the method of manufacturing the facilities with which we are to protect ourselves.

In the midst of the hullabaloo that has been raised by the advocates and opponents of an increased Army and Navy it is not surprising that many earnest and thoughtful men, both in and out of Congress, are very much perplexed.

Notwithstanding the bigotry and intolerance of some of those who favor a great increase, no fair-minded man doubts for a moment the patriotism of those who believe that it is an unwise and dangerous policy to establish a great Army and Navy in this country.

At the present time, for very good reasons, I shall not state my position as to the proposition of making the United States a great military and naval power, although I have given a great deal of thought and investigation to the subject for some time past.

There is one phase of the subject, however, regarding which I wish to state my position very definitely and as vigorously as possible, and that is the method of providing the armament, munitions, and equipment. Upon the method of manufacturing these things depends very largely the amount we shall manufacture.

The tendency to serve one's self-interest is the primary law of human nature. I am not saying that it is not a good thing that nature has made this motive play the leading part in men's lives. All I say is that it is a fact that man, first of all, tries to promote his own welfare. There are, of course, a few men who have thought deeply enough so as to know that very often, and, in fact, generally, what is best for the great mass of mankind is best for his individual self, but such men are the exception to the rule.

There are great private institutions, with billions of dollars invested, in this country and in every other great nation of the world for the manufacture of armament, munitions, and implements of war generally. These concerns, of course, were established for the purpose of making money, and we can not be surprised at their great anxiety for more business. But, gentlemen, is not the manufacture of the implements of war by private concerns a dangerous thing to the peace, safety, and welfare of any people? If the business is not forthcoming,

does not the private manufacturer whine that the Government owes him the business because it encouraged him to build plants for the manufacture of the implements and munitions of war? Not only does the manufacturer say this, but, in addition, the military experts urge as a reason for the increase of military and naval equipment the very proposition that we must furnish the private manufacturer enough business to keep him going. If you undertake to argue with these men the dangerous policy involved in such procedure, they denounce you as unpatriotic, as desiring to prevent our country becoming a great power, and so forth, just as the opponents of private manufacture in England were denounced as "Little Englanders" and in Germany as "Little Germany men." Is it possible that the earnest, industrious, peace-loving men of the United States will listen to such twaddle? I can not believe it. I know that they do not tolerate such doctrines.

Among the most serious objections to the private manufacture of armament, equipment, and munitions of war is the increased danger of our becoming involved in war because of the constant agitation and war scares engineered by the manufacturers in order to increase the demand for their products.

These private concerns constantly increase their demands and are continually raising the limit to which they think the Government should go with the Army and Navy in order, as they say, "to protect the country." All the nations of Europe engaged in the present war have gone through this experience. Almost always, of course, this is demanded for purely defensive purposes, not for aggression. The expenditures of the principal European countries increased by leaps and bounds during the last few years before the war, until the backs of the people were bent under the load of taxation.

Finally, of course, the jingoes must show that there is a real necessity for great armaments. Their continual promises that if given a certain number of ships and a certain number of soldiers, that is all they will ask, followed in another year by another demand for an increase in the Army and Navy, with another assurance that that will be enough, must give place to a different argument, and that argument war itself, with all the misery and bloodshed which necessarily results.

Another reason why it is unwise and dangerous for the Government to procure its war equipment from private individuals is the fact that these private individuals necessarily know all the secrets connected with the manufacture of either Army or Navy equipment, and this information, if given to a possible enemy, means a tremendous advantage to that enemy in time of war.

Another reason why it is best for the Government to manufacture its own equipment for war is that it can be done for a great deal less money than if done by private manufacturers. Secretary of the Navy Daniels in his report for 1914 said that the Navy Department manufactures anything, from a superdreadnaught to a pound of powder, cheaper than the same can be purchased from private manufacturers.

It is a fact that the Government can manufacture powder for one-half what it did cost to purchase from private manufacturers before the question of Government manufacture was urged so strongly two or three years ago in Congress.

These are some of the reasons which make it not only bad business, but, in fact, bad morals for the Government to continue the policy of procuring war supplies and equipment from private concerns.

It is a somewhat remarkable fact that while many of the great governments had been adopting a policy of direct government operations of many businesses, the business of preparation for war has almost universally been left to private individuals. The one thing which, above all others, should be free from the temptation to do everything for the sake of profit has been left in the hands of profit seekers, and has been a temptation which has grown instead of decreasing year by year.

Some of the farseeing men of Europe have cried out from time to time against the danger to the people of encouraging private industry in the production of death-dealing instrumentalities.

Mr. Philip Snowden, in a speech in the British Parliament during the year 1914, mercilessly exposed a condition of affairs existing in Great Britain, as bad or worse than what was shown a few weeks ago by Mr. TAVENNER on this floor in regard to the Navy League in this country. Mr. Snowden went on to show that the armament makers of Great Britain not only had carried on a systematic campaign for bigger contracts, but also showed that practically all of the armament concerns were really one and the same company. Not only that, but he further produced evidence to show that all of the different manufacturing plants for armament and munitions had ex-military officers in charge of the work.

A British paper called "Arms and Explosives," and devoted to the interests of the armament trade, contains the following statement:

> Contractors naturally are very keen to avail themselves of the services of prominent officers who have been associated with the work in which the contractors are interested. The chief thing is that they know the ropes, since the retired officer, who keeps in touch with his old comrades, is able to lessen some of these inconveniences, either by gaining early information of coming events or by securing the ear of one who would not afford like favors to a civilian. Kissing undoubtedly goes by favor, and some of the things that happen might be characterized as corruption. Still, judged by all fair tests, the result is good. The organization of facilities for supply is maintained through times of peace on an efficient and economical basis. Manufacturers do not make huge profits, and they are enabled to survive from year to year and to be on hand in the case of national emergency.

Another fact which illustrates the hypocrisy of the private manufacturers, who shout about patriotism when they are really thinking only of profits, is the fact that several of these concerns referred to by Mr. Snowden had plants before the war in foreign countries, and countries which were supposed to be the probable enemies of Great Britain. For example, Vickers, one of the great armament manufacturers of Great Britain, did business under the name of Vickers-Terni Co. in Italy, at that time allied against Great Britain. Vickers was also interested in the Whitehead Torpedo Works in Fiume, Hungary.

The armament manufacturing company known as Armstrong's, in Great Britain, did business as Armstrong-Pozzuoli on the Italian coast. Armstrong & Co., of Great Britain, and Armstrong-Pozzuoli, of Italy, were in possession of most confidential information in relation to both the Italian and British Governments, and would it not require these individuals to be more than human to avoid disclosing the facts from one to the other? Both Austria and Italy were considered as probable enemies at that time, and yet these British manufacturers were interested in manufacturing great quantities of war equipment for both of these countries. Austria has since that time become an enemy and at war with Great Britain, and there was serious doubt about Italy's attitude for some time. Nevertheless the Navy League Annual for 1911, published in England, had this to say:

> The modern naval resources of Italy for the building of warships owe their own origin in no small measure to the cooperation of British capital and resources.

Yet it was considered at that time that Italy and Great Britain were not on good terms and the British were building dreadnaughts to protect their interests in the Mediterranean against the possible aggression of Italy. The submarines and all the torpedoes used by Austria prior to 1914 were made by the Whitehead Torpedo Works, in Hungary. This same firm also had a plant at Weymouth, England. In other words, they were making torpedoes for the British navy at Weymouth and torpedoes with British capital in Hungary in order to destroy British ships. Does anyone doubt, therefore, the baneful influence of private profit in the manufacture of the instrumentalities of war? We could go on and cite many instances of the evil practices of private armament manufacturers in other nations of the world.

I call attention to the trouble the Japanese Government had with this same sort of thing. Vice Admiral Koichi Fujii, former Japanese naval attaché at Berlin, was sentenced to four and one-half years' imprisonment, charged with having received illicit commissions for influencing the allotment of naval contracts in favor of a German manufacturing concern. Capt. Sowasaki was sentenced one year for the same offense. Several Japanese contractors were arrested in connection with the military scandal, and foreigners in Japan who were involved in them were convicted and imprisoned as follows: George Blundell, an English journalist, 10 months; V. Hermann, Tokio representative of a German armament firm, 1 year; and Andrew M. Pooley, an English journalist, 2 years. A similar condition was exposed in Germany by Herr Liebknecht. Some of the facts revealed by him were these: That a German arms and armament factory, one of the greatest ordnance plants in the world, employed an agent by the name of Brandt, whose business it was to employ in his pay officers of the military department of the German Government; that Government documents of the most confidential nature found their way into the safe of Herr von Dernitz, one of the managers of the Krupp Works.

Herr von Gontard, director of the German Arms and Ammunition Factory, inspiring in the Pan-German organ—Die Post—the most violent diatribes against France; giving orders to have a French newspaper publish articles representing that the French war department was increasing its number of machine guns when it was doing nothing of the kind; first exciting French opinion by provocative matter in the German press, and then instigating a German demand for armaments by means of bellicose utterances in the French press.

Here is a letter published in Vorwarts, a German newspaper, which affords an inside glance of the business methods of a war-trafficking firm:

PERSONAL DOCUMENTS.

(Sheet 15.)

Mr. ——— ———, *Paris:*

(G. No. 8236. Geheim-registratur, I. e., number in register of secret documents.)

We have just wired you: "Please await in Paris our letter sent today."

The reason for this message was that we should be glad for you to get an article into one of the most widely read French newspapers—the Figaro, if possible—to the following effect:

"The French ministry of war has decided to accelerate considerably the provision of new-pattern machine guns and to order double the quantity at first intended."

Please do your utmost to secure the acceptance of an article on these lines.

Yours, faithfully,

VON GONTARD, *Posegarten,*
(For the German Arms and Ammunition Factory).

We have already heard discussed upon this floor the relations between the Du Pont Powder Co., which supplies the Government with most of its powder, and the United Rheinisch Westphalian Gunpowder Mills of Germany. Some years ago the Du Pont Powder Co. entered into a contract with the German company, in which it was agreed that the Du Pont Co. was to have no competition from the German company in the United States, and the Du Pont Co. agreed that every improvement upon the processes made by either company should be imparted to the other. A still more serious promise on the part of the Du Pont Co. was as follows:

Thirteenth. That the parties of the second part [the Du Ponts] will, as soon as possible, inform the party of the first part [the Germans] of each and every contract for brown powder or nitrate-of-ammonia powder received by the parties of the second part from the Government of the United States, or any other contracting party or parties, stating in detail quantity, price, time of delivery, and of all the requirements that the powder called for in such contract has to fulfill.

Yet, of course, these private concerns in every country are actuated by purely patriotic motives!

No doubt the American people, including some Members of Congress, at least, are puzzled to know what reason or argument these gamblers in human blood will be able to furnish after they realize that the people will insist on knowing why they are asked to build higher and higher their mountain of armament when they have been assured time and again that each addition would be sufficient. We might know, however, that the supporters of profits from war would have anticipated such a question and are ready with an answer.

Neitzsche, the Polish philosopher, justifies war for war's sake. Von Bernhardi makes the same argument. Lord Roberts, of Great Britain, and Harold Wyatt, the British author, in like manner justify war:

In the crash of conflict, in the horrors of battle fields piled with the dead, the dying, and the wounded, a vast ethical intention has still prevailed. Not necessarily in any given case, but absolutely certainly in the majority of cases, the triumph of the victor has been the triumph of the nobler soul of man. * * * In that great majority of instances which determines general result the issue of war has made for the ethical advantage of mankind. It must have been so; it could not be otherwise, because ethical quality has tended always to produce military efficiency.

All of these reasoning that the conflict of battle is necessary to the development of the highest moral qualities in man, and our own infallible (?) Mr. Roosevelt argues in very much the same strain. Surely the great American people are not ready to accept such a damnable doctrine. I can not believe that any sane man believes in such principles, but you know we must have a reason for justifying a business from which we make money.

With the proof clear and conclusive that the Government can manufacture everything it needs in war for a great deal less than it can purchase the same from private manufacturers, one would suppose that the Government officials at least would be in favor of manufacturing its own war munitions. But not so. The military officers of the Government have urged before committees of Congress the desirability of having war materials manufactured by private concerns, and in order to justify themselves, they say that even though it costs more in this way, it is necessary to have the additional facilities in case of emergency. But they go further than that and they have said recently that the Government should give them sufficient orders to keep their plants in operation.

Some of these military officers have apparently been very anxious that the Government should not procure its powder at too low a cost. Upon this point, in order to do justice to the industry of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER], who is known as well for the accuracy of his statements, I read the following from one of his speeches:

FORMER EMPLOYEE OF DU PONTS ESTIMATED THEIR COST AT 21 CENTS A POUND.

Mr. Robert S. Waddell, of the United Safety Powder Co., of Louisville, Ky., who was with the Du Pont Co. as general sales agent for the United States for 21 years, and who has built several powder mills, estimated, in the hearings on the fortifications appropriation bill in 1912, page 187, that the cost to the Du Pont concern in making ordnance smokeless powder is $0.218, exclusive of selling costs, which estimate aroused Admiral Twining, Gen. Crozier, and Vice President Buckner, of the Du Pont Trust, to a high state of fury.

Testifying at the hearing on the fortifications bill, February 18, 1908, Gen. Crozier, discussing the question of a fair price to be paid the Powder Trust for powder, scoffed at the idea that powder could be manufactured for 33 cents a pound, as had been charged, as he said, "by some people who objected to what they called a private monopoly.

"A board of which Maj. Hoffer was a member"—

Stated Gen. Crozier—

"finally concluded that 67 cents would be a proper price to pay private manufacturers, and they have accepted that" (p. 82, hearings on fortifications bill, 1908).

Contrast this "proper price" of 67 cents with the fact that the Du Pont trust is now glad to receive 53 cents and that the Government is itself manufacturing powder for 34 cents.

Page 282 of the 1912 hearings contains a table supplied by Gen. Crozier, in which he fixes the cost of powder in the Army powder plant at 40 cents and in the Du Pont plant at 50 cents, exclusive of profit.

This table is valuable to the Powder Trust because it would indicate that it costs the trust 50 cents a pound to manufacture powder without any profit included. The trust is now accepting 53 cents a pound for powder. But when an effort is again made to bring about a reduction in price the representatives of the trust will be in a position to say:

"How can the Government ask for any reduction when Gen. Crozier, who is in charge of the Army powder factory, and in a position to know, has estimated that it actually costs us, net, 50 cents a pound to manufacture our product?"

As to the possibility or desirability of the Government maintaining facilities sufficient to provide the extra supply in case of war, Mr. Waddell, who has been in the powder business for a quarter of a century, testified as follows:

I believe that the time has come when the Government should make its own powder in its own works. It does not cost anything to let a plant lie idle. You can paint the machinery, and the wooden tanks do not get hurt much if you keep them full of water. There is very little about a smokeless-powder plant that would deteriorate from standing idle.

I have not referred to anyone in my remarks for the purpose of assailing him or of proving him to be worse than the ordinary man. They are like ordinary human beings, anxious to advance their own interests. I do not condemn men. I condemn the system which makes war an advantage to a few private individuals.

You ask whether or not we wish to make our country safe and defend ourselves against our enemies. I answer most emphatically, Yes! But I wish to be sure that we are not feeding fat dividends to war traffickers who are thus encouraged to prod us into a fight. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 32 minutes.

[Mr. LANGLEY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Clerk to read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Miles Fuller, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mary J. Fruit, widow of William L. Fruit, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Nancy Gould, widow of James D. Gould, late of Company B, Seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joseph A. Hollister, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Kinser, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Page, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Greenamyer, late of Company H, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ruth E. Hering, widow of Samuel Hering, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Mahala Burns, former widow of John T. Montgomery, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Isaac M. Emley, late of Company A, One hundred and twenty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and of Company K, Eighth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James P. Barton, late of Company C, Thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Junius R. Clift, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment, and of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elias Worley, late of Company K, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Delia Anderson, former widow of Nicholas Parks, late of Company D, Thirty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Samuel A. Parrish, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Simeon L. Miles, alias Simeon Lorance, late of Company B, Forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Johnson, late of Company D, Thirty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Waldon, former widow of Christian Cieving, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Lucas Covert, jr., late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nancy A. Martin, widow of William H. Martin, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucy L. Laymon, widow of Stewart M. Laymon, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James Corn, late of Company B, Fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emily Schwartz, widow of George Schwartz, late of Company F, Independent Battalion, New York Infantry, and of Company D, First Regiment New York Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catharine Maconaughay, helpless and dependent child of James Maconaughay, late of Company G, Two hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Andrew Watts, late of Company B, One hundred and seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christopher C. Estes, late of Companies B and A, One hundred and tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cora E. Brooks, helpless and dependent child of Charles U. Brooks, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John T. Lovett, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Touseul (now Cardwell), former widow of Charles J. Touseul, late of Battery H, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna M. Jenkins, former widow of Joel N. Camp, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Mary A. Brackett, widow of Tryon J. Brackett, late of Company A, Sixty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Marquis D. Lillie, late of Company M, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Lyons, widow of John E. Lyons, late of Company K, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret M. Hack, widow of George A. Hack, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and of Companies F, Twenty-sixth and Twenty-seventh Regiments United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Ruth Ann James, former widow of Charles L. Robbins, late of Company B, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William C. Taylor, late of Company H, One hundred and thirty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Laura A. Peters, widow of Amos D. Peters, late of Company D, Second Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William H. Doll, late of Company A, One hundred and seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and of Company K, First Potomac Home Brigade Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Disia Stamper, widow of William Stamper, late of Company L, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James R. Parker, late of Company D, Twenty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William D. Alexander, late of Company A, Third Regiment New Mexico Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Newton, widow of Charles L. Newton, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment, and of Company K, Thirtieth Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary I. Keen, widow of George W. Keen, late of Company G, Seventeenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Boman R. Butcher, late of Company H, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Glover, former widow of Daniel Shelley, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William E. Hopkins, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary K. Dunn, widow of Francis M. Dunn, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Adlade Holland, widow of Patrick Holland, late of Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine A. Payne, widow of Freeman S. Payne, late of Company I, One hundred and sixty-second Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah B. Scott, widow of William G. Scott, late of Company A, First Battalion, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Jane Harris, widow of Smith A. Harris, late of Company K, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Emma R. Shattuck, widow of James H. Shattuck, late of Company G, Twenty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Emily E. Spencer, widow of Nimrod A. Spencer, late of Company E, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza J. Glover, former widow of Leander Dean, late of Company C, First Regiment Alabama Vidette Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Nancy McClellan, widow of Riley H. McClellan, late of Company B, First Regiment Alabama Vidette Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of James H. Holtzman, late of Companies K and C, One hundred and fourteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram H. Persell, late of Company E, Third Regiment North Carolina Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Riehl, former widow of Isaac H. Steele, late of Company G, Fifty-sixth Regiment New York National Guard Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Anna Holmes, widow of Lafayette Holmes, late of Company F, Ninety-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William P. Morris, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Arzila Wolf, helpless and dependent child of John Wolf, late of Company F, Thirty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Stillman Young, late of Battery E, First West Virginia Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julia E. Watson, now Jones, former widow of David M. Watson, late of Company I, Seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Sidney R. Tripp, late of Company I, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elvira Russell, former widow of George Vandruff, late of Company E, Forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Adelaide L. Curry, widow of Edgar W. Curry, late of Company L, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Maria W. Wilson, widow of George E. Wilson, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James L. Weirich, late of Company A, Sixty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Petty, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William P. Blackburn, late of Company D, Forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Hanes, late of Company B, One hundredth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Friederike Potter, widow of Frederick W. Potter, alias William Potter, late a seaman in the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Harriet L. Busick, former widow of Freeman Leonard, late of Company A, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Harriet L. Ferris, widow of Joseph E. Ferris, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Kane, widow of John J. Kane, late of Company D, Ninetieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Swope, late of Company D, Ninetieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Merrill, widow of Rufus Merrill, late of Company D, One hundred and thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George Hull, late of Company E, Ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ellen Carr, widow of Thomas Carr, late musician of Sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lida W. Ashton, widow of Charles L. Ashton, late of Company G, Fifty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Mary A. Hawks, widow of Alfred D. Hawks, late of Company B, Denver City Home Guards, Colorado Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara Wilt, widow of George W. Wilt, late of Company E, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Helen M. Brown, former widow of Harvey M. Brown, late of Thirty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Barbara Marx, widow of Paul Marx, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles Clark, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sophia Anderson, former widow of Edward Z. Holbrook, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Mary C. Kitchen, widow of William N. Kitchen, late of Company I, Fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Nora A. Kitchen, helpless and dependent child of said William N. Kitchen, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary C. Kitchen, the name of said Nora A. Kitchen shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary C. Kitchen.

The name of Hiram J. Mills, who served under the name of James H. Thomas, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Curtiss, widow of Frank S. Curtiss, late of One hundred and twenty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie J. Henderson, widow of Joseph D. Henderson, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza March, widow of Henry March, late of Company K, Ninety-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of James Gallagher, late of Company I, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clarinda Shields, widow of William B. Shields, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Kirk, widow of William M. Kirk, late of Company E, Hickory County Battalion, Missouri Home Guards, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William A. James, late of Company H, Fifty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha A. Crain, widow of William D. Crain, late of Company K, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Douglass Smith, late an officer's servant, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jennie Galbreath, widow of George Galbreath, late of Seventh Independent Battery, Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Aaron Hall, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Fifty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna Nau, widow of Joseph Nau, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Miller, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Juliet Kimbrough, widow of William Kimbrough, late of Company I, Forty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret B. Bradley, widow of Hugh M. Bradley, late of Company I, Third Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Leasen E. Callen, late of Company K, Thirty-eighth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jemima Furnier, widow of William H. Furnier, late of Company F, Eighty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles McMath, late of Company C, Twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Silas A. Wardlow, late of Company G, One hundred and seventy-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Brown, late of Company F, Eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lizzie Butler, widow of James F. Butler, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa Patrick, widow of Francis M. Patrick, late of Companies I and B, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth C. Johnson, widow of Joseph H. Johnson, late of Company H, Ninety-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Haring, widow of Charles R. Haring, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Second Battalion New Jersey Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James H. Howe, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Cirtwell, late of Company I, One hundred and eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Brannan, late of Company A, Fortieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Wright, widow of Charles H. Wright, late of Company K, Nineteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of H. Jenness Paul, late of Band, Second Brigade, Second Division Ninth Army Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel W. Pyle, late of Company M, Fifth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julia Kibbe, widow of Converse A. Kibbe, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Millie Rowe, widow of Richard W. Rowe, late of Company H, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna M. Goeller, widow of Balthasar Goeller, late of Company F, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Long, former widow of Ephraim Welch, late of Company C, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Samuel Steele, late of Company A, Seventy-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriet F. Kidd, widow of Meredith H. Kidd, late of Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara Keller, widow of Henry W. Keller, late of Company H, Twenty-seventh Regiment, and Company H, Twelfth Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of George C. Keller, helpless and dependent child of said Henry W. Keller, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Clara Keller the name of said George C. Keller shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pensions laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Clara Keller.

The name of Jordan J. McCann, late of Company K, Thirty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Freeman H. Bentley, late of Company F, Thirty-fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samantha March, widow of Lewis B. March, late of Company B, Forty-first Regiment, and Company G, Fifty-third Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John J. Lee, late of Company H, Sixtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Troop M, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Williams, late of Company C, Eighty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Marshall, late of Company I, One hundred and fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James T. Elder, late of Company H, Forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. McKenzie, widow of Charles C. McKenzie, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Quest, widow of William C. Quest, late of Company D, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Laura E. McFarland, widow of Winfield S. McFarland, late of Company C, Twenty-sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Stewart Gorton, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hillery A. McVicker, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cornelia Mathews, widow of Jacob Mathews, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-seventh Regiment, and Company I, Fifty-fourth Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles Leonard, late of Company M, First Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Cook, late of Company F, Forty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Philip E. Robertson, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David C. Woodruff, late of Company F, Eighteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clara May Brawner, helpless and dependent child of Henry K. Brawner, late of Company F, Twenty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Maggie S. Ford, former widow of Barton W. Ford, late of Company B, Forty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Samuel Reed, late of Companies F and K, Third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael R. Harned, late of Company A, Thirty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James P. Flaugher, late of Company D, Fortieth Regiment Kentucky Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Baker, late of Company H, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert S. McDonald, late of Company I, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth A. Marsh, widow of George M. Marsh, late of Company I, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Robert Stuart, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Grove, late of Company I, One hundred and sixty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aaron Freed, late of Company B, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Stump, late of Hewett's Battery, First Kentucky Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Allen, late of Company F, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Paulina Anderson, widow of John L. Anderson, late of Company H, First Regiment Minnesota Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas A. Williamson, late of the One hundred and eighty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi Airy, late of the Fourth Battery, Iowa Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Carmichael, late of Company H, Twenty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Leary, now known as James O'Leary, late a landsman, U. S. S. Ohio, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Moore, late of Company H, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment, and Company K, Sixty-fifth Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert W. Utter, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emma A. Smith, former widow of Whitman B. Smith, late of Company I, First Regiment California Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Manly R. Yardley, late of Company K, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sallie E. Mullin, widow of George H. Mullin, late of Company I, First Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alexander Noffsinger, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josiah Fosnot, late of Company F, Two hundred and seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Short, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William G. Otis, late of Company K, Thirty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Gunsolly, former widow of John Clingersmith, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Austin Williams, late of Company A, Thirty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and in Seventieth Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Wilson, former widow of William H. Binkley, late of Company A, Ninety-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and in Company G, Fiftieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Louis C. T. Kramer, now pensioned as Louis Kramer, late of Company G, First Regiment Michigan Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Roseberry, former widow of Richard B. Price, late of Company B, Thirty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Joseph M. Thomas, late of Companies B and A, Seventy-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Gardner, widow of Frank Gardner, late of Company B, One hundredth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 839. Miles Fuller.
H. R. 845. Mary J. Fruit.
H. R. 931. Nancy Gold.
H. R. 932. Joseph A. Hollister.
H. R. 959. James Kinser.
H. R. 961. George W. Page.
H. R. 963. John Greenamyer.
H. R. 986. Ruth E. Hering.
H. R. 1001. Mahala Burns.
H. R. 1031. Isaac M. Emley.
H. R. 1038. James P. Barton.
H. R. 1048. Junius R. Clift.
H. R. 1052. Elias Worley.
H. R. 1244. Delia Anderson.
H. R. 1297. Samuel A. Parrish.
H. R. 1325. Simeon L. Miles.
H. R. 1326. James M. Johnson.
H. R. 1378. Elizabeth Waldon.
H. R. 1386. Lucas Covert, jr.
H. R. 1401. Nancy A. Martin.
H. R. 1402. Lucy L. Laymon.
H. R. 1406. James Corn.
H. R. 1417. Emily Schwartz.
H. R. 1461. Catharine Maconaughay.
H. R. 1482. Andrew Watts.
H. R. 1483. Christopher C. Estes.
H. R. 1487. Cora E. Brooks.
H. R. 1508. John T. Lovett.
H. R. 1513. Sarah A. Touseul.
H. R. 1594. Anna M. Jenkins.
H. R. 1598. Mary A. Brackett.
H. R. 1602. Marquis D. Lillie.
H. R. 1630. Mary Lyons.
H. R. 1639. Margaret M. Hack.
H. R. 1656. Ruth Ann James.
H. R. 1724. William C. Taylor.
H. R. 1755. Laura A. Peters.
H. R. 1796. William H. Doll.
H. R. 1805. Disia Stamper.
H. R. 1828. James R. Parker.
H. R. 1848. William D. Alexander.
H. R. 1892. Sarah J. Newton.
H. R. 1897. Mary I. Keen.
H. R. 1982. Roman R. Butcher.
H. R. 1999. Sarah J. Glover.
H. R. 2018. William E. Hopkins.
H. R. 2025. Mary K. Dunn.
H. R. 2056. Adlade Holland.
H. R. 2082. Catherine A. Payne.
H. R. 2086. Sarah B. Scott.
H. R. 2191. Jane Harris.
H. R. 2223. Emma R. Shattuck.
H. R. 2245. Emily E. Spencer.
H. R. 2251. Eliza J. Glover.
H. R. 2252. Nancy McClellan.
H. R. 2276. James H. Holtzman.
H. R. 2449. Hiram H. Persell.
H. R. 2569. Eliza Riehl.
H. R. 2570. Anna Holmes.
H. R. 2609. William P. Morris.
H. R. 2679. Arzila Wolf.
H. R. 2731. Stillman Young.
H. R. 2747. Julia E. Watson.
H. R. 2758. Sidney R. Tripp.
H. R. 2775. Elvira Russell.
H. R. 2983. Adelaide L. Curry.
H. R. 3027. Maria W. Wilson.
H. R. 3122. James L. Weirich.
H. R. 3131. William F. Petty.
H. R. 3142. William P. Blackburn.
H. R. 3143. John Haines.
H. R. 3153. Friederike Potter.
H. R. 3206. Harriet L. Busick.
H. R. 3218. Harriet L. Ferris.
H. R. 3284. Mary A. Kane.
H. R. 3420. Samuel Swope.
H. R. 3421. Mary E. Merrill.
H. R. 3763. George Hull.
H. R. 3764. Ellen Carr.
H. R. 3775. Lida W. Ashton.
H. R. 3785. Mary A. Hawks.
H. R. 3789. Clara Wilt.
H. R. 3806. Helen M. Brown.
H. R. 3821. Barbara Marx.
H. R. 3875. Charles Clark.
H. R. 3865. Sophia Anderson.
H. R. 3976. Mary C. Kitchen.
H. R. 4301. Hiram J. Mills.
H. R. 4364. Annie J. Henderson.
H. R. 4380. Martha J. Curtiss.
H. R. 4392. Eliza March.
H. R. 4539. James Gallagher.
H. R. 4546. Clarinda Shields.
H. R. 4547. Mary E. Kirk.
H. R. 4600. William A. James.
H. R. 4620. Martha A. Crain.
H. R. 4628. Douglass Smith.
H. R. 4808. Jennie Galbreath.
H. R. 4923. Aaron Hall.
H. R. 4987. Anna Nau.
H. R. 5024. Samuel Miller.
H. R. 5108. Juliet Kimbrough.
H. R. 5119. Margaret B. Bradley.
H. R. 5175. Leasen E. Callen.
H. R. 5224. Jemima Furnier.
H. R. 5235. Charles McMath.
H. R. 5242. Silas A. Wardlow.
H. R. 5284. William H. Brown.
H. R. 5332. Lizzie Butler.
H. R. 5335. Louisa Patrick.
H. R. 5343. Elizabeth C. Johnson.
H. R. 5350. Sarah A. Haring.
H. R. 5397. James H. Howe.
H. R. 5587. Albert Cirtwell.
H. R. 5660. John Brannan.
H. R. 5611. Mary A. Wright.
H. R. 5616. H. Jenness Paul.
H. R. 5704. Samuel W. Pyle.
H. R. 5720. Julia Kibbe.
H. R. 5810. Millie Rowe.
H. R. 5814. Anna M. Goeller.
H. R. 5968. Mary A. Long.
H. R. 5976. Samuel Steele.
H. R. 5983. Harriet F. Kidd.
H. R. 6163. Clara Keller.
H. R. 6245. Jordan J. McCann.
H. R. 6276. Freeman H. Bentley.
H. R. 6353. Samantha March.
H. R. 6354. John J. Lee.
H. R. 6367. William H. Williams.
H. R. 6378. George W. Marshall.
H. R. 6393. James T. Rider.
H. R. 6479. Sarah A. McKenzie.
H. R. 6581. Sarah Quest.
H. R. 6607. Laura E. McFarland.
H. R. 6635. Stewart Gorton.
H. R. 6649. Hillery A. McVicker.
H. R. 6685. Cornelia Mathews.
H. R. 6695. Charles Leonard.
H. R. 6718. William Cook.
H. R. 6941. Philip E. Robertson.
H. R. 6976. David C. Woodruff.
H. R. 6998. Clara May Brawner.
H. R. 7007. Maggie S. Ford.
H. R. 7008. Samuel Reed.
H. R. 7052. Michael R. Harned.
H. R. 7065. James P. Flaugher.
H. R. 7097. James H. Baker.
H. R. 7100. Robert S. McDonald.
H. R. 7168. Elizabeth A. Marsh.
H. R. 7171. Robert Stuart.
H. R. 7187. Henry Grove.
H. R. 7190. Aaron Freed.
H. R. 7192. James H. Stump.
H. R. 7206. Andrew J. Allen.
H. R. 7307. Paulina Anderson.
H. R. 7314. Thomas A. Williamson.
H. R. 7336. Levi Airy.
H. R. 7410. John W. Carmichael.
H. R. 7431. James Leary.
H. R. 7505. John H. Moore.
H. R. 7750. Albert W. Utter.
H. R. 7798. Emma A. Smith.
H. R. 7969. Manly R. Yardley.
H. R. 8079. Sallie E. Mullin.
H. R. 8080. Alexander Noffsinger.
H. R. 8082. Josiah Fosnot.
H. R. 8094. George W. Short.
H. R. 8305. William G. Otis.
H. R. 8414. Sarah Gunsolly.
H. R. 8419. Austin Williams.
H. R. 9029. Sarah E. Wilson.
H. R. 9073. Louis C. T. Kramer.
H. R. 9103. Mary E. Roseberry.
H. R. 9199. Joseph M. Thomas.
H. R. 9451. Mary Gardner.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the bill by striking out lines 7, 8, 9, and 10, on page 22, being the name of Mary A. Long, as she died yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, strike out all of lines 7, 8, 9, and 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a memorial address to Congress from the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Los Angeles, Cal., upon the question of preparedness on the Pacific coast.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner stated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. In the same connection the gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to ask leave to extend and not revise. The gentleman will make sufficient revision anyway. Do not let us introduce the practice of asking to revise remarks.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I understood that I asked leave to extend and revise.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the request submitted.

Mr. MANN. It is not necessary for the gentleman to ask permission to revise, and I think it would establish a very bad practice.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to strike out the word "revise"?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a petition and resolution from the Jacksonville branch of the National Security League advocating preparedness.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner stated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR.

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call up now bills on the Private Calendar. In order to dispose of as many of these bills as possible, I ask unanimous consent that we go through the calendar by unanimous consent, for if we proceed to consider any of the contested claims the chances are that we will not get through the first bill that is contested.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to take up the Private Calendar and call the same by unanimous consent, passing for the time being those bills to which there is objection.

Mr. POU. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none; and the Clerk will proceed to call the bills on the Private Calendar.

CARLOS HEVIA Y REYES GAVILÁN.

The first business on the Private Calendar was the resolution (H. J. Res. 95) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis Mr. Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán, a citizen of Cuba.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of this joint resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he hereby is, authorized to permit Mr. Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán, a citizen of Cuba, to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis: *Provided*, That no expense shall be caused to the United States thereby, and that the said Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán shall agree to comply with all regulations for the police and discipline of the academy, to be studious, and to give his utmost efforts to accomplish the course in the various departments of instruction, and that the said Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán shall not be admitted to the academy until he shall have passed the mental and physical examinations prescribed for candidates from the United States, and that he shall be immediately withdrawn if deficient in studies, of conduct, and so recommended by the academic board.

The joint resolution was ordered to be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

ELLIS P. GARTON.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7502) for the relief of Ellis P. Garton, administrator of the estate of H. B. Garton, deceased.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The Clerk will report the next bill.

LOUIS LANDRAM.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1584) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Louis Landram, administrator of William J. Landram, deceased.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

ALBERT GREENLAW.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2180) for the relief of Albert Greenlaw.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Albert Greenlaw, postmaster at Eastport, Me., in the sum of $3,494.83, due the United States on account of post-office funds embezzled by Ernest A. Farris, assistant at the Eastport (Me.) post office during several years, ending December, 1900: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall be taken as releasing any other person or persons from liability to the United States on account of said embezzlements or in any manner affecting such liabilities.

The committee amendments were read, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the figures "$3,494.83" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$3,378.02," and, page 1, line 9, after the word "hundred," insert the words "and twelve."

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

THOMAS R. MASON.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2288) for the relief of Thomas R. Mason.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Thomas R. Mason, of Dexter, Mo., the sum of $128.24 for services in carrying the mail on route No. 9683, in Kentucky, from January 1, 1861, to May 31, 1861.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, Thomas R. Mason has died since this bill was introduced. I may state now that this is a debt due on a contract for carrying the mail during the Civil War from a point in Kentucky to a point in Tennessee. The Government officials admit they have owed this money for over 50 years. It has passed the House three times, but has not passed the Senate. I desire to amend now by inserting after the second "to," in line 4, the words "the legal representative of."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to further amend by inserting after the word "Mason," in line 4, the words "deceased, late of."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the bills for the carrying of mails in the Southern States at the outbreak of the war. We have passed from time to time a number of these bills in three or four or half a dozen different Congresses. It seems to me that if we are to continue to pay these claims it would be perfectly proper to authorize it by a general law on the subject. I think there may be claims outstanding on the books of the department to the extent of a hundred or a hundred and fifty or more thousand dollars. As long as we have made a precedent and stuck to it for several Congresses, and are likely to pass any of these bills that come in as special bills, the amounts being small in each case, it seems to me that Congress ought to pay them by a general act, so that the claimants shall not be put to the bother and expense of trying to push a special bill through

the Congress, and that the Committee on Claims shall not be put to the trouble, bother, and expense of taking up these claims individually. They have been passed in the last few Congresses by unanimous consent. I have no objection whatever to the passing of this bill. Some one, I noticed, has introduced a general bill on the subject. I do not remember who it was, and I do not remember whether it went to the Committee on Claims or to the Committee on the Judiciary or some other committee.

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that the bill to which he refers is probably the bill introduced by Mr. ALEXANDER, and the Committee on Claims now has the bill under consideration and expects in the near future to report a bill covering all these claims.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I heartily agree with all that was stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], that where the Government owes money on a contract and admits it has owed it for 50 years, it does seem to me there ought to be some general legislation that will give relief without requiring the parties to come here to seek relief by special bill. This bill has passed the House three times, but never has passed the Senate. There has never been any objection to it in the House, because the Auditor for the Post Office Department has stated that the Government owed the money on the contract. About 60 days ago I received a letter from this old gentleman saying unless he got this money very soon it would do him no good; and since I have introduced this bill and had a favorable report upon it I have been notified of his death, so that these premonitions of his early death were correct. I now desire to get this bill through as early as possible for the benefit of his widow and children who survive him.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

MICHAEL F. O'HARE.

The next bill on the Private Calendar was the bill H. R. 4330, a bill for the relief of Michael F. O'Hare.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated to Michael F. O'Hare, of Tyngsboro, Mass., the sum of $200, in full compensation for loss of cow and injury to his business through negligence on the part of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology, on June 11, 1911.

The committee amendment was read as follows:

In line 7, page 1, strike out the figures "$200" and insert in lieu thereof "$85."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

POSTMASTER AT KEGG, PA.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4881) to reimburse the postmaster at Kegg, Pa., for money and stamps taken by burglars.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next bill.

DE BARBIERI & CO., VALPARAISO, CHILE.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8318) for the relief of De Barbieri & Co., of Valparaiso, Chile.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8318) for the relief of De Barbieri & Co., of Valparaiso, Chile.

Be it enacted, etc., That there be, and is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,470, to pay in full claims arising out of an agreement by De Barbieri & Co., of Valparaiso, Chile, to furnish fresh meats to the U. S. S. *South Dakota* in June, 1910.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on laying the bill aside with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

JAMES STANTON.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5835) for the relief of James Stanton.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5835) for the relief of James Stanton.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to James Stanton, of Leavenworth, Kans., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,912.40, the same being for extra work performed by said James Stanton on a contract with the War Department, dated June 8, 1908, for grading, paving, curbing, and rock hauling on Grant Avenue, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.: *Provided*, That no part of the said sum shall be paid to the said James Stanton unless he has carried out a certain agreement under a contract dated August 27, 1907, namely: That he would keep the said road in satisfactory condition for a period of five years from the completion of the work under the last-named contract; and that in case of his refusal or failure to fulfill said agreement, any amounts which may have been expended by the United States for keeping this road in a satisfactory condition during the five-year period shall be deducted from the said sum of $1,912.40, and shall be available to reimburse the War Department for such necessary expenditures as the same are made: *And provided further*, That the Government does not relinquish any of the rights secured to it under the guarantee bond of the said James Stanton in the Massachusetts Bonding & Insurance Co., dated January 4, 1910, should the said sum of $1,912.40 prove insufficient for defraying the cost of the work necessary to place and keep the road in such satisfactory condition during the said five-year period.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Strike out all of the remainder of the bill after the word "Kansas" on line 10, page 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, I move to lay the bill aside with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

UNITED STATES DRAINAGE & IRRIGATION CO.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7248) for the relief of the United States Drainage & Irrigation Co.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7248) for the relief of the United States Drainage & Irrigation Co.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the United States Drainage & Irrigation Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of New York, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $9,498.43, which sum is hereby appropriated, the same being payment in full for additional work performed by said United States Drainage & Irrigation Co. under its certain contract with the War Department, dated December 15, 1911, for jetty work at the mouth of Broadkill River, Del.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on laying the bill aside with a favorable recommendation.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bills to the House, some with amendments and some without amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bills do pass.

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration sundry bills, and had directed him to report the same back to the House, some with amendments and some without amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bills do pass.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10037) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 95) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Mr. Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán, a citizen of Cuba.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2180) for the relief of Albert Greenlaw.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2288) for the relief of Thomas R. Mason.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4530) for the relief of Michael F. O'Hare.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8318) for the relief of De Barbieri & Co., Valparaiso, Chile.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5835) for the relief of James Stanton.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7248) for the relief of the United States Drainage & Irrigation Co.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the several bills were passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following personal requests, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 28, 1916.

Mr. Moss of West Virginia requests leave of absence indefinitely, on account of illness.

JANUARY 27, 1916.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully ask five days' leave of absence from the House, on account of important business.

Very truly, CALEB POWERS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, these requests will be granted.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 29, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. PADGETT, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9224) providing for an increase in number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 83), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4784) to provide for a change in the designation of the Steamboat-Inspection Service, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 84), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6918) to relieve Congress from the adjudication of private claims against the Government, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 85), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WEBB, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 91) requesting the Attorney General to furnish the names and former allegiance of persons involved in alleged criminal plots, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 86), which said resolution and report were laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8423) for the relief of Robert F. Risley; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 6230) granting a pension to Christopher C. Hamilton; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 10303) to provide for an examination, survey, and estimate of cost of an inland waterway on the Atlantic coast of the State of New Jersey, between Cape May and New York Bay, N. Y. and N. J.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10304) to provide for the erection of a public building at Lake City, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10305) to grant certain lands to the State of Oregon as a public park, for the benefit and enjoyment of the people; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10306) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the sale of certain lands belonging to the Indians on the Siletz Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon," approved May 13, 1910; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10307) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay and to distribute the balance now in the Treasury to the credit of the Alsea and other Indians on the Siletz Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 10308) to provide revenue by taxing wine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 10309) for the reduction of postage on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 10310) to create a Federal land credit system, provide credit facilities for farmers, reduce interest rates on farm mortgages, encourage agriculture, promote thrift, provide a market for United States bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 10311) to provide for the enlargement, extension, and remodeling of the Federal building at Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 10312) relating to appeals and writs of error and costs thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 10313) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Greensboro, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 10314) to provide capital for agricultural development, to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgage, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to create Government depositaries and financial agents for the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10315) for the erection of a public building at Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10316) appropriating $5,000 for the improvement of that portion of National Avenue, village of West Milwaukee, Milwaukee County, Wis., abutting the grounds of the Northwestern Branch National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BRITT: A bill (H. R. 10317) to purchase a post-office site and to build a post-office building in the city of Murphy, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CROSSER: A bill (H. R. 10318) relating to liability of employers and assuring compensation for injuries or death of certain employees in the District of Columbia, providing for an industrial commission in said District and defining its duties,

and providing for an appropriation to carry out the provisons of this act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A resolution (H. Res. 112) directing an investigation of the proposed motorization of the Rural Mail Service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BARKLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 121) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 10319) granting a pension to Henry Pudor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10320) granting an increase of pension to John W. Pence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10321) granting an increase of pension to John R. Tallentire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10322) to correct the military record of George Vansickle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10323) for the relief of the Citizens' Building & Loan Association Co., of Newark, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10324) for the relief of the Granville Building, Savings & Loan Co., of Granville, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 10325) granting an increase of pension to Alfred D. Cosby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10326) granting an increase of pension to Anderson Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10327) granting a pension to Malisa Sunderland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10328) granting a pension to Boyd L. Mahon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10329) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of Ellery P. Roberts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10330) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of Lee Thompson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 10331) granting a pension to Oscar Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10332) granting a pension to James H. Swallum; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 10333) to place the name of Jedediah C. Paine upon the unlimited retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10334) for the relief of James A. Griffith and Hannibal I. Griffith; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CONRY: A bill (H. R. 10335) for the relief of S. A. Russell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 10336) granting a pension to Jennie Bridwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW (by request): A bill (H. R. 10337) for the relief of Mary J. Higgs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 10338) granting an increase of pension to William S. Nail; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 10339) granting an increase of pension to David Cromwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10340) granting an honorable discharge to James Crowley; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAMLIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 10341) granting to the National Investment & Development Co., a corporation of Warsaw and Kansas City, Mo., right, so far as the interests of the United States may be affected or concerned, to construct and maintain reservoir, dam or dams, and tunnels across and from and to the Osage River, for the development of water power at a point above the town of Warsaw, Benton County, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10342) granting a pension to Mary E. Hazelrigg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULBERT: A bill (H. R. 10343) granting a pension to Arthur O. Herman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10344) granting an increase of pension to George W. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 10345) granting a pension to Hannah Hagan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 10346) granting an increase of pension to James Sillett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10347) granting an increase of pension to Walter J. Wall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 10348) granting an increase of pension to Hannah F. Blood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 10349) granting an increase of pension to Allen C. Walkington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGEE: A bill (H. R. 10350) for the relief of John P. Stanton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 10351) granting an increase of pension to James M. Blakeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10352) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Rader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 10353) granting an increase of pension to Jacob J. Hare; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10354) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan E. Kidd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10355) granting a pension to Charles A. Gailey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORTH: A bill (H. R. 10356) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10357) granting a pension to Annie North; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 10358) granting an increase of pension to George A. Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10359) granting an increase of pension to Hannah B. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10360) granting a pension to Susan L. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 10361) granting an increase of pension to J. H. Burns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10362) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Schoner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 10363) to remove the charge of desertion against James Green; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 10364) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10365) granting a pension to Albert De Witt Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10366) granting a pension to John Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10367) to correct the military record of John Henry Dolchy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10368) to correct the military record of Thomas F. Lindersmith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10369) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Fried; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10370) granting a pension to Andrew C. Ross; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10371) granting an increase of pension to Oliver H. P. Meek; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 10372) to remove the charge of cowardice against John McNeil; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 10373) granting an increase of pension to F. A. Heebner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 10374) to correct the military record of Herman Neff and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 10375) for the relief of David A. Trousdale; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10376) granting an increase of pension to William F. Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 10377) for the relief of J. M. Crumpton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 10378) granting a pension to Andrew B. Putnam; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10379) granting a pension to Nettie E. Browning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 10380) granting a pension to Manuel C. Gorton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10381) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Pack; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10382) granting an increase of pension to John W. Leathers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10383) granting an increase of pension to James Holderby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 938, for the relief of Sanford T. Timmons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of bankers and other citizens of Sedgwick, Derby, Cheney, and Galva, Kans., protesting against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Evidence to accompany House bill 10047, a bill granting a pension to Ortha A. Glanville; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Petitions of 100 citizens of Nashville and 200 citizens of Springfield, Tenn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petitions of depositors in banks of Kansas, opposing placing revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., asking that the subject of railway-mail pay be submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission for an investigation and report; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Travelers' Protective Association of America, indorsing the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASEY: Petition of 1,000 citziens of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petitions of 100 people of High Springs and 300 of Gainesville, Fla., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of the Jessup & Moore Paper Co., relative to compulsory pilotage of barges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Travelers' Protective Association, favoring passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Department of Social Betterment of the Brooklyn Bureau of Charities, favoring passage of House bill 476, the workmen's bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Central Union Label Council of Greater New York, favoring passage of House bill 6871, relative to convict-labor goods; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of Leslies, Underwood Typewriter Co., and Edwin H. Burr, all of New York, against reduction of mail deliveries in New York; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DARROW: Memorial of Travelers' Protective Association of America, favoring the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Mrs. Franklin S. Edmonds and others, of Philadelphia, relative to woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of Local Union No. 46, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, favoring the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of E. L. Robinson, St. Louis, Mo.; favoring the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of Fred A. Keller and P. W. Hampton, against censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Missouri Cattle, Swine, and Sheep Feeders' Association, favoring a law for the standardization of agricultural products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Koken Barbers' Supply Co., St. Louis, Mo., protesting against schedule B of the emergency war-tax measure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EGAN: Memorial of Stockton Chamber of Commerce, in favor of submitting the question of railway-mail pay to the Interstate Commerce Commission for an investigation, and report to Congress; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Joseph P. Byers, of Philadelphia, secretary committee on provision for the feeble-minded, favoring an appropriation by Congress to establish a home for the feeble-minded in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Travelers' Protective Association, favoring the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of C. E. Lindner and 30 others, of Colby; and Otto S. Olson and 24 others, of Curtiss; all in the State of Wisconsin, favoring Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Methodist Episcopal Church of Belvidere, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Bourse, favoring repeal of the seamen's act; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GARNER: Petition of Texas Staats-Verband, relative to forbidding Americans to sail on vessels belonging to warring nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Travelers' Protective Association, favoring the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Southern Medical Association of Dallas, Tex., relative to increasing medical department of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of V. R. Blehdon, of Buffalo; C. W. Rathgeb, of Highland, N. Y.; James Mortin, of Washington, R. I.; Joseph Jensen & Co., of Chicago, Ill.; William Skinner & Sons, of Holyoke; and Windsor Print Co., of North Adams, Mass., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Memorial of Social Service Commission of South Dakota, favoring censorship of moving-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 8423, for the relief of Robert F. Risley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Orrin W. Auman and 700 members of the Grant Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, Thomas S. Young and 450 members of the Broadway Baptist Church, Roy Leslie Smith and 150 members of the Washington Park Methodist Episcopal Church, W. W. Winne and 1,500 members of the Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, O. W. Fifer and 500 members of the Warren Memorial Church, and L. A. Spring and 30 members of the North Denver Mission of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, all of Denver, Colo., urging the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution providing for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Frank W. Bretwall and 154 citizens of Julesburg, Sedgwick County, Colo.; J. C. Hoover, pastor, and 24 members of the Englewood, Arapahoe County (Colo.), Baptist Church; Walter Raymond Loupe, pastor, and 77 members of the Englewood, Arapahoe County (Colo.), Christian Church; and Edward Nolte and 50 citizens of Platner, Washington County, Colo., urging the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution providing for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Travelers' Protective Association, favoring passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of W. A. Bryan and 50 others, of Carrollton, Ohio, favoring law misbranding articles made from leather, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of 187 citizens of Steubenville and 300 citizens of Harrison, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULBERT: Memorial of United Spanish War Veterans of St. Louis, Mo., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IGOE: Memorial of Travelers' Protective Association of America, favoring the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Capt. Fred A. Bottger and members of Company K, First Regiment, National Guard of Missouri, favoring National Guard pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETTNER: Resolutions of Canners' League of California, favoring adequate American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of Canners' League of California, favoring cooperation between Federal and State Governments for rivers, harbors, and inland waterways development; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of Society Sons of Revolution in the State of California, favoring development of practicable system of national preparedness against war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of Oakland Chamber of Commerce, favoring additional appropriations for improvements in equipment of Geodetic Survey on Pacific coast; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Commodore Council, No. 14, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Wakefield, R. I., favoring restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of Travelers' Protective Association, in convention at Omaha, Nebr., favoring passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Ogdensburg, Pa., relative to increased efficiency and compensation of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of C. H. Anschutz, of Tawas City, Mich., favoring embargo on munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McLEMORE: Petition of sundry citizens of Hill County, Tex., against any great increase of taxes for purposes of preparedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of American Neutrality and Peace Convention, at San Francisco, Cal., favoring an embargo on arms and ammunition; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petitions of St. Louis Waiters' Union, Local No. 20, F. S. Elliott, and Robert J. Fritz, all of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of St. Louis Moving Picture and Projecting Machine Operators Union, Local No. 143, and Awning Workers' Union, No. 14667, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Journeymen Steamfitters and Helpers, No. 562; International Association of Pile Drivers, Local No. 43; Future City Lodge, No. 1; Badge and Lodge Paraphernalia Makers' Union, No. 9136; Soda and Mineral Water Employees' Union, No. 14797; United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Local No. 1011; World's Fair Lodge, No. 390; the Order of Railway Telegraphers, Missouri Pacific Division, No. 31; G. B. B. Association of United States and Canada, No. 5; International Hod Carriers, Local Union No. 284; International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, Local No. 41; Brotherhood Railway Car Men, Mountain Lodge, No. 19; United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Local No. 45; Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers, No. 204; Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, Local No. 102, all of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of William G. Pettus and others, of Philadelphia, Pa., urging embargo on munitions of war, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Philadelphia Board of Trade, urging passage of Senate joint resolution 60 relative to legislation bearing upon shippers, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Travelers' Protective Association of America, favoring law relative to unfair competition; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Louis W. Carlisle Camp, No. 56, United Spanish War Veterans, of Watertown, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Louis W. Carlisle Camp, No. 56, United Spanish War Veterans, of Watertown, N. Y., favoring pensions for widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OAKEY: Petition of the Williams & Carleton Co., of Hartford, Conn., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Admiral Bunce Section, No. 42, Navy League of the United States, of Hartford, Conn., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of Gorham Manufacturing Co., of Providence, R. I., favoring increased appropriations for governmental work in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorials of Homer Bleach & Dye Works and Union Webbing Co., in favor of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorials of Rev. Edward R. Evans, Annabel L. Berry, Sarah J. Eddy, Rhode Island Federation of Labor, and Albert C. Rider, of Rhode Island, favoring the Keating-Owen bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of Commodore Perry Council, No. 14, favoring more strict laws governing admission of foreigners to this country; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of E. J. Waters, of Providence, R. I., protesting against any embargo on arms; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Rev. George McClellan Fiske, in favor of the Keating-Owen bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. OVERMYER: Petitions of Ludwig Tuler and 24 citizens and J. J. Danch, of Sandusky, Ohio, and German-American Alliance, of Bellevue, Ohio, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: Petition of sundry citizens of the thirty-ninth congressional district of New York, favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHALL: Memorial from the business men of Cambridge, Sandstone, Hinckley, Anoka, Braham, Mora, Rush City, Foreston, Lindstrom, Center City, North Branch, Pine City, Montrose, Wayzata, Long Lake, Princeton, Excelsior, Hopkins, St. Bonifacius, Maple Plain, Taylors Falls, Stanchfield, Ogilvie, Brook Park, Isanti, Rockford, Harris, Delano, Oak Park, Chisago City, Rock Creek, Buffalo, Annandale, Cokato, Dassel, Howard Lake, Waverly, Minn., favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of Fred Van Brunt and Edward H. Van Camp, of Long Branch, N. J., favoring embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of New Jersey Society Sons of American Revolution, favoring erection of national archives building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Daughters of Liberty, Cedar Run, N. J., favoring passage of Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Stockton (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway-mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of New Jersey, favoring passage of Stevens-Ayres bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNELL: Memorial of Ogdensburg Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway-mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Commodore Perry Council, No. 14, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Wakefield, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, favoring House resolution, granting the erection of a monument in Arlington Cemetery to the nuns of the battle field; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 4624, granting an increase of pension to George H. Naylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: Petition of Walsh Paper Co., Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of K. S. Ramsett, Fingal, N. Dak., and 272 other merchants, favoring Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *January 29, 1916.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pray Thy blessing upon these Thy servants whom Thou hast in Thy providence placed in positions of great responsibility and power. There is no phase of the work committed to their hands that does not pertain to the interests of the larger life and of the higher kingdom. Thou hast a purpose and a plan in all that Thou dost require at the hands of this honorable Senate.

O God, give that clearness of discernment, that calmness of thought, that evenness of temperament, that likeness to Christ to Thy servants that they may well perform the duties committed to them, and that each day they may enjoy the blessed

satisfaction of having given something of their lives to the advancement of the interests of humanity and the extension of the kingdom of God. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

LIST OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 265).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to the order of the court, a list of cases referred to the Court of Claims by the United States Senate, which cases were dismissed by the court under the act of March 4, 1915, etc., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2180. An act for the relief of Albert Greenlaw;
H. R. 2288. An act for the relief of Thomas R. Mason;
H. R. 4530. An act for the relief of Michael F. O'Hare;
H. R. 5835. An act for the relief of James Stanton;
H. R. 7248. An act for the relief of the United States Drainage & Irrigation Co.;
H. R. 8318. An act for the relief of De Barbieri & Co., of Valparaiso, Chile; and
H. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis Mr. Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán, a citizen of Cuba.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I present resolutions adopted by the Jacksonville (Fla.) Branch of the National Security League, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Article IV, section 4, of the Federal Constitution provides "that the United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government and shall protect each of them from invasion"; and

Whereas statements in the annual reports of the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, and in the reports of the military and naval heads of departments appended thereto prove that the defense of this country are inadequate and would be ineffective in the event of foreign invasion; and

Whereas an attack waged against any part of the United States would be felt with equal hardship by all citizens of the United States on account of the distributed holdings of securities, etc., and the need for requiring men for an army of defense from each State in the Union: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Jacksonville Branch of the National Security League in conference as follows, to wit:

First. We favor such an increase in our Navy that it will be second to none in the world and one that will demand the respect of all nations for our commerce and trade on the high seas, and efficient to maintain the first line of defense on both the coasts of these United States.

Second. We favor a substantial increase of our Regular Army.

Third. We favor sufficient appropriations to place our National Guard on a proportional-pay basis and provide for ample instruction for these volunteer forces; as it is our belief that only through the National Guard is it possible to train a citizen army in times of peace.

Fourth. We favor the organization of cadet companies, as contemplated in the War Department bill now under consideration, and a corps of citizen officers who can supply the needs of a volunteer army in time of need.

Fifth. We also favor the holding of student camps as conducted by the War Department last year.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to each Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States from Florida and they, respectively, be requested by the chairman of this branch of the National Security League to favor and support the increased appropriations of Congress to establish an efficient Navy and Army and a National Guard and officer corps along the lines and views herein expressed.

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of resolutions adopted December 20, 1915.

CROMWELL GIBBONS,
Chairman Jacksonville (Fla.) Branch National Security League.

Attest:

ERNEST METCALFE, *Secretary.*

Mr. GRONNA. I present resolutions adopted by the Burleigh County Farmers' Union, in convention assembled at Bismarck, N. Dak., against an increase in armaments. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions adopted by the Burleigh County Farmers' Union, in the quarterly convention assembled at Bismarck, N. Dak., December 10, 1915.

Whereas more than 60 per cent of all the Federal revenues are now used for war expenses, a burden that is already too heavy to be borne by the producing classes without protest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we demand economy in all appropriations made by Congress, and that we are especially opposed to any great increase in expenditures for the Army and Navy, but approve a reasonable outlay for coast defense by submarines and other agencies proved by recent experience to be effective for that purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That we are unalterably opposed to a large standing Army and to any change in our military system tending to compulsory military service; and be it further

Resolved, That we demand that our Senators and Congressmen use their votes and influence to prevent the appropriation of any unreasonable amount of money for war preparedness and Army and Navy increases. We demand that Congress redeem all pledges made to the farmers and proceed at once to enact a rural credits law, a law against gambling in produce options on boards of trade, a law providing for national standards for grain grading and inspection, and a law creating a national bureau of markets, all of which were indorsed by the national convention of the Farmers' Union at Lincoln, Nebr., on September 8, 1915; and be it

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from North Dakota and to the local papers of Burleigh County, N. Dak., for publication, and that a copy be spread upon the minutes of this meeting.

J. F. PERKINS, *Chairman,*
E. A. TRYGG,
H. W. RUPP,
C. O. KELL,
H. P. KNAPPEN,
Committee on Resolutions.

Submitted by C. F. Lindsey, secretary-treasurer, Regan, N. Dak.

Mr. GRONNA presented the memorial of Nick Thinnes, of Rock Lake, N. Dak., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition adopted by the American Neutrality and Peace Convention, held at San Francisco, Cal., praying for an investigation by Congress of alleged violations of neutrality, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KENYON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Sigourney, Iowa, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation limiting the free use of the mails, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. STERLING presented a memorial of the Commercial Club of Huron, S. Dak., remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LIPPITT presented a petition of Fred L. Sayles Co., of Pascoag, R. I., praying for the imposition of a tax on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. FLETCHER. I present a resolution, being a favorable report from the Committee on Printing, and I should like to ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 87) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the report entitled "Electric Power Development in the United States and Concentration in its Ownership and Control," transmitted to the Senate by the Secretary of Agriculture on January 20, 1916, in response to Senate resolution No. 544, Sixty-third Congress, be printed as a Senate document, together with accompanying tables and illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, before unanimous consent is given I desire to call the attention of the Senate to certain public documents that have been printed covering the subject matter of this report.

In the first place, I wish to say that it will cost the Government for printing this document some twenty-odd thousand dollars. The information it contains, which is claimed will be used in the discussion of the water-power bill, has been printed many times, either in this body or in the House of Representatives; volume after volume has been printed and reprinted.

I noticed in the Evening Star of January 26, 1916, the following statement:

Gifford Pinchot, president of the National Conservation Association, who is in New York, has made public through the Washington office of the association in the Munsey Building a statement drawing attention to the report on water power made to the Senate by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Pinchot says that the report, which charges that a monopoly of control of water powers and water-power sites exists in the United States, establishes every contention as to the water-power situation made by the conservation association.

"On January 20," Mr. Pinchot says in his statement, "Secretary Houston's report was referred to the Senate Committee on Printing.

"There is grave danger that its publication will be held up until too late to affect legislation now before Congress. The revelations of the report as to the growth of monopoly in water power and the facts as to development are so damaging to the water-power interests that serious efforts will be made to smother it."

Now, Mr. President, what are the facts in relation to this matter?

On January 20, 1916, the Senate referred the report to the Committee on Printing.

On January 21, 1916, the report was received by the committee from the Secretary of the Senate.

On January 21, 1916, the report was referred to the Public Printer for an estimate, as required by law. The committee could not act upon it until it had that estimate.

On January 25, 1916, there was a meeting of the committee called to consider printing the report, but it was postponed until January 28, as a quorum could not attend. Furthermore, the Public Printer had not completed his estimate as to the cost of printing the report, and it was not in the possession of the committee.

On January 27, 1916, the estimate was received from the Public Printer. The delay in submitting the estimate was due to the fact that the report contains 220 lithographic plates, on which the Public Printer had to obtain quotations from private contractors before completing the estimate.

On January 28, 1916, a meeting of the committee was called for 10 a. m. to consider the printing of the report.

This morning, Mr. President, a report was made by the chairman of the committee and unanimous consent is asked that the report be printed.

I call this to the attention of the Senate owing to the fact that this same bulldozing method has been going on for years from this same source whenever one of their pet schemes is before Congress, and I think the public ought to know it, Mr. President.

As far as I am concerned, if the Government of the United States wants to virtually throw $21,000 away, let us order the report printed; but when I stop to consider that volume after volume has been printed upon this same subject, with cuts and diagrams and all the information that will ever be referred to in the consideration of the water-power bill, not printed once but has been printed many times——

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I suppose the Senator refers to the official publications upon the subject. Is it not also true that this same information has been printed on many occasions in magazines and newspapers of the country?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, of course; but what I am speaking of now are official documents paid for by the Government.

Mr. THOMAS. But I wanted to emphasize another side of the situation, so that the Senate might understand that this information has been given to the public from private and official sources time after time within the last five or six years.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no question about it, Mr. President.

In this connection I wish to call attention to the fact that Mr. Pinchot bases his fear of the report not being printed upon the statement that the men who are opposed to conservation will prevent it. There is no basis of fact for this fear. The power bill is not conservation legislation, but legislation which robs the State of its water and gives the control of it into the hands of a bureau here at Washington. Mr. Pinchot claims that those opposed to the passage of the power bill are fearful that the information contained in this report, if printed, would show the power companies and water-power sites of the country in the hands of a monopoly, and, if so, their whole contention would be swept aside.

Mr. President, I wish to say that it is conceded by those who have studied the question and know the nature of the business that the most efficient and cheapest service can be rendered the people of any community or of any State by the concentration of small powers into one great unit. It is impossible to serve a community or a State or States, for that matter, and have a large number of small, insignificant units of power. But everyone, Mr. President, admits that when this great unit is established it should be controlled by the public utility commission of the State in which the plant is located. The price of power must be and is controlled; the distribution of power is and must be controlled by these commissions. Laws in virtually all the States have been—and, no doubt, will be—passed for this purpose, and there can be no harm come to the people of the United States in having electric energy centered in great power companies that can furnish service efficiently, cheaply, and promptly, but under the supervision of the commissions of the States.

Mr. President, I wish to insert as a part of my remarks an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle of January 22, 1916, upon this very question. It is short:

"CONTROL" OF WATER POWER—A CONTROL WHICH PREVENTS UTILIZATION IS NOT TO BE DESIRED.

The Secretary of Agriculture is one of the members of the President's Cabinet who is reputed to possess intellectual strength. He certainly does not, and presumably can not escape from the blighting influence of the university environment from which he was taken and which incapacitates all who are long subjected to it for any useful service in the direction of affairs.

In his report on the water power of the Nation Secretary Houston shows his university-bred fear of "monopoly" of water power in his comment on the situation, which he finds to be that more than half the water power now utilized is in control of 18 corporations and one-quarter in the control of 6.

The fact is that all sources of water power which can be united by connecting wires ought to be united and under single control. In no other way can temporary deficiencies in one section be so promptly and economically supplemented from surpluses in other sections.

If unbelievers are not satisfied with the authority of the Chronicle and their own common sense, we respectfully refer them to Gifford Pinchot, whose authority no uplifter will deny, and who is a sturdy supporter of this view of the case.

But Secretary Houston, who, had he developed in a more favorable environment, would have quite probably become a vigorous man of affairs, quakes and shudders at the university-created bogie of "monopoly."

An unrestrained monopoly of a necessity would, of course, suck the lifeblood out of any community which it could get at; but when the price of service is fixed by the people served, the situation is reversed, and the danger is that the community will suck the lifeblood out of the monopolies.

Which is, in fact, the danger which threatens the American monopolies to-day.

As, however, the votes of the ignorant greatly outnumber the votes of the wise, Congress legislates to placate ignorance rather than wisdom, with the inevitable result. Ignoring the national obligation to the States, it has so legislated that no new hydroelectric power whatever is being developed on the public domain, and the monopolists which so terrify Secretary Houston are thereby protected in their monopoly—such as it is.

As this result is now too obvious to be ignored, even by university professors and Congressmen, a new law is being engineered through Congress intended to make it possible to conserve some of our coal and oil by the substitution of hydroelectric power. Whether it will have that result will only be known when possible investors have studied the bill as finally passed.

If development follows, even on a trifling scale, the administration will shout that it has unlocked the sources of hydroelectric power, trusting that the people will forget that there would have been no occasion for unlocking if the same people had not previously locked, barred, and barricaded the same sources which they now ask credit for turning loose.

I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that Mr. Gifford Pinchot has admitted that public-service corporations for the distribution of electric power are more effective and can give better and cheaper power to the people in a single large unit than in many small ones, but that it ought to be regulated by some power other than its own officers no one disputes.

Mr. President, there are a mass of illustrations, 220 of them, in this report that will have to be lithographed. The cost of printing as provided in the committee report is over $20,000. This is only for a limited number of copies, 1,345 in all, and under the law the printed report will have to go first, 220 to the Senate, 350 to the House, 500 to depository libraries of the United States, and balance to departments, and so forth. The distribution gives each Senator two and hardly one to each Representative in Congress.

I warn you if this is ordered printed it will be only the beginning of the expense to the Government of the United States.

However, I wish to say if the printing of the report would assist any Senator in determining how his vote should be cast upon the water-power bill, I would not say one word about the expense. Not one change in the bill will be made by the printing of the report.

Now, Mr. President, I shall say no more. I shall not interpose an objection at this time to the present consideration of the resolution. If the Senate wants to vote for the expenditure of money in this way, well and good; I have done my duty in calling the attention of the Senate to it. I want the Senate to vote upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida a question before that is put. What is the estimate of the cost of the publication of this report without the illustrations?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have not an estimate of the cost without the illustrations.

There is this about it, I will say to the Senator. This report was made by the Secretary of Agriculture, but it was the work of the Forest Service, the chief engineer, Mr. Merrill, having compiled it, as he had done the work of collecting the data in pursuance of a resolution offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] last year. There have been some six or eight months' hard work put upon the preparation of the data. It probably cost the department twice as much as $20,000 in actual expense. It is regarded as the most complete compilation of data on the subject of water-power development throughout the whole country, covering all the United States, that has ever been gotten together. The report is made in pursuance of that reso-

lution calling upon the Department of Agriculture to collect the data and perform this service and make these estimates and furnish the information to Congress.

The report was referred to the Committee on Printing, as the Senator from Utah very properly has said, on the 20th of this month. There has been no delay, and there has been no excuse for anyone to suggest a criticism of delay in action on the part of the committee or anyone else, because as fast as we could we obtained what it was required by the law that we should obtain, an estimate of the cost, before we made a report upon the resolution. That estimate came in but a day or so ago, and this morning I have been authorized by the committee to make this report.

The estimated cost is $20,903.06. That includes, of course—and there was a delay perhaps of a day in getting that estimate, because we had to call upon outside parties to make the estimate on the lithographic work, which the Public Printer himself did not have in hand—the maps and drawings, some of which are colored, but they are an important part of the report. I would not think it advisable to print this report without those, because they explain and illustrate it. To print the volume of typewritten material I should think would not probably cost over one-tenth that amount, or somewhere in that neighborhood.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I have no doubt the committee has acted very promptly in the matter, and I should like very much for the report to be printed were it not for the fact that the illustrations are so costly. If the illustrations are to cost $18,000 and the printed matter is to cost but $2,000, I very much doubt the expediency of publishing both. I should be glad, however, to have all the typewritten matter published.

Mr. FLETCHER. I can not say that that difference would exist. I have not the material before me for separating the estimate. The estimate furnished to the committee was that the cost would be $20,903.06 to print the material as a public document, which would give about 1,345 copies, as I recall.

It is a very important document; there is nothing more important to this country, in my judgment, than the proper development of that great resource—the water power of the country. This covers the whole United States, the information has been carefully gathered, at enormous expense and outlay of time and effort, and I think the report ought to be printed.

Mr. STONE. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] a moment ago stated that substantially all the matter embraced in this proposed print had already been published. I should like to know whether the Senator from Florida agrees to that statement?

Mr. FLETCHER. No.

Mr. STONE. If it be true, what is the need of multiplying these publications, at very great expense?

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator from Utah is in error about that, I am quite sure. There were hearings before the Public Lands Committee in 1914, I think, and some of those hearings were printed as late as two years ago; but I am sure that this material is not embodied in those hearings. I am quite positive that the material here offered to be printed is down to date, is new, and while, of course, the hearings may have in a general way gone into this question, by no means has this material ever before been printed.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to say in answer to the Senator from Florida with reference——

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I should like to ask a question. Who is recognized, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognized nobody, as for a good long time the Senate has been taking charge of itself. The Chair will, however, ask the Senator from Florida whether he will yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thought the Senator from Florida had concluded, and I desired to be heard for a moment on this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. FLETCHER. If the Senator desires to interrupt, I am perfectly willing to have him proceed.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thought the Senator had finished, and I desired to be heard for a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The colloquy was going on, and the Chair was not interfering.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply desire to correct the statement made by the Senator from Florida, based upon the question asked by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE].

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am interested in this proposition, and I can not hear the debate.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Missouri asked a question as to whether practically all of the information contained in the report now proposed to be printed had not already been printed, basing that question upon a statement that I had made.

I want to say to the Senator from Missouri that the illustrations have not been printed. All, no doubt, will remember that when that report was presented to the Senate there was a stack of illustrations at least 1 foot high and, I should judge, 2 feet wide and about 2 feet 6 inches long. This is what I did say: That every question that is involved in the passage of the so-called Ferris power bill that is now upon the Senate Calendar has been discussed before the Committee on Public Lands of the Senate and also before the committee of the House of Representatives. I have in my hand one of the three volumes of the hearings that were held one year ago, where every phase of the present bill now on the calendar was discussed; and the hearings are to-day in printed form.

Not only that, Mr. President, but any Senator who will take the volumes and look through them will find illustrations as to many of the contested points. I do not want it understood, however, that the published reports of the proceedings of the committee contain all the vast number of illustrations submitted with this report. There are 220 of them, and the Government Printing Office had to send out for bids for the lithographing of those exhibits before it could submit the estimated cost of the report.

I want to say that so far as the information is concerned that is contained in the report, if it had not been printed before, by all means print it; I would not hesitate a moment to advocate doing so. My only contention is, that so long as we have this information, and all that will ever be referred to in the consideration of the power bill which is now upon the calendar, and all that has been referred to by Mr. Pinchot not only in this body, but in the other House as well, it seems to me like a useless expenditure of public money to now print this report with the illustrations.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am quite sure that, although there have been hearings, as the Senator from Utah has stated, there are diagrams, drawings, illustrations, maps, plats, and other data collected and submitted with this report, which constitute a very important part of it; and without them, mere statements such as would be brought out in hearings would not properly give the information as to what is contained in this report.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have nothing further to say.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the Senator a question before he leaves the floor.

Mr. FLETCHER. Very well.

Mr. NORRIS. Is it not true that this report comes before the Senate in answer to a resolution passed by the Senate?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have just so stated.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not hear the Senator, and I have come over on his side of the Chamber in order that I might hear him. If I have the right idea, this report comes before us now because we ordered the work which it embodies to be done and the facts contained in it to be gathered?

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely.

Mr. NORRIS. And those facts and that information were gathered in pursuance of our order; they are ready to be published; and unless they are published, we can get no benefit from the research and work that has been done up to this time?

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator from Nebraska is entirely right; and, as I have already said, it has cost the Government to gather the data and information contained in the report many times more than the printing will cost. I think it is very important to print it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word. If I remember correctly, this report was made in response to a resolution which I had the honor to submit to the Senate, and I judge it contains a great deal of very important information. I do not construe the information which it contains as it has been construed by others, but I am satisfied that it contains information which would be interesting to those who may wish to discuss this question from any standpoint.

I am not able to confirm what has been said by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] that all this information is to be found elsewhere, because I have not had time to look fully into this report, as I have been endeavoring to do, but, from conversa-

tions which I have had with those who seem to know its contents. I think it a very valuable report. Does any Senator know about what it will cost to print it?

Mr. SMOOT. It will cost $21,000 to print it as a public document providing for 1,345 copies, of which 220 will go to the Senate, 350 to the House, and 500 to depositary libraries of the country. There will be two for each Senator and nearly one for each Member of the House.

Mr. FLETCHER. I find, Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to answer that question and also the question submitted by the Senator from Colorado, which I was unable to answer a moment ago, that the cost of printing the text without the illustrations, plats, maps, and so forth, will be $7,832.24. The total cost of printing the whole thing—and the illustrations are so involved with the text as to make it almost useless to print the text without the illustrations—will be $20,903.06.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the amount which has been suggested seems a large one to incur in the printing of a document, but the subject with which we are dealing involves not only thousands, but hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars; and, in addition to that, in my judgment, it involves other questions of more moment to this country than the mere question of dollars and cents. I am very anxious myself to have the information that this report is supposed to contain. There can be no exaggeration as to the importance of the subject with which we are soon to deal and concerning which this report is made, and I feel that this information ought to be at our disposal.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the printing of the illustrations constitutes almost two-thirds of the total cost. I have never seen any great information derived from illustrations. It seems to me that if we could print the text and omit the illustrations we would get all the information that is desired and save the Government about $13,000 or $14,000.

What I was inquiring of the Senator from Florida was whether or not that could not be done and what amount of saving it would involve. As I have said, people do not acquire information to any great extent from illustrations, unless they contemplate construction work; but if they simply desire to get information on the subject intended to be covered by the resolution, namely, the desirability or undesirability of enacting the kind of legislation proposed, it seems to me it would be well to omit the illustrations and thereby save the Government that amount of money.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Florida that, so far as I am personally concerned, if the report is to be printed, it ought to be printed with the illustrations, and for this reason: The substance of the report—that is, the testimony—has already been printed time and time again, but it has not been printed with all of the illustrations.

This information, Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Idaho and also to the Senator from Florida, was not collected in answer to the resolution of the Senator from Idaho. The information was all collected before the resolution was introduced; and, of course, all the expense incurred by the Government in the collection of the material was incurred before the resolution was introduced. I will further say to the Senator that I know that to be true, because we had the subject before the Public Lands Committee, and Mr. Merrill, who collected the information, appeared before the committee day after day and had the information to submit to the committee at that time.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there is one thing I want to say, namely, that I am not afraid of this report——

Mr. SMOOT. Nor am I.

Mr. BORAH. Because of the fact that it establishes the existence of a monopoly. If that fact is established, I want to make further inquiry as to why it is permitted to continue; and I shall be able to demonstrate, to my satisfaction at least, that this present bill will not discontinue it. I think it is worth while for us to know all that can be known about this subject. If there is a monopoly of water-power sites and of water development, and this report proves it, we shall be ready to call upon some one to proceed to get rid of this monopoly, if it is monopoly we fear. There has been much said by the advocates of the Ferris bill that one of its virtues is to prevent monopoly. There is a more effective way to get rid of monopoly, if it exists, and I want to know some of the present conditions as to monopoly.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. I thought the Senator was through, but perhaps he will let me interrupt him long enough to say further that I have a letter from the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands of the House, Mr. SCOTT FERRIS, in which he says:

> As you doubtless recall, Senator BORAH introduced a resolution last year calling for the compilation of certain data with reference to water-power development.
>
> Mr. O. C. Merrill, chief engineer, Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, has made a compilation which, to my mind, is the greatest thing ever had on the subject. He was good enough to let us have part of the data to help us in handling our water-power legislation in the House, and everyone who has observed it all is delighted with it.
>
> I want to urge you, if I may, to have the data printed.

Then he proceeds to specify that he would like to have the text of the report at once for use, the other portion to follow. That is the request coming from the other body as to the printing of this material; and, without going into the question of legislation on the subject at all, it is simply a question about what we will do with this report. I do not know how far we may have to go in connection with legislation.

Mr. BORAH. I think the report ought to be printed.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not know that I would object to the publication of the report if the illustrations were excluded. At the same time, so far as I can estimate its worth from what has been said about it, it seems to me its purpose is to establish what I think every man who has given much attention to the subject knows to be the fact, and that is the existence of a monopoly in the water-power development of the country. That such a monopoly exists is, in my judgment, beyond all question. The subject matter of the business is a natural monopoly, and, that being so, in my judgment, in view of material and industrial conditions, we might as well try to interfere with the operation of the law of gravitation as to interfere with the law of monopoly as applying to such a great subject as the question of the development and distribution of hydroelectric power. It is here; it has been here for a long time; and all the reports on earth, I do not think, will change that fact, nor will any legislation such as has been proposed affect it very much, if at all. So long as the business is permitted to be a private one—that is to say, one which is developed, owned, and operated by private interests—just so long the monopoly will continue.

The action of the Government in the proposed water-power bill, instead of interfering with, preventing, modifying, or destroying existing conditions, will simply add to them. The only possible remedy—and I think the public will realize it at some time—is in the public ownership of the development and distribution of electric power.

I do not think it requires a lot of illustrations to demonstrate the existence of the conditions to which the report pertains; but, at the same time, if it is desired by the Senate to print it, I am perfectly willing to see it done, provided that the illustrations, which seem to me entirely beside the purpose, are eliminated. I can not conceive what purpose the illustrations can subserve, except to secure, perhaps, a wider distribution of the document. A great many books in these days which are not worth printing receive quite a circulation because of the fact that they are handsomely illustrated. We are illustrating too many of these reports. So far as one particular report is concerned, the expense to the Government is comparatively nominal, but when duplicated and reduplicated and multiplied time after time, as is always the case when precedents are set, we are rapidly reaching the time when reports and documents published by official authority will be more attractive and perhaps more useful by reason of the illustrations they contain than by reason of the printed matter they contain.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I think the report ought to be printed, so that we can see what it contains. Undoubtedly the substantive part of it would be as valuable without the illustrations as it would be with the illustrations. It might not be as interesting, but perhaps it would be as valuable.

The admitted existence of a national water-power monopoly does not remove the difficulty of deciding the form of legislation in regard to further grants of water powers. Suppose there is a national monopoly; the methods of its formation and control, to what extent it has developed power already in private hands will all be elucidated by this report.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator to say that these illustrations are not pictures? They are maps and drawings and plans, which are so connected with the text that it would not be understood without the illustrations. They are not merely photographic pictures.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, we can not pass any judgment upon the comparative value of the illustrations until we see them, and, not being printed, we have no practical oppor-

tunity to see them; but I should like to ask the Senator upon what he bases his estimate of the cost of this publication.

Mr. FLETCHER. The law requires the committee to obtain an estimate of the cost, and that is done through the Public Printer. The Public Printer has been obliged to get estimates outside of his office, because some of this work can not be done in his office; and the estimate we have is furnished to us by the Public Printer. He has made the inquiry and obtained the information.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Has the Senator any estimate of the cost of printing that part of the report, outside of the illustrations?

Mr. FLETCHER. We have estimates as to both and as to all.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I simply wanted to ask the Senator from Florida a question. I should like to ask him if he has any information or any estimate as to the time that would be required to get out this publication with these illustrations—how long it would take?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no definite information as to that. Of course, the text can be printed within a very short time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not asking about the text. I have an idea about that. What I should like to know, Mr. President, is about how long it would take to publish this document with the illustrations included? I have had some experience along that line, and I have an idea that it will not be completed until three or four or perhaps five months, when all the legislation intended to be affected by it will have passed, if it should be passed at this session of Congress.

Mr. FLETCHER. My information is that all of it can be done inside of a month.

Mr. BANKHEAD. How does the Senator get that information? From the department?

Mr. FLETCHER. From the Printing Office.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I have noticed a great number of reports in which the maps were printed in a separate volume from the text of the report and could be considered as a separate proposition. When we see the text of the report we can then determine with some degree of intelligence the importance of the maps and appendices, and for that purpose, if for no other reason, that portion of the report ought to be printed.

Now, as to the cost of this. I suppose the Senator estimates the salaries of the employees in the Printing Office, the cost of maintaining the Printing Office, and so forth. All of that is an overhead charge which goes on just the same, whether this report is printed or not.

So far as the existence of a monopoly is concerned, and whether or not this report shows the existence of a monopoly, the question which will have to be determined in the passage of water-power legislation is what we are going to do about it if it is admitted that there is such a monopoly, whether or not the Federal Government is going to reserve some regulative control over the combination. There is an intermediate ground before we reach Government ownership. We are not necessarily going in one step to Government development and ownership of water power, which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] says is the only alternative to private monopoly. That is a question that is involved in the bill which is coming up when the Philippine bill is disposed of.

This report undoubtedly is the result of a considerable expenditure of money in obtaining the facts which compose it, and it is perfectly useless unless it is printed. I have seen in the Literary Digest, for instance, advertisements of the General Electric Co., advertising for sale electric power in Spokane, Wash.; in Baltimore, Md.; in Washington, D. C.; and in every important city in the United States and Canada. That is conclusive proof of the existence of some central control over this kind of power. But the mere admission of this does not solve the problem. There are other questions to be decided, and the detailed information and conclusions contained in this report will throw light upon them.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I hope this report will be printed. The Senate on this occasion, as it has been on a number of other occasions, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Here is a report which is made pursuant to a resolution heretofore adopted by the Senate that will cost the Government something like $20,000. The procurement of the information has cost more; and yet, as has been said by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], it involves a subject that is worth millions of dollars, and I may say billions of dollars, to this country; and we hesitate now to print the data that have been secured and that can be made available and used when we come to the consideration of the Ferris bill and other measures affecting water power.

A water-power conference was held in my city a few months ago. That conference adopted a set of resolutions in opposition to the so-called Ferris bill. There were differences of opinion amongst the distinguished gentlemen who attended that conference with reference to Federal control of water-power sites and those who favored the acquisition of these power sites by the States and their control by the States under the jurisdiction of public utilities commissions. Notwithstanding the adoption of those resolutions at the water-power conference referred to in opposition to the Ferris bill or anything like it, or anything like Federal control, the Committee on Public Lands of the Senate and the Committee on the Public Lands of the House have reported out practically all that has been insisted upon with reference to Federal control of water-power sites.

That is the question involved. It is one that is going to be discussed here for weeks and months before it is finally disposed of and the issue settled. I assume that the gentlemen who oppose Federal control, like the distinguished Senator from Utah and others whom I might name, want information on this subject, and all that can be availed of. This report gives it all in such form that it is easily accessible to the Members of the Senate and those who are interested in the subject.

It is true, as the Senator from Utah has said, that much of this information has been printed from time to time, but it is scattered through hundreds of different printed reports and hearings, and it is physically impossible ever to collate it so that the Senate can have the benefit of the views of officials of the Government when we come to consider the bills on the subject. This report puts it all in such shape that the Senate can get access to the information in abbreviated form, if that be possible. The Senator from Utah would say it was not in abbreviated form, but it is, because the subject is discussed in thousands of volumes, and there are as many views of it as it is possible to find views on any subject of interest to the people of this country.

Mr. President, with reference to the question of monopoly I agree with the Senator from Idaho. If this report establishes that the water powers of this country have been monopolized, then either the Government itself has been derelict in its duty in not dissolving the monopolies or it ought to be possible for the Congress of the United States, in the light which will be furnished by these reports, to find some method of controlling them. It is the last natural resource that the people have, the last that has not been disposed of and has not been monopolized in its entirety.

It is to protect the water powers of this country that it is insisted that this report ought to be printed, no matter what it costs, so that the Senate may determine for itself whether or not there is a monopoly, whether or not the Government has been derelict in its duty, and lastly, whether or not, if it has been derelict in its duty, the Congress of the United States can not do its duty and find some method for the control of this power.

I hope the Senate is not going to balk at the expenditure of $20,000 to print a report, with the illustrations that accompany it, when there is involved in it so much money, and not only so much money but so much of interest to present and to future generations.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. In looking over the report of the hearings before the Committee on Public Lands, which I hold in my hand, I notice an illustration of the Butte, Anaconda & Pacific Railway. "Silver Bow Canyon: Freight train, 22 cars; total weight, 1,200 tons; two 80-ton electric locomotives." Is that necessary to give any information?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Oh, you can not say what is necessary.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Well, wait; let us take another. We have another of the same kind.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; you can pick out things——

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Oh, yes; but if the Senator will permit me, you might put in any picture you pleased. We are not issuing an illustrated magazine. I am in favor of printing this report. I am agreeing with the Senator; but I do not want these things put in the report that are very expensive and are of no possible value to anybody on earth.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, there is not any question but that there may be material in these reports that would be useless.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to say that in the proposed report there are no photographs at all? Those data do not go in this report. They are not a part of the report. There are no photographs at all in it.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, Mr. President; there are. I do not want the Senator to make such a broad statement as that, because I will say that, while most of the illustrations are maps and diagrams, I am quite sure that the Senator, if he will look through, will find a few photographs.

Mr. SHAFROTH. What kind of diagrams and maps are they, please?

Mr. SMOOT. I will answer the Senator from Colorado just as soon as the Senator from Oregon concludes.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I should like to know who has the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is trusting the Senator from Oregon to take care of himself.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection to being interrupted, but I object a little to the general conversation on the outside while I am trying to say something to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There is not any question, Mr. President, but that some illustrations and some photographs have been printed in the past, and some may be printed in this report, that are of little, if any, value; but they are a small proportion of the whole in the very nature of things. It is a little bit singular—and I mean no disrespect to my colleagues when I say it—that the gentlemen who oppose the Ferris bill or any sort of Federal control are the gentlemen on the floor of the Senate who are objecting to the printing of this report.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator to get me mixed up with those who favor the Ferris bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator from Idaho is not opposing the printing of the report?

Mr. BORAH. No.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that I am not making any charges, Mr. President; but it is a fact that the gentlemen who are opposing the printing of this report are the gentlemen who have stood in opposition to any kind of Federal control.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Will not the Senator supplement that statement by saying that Senators who are opposed to the Ferris bill also are in favor of printing the report?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have not heard of any of them yet. I hope they are.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I was one of them, Mr. President.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator from Wyoming certainly is in favor of getting all the information that it is possible to secure. He has no fear of any information coming before the Senate or elsewhere. So I hope the Senator will not go into the merits of the Ferris bill and impute to the opponents of the bill the motive of wishing to suppress information.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am glad to know that some of the Senators who oppose the Ferris bill are favorable to printing this report.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. So far as I am personally concerned, Mr. President, the only reason why I even suggested that the report be not printed was from the fact that all of the information contained in the report, with the exception of some of the diagrams, is in print at present, and has been for the last four or five years, and I thought it was a duplication of printing.

If the Senator will yield for just a moment further, I want to say to the Senate that if this report is to be printed I hope all of it will be printed. I do not believe it would be right to print just the text of the report and let the diagrams go out.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. I am one of the Members of this body who is opposed to what is called the Government leasing of its domain or any part of it. Now, it may be that that has something to do with my opposition to the publication of this report. I think, however, that the Senator can be charitable enough to assume, at least, that some of those who desire to have the report printed are actuated quite as much by their friendship for Government leasing measures as those who, from a sense of duty, are opposed to Government leasing measures.

So far as I am concerned, my objection is based on the fact that this is a proposed expenditure for what seems to me to be a wholly useless purpose. If the monopoly exists, it is not necessary to illustrate it by diagrams.

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all.

Mr. THOMAS. If it does not exist, diagrams will not establish that fact. Why should we expend for these, to my mind, useless illustrations thousands of dollars of the public money, especially when most of them have been published in other reports and at other times?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I want to disclaim any purpose to question the motives of any Senator. I simply call attention to the fact; that is all. I attribute to them the same purity of purpose and intent as I claim for myself. I simply call attention to that particular fact.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] continues to reiterate the statement that this matter has all been published in other documents. Assuming that some of it has been published, it has been so published that it is impossible of study by the Senate of the United States as a consecutive whole.

I have been a member of the Public Lands Committee for a good many years. A witness will come in to the committee room, Mr. Merrill, for instance. There are three or four members of the committee present, and they proceed to interrogate him and disturb his line of thought. When they have exhausted themselves three or four other members of the committee will come in and exhaust themselves, covering parts of the same subject. When the witness gets through no man can sit down and intelligently arrive at a conclusion as to what the witness meant. That is the way it is done, and this matter is scattered through various tomes filled with this and other subjects.

I hope this matter may be printed and brought before the Senate in answer to the resolution adopted here, so that the Senate may have before them when they consider the bill all the information. I wish to say to the Senate now that that bill is not going to be disposed of in a day. Some one wanted to know how long it would take to print this report. It does not make any difference if it takes three months; the bill will probably be pending before the Senate at that time, and it may not go through at all. I hope the Senate will print the report.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I am one of those who are very strenuously opposing the so-called Ferris bill. That is no reason, however, why I should object to the printing of this report. I think the Senate ought to be thoroughly educated on this subject, and when it is and the whole matter is thoroughly understood I think the Ferris bill will be defeated. I regard it as one of the most important cases of proposed legislation that will come before the Senate at the present session. It involves an entire change of the policy of the Government in dealing with its public lands. It will amount to an infringement upon the rights of the States to deal with the flow and use of the waters within the States. That is an exceedingly serious question.

I think, Mr. President, we ought to get all the information we can upon a matter as important as that, and I certainly do not object to the publication of this report if it is going to give us any information that will help us to reach right conclusions upon that question.

So far as the question of monopoly is concerned, Mr. President, of course these streams are being controlled by monopolies all over the country. Everyone knows that. The Government has been dealing with these monopolies in disposing of the public lands for purposes of that kind, and it will continue to do so even if the Ferris bill is passed. In fact, the Ferris bill has no tendencies, in my judgment, to dissolve monopolies or to hinder their operations in the future. The Ferris bill does not involve the question of monopolies, in my judgment, at all.

So this information will be of little profit, so far as the Ferris bill is concerned, respecting that particular matter; but believing that we should get all the information we can on this subject I am quite favorable to the motion to have the report printed. I am afraid it will be read by very few Senators, and probably no one else will read it, but that does not seem to be an objection to the printing of matter by Congress. Some one may get some information of value out of the report, and therefore it is proper the Senate should print it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I should like to say a word, if this discussion is going to continue, as I offered the resolution which seems to have brought forth this report. At the time the

resolution was offered there was a propaganda going on throughout the country to the effect that the Ferris bill was designed and intended to destroy a monopoly of water-power business. I felt that I should like to know what information there was at hand with reference to the existence of a monopoly and with reference to the relationship of some of those who are much in favor of the Ferris bill in reference to those monopolies. I therefore introduced the resolution. I am opposed to the Ferris bill as it is now written.

I merely wished to say this in order that there might not be a misunderstanding as to my position with reference to the Ferris bill and also with reference to publishing the report.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I rose merely to say to the Senator from Florida that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] has given notice that upon the conclusion of the bill now under consideration, the Philippine bill, he will move to take up the bill on which a report was made by the Committee on Commerce. It deals with dams across navigable streams, and that will involve the consideration, in all probability, of all these questions. Some of us believe that no other legislation coming before Congress transcends in public importance that measure and the other measure dealing with water power, and I most sincerely hope that it will be taken up at the conclusion of the consideration of the Philippine bill.

I gathered, from what the Senator said, that it will be impossible to get this report out for use in connection with the consideration of that measure if it should come up at the time that has now been suggested. I hope we shall not meet any objection to the consideration of that bill at that time upon the ground that this particular report is not then before the body. I trust that it is not intended to postpone the consideration of those important measures to await the printing of this report.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I do not rise as opposing or defending the motion. I really do not know enough about the matter to vote for or against it; but it is a question which, it seems to me, ought to be decided before the measure to which it relates is considered. I gather from what has been said here this morning that in all human probability the expenditure of this $20,000 will not in any way affect the water-power question. The Senator from Florida states that his information is to the effect that it will take at least a month. Does anyone expect to spend a month waiting for the illustrations in the printed report? Does anyone expect to spend a month upon the consideration of the water-power bill?

The Senator seems to have great faith in this report and its effect upon Members of this body. As far as my experience goes, I am convinced that the illustrations which appear in that report will not change the views of a single Senator here with reference to the existence or nonexistence of a monopoly. I think our experience in other cases will show that such a question will not be decided by illustrations appearing in publications. I have yet to see an instance where a Senator had changed his mind by what was found in illustrations.

This is a considerable item. I do not suppose there is any severer criticism leveled against this body or the other body with reference to the wasteful expenditures of public money than grows out of the continual attempt to publish reports of one sort or another. Sometimes they are obviously and palpably useless; sometimes they are of doubtful utility.

It would seem to me that we have such a case here. We are asked to spend $21,000 for the publication of a report. As I gather the situation from the statements which have been made here, the report does not come in answer to the resolution of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], but it simply collates information that was in existence and had been gathered by the Government long before the Senator from Idaho tendered his resolution. That is my understanding of it. It is true that the Senator from Idaho offered a resolution, and in response to that resolution these illustrations and this text appear, but the information was in the possession of various agents and officers of the Government long before. It had been laid before the Public Lands Committee of the Senate, had been printed in their hearings, had been laid before the corresponding committee on the other side, and had been printed in their hearings, and, I understand, is easy of access to any man who is sufficiently interested in the subject.

It seems to me to be rather a doubtful proposition that we shall spend $21,000 to gather up in convenient form this information. Students and advocates of it who have sufficient interest in the subject will go to the various publications and obtain the information they want. There is no trouble about that. Other Members who are not interested in the subject will not read it, no matter how beautiful the illustrations may be.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HUGHES. With pleasure.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Can the Senator from New Jersey refer to any document or source of information showing what proportion of water-power sites in the United States is in private ownership and giving the names of the companies and corporations that own and control them?

Mr. HUGHES. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show it. The Senator from Washington said a while ago that the water power of the country is under the control of the Hydro-Electric Co., and that it was advertising the sale of hydroelectric power in Washington, Baltimore, and various cities of the country. That is probably true. I have no doubt the Senator would not say that if it was not true. The Senator is convinced; that fact of itself is sufficient to demonstrate something; and all the illustrations the committees can lay before him will not change his mind about it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; I do not think it will change the mind of the Senator from New Jersey either, but that is an entirely different question from the one I asked the Senator. That is only one phase of this resolution. One question that will come up in the consideration of the bill is that it is urged by a great many people that the water powers ought to be developed and that if a liberal law is passed, when the Government relinquishes all the power of regulation to private companies private companies will invest their capital in these water-power sites and develop them, and it will add to the prosperity of the country. It would be quite interesting to know in that connection what proportion of the water-power sites have already passed out of the hands of the Government and are in the hands of private companies without any reserved power of control or regulation by the Government. Also, it would be interesting to know what proportion of those privately held have been developed.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] informs me that he can give the Senator that information in present publications already paid for by the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will yield——

Mr. HUGHES. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. The question asked by the Senator from Washington can be answered in detail not only as to the horsepower that is owned by every company but as to the director of every company, and not only the director of every company, but showing in how many companies each individual director is, if in any other power company of the United States, and diagrams showing the interlocking directorates of the different companies. All have been printed before, as I stated.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator from Utah speaks out of the abundance of his knowledge on this subject. He is a member of the Committee on Public Lands, as I was at one time. I am no longer a member of the committee, but I attended a great many of the hearings, and I know there must be a great pile of data in the possession of that committee already printed. I can not think of any possible thing in connection with this whole question that is not now in print. What I am trying to do is to save the Government the useless expenditure of $21,000.

Mr. President, I should like to ask what is the parliamentary status? Is there a motion pending?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no motion pending. The Chair has not yet had an opportunity to ask the Senate whether it gives unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. The Chair has been trying to ask that for an hour. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. HUGHES. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It goes to the calendar. Reports of committees are in order.

ASSISTANT APPRAISERS OF MERCHANDISE.

Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (S. 2730) to fix the compensation of assistant appraisers of merchandise, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 96) thereon.

GEORGE H. HERVEY.

Mr. FLETCHER. From the Committee on Military Affairs I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 3344) to authorize George H. Hervey, of Pensacola, Fla., to construct and operate an electric railway line on the Fort Barrancas Military Reservation, Fla., and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 95) thereon.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in the Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were, in line 6, after the word "military," to strike out "reservation" and insert "reservations," and in the same line, after the words "Fort Barrancas," to insert "and Fort McRee," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of the United States is hereby given to George H. Hervey, of Pensacola, Fla., to locate, construct, maintain, and operate a line of electric railway on the military reservations of Fort Barrancas and Fort McRee, in Escambia County, State of Florida, upon such location and under such regulations and conditions as shall be approved by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize George H. Hervey, of Pensacola, Fla., to construct and operate an electric railway line on the Fort Barrancas and Fort McRee Military Reservations, Fla., and for other purposes."

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. SHAFROTH, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 85, to authorize the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico to employ a stenographer to take testimony, etc., reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 4059) authorizing suits to be brought by any State or States against the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGHES:

A bill (S. 4060) to limit the effect of the regulation of interstate commerce between the States in goods, wares, and merchandise wholly or in part manufactured, mined, or produced by convict labor or in any prison or reformatory; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 4061) providing for the refund of duties collected on hot-rolled flat-steel wire rods, about 3 inches in width and one-eighth of an inch in thickness, under the act of Congress approved June 24, 1897, and under the act of Congress approved August 5, 1909, imported subsequently to June 4, 1908, and prior to October 3, 1913; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 4062) granting a pension to Harry S. Comrey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 4063) authorizing the replacement of a bridge across the Republican River near Fort Riley, Kans., under the direction of the Secretary of War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 4064) granting a pension to William H. Houston; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 4065) for the relief of Rittenhouse Moore; and

A bill (S. 4066) to satisfy the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of William Moseley, administrator of Temperance Moseley, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4067) to establish a fish hatchery in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Fisheries.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 4068) for the relief of Mary E. Boyd (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 4069) to protect the dignity and honor of the uniform of the United States; and

A bill (S. 4070) to provide for the utilization of the Forest Service personnel for military purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution and ask that it be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 91) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives to investigate the conditions relating to the national defense and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, through a joint subcommittee of 10 Senators and 10 Representatives, who shall be selected by said committees, respectively, 5 by each, are hereby appointed to investigate—

(a) The general subject of the national defense.

(b) The efficiency of the present organization of the Army and Navy and the increase of such efficiency.

(c) The advisability of compulsory service.

(d) The relation of the State Militia to the national defense.

(e) The advisability of creating a council of national defense, and its composition.

(f) The increase of the military and naval schools for training officers and utilization for this purpose of the schools of agriculture and mechanic arts created under the Morrill Act.

(g) National cooperation with the States in school training, involving the fundamental idea of the use of arms for the maintenance of civil order, both domestic and international, and not for conquest, and the method to be adopted for the inculcation of such idea.

(h) The construction, equipment, and personnel of auxiliary ships for the Navy to be used in war in aid of the fighting ships and in peace for establishing routes of commerce and mail to foreign countries.

(i) The necessary cost of the national defense covering a period of five years, and including in this the extent and size of such organization of the national defense as will be covered by an annual expenditure of $300,000,000, $350,000,000, $400,000,000, $450,000,000, and $500,000,000, respectively, for a period of five years, commencing July 1, 1916, with authority to sit during the recess of Congress and with power to summon witnesses, to appoint necessary experts, clerks, and stenographers, and to do whatever is necessary for a full and comprehensive examination and study of the subject, and report to Congress as expeditiously as may be; that the sum of $10,000, or so much thereof as is necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution and to pay the necessary expenses of the subcommittee and its members, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Said appropriation shall be immediately available and shall be paid out on the audit and order of the chairman or acting chairman of said subcommittee, which audit and order shall be conclusive and binding upon all departments as to the correctness of the accounts of such subcommittee.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I would like to make a brief statement in connection with that joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The President has called the attention of Congress to the question of preparedness. There are now four committees, two of the House of Representatives and two of the Senate—the Committees on Military Affairs and the Committees on Naval Affairs—engaged in the consideration of the question of the national defense. Four separate hearings are being had, at which the various witnesses appear in rotation, the same witness appearing before two or more committees. The country is confused with these various hearings; the newspapers themselves are not able to keep track of them, and the country is not being informed of their progress.

The purpose of this joint resolution is to coordinate all four of these committees—the Committees on Military Affairs of both Houses and the Committees on Naval Affairs of both Houses—through a subcommittee to be appointed from each, with a view to having one hearing and making a report, which can be submitted to the respective committees and then action taken upon the subject. My idea is that this will very much expedite the orderly progress of this matter. The national defense is a unit, and the Army and Navy are merely divisions of that unit. They should be considered together and not separately. An increased expense in the one should involve a diminished expense in the other.

I ask that the joint resolution may lie upon the table, in the hope that the chairmen of the committees referred to will favor it, and in the further hope that it may then be immediately adopted.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to make a statement in answer to the last statement which was made by the Senator from Nevada. I understand that this is a joint resolution.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Nevada understands full well that such a resolution can not be immediately considered, but must be referred to a committee. In order that the Senator may be informed, I will say that if he asks for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution I shall object, because, under the rules, a joint resolution has to go to a committee.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I am not asking for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution. I have asked that it lie on the table. I shall bring it up next Monday, in the hope that the committees will cooperate in the immediate adoption of the resolution. It is a matter for next Monday.

Mr. SMOOT. If the joint resolution is brought up on next Monday it will have to go to a committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the resolution lying on the table? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CENTRAL HEATING, LIGHTING, AND POWER PLANT.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution and ask that it be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 92) relative to the construction on the site selected of the central heating, lighting, and power plant authorized by the provisions of the sundry civil appropriations act approved June 23, 1913, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That inasmuch as the plans adopted for the construction of the central heating, lighting, and power plant authorized by the provision of the sundry civil appropriations act approved June 23, 1913 (38 Stat. L., p. 25), on the site selected raise serious questions affecting the appearance of the city of Washington and the desirability of erecting said plant according to said plans, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to submit these plans to Congress, together with all reports from commissions, architects, engineers, and others who have been consulted in connection therewith; and that no work upon the construction of said plant shall be commenced until plans therefor shall have been approved by the President of the United States.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution. I desire to say that it is very much feared by the Commission of Fine Arts that the erection of the structure referred to in the joint resolution, according to present plans, will be exceedingly unsightly, and that it is quite possible that it may be something of a nuisance. It is proposed to construct this immense heating and lighting plant in the neighborhood of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, near the Mall. I am told that its smokestacks will be four in number and that they will be 195 feet in height. It seems to me very important that we should get the report of the Commission of Fine Arts on this subject, and determine whether or not the height of these smokestacks can not be diminished and the unsightliness of the building modified.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have no possible objection to the joint resolution; on the contrary, I sympathize with it; but I think the Senator from Nevada had better make it either a concurrent resolution or a Senate resolution, because under the rules the joint resolution would have to go to a committee.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I have put this in the form of a joint resolution because it directs the holding up of the construction of this building until the report asked for is made. I assumed that it would have to be a joint resolution in order to do that, as the building is being constructed under an appropriation made in the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. LODGE. Is not that matter covered by the urgent deficiency bill now on our tables? There is a long amendment in that bill in regard to the matter.

Mr. SMOOT. That is an additional amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes; that is an additional appropriation.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I simply want an opportunity for the Art Commission to make a thorough inquiry and report upon this subject, with a view to the preservation of the beauty of the Mall.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me suggest to the Senator that he withdraw the joint resolution at this time for the reason that there is an item concerning this building in the urgent deficiency bill, which is now on the calendar. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has already given notice that he intends to ask that that bill be taken up on Monday, and I suggest that the Senator from Nevada might consult with the chairman of that committee before asking for the consideration of the joint resolution. There is, as I have stated, an item contained in the appropriation bill providing for extending the limit of cost of the construction of the plant referred to in the Senator's joint resolution. The plant, as I remember, is to be located at Fourteenth and B Streets. While I am in sympathy with the joint resolution itself, being a member of the Appropriations Committee I should feel obliged, in the absence of the chairman of that committee, to make an objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution, even if it were a Senate resolution. If the Senator from Nevada will take the matter up with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], I think perhaps he can come to some arrangement with him.

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to say that this resolution has reference only to furnishing an additional building with heat, to wit, the Red Cross Building and one of the Navy buildings. I think that is the only purpose of the additional appropriation provided for in the bill. It does not affect the location of the plant or the manner of its erection.

Mr. SMOOT. But it affects the size of the plant.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes; the size of the plant is affected.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from Nevada will permit me, his joint resolution would be in order as an amendment to the urgent deficiency bill on Monday.

Mr. SMOOT. It would go out on a point of order.

Mr. LODGE. It would not go out on a point of order, if the Senator will excuse me. It is not legislation and proposes to make no appropriation; it involves no expense even. It only asks for certain orders to hold up this work.

Mr. OVERMAN. The committee amendment itself would go out on a point of order.

Mr. LODGE. The main amendment of the committee?

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. If the committee reports it, it does not make any difference whether the item is estimated for or not. The joint resolution offered by the Senator from Nevada, unless I am very much mistaken——

Mr. OVERMAN. If it is new legislation, it would go out on a point of order.

Mr. LODGE. It would be entirely in order as an amendment, because it is a mere direction as to the expenditure of an appropriation and asks for certain papers.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the Senator is wrong in his statement. If the committee reports new legislation, is not that subject to a point of order? Suppose our committee should report new legislation?

Mr. LODGE. Of course new general legislation would be subject to a point of order under our rules, but this is not general legislation. The resolution of the Senator from Nevada, as I understand, puts a limitation on an expenditure, and such a proposal has always been held to be in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. I agree with the Senator. I merely wanted to correct the statement of the Senator, as I understood him, that anything the committee put on is not subject to a point of order. I will say that there is one exception to that general statement, and that is where new general legislation has been added.

Mr. LODGE. If it is general legislation, certainly. I was not going into that, but this case, I think, does not come under that rule. I feel very sure that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will be glad to take up this matter with the Senator from Nevada, and I think that is the quickest way of reaching the result. The joint resolution, at all events, could lie on the table until Monday and we could see what we could do in connection with the appropriation bill.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Very well; I will ask that the joint resolution lie on the table until Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will lie on the table and be printed.

AMENDMENT TO DISTRICT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $90,000 for the improvement of Sixteenth Street NW., from Montague Street to Alaska Avenue, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ALLOWANCE OF CLAIMS.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 651) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the Court of Claims, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his clerks, announced that the President had on January 28, 1916, approved and signed the following act:

S. 1773. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Warfield, Ky., and Kermit, W. Va.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2288. An act for the relief of Thomas R. Mason;

H. R. 4530. An act for the relief of Michael F. O'Hare;

H. R. 5835. An act for the relief of James Stanton;

H. R. 7248. An act for the relief of the United States Drainage & Irrigation Co.; and

H. R. 8318. An act for the relief of De Barbieri & Co., of Valparaiso, Chile.

H. R. 2180. An act for the relief of Albert Greenlaw was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval

Academy at Annapolis Mr. Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán, a citizen of Cuba, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask unanimous consent that Order of Business No. 33, being Senate joint resolution No. 60, be taken up.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think we are entitled to dispose of the cases on the calendar as they stand in order. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada how long it will require to dispose of this joint resolution?

Mr. LODGE. It will take some time.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will say to the Senator that this joint resolution has been under consideration, I think, at three sessions during the morning hour, but is yet undisposed of. I know of but two Senators who desire to discuss it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LODGE. I object. It will take some time to consider the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the regular order will be proceeded with.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 33, being the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution 60.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hardwick	Myers	Smoot
Bankhead	Hollis	Nelson	Sterling
Borah	Hughes	Newlands	Stone
Brandegee	Husting	Norris	Sutherland
Broussard	Jones	Oliver	Swanson
Bryan	Kenyon	Overman	Thomas
Catron	La Follette	Page	Tillman
Chamberlain	Lane	Poindexter	Townsend
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Colt	Lodge	Shields	Walsh
Curtis	McCumber	Simmons	Warren
Dillingham	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	Weeks
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.	Works
Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.	

Mr. CHILTON. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent from the Senate on account of illness.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], who is absent, is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I desire this announcement to stand on all votes to-day.

Mr. BANKHEAD. My colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is unavoidably absent from the Senate. He has a pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING]. I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am requested to state that the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] is absent on official business. He is paired with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. STONE. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. REED] has been called from the city on important business and will not be present to-day. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

I also wish to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is detained at home by sickness, and I will ask that this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada to proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution 60.

Mr. SMOOT. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator to withhold that request for a moment. The Senator from Nevada is willing to give way in order that the Senate may take up the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, as I understand from him. I ask that that bill may now have the consideration of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with and that the bill be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the top of page 2, to insert:

LINCOLN MEMORIAL COMMISSION.

For improvements in and additions to the Lincoln Memorial, and for masonry steps and approaches and terrace wall, not heretofore provided for, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, $263,000, to remain available until expended, and the limit of cost of the said Lincoln Memorial is hereby increased from $2,000,000 to $2,594,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 7, to insert:

ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE COMMISSION.

To enable the commission created by section 23 of the public buildings act approved March 4, 1913, to investigate and report to Congress a suitable design for a memorial bridge across the Potomac River from the city of Washington to a point at or near the Arlington estate in the State of Virginia, together with such surveys and estimates of cost as they may deem advisable, $25,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 17, to insert:

BUREAU OF EFFICIENCY.

For investigating duplication of statistical and other work in the various branches of the Government service, $1,200: *Provided*, That hereafter the Division of Efficiency of the Civil Service Commission shall be an independent establishment and shall be known as the Bureau of Efficiency; and the officers and employees of the said division shall be transferred to the Bureau of Efficiency without reappointment, and the records and papers pertaining to the work of the said division and the furniture, equipment, and supplies that have been purchased for it shall be transferred to the said bureau: *And provided further*, That the duties relating to efficiency ratings imposed upon the Civil Service Commission by section 4 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved August 23, 1912, and the duty of investigating the administrative needs of the service relating to personnel in the several executive departments and independent establishments, imposed on the Civil Service Commission by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved March 4, 1913, are transferred to the Bureau of Efficiency.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill as to the part of the bill now under consideration, relating to the Bureau of Efficiency. Is it intended to be the effect of this amendment to put all the present employees of the bureau under the civil service, so as to make them permanent employees?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It has no relation whatever to the civil service. It makes no change in the existing law. It simply makes this an independent bureau, but all the rules of the civil service that apply now will continue to apply. It does not change the law in that respect at all.

This bureau has done splendid service. It has saved the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars at a very small relative cost, and this is to give it a more permanent status. To be perfectly frank, there is some friction in the bureau as now organized, and it is intended to remove that.

I have made careful inquiry, and I find that the bureau has done splendid service. This simply makes it an independent bureau instead of a bureau subordinate to the Civil Service Commission; but it does not change the civil-service status of a single employee—not one.

Mr. STONE. My inquiry was not intended to elicit the opinion of the Senator, though I am glad to have it, on the merits of the proposition as a whole. My attention was attracted to this language:

And the officers and employees of the said division shall be transferred to the Bureau of Efficiency without reappointment—

And so forth.

I am told that there are some persons now employed in the service of the Bureau of Efficiency who are not within the civil service, and the information I sought was whether the adoption of this amendment would, in effect, cover them into the civil service.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It will not. It does not change their status in any respect.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator, also, that there are very few employees doing this work. They all have to be very technical men, as the Senator knows.

Mr. STONE. Yes; I think that is true. I will ask both the Senators, or the chairman of the committee especially, since what the Senator from Utah has just stated is true, as I believe it to be, why would it not be very well to amend this amendment so as to cover these employees, efficient men already employed and already performing satisfactory service, into the service permanently?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I think we had better not open the doors to a wide field of discussion about the civil-service matter. This amendment does not change the status of these employees at all, and I very much hope it will be allowed to go, because I believe it is an important measure for the benefit of the service. I hope that we will not go into the question of the civil service in respect to it.

Mr. STONE. Of course if it is going to provoke any discussion, or if the Senator seriously fears that it would, I will not press it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do; and I feel that the language of any such amendment ought to be carefully prepared. It is a matter that I would not myself be ready to dispose of at this time.

Mr. STONE. I yield entirely to the judgment of the Senator in regard to the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 14, to insert:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

For necessary traveling expenses, including those of examiners acting under the direction of the commission, and for expenses of examinations and investigations held elsewhere than at Washington, and attendance at meetings of public officials, $6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 20, to insert:

For field examiners at the rate of $1,500 per annum each, for work in connection with members of local boards and other necessary work as directed by the commission, $300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of State," on page 4, after line 7, to insert:

Division of Mexican Affairs: For additional clerical services for the Division of Mexican Affairs, to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of State, $7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read to the bottom of page 8, the last item read being:

Cody, Wyo., post office: For commencement, $500.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia with reference to some of the appropriations for the commencement of post-office buildings. This bill, as I understand, is an urgent deficiency bill. How does it happen that appropriations are made to commence public buildings under an urgent deficiency bill? Has an act been passed for the building?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. These appropriations are all routine estimates from the department. Not a single thing is done, except to appropriate for pending work that has already been authorized. The department is proceeding to carry out the orders of Congress, and it lacks the money. There is a deficiency.

Mr. KENYON. Are there certain limits of time, under those acts, within which commencement of the building must be made?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think not. I do not think it is usual to put in any limit of time. Perhaps it ought to be done; but there is no limit of time as to the commencement of the work under these appropriations made by Congress.

Mr. KENYON. I do not understand how the commencement of a building can be an urgent deficiency.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, may I make a statement to the Senator in that connection?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The first thing in arranging for a public building, after the law is passed authorizing the building and the limit of cost, is to draw the plans; but before that there is the examination of the site, the borings, etc., to know the character of the soil, subsoil, and so forth, as to the foundation, and how they are to arrange for foundation material, and also for the grading of the land on the site; this before the plans are made. Those small appropriations, some of them only $500, comprehend the starting of the building.

Mr. KENYON. It does not mean the actual physical starting of the building, but merely the preparation of the plans?

Mr. WARREN. That and the plans, and in some cases the continuation of the building where it needs protection, and so forth.

Mr. KENYON. But will the Senator tell me why that is placed in an urgent deficiency bill?

Mr. WARREN. It is so that their office force may be employed on plans, and so that their engineers may be in the field, and not all have to be laid off and wait until such time as we pass the regular appropriation bills.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Treasury Department," subhend "Public buildings, construction, sites, and rent," on page 17, line 6, after "$600,000," to insert:

Provided, That so much of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes," approved June 23, 1913 (38 Stats., 25), as authorizes the construction of a central heating, lighting, and power plant in the city of Washington, D. C., be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to add to the buildings already enumerated in said act to be furnished with heat, light, and power the Johnson-Walker Building (known as the Navy Annex), the Interior Department Office Building, the Lincoln Memorial, and the Women's Memorial Building (Red Cross Building), and the limit of cost for said plant is hereby increased from $1,494,104 to $1,669,104, and the limit of $35,000 therein fixed for the employment of technical services in connection with the plans and specifications and construction of said plant is hereby increased to not exceeding $60,000 and made available for the employment of technical and clerical services for said purposes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Virginia to an amendment which I offer to come at the end of the appropriation regarding the central heating, lighting, and power plant in Washington, near the Mall.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the committee amendment as proposed in the bill, on page 18, line 2, after the word "purposes," the following:

Provided, That no work upon the construction of said plant shall be commenced until the plans therefor shall have been submitted to the National Fine Arts Commission for their approval and approved by the President of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, it is impossible to give intelligent consideration to a proposition like that, presented as it is. I suggest, and I hope it will be satisfactory to the Senator, that it be permitted to go on the bill, with a view to the investigation of the matter.

For instance, the amendment says "that no work * * * shall be commenced," and so forth. The work is already commenced. It is progressing now. The language might be changed, however. If there is anything in the plans which mars the beauty of the city it ought not to be done. I would be very willing for the Fine Arts Commission to be consulted, and I think it is well enough for that amendment to go on to afford opportunity for investigation.

I say that because if it should develop that there is no necessity for the amendment, and we did not persistently demand its retention, I want the Senator to understand it. I am as anxious as he is that no mistake shall be made, and I am very willing to have the amendment go on in order that it may be carefully investigated.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state, Mr. President, that that is entirely satisfactory to me. My only solicitude is to avoid unsightliness in the neighborhood of the Mall; and I have no doubt that the matter can be disposed of satisfactorily.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It will have careful investigation. I am as anxious as the Senator is to avoid any unsightly structure.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment stated again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will again state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the committee amendment, which comes on page 18, line 2, after the word "purposes," the following words:

Provided, That no work upon the construction of said plant shall be commenced until the plans therefor shall have been submitted to the National Fine Arts Commission for their approval and approved by the President of the United States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Has not the work been already started on this plant?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It has, Mr. President; and therefore I said that we could not perfect this amendment now, but that I was willing to have it go on the bill in order that the conference committee might give it careful attention; and if anything is necessary along this line proper languag will be provided.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Very well. It seems to me the amendment ought not to be adopted in that form.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, in the meantime is the work to be discontinued?

Mr. NEWLANDS. As I understand, the substantial work has not been commenced. There has been some work done with reference to excavation, but I do not think anything has

been done relating to the construction of the building. At all events, as the Senator from Virginia suggests, the amendment can be properly shaped.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, it strikes me that if the Senator from Nevada would amend the resolution so as to provide that the plans shall be submitted to the National Fine Arts Commission for the purpose of suggesting changes, and such changes as they may suggest shall be adopted, with the approval of the President, the work can go right along.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say to the Senator that, as I understand the amendment, that is substantially what it does. If it does not do that, and if any change of phraseology is necessary, it will be perfected in conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will suggest that there is a general statute on the subject providing that these public buildings shall not be erected until they have been submitted to this commission.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, within an hour or two I have received for my consideration in relation to this item a statement which is rather startling in its nature, particularly as to what the ultimate cost of the undertaking will be; and, further, that it is the intention to carry steam through pipes under the streets of the city from one building to the other at a pressure of 270 pounds for furnishing power for the operation of elevators and heating the buildings. I do not know whether there is any truth in the statement or not.

I had hoped that the matter could go over until Monday, but I shall not interpose any objection to its consideration and passage now, knowing that between now and the time the item shall be considered in conference I can get additional information. If there is any vital objection, and if the assertions contained in the statement submitted to me are correct, then, of course, I know that the conferees will take it under consideration.

Therefore I shall not object to the consideration of the matter at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senator can rest assured that the conferees will be glad to have the data which he may get and give them careful consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. McLEAN obtained the floor.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The chairman of the committee is not here. I do not know what his wishes are.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the present, and when the chairman of the committee comes in we will hear what he has to say. We had just as well finish the appropriation bill.

Mr. McLEAN. The chairman of the committee told me that he would be absent for a few minutes and would soon return. I shall occupy only a very few moments.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have sent half a dozen messengers to look for the chairman of the Philippine Committee without being able to find him. Under the circumstances I hope the Senator from Connecticut will defer his remarks for the present.

Mr. McLEAN. I will state to the Senator from Virginia that I was about to proceed with the knowledge of the chairman of the Committee on the Philippines, but if the matter before the Senate is not to take all the afternoon, I have no objection to yielding for the present.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am sure the appropriation bill will be finished in a very few moments.

Mr. McLEAN. Very well.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to laying aside the unfinished business temporarily and proceeding with the consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill? The Chair hears none.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Public buildings, repairs and equipment," on page 19, line 10, after "nineteen hundred and sixteen," to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$50,000," so as to make the clause read:

Repairs and preservation: For repairs and preservation of all completed and occupied public buildings and the grounds thereof, including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead, "Collecting internal revenue," on page 20, after line 8, to insert:

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue is authorized to reopen and allow claims for taxes for the recovery of which suits are pending and which would be allowable under the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of McCoach, collector, against Minehill & Schuylkill Haven Railroad Co.; and there is hereby appropriated for the payment of such claims a total sum not to exceed $300,000, this appropriation to be available for the payment of such of the aforesaid claims as are not payable out of moneys heretofore appropriated and available during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, for the payment of claims.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 9, to insert:

BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING.

The limitation in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916 as to the number of delivered sheets of United States currency to be executed is hereby increased from 82,000,000 to 90,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 15, to insert:

For engravers' and printers' materials and other materials, except distinctive paper, including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer $120,000 from other appropriations made for the fiscal year 1916, as follows: From "Salaries of all necessary employees, other than plate printers and plate printers' assistants," $75,000, and from "Wages of plate printers," $45,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead, "Public Health Service," on page 22, after line 5, to insert:

For special studies of and demonstration work in rural sanitation, including personal service, $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if he thinks $50,000 is sufficient to meet the emergency just now?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that this is intended to run only until the 30th of June. We had before us the Surgeon General, in charge of the Public Health Service, and we concluded, after hearing all he had to say, that $50,000, in addition to what has heretofore been appropriated, will meet the necessities until the end of the present fiscal year.

Mr. VARDAMAN. All I desire is that this service shall not be crippled. It is just in the infancy of its great work, and it was my understanding that the department had most earnestly asked for $100,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say to the Senator that that recommendation was made, but it was intended to go beyond the 30th of June.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I am perfectly willing, after what the Senator says, that the appropriation shall remain as proposed by the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Surgeon General appeared before us, and we are satisfied that this appropriation will answer until the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. SMOOT. It is perfectly satisfactory to the Public Health Service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "District of Columbia," on page 22, after line 22, to insert:

Publication of notices in condemnation cases: The provision contained in the urgent deficiency act for the fiscal year 1913, approved October 22, 1913, regarding notice by publication in condemnation cases for the opening, extension, widening, or straightening of streets, avenues, roads, highways, alleys, or minor streets in the District of Columbia is hereby repealed, and section 491c of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia be, and the same is hereby, reenacted so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 491c. The said court shall cause public notice of not less than 20 days to be given of the institution of such proceeding, by advertisement in three daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia, which notice shall warn and require all persons having any interest in the proceeding to appear in court at a day to be named in said notice and to continue in attendance until the court shall have made its final order ratifying and confirming the award of damages and the assessment of benefits by the jury herein provided for; and in addition to such public notice said court shall cause a copy of said notice to be served by the United States marshal for the District of Columbia, or his deputies, upon such owners of the land to be condemned as can be found by said marshal, or his deputies, within the District of Columbia and upon the tenants and occupants of the same. The said court shall appoint a guardian ad litem for any person interested in the proceedings who may be under disability."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 4, to insert:

Public schools: For additional amount necessary for construction of an eight-room addition, including an assembly hall, to the Powell School, $9,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Navy Department," on page 25, after line 18, to insert:

For rental of additional quarters for the Navy Department, $1,250.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. My attention has been called to the wisdom of inserting a few words there. In line 20, after the figures "$1,250," I move to amend by adding "or so much thereof as may be necessary."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of the Interior," at the top of page 28, to insert:

NATIONAL PARKS.

There is appropriated from the several appropriations for protection, improvement, and management, etc., of the various national parks, including the Hot Springs Reservation, as well as from the revenues from privileges, etc., in the national parks and the Hot Springs Reservation, such sum or sums as the Secretary of the Interior in his judgment may deem necessary, to be expended in employment of the superintendent of national parks and not exceeding four other competent persons in the District of Columbia and in the field, and other necessary expenses in connection with the administration of the national parks and the Hot Springs Reservation, including expenses of travel incident to the transferring of employees from one park to another and of park supervisors in conferring with the superintendent of national parks; a detailed statement of such expenditures to be submitted to Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to line 2 on page 29.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move to strike out lines 3, 4, and 5 on page 29, in the following words:

For payment of limited indemnity for the loss of pieces of domestic registered matter, first, third, and fourth classes, fiscal year 1914, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 10 on page 29.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the period at the end of line 10 be stricken out and to insert in lieu thereof a semicolon, and after line 10 to insert "1914, $5,000."

I will say, Mr. President, that I move this little alteration in pursuance of a letter received from the Postmaster General, in order that this appropriation may be applicable to pay for insured mail as well as the classes of mail provided for already in the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask that the communication, which I send to the desk, from the Postmaster General be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1916.

Hon. THOMAS S. MARTIN,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: My attention has been called to the provisions of page 23, lines 3, 4, and 5, of H. R. 9416, as passed by the House of Representatives, making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years. The lines in question read as follows:

"For payment of limited indemnity for the loss of pieces of domestic registered matter, first, third, and fourth classes, fiscal year 1914, $5,000."

The purpose of this deficiency item is to pay claims for indemnity arising on account of the loss of insured mail as well as registered mail. On January 1, 1913, the privilege to register fourth-class mail was withdrawn, as at that time the law was placed into effect providing for the insurance of fourth-class or parcel-post mail, as contemplated by the act of August 24, 1912. Therefore, during the fiscal year 1914 the department paid indemnity for the loss of registered, insured, and collect-on-delivery mail. Authority was granted in the deficiency appropriation act approved July 29, 1914, for the payment of limited indemnity for lost insured and collect-on-delivery mail out of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1914 by the following provision:

"For payment of limited indemnity for lost insured and collect-on-delivery mail, $35,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $60,000 for 'payment of limited indemnity for the loss of pieces of registered matter, first, third, and fourth classes,' for the fiscal year 1914."

As the total amount appropriated by this act (approved July 29, 1914) has been entirely exhausted, it is thought that the provision in the pending deficiency appropriation act (H. R. 9416) will make the funds available for payment of indemnity for lost registered mail only. For the fiscal years 1915 and 1916 there has been only one annual appropriation out of which to pay claims for indemnity for both registered and insured mail, but both classes of mail have been stipulated.

Under these circumstances I beg to request the following amendment to the act in question: That lines 3, 4, and 5 on page 23 be stricken out and that between the present lines 10 and 11 a line be inserted reading "1914, $5,000."

Unless this amendment is made, it is not believed that the appropriation will be available for the payment of claims for lost insured and collect-on-delivery mail.

Respectfully,

A. S. BURLESON,
Postmaster General.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Agriculture," subhead "Bureau of Plant Industry," on page 30, after line 21, to insert:

For the emergency caused by the infectious nature and continued spread of the destructive disease of pine trees known as the white pine blister rust, by conducting such investigations of the nature and means of communication of the disease, and by applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary, $20,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to pay such expense and employ such persons and means, and to cooperate with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations, or individuals, as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 7, to insert:

BUREAU OF BIOLOGICAL SURVEY.

To meet the emergency caused by the prevalance and continued spread of rabies in wolves, coyotes, and other predatory wild animals, which is being communicated by them to stock and other domestic animals, on the public lands, national forests, and elsewhere, in the Western and Northwestern States, by the destruction of such wild animals, $75,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to incur such expense and to employ such persons and means, as, in his judgment, may be necessary to enable him to carry out the purposes of this appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Commerce," subhead "Coast and Geodetic Survey," on page 33, after line 1, to insert:

For clerk to the superintendent, at the rate of $1,800 per annum, from February 1 to June 30, 1916, both dates inclusive, $750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Fisheries," on page 33, line 10, after the date "nineteen hundred and sixteen," to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$7,500," so as to make the clause read:

Maintenance of vessels: For maintenance of vessels and launches, including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916, $7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Legislative," on page 35, after line 3, to insert:

SENATE.

The Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay to Mary Meyer, niece of Jacob C. Donaldson, deceased, late a skilled laborer in the Senate Library, the amount of salary due him for the month of December, 1915.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 9, to insert:

Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, and for all necessary personal and other services for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building, under the direction and supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules, $2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Government Printing Office," subhead "Printing and binding," on page 35, after line 22, to insert:

Holidays: To enable the Public Printer to comply with the provisions of the law granting holidays and the Executive order granting half holidays with pay to the employees of the Government Printing Office for the fiscal years that follow:

Nineteen hundred and sixteen, $27,305.93;
Nineteen hundred and fifteen, $270.22.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 4, to insert:

Leaves of absence: To enable the Public Printer to comply with the provisions of the law granting leave to employees of the Government Printing Office, $48,866.76, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 17, to insert:

For printing and binding for the Court of Claims, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Judgments, United States courts," on page 37, line 2, after the word "sixty-three," to insert "and Senate Document No. 253," so as to make the clause read:

For payment of the final judgments and decrees, including costs of suits, which have been rendered under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," certified to Congress at its present session by the Attorney General in House Document No. 563 and Senate Document No. 253, and which have not been appealed, namely.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 4, after the words "Treasury Department," to strike out "$744" and insert "$1,097," so as to make the clause read:

Under the Treasury Department, $1,097.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 5, after the words "War Department," to strike out "$1,060.53" and insert "$5,714.42," so as to make the clause read:

Under the War Department, $5,714.42.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 7, after the words "In all," to strike out "$2,388.28" and insert "$7,395.17," so as to make the clause read:

In all, $7,395.17; together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interest on the respective judgments at the rate of 4 per cent per annum from the date thereof until the time this appropriation is made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Judgments, Court of Claims," on page 37, line 14, after the number "566," to insert "and Senate Document No. 252," so as to make the clause read:

For the payment of the judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, reported to Congress at its present session in House Document No. 566 and Senate Document No. 252, namely.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 16, after the words "Treasury Department," to strike out "$52,986.35" and insert "$52,988.23," so as to make the clause read:

Under the Treasury Department, $52,988.23.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 18, after the words "War Department," to strike out "$67,115.23" and insert "$87,645.05," so as to make the clause read:

Under the War Department, $87,645.05.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 19, after the words "Navy Department," to strike out "$90,244.77," and insert "$97,373.74," so as to make the clause read:

Under the Navy Department, $97,373.74.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 20, to insert:

Under the Department of Agriculture, $34.45.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 22, after the words "In all," to strike out "$210,411.06," and insert "$238,106.18," so as to make the clause read:

In all, $238,106.18.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Claims allowed by the Auditor for the State and other departments," on page 50, after line 18, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 3. That for the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1913 and other years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884, as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 255, reported to Congress at its present session, there is appropriated as follows:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

For refunding taxes illegally collected, $28,406.30.
For payment of judgments against internal-revenue officers, $2,985.95.
For pay of crews, miscellaneous expenses, etc., Life-Saving Service, $17.77.
For Life-Saving Service, $600.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

For pay, etc., of the Army, $5,412.54.
For extra-duty pay to enlisted men as clerks at Army division and department headquarters, $369.60.
For mileage to officers and contract surgeons, $28.10.
For regular supplies, Quartermaster's Department, $81.88.
For incidental expenses, Quartermaster's Department, $5,592.65.
For barracks and quarters, $44.40.
For transportation of the Army and its supplies, $69.15.
For headstones for graves of soldiers, $1.66.
For raising four additional regiments, $46.35.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

For pay of the Navy, $757.52.
For pay, miscellaneous, $127.12.
For pay, Marine Corps, $66.60.
For transportation, Bureau of Navigation, $536.09.
For maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, $65.20.
For freight, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, $4.
For construction and repair, Bureau of Construction and Repair, $204.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915, $969.96.
For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1914, $80.73.
For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 70 cents.
For Indian school, Fort Bidwell, Cal., repairs and improvements, 1915, $15.36.
For Army pensions, 10 cents.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE STATE AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS.

For contingent expenses, Executive Office, 1914, 88 cents.
For salaries of vice consuls (act of Feb. 5, 1915), 1915, $79.17.
For allowance for clerks at consulates, $80.
For relief and protection of American seamen, 1915, $594.06.
For contingent expenses, Department of Commerce and Labor, $7.84.
For expenses of regulating immigration, $144.25.
For fees of commissioners, United States courts, 1915, $82.20.
For fees of jurors, United States courts, $51.
For support of prisoners, United States courts, $1.30.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This completes the committee amendments.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 6, after line 9, insert:

To pay the subscription of the United States to the International Geodetic Association for the years 1915 and 1916, $3,000.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say to the Senator from California that the committee did not allow that item, but speaking for myself personally I am by no means certain that it ought not to be allowed. I am very willing that it shall go into the bill and have careful investigation in conference. I am not at all satisfied with the action of the committee in not allowing it.

Mr. WORKS. The matter was in the special charge of my colleague [Mr. PHELAN], and not knowing that the bill was to come up to-day my colleague is absent from the Senate. I am presenting it on his account. I greatly appreciate the fact that the chairman of the committee will allow it to go in the bill, its merit to be determined hereafter.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It certainly shall have careful consideration.

Mr. WORKS. In connection with the amendment I should like to have printed a letter which I received from the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, giving the particulars and the reasons why the appropriation should be made, and also a statement in connection with it signed by other persons interested in having the appropriation made. With that leave I shall submit it.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY,
Washington, January 18, 1916.

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Regarding the matter of the International Geodetic Association, and its work at the latitude station located at Ukiah, Cal., and my promise yesterday to furnish you with data in connection with the emergency appropriation relative to this observatory, I beg to submit the following:

THE UKIAH OBSERVATORY.

For many years the determination of latitude was very much complicated by the shifting of the earth's axis of rotation. The motion of the earth's axis is a very irregular one and does not follow any known law.

In order that this subject might be studied and the law of the shifting of the axis be discovered, the International Geodetic Association, in 1899, established five stations on the thirty-ninth parallel of latitude as equally spaced as possible around the globe. Two of these stations were located in the United States, one at Gaithersburg, Md., and the other at Ukiah, Cal.

At each of these stations, except Gaithersburg, continuous observations have been made. There are many astronomers throughout the world who are continuously using the results obtained at these latitude stations to correct their observations, and it is of the greatest importance to them to have the latitude work continued without interruption for an indefinite period.

On September 14, 1915, Dr. F. R. Helmert, director of the central bureau of the International Geodetic Association, whose office is at Potsdam, Germany, wrote me a letter of which the following is a partial translation:

"Your letter of August 19 has to-day been received. The Ukiah observation book for July has also come to hand. * * * It is to be hoped that Japan and Italy, as well as Russia, will maintain their stations at Mizusawa, Carloforte, and Tschardjui. If they support those stations, they will not be expected to pay their yearly quota, for the support of these observatories would balance the yearly contribution to the association. With the American stations the situation is different. The United States has paid no quota during the year 1914, and it was necessary, for that reason, to discontinue the observations at Gaithersburg, Md. Because of the scarcity of money on account of the war we must also eventually close Ukiah. In 1915 only a few quotas were received, and in 1916 it is certain that nothing more will be paid. * * * Permit me to make the request on you that everything possible be done to continue the work of the international latitude service in North America."

It will be seen from this that one of the two stations in the United States was closed because of our failure to pay our part of the expenses of the International Geodetic Association, and it will also be seen that the observations at Ukiah must be discontinued unless we resume payment of our quota.

There is attached to this letter a table showing the amount of money spent in the United States each year for the maintenance of the observatories at Gaithersburg and Ukiah since the beginning of the work in 1899. The total amount shown in the table is about $65,000. During the time that the latitude work was going on in the United States we paid into the treasury of the International Geodetic Association only $24,000.

This shows that the association spent over twice as much in the United States as we paid into the treasury. If the United States resumes the payment of its quota, it is reasonably certain that the central bureau will continue the work at Ukiah and it is possible that, after the close of the European war, it may also resume observations at Gaithersburg.

It is because few, if any, of the nations now at war will be able to pay their quotas into the treasury of the association while the war is in progress that $2,500 has been asked for in the urgent deficiency bill with which to maintain the observatory at Ukiah until the International Geodetic Association finds it possible to resume its support after peace has been declared. There is also an item of $3,000 in the same bill to be used in paying our quota to the association for the two years 1914 and 1915.

As it costs about $1,700 to pay the expenses of the Ukiah station for a year, the sum requested in the bill—$2,500—will continue the work for about 18 months.

The accompanying statement shows that the International Geodetic Association has spent much more money in the United States than we have contributed to its treasury, and therefore we should feel it a duty to make up the arrears in our promised contribution. Even if the association had spent nothing in this country, we should still feel it to our advantage to maintain our membership and pay our quota.

The work of the association is of great importance to every civilized nation, for there are many world-wide problems with which only an international association can deal. The problems come under this head. As long as people are interested in the search for truth they will wish to know the exact shape and size of the earth, partly from a desire to know the facts in the case and partly because such exact information is of advantage in conducting scientific and astronomic investigations. The figure of the earth can only be determined with a great degree of accuracy when the geodetic observations of many nations are combined, and it is necessary that some international association should assemble the results and solve the problems.

There are other operations of the association the results of which have more obvious value. One is the coordination of the geodetic results of the surveys of each of two contiguous nations, which enables them to give to points on their common boundary the same geographic positions and elevations on the maps of the two countries. Such an agreement of maps would obviate many disputes in regard to boundaries which might otherwise occur.

Another problem which it is impossible for any one nation to solve is the derivation of a formula which will give the value of the intensity of gravity at any latitude. The gravity observations are made by many nations, but one central bureau must coordinate all the results.

MEMBERSHIP IN THE ASSOCIATION.

Although the United States did not contribute to the International Geodetic Association in 1914, the permanent secretary of the association invited the United States representative, Dr. O. H. Tittmann, to vote on the question of whether or not the association should continue in force for another 10 years the previously adopted convention and w ether or not there should be any alterations in this convention when the present one expires on December 31, 1916. The authority for Dr. Tittmann's reply to the permanent secretary was given in a letter of which the following is a copy:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 22, 1914.

Hon. WM. C REDFIELD,
Secretary of Commerce.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I find that I have not answered your inquiry of November 24. The appropriation asked for as our share of the permanent advisory committee of the International Geodetic Association is so small that I heartily agree with you in the opinion that we should continue our membership, and that our representatives should be advised to so vote. I shall be glad to join with you in recommending action to Congress.

Very truly, yours, W. J. BRYAN.

Upon receipt of this letter Dr. Tittmann wrote to the permanent secretary of the association that the United States voted to continue the convention without change for another 10 years.

From this it will be seen that Dr. Tittmann was empowered by the Secretary of State to vote for the continuation of an international agreement among practically all of the civilized nations of the world. In spite of the authority vested in Dr. Tittmann and in spite of his action in voting to continue the convention of the association for another 10-year period, an action which should have the strength of a treaty, our Congress has failed to appropriate money for our quota. This, of course, places the United States in a very awkward and embarrassing position.

Upon Dr. Tittmann's resignation last spring as a member of the permanent committee of the International Geodetic Association the question of his successor arose, and I recommended that Mr. William Bowie, at the present time Chief of the Division of Geodesy of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, be designated as a member of the permanent commission of the association in succession to Dr. Tittmann. In a letter, dated June 12, 1915, the Secretary of State ad interim, Hon. Robert Lansing, wrote in part as follows:

"In reply I have the honor to say that it does not appear from the act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, that Congress has made any provision for the continuance during the fiscal year of membership by the United States in the International Geodetic Association. This department would not, therefore, seem to be in a position to comply with your request."

It is my urgent desire that Congress appropriate money for the continuation of the work at Ukiah during the progress of the European war, and that it will also appropriate sufficient funds to pay our arrears in dues to the association for the two years 1914 and 1915.

As the representative of the United States has always been a member of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, this bureau feels particularly humiliated because of our failure to meet our obligations.

There is transmitted herewith a photostat copy of a letter, dated December 3, 1915, signed by several prominent astronomers of the Pacific coast and indorsed by the presidents of the University of California and of Leland Stanford Junior University. An original copy of this letter was sent by Dr. Campbell, of the Lick Observatory, to you and the other Senator and Representatives from California. It is an urgent plea to Congress to provide funds for the support of the Ukiah Observatory:

The table mentioned in the third paragraph of the second page of this letter, showing the amount of money paid by the United States to the International Geodetic Association and the amount expended by the association in the United States, follows:

Fiscal year.	United States quota.	Expended in the United States.
		Marks.
1899	$1,500	2,812
1900	1,500	17,350
1901	1,500	18,051
1902	1,500	18,060
1903	1,500	17,000
1904	1,500	17,000
1905	1,500	17,000
1906	1,500	18,000
1907	1,500	16,000
1908	1,500	17,000
1909	1,500	17,000
1910	1,500	17,000
1911	1,500	17,000
1912	1,500	17,000
1913	1,500	17,000
1914	1,500	17,000
1915		9,000
1916		
	24,000	269,273
		.24
		1077092
		538546
		$64,625.52
Cost of zenith tube		2,500.00
		65,125.52

There is an apparent discrepancy between this table and the quotation from Dr. Helmert's letter, but not a real one, for the amounts of the United States quota given in the table are for fiscal years, and, therefore, the 1914 quota, as mentioned in the table, was paid to Dr. Helmert during the calendar year 1913. Dr. Helmert is correct in his statement that during the (calendar) year 1914 and again in 1915 no funds were received from the United States.

If the above information is not clear to you, please let me know, and I will gladly furnish you any additional details.

I am, respectfully, yours,

E. LESTER JONES, *Superintendent.*

MOUNT HAMILTON, CAL., *December 3, 1915.*

DEAR SIR: We respectfully call your attention to the problem of the International Latitude Observatory at Ukiah, Cal. In effect, that observatory was maintained by the United States Government from early in 1899 to the end of 1913, on the basis of congressional appropriations contributed through the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey to the International Geodetic Association, the latter administered from headquarers at Potsdam, Germany. Although the United States Government was pledged to lend its further support, in so far as the Superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Department of Commerce could make such a pledge, the Congress in 1913 failed to continue the appropriations ($1,500 per annum) of the preceding 14 years. The Ukiah Observatory has been supported during the years 1914 and 1915 on funds appropriated by all the leading countries of the world except the United States, notwithstanding the existence of war conditions in those countries. The funds from foreign countries are available to maintain the Ukiah Observatory until April or May, 1916; these funds will then cease to come. We feel that the maintenance of the Ukiah Observatory by Congress is a debt and an obligation of honor. With the United States at peace and all other leading countries which support the international association at war, our obligation seems to be accentuated.

The International Geodetic Association is an organization composed of the geodetic survey departments of the leading national Governments. The United States Coast and Geodetic Survey is a member. The association's purpose is to promote the solution of those problems of the earth, such as the earth's size, shape, gravitational power, etc., which demand that observations be made in many widely distributed countries and which therefore require international cooperation.

In the eighties it was discovered that the latitudes (and to a small degree the longitudes) of all points on the earth are constantly changing. The earth as a whole "wabbles" a little as it rotates on its axis. This affects all precision surveys of the earth more or less seriously. To determine the amount of the changes, the law of the changes, and, if possible, the reasons for the changes, the International Geodetic Association established in 1898–99 four special observatories, distributed as uniformly as practicable around the earth on the same parallel of latitude, north 39° 8′—one observatory in Maryland, one at Ukiah, Cal., one in Japan, and one in Sardinia (Italy). Later the Russian Government established a similar observatory in Turkestan in latitude 39° 8′, and considerably later, the Cincinnati Observatory, happening to have the same latitude, 39° 8′, voluntarily and at its own expense, assumed a share in the work. (It is absolutely necessary that all these observatories be on the same parallel of latitude so that they can observe the same stars in their zeniths.)

For lack of funds the observatory in Maryland has first been discontinued. The closing of the Ukiah Observatory would deal a terrible blow to the plans, because it occupies a strong strategic position in longitude. The circuit of the earth in latitude north 39° 8′ and the international latitude observatories on that circuit are represented in the accompanying figure.

(Figure omitted.)

You will see that, without the Ukiah station, the Cincinnati station would be alone in five-eighths of the circuit of the globe, with Japan, Turkestan, and Sardinia relatively close together in the remaining three-eighths of the circuit, and that the three-eighths from Cincinnati to Japan would be wholly unoccupied. The solution of the international

latitude problem on the basis of observatories in Japan, Turkestan, Sardinia, and Cincinnati is entirely analogous to the building of a great circular tower upon a foundation consisting of four piers, distributed irregularly on a circle, as Japan, Turkestan, Sardinia, and Cincinnati are located in the above sketch. An observing station on the Pacific coast of the United States, in latitude 39° 8′—that is, at Ukiah—is demanded in order to give a satisfactory support to the international structure.

The motion of the earth, involving variations of latitudes, has not gone through a complete cycle of change since these international observatories were established, and the observations should be continued at least until the variations become predictable. We respectfully request your support of an item in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill for the maintenance of the Ukiah international latitude station, to be applied as the Superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey considers most desirable and efficient.

Yours, respectfully,

W. W. CAMPBELL,
Director of the Lick Observatory, University of California.
A. O. LEUSCHNER,
Director Students' Observatory and Professor of Astronomy, University of California.
SIDNEY D. TOWNLEY,
Professor in Leland Stanford Junior University, in Charge of Astronomical Instruction.

We approve of the foregoing.

BENJ. IDE WHEELER,
President University of California.
J. C. BRANNER,
President Leland Stanford Junior University.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] is agreed to.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, inasmuch as I was not able to be present at the meeting of the committee, how the second item on page 2 happens to come into an urgent deficiency appropriation bill—an item of $25,000 for the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It comes in the deficiency bill, Mr. President, because the expenditure was authorized by Congress, and the money has not been appropriated. There is a deficiency of money to carry out the instruction of Congress. A commission of three was created, of which the President is one, with instructions to make an investigation as to a suitable design for a memorial bridge. The money has not been appropriated and the commission ask that they be given the money to carry out the instruction of Congress. It is manifestly a deficiency under existing law.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I think I recognize the desirability of a bridge in this locality, but I have wondered if, with the condition of our national finances at the present time, it has been a good thing to insert this item of $25,000 in the bill. I understand, of course, how desirable it is to the Senator from Virginia, and how important, perhaps, it is to the city of Washington that such a bridge should be constructed at some time, and if we had the money, if we were not trying to economize to meet some conditions which are an absolute necessity, I should not even raise the question as to the propriety of the appropriation. However, I still feel that it was a mistake at this time to put this item into an urgent deficiency bill, when at least it is a matter that would not suffer if it were postponed to a time when we would know where the money is coming from to meet the expenses of the Government.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I do not like to object to appropriations; I know it is unpopular; but I should like to ask the chairman about the appropriation for a post-office building at Binghamton, N. Y. This bill carries $100,000 for a site for a post office in a city that, according to the census of 1910, has 48,000 people. It seems to me that is a tremendous amount of money to pay for a site. Why should the site be provided for in the urgent deficiency bill I can not just get through my head.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, the purchase of these sites and the erection of these buildings was authorized, and work has been proceeding more rapidly in recent days than formerly. It has gotten to a point now where the Secretary of the Treasury needs the money for these purposes. The items here appropriating money for post-office sites and post-office buildings are within the limit already authorized, and were duly estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury and asked for as urgently necessary.

He is ready to go on with the work. He has a force in the architect's office, and he wants to proceed with the work Congress ordered him to do. He lacks the money. The money is a deficiency for a purpose for which Congress has authorized the work to be done. He estimates for it. There is not an item here that was put on at the instance of any Senator; it was done purely on the certificate from the Secretary of the Treasury that these amounts are urgently needed, and they are appropriated accordingly.

Mr. KENYON. I am not going to take any time on it. I assume the Federal court is held at Binghamton, N. Y. It does seem to me to spend $100,000 for a site for a post office in a town of 48,000 is, to say the least, pretty strong.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator will excuse me for a moment, I will say I have no doubt there is not a dollar provided here except what was authorized. I have no doubt the Secretary of the Treasury has contracted for the purchase of this property in pursuance of the act of Congress, and it is an absolute liability on the Government just as much as the coupons on its bonds. He was authorized to make this purchase; he has contracted for the property, and he needs the money to pay for the property.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. How much money has been appropriated for the construction of the building?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do not recall the amount appropriated, but it is within the limit, I think, provided by the act of Congress. There is not a single dollar appropriated here except in accordance with previous legislation.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator does not know the amount of money that has been appropriated for the construction of the post-office building?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I can look it up. I can not carry those figures in my mind.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I have not surrendered the floor. Has the Senator any information in his records about the courthouse at Binghamton, as to what courts are held there?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say to the Senator that I have no information in respect to that subject.

Mr. KENYON. I simply want, Mr. President, in a mild way to raise an objection to providing for Federal buildings in an urgent deficiency appropriation bill. There are here some 13 pages of appropriations for public buildings, many of them for the commencement of public buildings and some of them in towns of less than a thousand people. The Senator from Utah predicted some time ago that the urgent deficiency bills would amount to $20,000,000 this session. I think he was rather criticized and laughed at about it, but it is apparent now that they will go vastly beyond that sum, perhaps to $25,000,000 or $30,000,000. It is because in the future I myself may object to some of these appropriations that I simply did not want to sit quietly and have them go by without a protest.

Mr. BRYAN. I will state that the Treasury Department and the Post Office Department, acting together, have declined to spend any money for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building in a town of less than 5,000 people, and also in towns which have not $15,000 of receipts per annum.

Mr. KENYON. I desire to understand the Senator.

Mr. BRYAN. Notwithstanding that the act of Congress authorized the construction of buildings in towns of smaller population.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

Mr. KENYON. Just one moment. Does the Senator from Florida say that the Secretary of the Treasury has refused to commence the construction of buildings in towns of less than 5,000 people?

Mr. BRYAN. That is my understanding, and I got it authoritatively from the department.

Mr. KENYON. I venture to say there are at least 10 provisions in this bill for the erection of buildings in towns of less than 5,000 population.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. I merely wanted to correct the statement made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. On the contrary, I know where acts of Congress have authorized buildings in towns of less than 5,000 inhabitants and having less than $10,000 receipts. The sites for such buildings at least have been purchased in some instances. For that matter, with the permission of the Senator, I will say, if he still yields to me, that I do not see how the Secretary of the Treasury could possibly have the right not to carry out a law after it had been passed by Congress. I am not criticizing him for doing it. The responsibility is on Congress for making such appropriations.

Mr. BRYAN. I agree with the Senator in his last statement; but I know that what I have stated has been the attitude taken by the department. It has been publicly stated that the department would not erect a public building in a city of less than 5,000 population or in which the post-office receipts do not amount to $15,000 annually. That is a contested point between the legislative branch and the executive branch of the Gov-

ernment. A speech was made in the House of Representatives only a few days ago taking the position that the Treasury Department had no right to refuse to carry out the will of Congress which authorized the construction of public buildings in towns of less than 5,000 people and having less than $10,000 receipts annually.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not know who has the floor.

Mr. BRYAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HARDWICK. I merely want to say to the Senator that no matter where he got his information, surely, from my own knowledge, I know he is mistaken in his statement of facts.

Mr. BRYAN. I got it from the department.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not care who gave the information to the Senator. I know of instances in my own State where there are cities of less than 5,000 people and with less than $10,000 receipts, where appropriations have at least been made for the purchase of sites for public buildings.

Mr. BRYAN. It may be that I am mistaken as to the attitude of the department with reference to the purchase of sites for public buildings; but does the Senator from Georgia know whether such buildings have been erected?

Mr. HARDWICK. I think so, in cases where they have less than that number of population, but I do not know as to the receipts.

Mr. BRYAN. Then, I understand it may be a question of whether they can make the Secretary of the Treasury believe that they have more people than they really have.

Mr. HARDWICK. Of course, the people we have there are pretty fine. There is no trouble about their quality, even though we have not the quantity.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida what is the population of De Land, Fla.? According to the census of 1910 the population was 2,812.

Mr. BRYAN. What are the annual receipts?

Mr. KENYON. I have no statement as to the receipts; but this bill makes an appropriation of $12,000 for the commencement of a building there.

Mr. BRYAN. I imagine it comes under the rule as to towns where the receipts are above $15,000.

Mr. KENYON. Even though the town may be below 5,000 population, if the receipts exceed $15,000, the Treasury Department will go ahead with the work? I simply want to say that there are appropriations scattered all through this bill for the commencement of public buildings in towns of less than 5,000 population.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish merely again to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that, as to these buildings, it may be that Congress acted unwisely; but the buildings have been authorized by law. The time to object was when they were proposed to be authorized; but after the Secretary of the Treasury has been authorized and directed to acquire sites and to construct buildings it is too late to say that the towns were too small and that the receipts were too small to justify that course. There is not a dollar appropriated in this bill except in pursuance of previous legislation by Congress—not one dollar.

Mr. KENYON. I realize that that is true. I regret that I did not have an opportunity to object to them when the provisions were under consideration; but I am going to object now, and I am going to keep on objecting whenever an appropriation is presented here for a public building in a town of less than a thousand people. I think it is not a proper way to spend the public money, especially in times of financial distress such as we just now have.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Virigina a question in relation to the appropriation for Binghamton, which is $100,000. I noticed a moment ago that great care was taken to insert after an item appropriating $1,250 the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary." If it was important to add those words there, why would it not be well to add them here?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have no objection, Mr. President, to having those words added. I move that the language suggested by the Senator from Washington be inserted at the point to which he refers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, line 2, after the sum "$100,000," it is proposed to insert "or so much thereof as may be necessary," so as to read—

Binghamton, N. Y., post office, courthouse, etc.: For site, $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, my observations will be brief, as usual.

Before the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] offered his amendment or substitute I felt, and I think a majority of the Senate felt, that this important matter would be disposed of wisely and honorably and satisfactorily by the enactment of the bill as it came from the committee. The bill was drawn with great care. It met the views of the President and all those now in authority in the Philippine Islands. It has been under consideration and subject to criticism for two years. The committee heard many witnesses whose opinions were entitled to great credit because of their long experience in the islands and their study of the problem which faces us there. If my recollection is correct, not a single witness believed that the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands could maintain a stable and just government now or at any time within four years.

Gen. McIntyre, Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, in his testimony before the committee stated the case very clearly, as it seems to me. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] asked him this question:

Is it your opinion that if these people are turned loose to work out their own salvation they will maintain a stable government there and become more and more educated and civilized and competent to take care of themselves?

Gen. McINTYRE. Well, the theory of this bill is that at this time they are not.

Senator REED. I say, is it your opinion that they will, if they are given the right to govern themselves—will they develop along the right lines?

Gen. McINTYRE. Do you mean if they were given independence to-day?

Senator REED. Oh, no; in a reasonable time.

Gen. McINTYRE. Well, I think that would have to be studied very carefully at the time, Senator REED. My disposition is to think that that is somewhat in the future.

There were Senators on the committee who wanted the United States to be relieved of all responsibility in the islands as soon as possible; but I think those Senators felt that we could not abandon now a plain duty to a people whose guardianship we had solemnly assumed. The bill received the unanimous support of the Democrats on the committee, and I think the Republican opposition was mainly directed to the preamble.

From the first the effort of the committee was to get at the wise and safe thing to do in a nonpartisan spirit, and I think the Democratic members of the committee deserve great credit for the wise and impartial way in which they accomplished their work.

But now, Mr. President, the wind has changed, and I think it is blowing from a very dangerous quarter. As soon as I could I submitted the substitute offered by the Senator from Arkansas to two men in high authority in the military and naval service of the United States. Both of them agreed that for us to retain responsibilities in the islands of any name or nature in conjunction with other nations would be a dangerous thing to do.

Gov. Martin, in his statement before the committee upon this question, gave the following answer in response to this question by the chairman:

Suppose we had an international agreement with Japan, Germany, and Great Britain to maintain the independence of the Philippine Islands, do you think the Philippine Islands would still be a difficulty in case of war or likely to provoke a war?

Mr. MARTIN. I asked that question in Manila not long ago of a gentleman whose opinion I wanted. There were some foreign sailors in Manila who were on what we call the Luneta. That is an open field. It runs between the sea and the city. It is territory that is reclaimed from the sea. He said, "I would expect within a few months some drunken sailors would get into a riot or a fight with some Filipinos on the Luneta, and that that nation would say the Filipino people have violated the terms of the neutrality agreement." I am not opposing neutrality. I am only saying that if I were in charge of it when we leave the islands I would leave under such conditions that we would not be in danger of becoming involved in war.

At another place the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] asked this question:

What is your suggestion with relation to any protectorate or any agreement with other nations with respect to the neutrality of the Philippines?

Mr. MARTIN. I would do anything I could for the benefit of the Philippine Islands, but when we leave I would leave bag and baggage.

Mr. President, it has seemed to me that great benefit would result to the United States by reason of our possession of the Philippine Islands if we could say to the world some day, "We once took a weak people, gave them strength, and let them go." Nobody knows now whether this is possible or not. But if the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas is adopted, or any amendment that gives the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands their independence within the next four years, we may safely conclude that the American lives which have been sacrificed in the islands and the money which has been expended there will go for naught; the most interesting experiment in history, the most laudable and honorable in history, will fail. And what may be much worse, if we quit now the world will say that we quit to save money or because we were afraid to remain.

I regret that the party responsible for this legislation, the framers and proposers of the committee report, have so suddenly changed their position, and I am wondering if history is again to repeat itself and a wise and safe disposition of a most important question is to be abandoned because the party responsible for this bill, at some time in the past, made promises to do an unwise and an unsafe thing.

It is true that the bill as reported by the committee is not in accord with Democratic platform promises. The first time I read the bill after it was referred to the committee it seemed to me that it was in direct harmony with Republican promises and pledges to the Filipinos and directly contrary to Democratic pledges.

President McKinley, in 1900, in Chicago, said:

The War with Spain was undertaken, not that the United States should increase its territory, but that oppression at our very doors should be stopped. This noble sentiment must continue to animate us and we must give to the world the full demonstration of the sincerity of our purpose.

If President McKinley meant anything in 1900, he meant precisely what the committee bill means. Step by step we must do our best to prepare the Filipinos for independence, and when prepared, or after they have had a fair and reasonable chance to prepare, we may honorably let them go. I was congratulating myself that the Democratic Party had abandoned its mistaken views expressed in 1900, and I hoped that nothing would be found in any Democratic platform that would compel the majority to turn from the path of safety and wisdom.

It is true that in 1900 the Democratic platform denounced our occupation of the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico as an act of criminal aggression and Democratic orators accused President McKinley of imperialistic ambitions, but now a Democratic President and those in authority in the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico can not find words strong enough to express their approval of the work done there. I might say, in passing, that if the same high purposes had been accorded to President McKinley in 1900 that are accorded to him now many precious lives would have been saved.

President Wilson, in his message to Congress in 1913, in discussing this matter, referring to our island possessions, said:

These are all matters of vital domestic concern, and besides them, outside the charmed circle of our own national life in which our affections command us, as well as our consciences, there stand out our obligations toward our territories oversea. Here we are trustees. Porto Rico, Hawaii, the Philippines, are ours, indeed, but not ours to do what we please with. Such territories, once regarded as mere possessions, are no longer to be selfishly exploited; they are part of the domain of public conscience and of serviceable and enlightened statesmanship. We must administer them for the people who live in them and with the same sense of responsibility to them as toward our own people in our domestic affairs. No doubt we shall successfully enough bind Porto Rico and the Hawaiian Islands to ourselves by ties of justice and interest and affection, but the performance of our duty toward the Philippines is a more difficult and debatable matter. We can satisfy the obligations of generous justice toward the people of Porto Rico by giving them the ample and familiar rights and privileges accorded our own citizens in our own Territories and our obligations toward the people of Hawaii by perfecting the provisions for self-government already granted them, but in the Philippines we must go further. We must hold steadily in view their ultimate independence, and we must move toward the time of that independence as steadily as the way can be cleared and the foundations thoughtfully and permanently laid.

Acting under the authority conferred upon the President by Congress, I have already accorded the people of the islands a majority in both houses of their legislative body by appointing five instead of four native citizens to the membership of the commission. I believe that in this way we shall make proof of their capacity in counsel and their sense of responsibility in the exercise of political power, and that the success of this step will be sure to clear our view for the steps which are to follow. Step by step we should extend and perfect the system of self-government in the islands, making test of them and modifying them as experience discloses their successes and their failures; that we should more and more put under the control of the native citizens of the archipelago the essential instruments of their life, their local instrumentalities of government, their schools, all the common interests of their communities, and so by counsel and experience set up a government which all the world will see to be suitable to a people whose affairs are under their own control. At last, I hope and believe, we are beginning to gain the confidence of the Filipino peoples. By their counsel and experience, rather than by our own, we shall learn how best to serve them and how soon it will be possible and wise to withdraw our supervision. Let us once find the path and set out with firm and confident tread upon it and we shall not wander from it or linger upon it.

I had hoped that this vindication of the Republican control of the islands and our purposes in going there and our purpose in remaining there was as sincere as it is well deserved.

Of course I could not forget that in 1900 the same platform that denounced our occupation of the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico as an act of criminal aggression also denounced the gold standard, and that the candidate of the Democratic Party in 1900 had two missions in life, one to free the Philippine islanders and one to free silver and save mankind from crucifixion upon a cross of gold. Fortunately he failed in both. We all agree to that now. Certainly we all agree that it was fortunate that he failed in his determination to abolish the gold standard. This is evidenced by the fact that the Democratic Party in the last campaign claimed all the credit for the wise protection thrown around the gold standard in the new Federal banking act. But I tremble when I recall the fact that the Federal reserve act was greatly marred, and I think largely deprived of its ultimate usefulness, because somebody at the eleventh hour discovered a plank in the Democratic platform which compelled Democratic Senators to vote against a single central bank, a system that would have been free from the domination of political appointees, and which would probably have done business enough to pay running expenses. I was sorry, and I think a great many Democrats were sorry, that the Democratic platform stood in the way of a single-bank system, admitted by all economists to be the best system.

But, Mr. President, not only on the Philippine question and the money question but on many other important questions we find the Democratic Party entering the Republican sanctuary to scoff but later on indicating that they would be glad to remain and join in the hymns did not some Democratic convention creed prohibit it.

I think it may fairly be said that such has been the rule with regard to the treatment of Republican policies by the Democratic Party. First, violent denunciation, than painful uncertainty and symptoms of remorse, then quiet imitation, and then proud adoption if its platforms would permit. The tariff question, by far the most important of all, may be said to be an exception, but even now there are ominous signs that the Democratic Party will claim all the rewards for the discovery of the tariff-commission idea, with all that it promises for the protection of our industrial independence.

But how may we hope that after the new Democratic commission has been created and the Democratic orators in the North have promised protection, as they always do; after the Democratic tariff commission and the Democratic orators have done their election-day duty—how can we hope that the Democratic platforms declaring protection to be unconstitutional, unjust, and undemocratic will not in the future, as in the past, recall and rebind Democracy to the fatal policy of a "tariff for revenue only."

Mr. President, I do not say that this unwise change of front on the part of the majority with regard to the pending measure, this abandonment of a unanimous committee report, is due to a sudden revival of a lost love for platform promises, but I do say that the Clarke amendment is in harmony with Democratic promises and the committee bill is not, and that no other reason of any force has been assigned for this sudden reversion to Democratic platform promises.

It has been urged that we may as well quit the Philippines now as 20 or 30 years from now because it is the edict of history and experience that an ignorant and untrained people can not learn the art of self-government from the bottom up in anything less than centuries of time. My answer is that history presents no experiment that is not the precise opposite of the one we are trying in the Philippines. The South American countries which have been cited as examples for our discouragment all obtained their independence from a despot, and history tells us that the leaders in these new republics either could not maintain order at all or they themselves endeavored to set up Republican despotisms, which are the worst variety known. The South American countries were compelled to learn the art of self-control in the school of assassination and war and hatred, and of course it took centuries, but it does not follow that it would take centuries for the Filipinos to learn to maintain order and good will where peace and good will only are taught. It generally takes a long time for boys of any race to learn good habits where only bad habits are taught, and a very short time for them to learn good habits where only good habits are taught. It is the universal opinion that the Filipinos are not a warlike people.

On the contrary, they are by instinct lovers of peace, and they are quick to adopt wise customs and habits.

Gen. Gordon—"Chinese Gordon," as he is called—speaks thus of the Philippine troops who formed a part of his forces in the China war:

> They are a fine, sturdy body of fellows, faithful and long suffering, bearing hardships without murmurs, plucky and never losing heart in defeat, and considerably superior to the Japanese.

I think Gen. Gordon was a fair judge of human nature in the East.

Sir John Browning, who was consul general at Manilla for a great many years, a most impartial witness and whose testimony is indorsed by Dean Worcester, said with regard to the Filipinos:

> Rarely is an intertropical people a satisfactory one to eye or mind. But this can not be said of the Philippine Malay, who, in bodily formation and mental characteristics alike, may fairly claim a place, not among the middle ones merely, but among the higher names inscribed upon the world's national scale. He is characterized by a concentrated, never-absent self-respect; an habitual self-restraint in word and deed, very rarely broken, except when extreme provocation induces the transitory but fatal frenzy known as "amuck"; an inbred courtesy, equally diffused through all classes, high or low; by unfailing decorum, prudence, caution, quiet, cheerfulness, ready hospitality, and a correct though not inventive taste. His family is a pleasing sight—much subordination and little constraint; unison in gradation; liberty, not license; orderly children, respected parents; women subject but not oppressed; men ruling but not despotic; reverence with kindness; obedience in affection—these form a lovable picture by no means rare in the villages of the eastern isles.

And, again, Ramon Lala, himself of native birth, in his recent work on the Philippines, says:

> All the people are born musicians; even little boys and girls of 5 or 6 years of age play the harp, the guitar, or the piano as if by instinct, while their elders show a proficiency that, when their opportunities are considered, is truly astonishing.

We are told what men are fit for who have no music in their souls. I do not see why we may not expect a capacity for peace and a love of justice in a people who have nothing but music in their souls.

It is my belief that a very few years more would be sufficient to save the Filipinos from themselves. It is possible that they could succeed if abandoned now, but it is doubtful. Ten to 15 years more, however, would, in my opinion, give them a start that they would maintain. Ten to 15 years more of generous treatment on our part would find them with a generation of mature men whose influence would leaven the whole lump. The experiment up to date has met with unexpected success. Certainly we need not quit now because we fear the experiment will fail.

Another reason assigned in support of the substitute is that the Filipinos have an inalienable right to liberty—an inalienable right to work out their own salvation. The word "liberty" is an attractive word, but we know that there are as many kinds of liberty as there are liquids, and their effect upon the human system is about as varied. And we know that the price of the only kind of liberty worth having is sacrifice and bondage to the law. The Mexicans are enjoying the kind that we may give to the Filipinos if the Clarke amendment is adopted. The Mexicans are now exercising their inalienable right to work out their own salvation in the school of murder, arson, and rapine. It can not be done. Where both sides are wrong, both sides must stop and cool off before either side can learn anything worth knowing. Two cutthroats fighting over a stolen purse are not learning the art of self-control. When we substituted our sovereignty for that of Spain, we became morally obligated to keep the peace, and we are not depriving the Filipinos of their inalienable rights when we are honestly trying to teach them how to save their inalienable rights.

Still another reason assigned for the immediate abandonment of the islands is that the retention of the islands constitutes a grave military danger. We took possession of the Hawaiian Islands and Guam Island because they would be of great strategic value in the event of war. Guam is nearer to Tokyo than Tokyo is to Manila. If Japan should desire to make us trouble in the Philippines, our fleet operating from Guam would be nearer to Japan's heart than she would be to the tip end of our tail.

Let us reverse the situation. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways. Suppose that Japan owned 100,000 square miles of land on the Mexican coast and the Hawaiian Islands and another island midway between San Francisco and Honolulu. Would we consider those possessions by Japan a grave military weakness for Japan? If so, why are we struck dumb with terror every time it is hinted that Japan is trying to get a naval station on the coast of Mexico?

The fact is we are afraid of Japan. Japan knows it and enjoys the situation. I give Japan credit for possessing ordinary common sense. And, furthermore, no nation in history has a better record for keeping her word than Japan. She is now helping her English ally because she agreed to. Japan feels that she should be treated as an equal by us because she is in some ways our superior. There is an economic reason why the Japanese should not be allowed to come to this country, and if our statesmen on the Pacific coast would treat that question with tact and fairness I think it could be settled quickly and satisfactorily to all parties.

When the Japanese cruiser *Asama* was in the Pacific trying to help England overhaul a German cruiser she ran aground in Turtle Bay. The Sacramento press closed its eyes to the truth and announced to the world in red ink and large type that Japan had captured Turtle Bay, mined the approaches to the harbor, and landed 4,000 Japanese soldiers under the convoy of five of her largest battleships. It was, of course, untrue. But it is true that the Pacific coast did not think that Japan was getting land 7,000 miles away for the purpose of acquiring a military weakness.

How can we expect that Japan will respect us or fail to have all the fun she can at our expense if we persist in lying about her and her purposes? If we ever have a war with Japan, it will be due to our assumed superiority and that particular kind of pride which "goeth before a fall."

Mr. President, when this war is over Christian civilization must take an inventory of its assets, and if these assets are to include other things than oppression and hatred and greed, the United States must help furnish them. If the world ever expects to be led out of the wilderness of ignorance and cruelty the United States must point the way. To-day we are hated by the world. We are the international partner who is taking all the profits and sharing none of the losses. Our flag is a rag in Mexico and a dollar sign in Europe. This is unjust to us. We know it is unjust, but there is only one way in which we can establish our innocence. We have been preaching peace and good will to all men for 2,000 years. We must show our faith by our works or take down our sign. We have put our hands to this plow in the Philippine Islands, and we can not turn our back upon it now and escape the consequences. Our mission in the Philippines calls for courage, generosity, and unselfish devotion to the right as God gives us to see the right. If we remain steadfast we will light a candle in the East that will never go out.

Let us quit taking counsel of our fears and be Americans and do our duty. Japan is now at war with several great military powers. She will certainly wait until she knows the result of that war before she begins one that would mean disaster to her in the end. She does not like us, because she thinks we have been caustic and boorish in our treatment of her; but she knows that, provincial and impolite as we may seem to be, we would fight to the last ditch and cripple her for good if she forced us to defend our national integrity.

There is no good reason why we should abandon the greatest and grandest philanthropy in history through fear that Japan or any other nation will interfere with us. We may easily invite ridicule and hostile demonstrations if we leave this great and noble work half done because we are afraid somebody else with an ignoble purpose will make us trouble. And we can excite the admiration and support of the world by taking the position that nothing will frighten us away from a righteous cause.

I am for peace and I am for having all the tools necessary to defend peace, but when I try to look into the future I see nothing but wars and rumors of wars as long as a national conscience is admitted to be an impossibility. If we pass this bill as it came from the committee we will demonstrate to the world the sincerity of our purposes in the Philippines, and we will clearly indicate to the world that we have renounced the doctrine that "might makes right." We will set an example that other nations must follow some time if humanity ever expects to rescue itself from the fangs of war and injustice.

If the President has changed his mind and is now advocating the Clarke amendment because he has inside information that the retention of the islands will hazard our peace with other nations, the Committee on Foreign Relations should be informed, and that committee should take the matter in hand in conjunction with the Committee on the Philippines and a substitute should be prepared that will meet the situation safely and quickly.

If the President is simply following the lead of those Senators who are for the Clarke substitute because it is historically democratic, I desire to say that this is a most inopportune time for such a radical change of front. International conditions are now such that any attempt to operate the provisions in the substitute offered by the Senator from Arkansas, in so far as

they seek to secure the assistance of other nations, will be fruitless.

If the substitute is adopted, and disturbances should arise in the islands at any time within the four-year period, other nations would be much more likely to interfere than if we leave things as they now are. If this substitute should be adopted, it would be very easy for any foreign nation to start an insurrection in the islands. Ten thousand dollars would do it. The different factions would probably invite assistance from the outside. The United States, resenting the ingratitude manifested by the inhabitants of the islands, would probably be compelled to interfere, and a deplorable condition would be possible.

I thoroughly agree with Gov. Martin and others who are, and have been, in a position to wisely analyze the situation. When we quit we should quit "bag and baggage," and the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa, which gives the Filipinos independence after they have voted in favor of it, which, of course, they would do immediately, is far preferable to the substitute offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

If we are going to cross this bridge now, let us cross it and be sure that it is safe while we are on it, and not try to jump a river the opposite shores of which are invisible.

Right in line with the Clarke amendment is the prohibition amendment, which was hastily and, I think, unwisely adopted the other day. That amendment excepts native drinks and permits their use. It was admitted that native drinks contain much more alcohol than those imported. It is very clear to me that the gentlemen interested in the traffic will change the labels on the bottles from "whisky" to "vino," and the amendment will be a dead letter. Some slight adulterations may be necessary to enable the supreme court of the islands to arrive at a satisfactory distinction between native drinks and imported drinks, but the sole effect of the amendment will be to deprive the Philippine treasury of $2,000,000 a year in revenues.

The intentions of the Senators who voted for the prohibitory amendment were of the best, and the intentions of those advocating the Clarke substitute for the committee bill may be of the best; but when we are dealing with matters which affect the vital interests of 8,000,000 people we should know what we are doing, and if we do not know, we should either find out or let well enough alone.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to have printed certain amendments which I propose to offer to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Without objection, that course will be pursued.

The amendments submitted by Mr. HITCHCOCK are as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. HITCHCOCK to the amendment proposed by Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas to the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, viz:

Page 1, on line 9, after the word "government," insert the words "republican in form."

Page 1, on line 10, after the word "thereof," insert the words "by peaceful means."

Page 2, on line 3, strike out "date of the approval of" and insert the words "first meeting of the legislature provided for in."

Page 2, on line 9, after the word "doing," insert the words "or that the interests of the United States so require."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "at," insert the words "any time before."

Page 3, line 3, after the word "States," insert the words "and of other countries."

Page 3, line 7, strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "may."

Page 3, line 10, after the word "Philippines," add the following: "The President shall also require the Philippine Government so recognized and established to assume all of the obligations in the Philippines incurred by the United States under the treaty of Paris.

Page 3, line 11, strike out the words "immediately upon" and insert "within four years after."

Page 3, line 24, strike out the last word and all the remainder of the proposed amendment.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Harding	Martine, N. J.	Stone
Brandegee	Hitchcock	Myers	Sutherland
Bryan	Hollis	Nelson	Swanson
Catron	Husting	Norris	Tillman
Chilton	Jones	Overman	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Page	Vardaman
Colt	La Follette	Poindexter	Wadsworth
Cummins	Lane	Shafroth	Walsh
Curtis	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Weeks
Dillingham	Lewis	Smith, Ga.	
Fletcher	McCumber	Smoot	
Gore	McLean	Sterling	

Mr. CHILTON. My colleague [Mr. GOFF] is detained from the Senate on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-five Senators have responded to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of absent Senators.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 31, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *January 29, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We wait upon Thee, our Father in heaven, in the sacred attitude of prayer, for inspiration and guidance that with clear vision, high ideals, and patriotic endeavors the work of the hour may be well pleasing in Thy sight and redound to the good of our beloved country. Our minds instinctively turn to-day to one of our martyred Presidents, whose untimely death cast a gloom of sorrow and regret throughout the land. A patriot, a soldier, a statesman, may his work live and ever be an inspiration to men of every creed, of every party, of every calling in life. Blessed be his memory.

And, O God, our heavenly Father, we pray that our President may be protected from violence and the dangers which attend him on his mission throughout the country, that he may return in safety to take up the great problems which confront us and bring them to a happy solution. And Thy name shall be praised forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported the bill (H. R. 10383) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (H. Rept. 87), which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] reserves all points of order on the bill.

PERSONAL STATEMENT.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHALL. My friends, I am feeling pretty proud this morning, because through your kindness I now have a page who devotes himself to my personal service. During a recess of the Immigration Committee, whose sessions I have been attending continuously since Wednesday, I was startled when Mrs. Schall read to me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the House had passed a resolution pertaining to me, by which I have been given the services of a page. The thoughtful, big-hearted gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS], unsolicited and unexpected by me, offered this resolution, and the kindly spirited leader of our side [Mr. MANN] assisted in securing unanimous consent for its consideration, so that I now have the privilege of the services of this page; and I want to say to you gentlemen that I am deeply grateful, because this is only another manifestation of the courtesy and consideration which I have received from everyone since I have been here. To the blind man work is his pleasure. Whatever extends his usefulness widens his enjoyment. By giving me the means of doing more work you have expanded my pleasure, and released me from bondage, and given me a freedom which expands my heart. The helping hands stretched out to me along the way and the cheering voices which come to me from the dark are the inspirations which make bright the otherwise gray days and give me a renewed zest and make life worth the fight. Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth. I have often wished that He had not loved me quite so much; but you know Robert Louis Stevenson says that so long as a man has a friend he is not useless; and I find that I have many friends in this House, and through their kindness in giving me the services of this page they have con-

bined to augment my usefulness. I want to thank you, gentlemen, and perhaps I may be permitted to say to my friends with full pride that—

In the fell clutch of circumstance
I have not winced nor cried aloud;
Under the bludgeonings of chance
My head is bloody but unbowed,
And all the menace of the years
Finds and shall find me unafraid.

It matters not how strait the gate,
How charged with punishments the scroll,
I am the master of my fate;
I am the captain of my soul.

[Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3144. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River, between the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, in the State of Washington.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, bill of the following title:

H. R. 8235. An act to provide for the maintenance of the United States section of International High Commission.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill and joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 3144. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River, between the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution for repair and rebuilding of the levee at Yuma, Ariz.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PORTO RICO.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 9533) to provide a civil government for the island of Porto Rico may be given a privileged status. I want to say, if I may be permitted, that this is practically the bill which was unanimously reported from the Committee on Insular Affairs in the Sixty-third Congress, and that it was found impossible to get consideration for it in the House in that Congress. We have again reported this bill unanimously, and the committee are very desirous that it shall be passed by the House before the anticipated congestion comes, because it is exceedingly important to the people of Porto Rico that this bill be passed.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I hope no one on this side will object. This bill does not involve any questions except purely those which relate to the administrative government of Porto Rico. As the chairman of the committee has said, the bill is reported unanimously. It has been considered without partisanship. While, of course, there may be some changes made in it upon the floor of the House, there is nothing in it that will, in my judgment, embarrass the progress of business or in any way raise any political question.

Let me say further that the matters in the bill have been so well discussed and thrashed out in the consideration of the bill by the committee, in the last Congress and in this Congress, that, in my judgment, it will take very little time in the House. I hope there will be no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that this bill be given a privileged status. Of course that would have to yield to appropriation bills, revenue bills, and things of that sort. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, let us understand just what the expression "privileged status" means. I think the usual request has been to give a bill the status of a bill reported from a committee which has the right to report at any time, with the understanding that it will not interfere with appropriation bills.

The SPEAKER. The Chair added the condition that it should not interfere with appropriation bills or revenue bills, so there could be no mistake about it.

Mr. JONES. Even if we had the right to do so, it is not the purpose of the committee to interfere with the consideration of appropriation bills. We will certainly not call up the bill without first conferring with gentlemen who have charge of appropriation measures, because we would not want, in any event, to antagonize any measure of that sort.

The SPEAKER. Of course the exception includes Calendar Wednesday and also the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

Mr. MANN. The usual request is to give a bill the privilege of a bill reported from a committee which has the right to report at any time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not want this bill or any other bill to get in ahead of revenue bills or appropriation bills, so far as the Chair is individually concerned.

Mr. MANN. I think it is quite safe to say that the House would not take up this bill ahead of any such bill.

Mr. JONES. I certainly will not ask that it be taken up ahead of any such bill, and we only ask that it be made privileged under the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 9533) to provide a civil government for the island of Porto Rico be given the status of bills reported from committees having the right to report and call up bills at any time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the speeches to be delivered to-day under special orders have been concluded the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE] be allowed 45 minutes to address the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE] may have 45 minutes in which to address the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD Secretary Lansing's last note to Great Britain covering the question of seizure of mails and parcel post and the tentative reply of Great Britain thereto; also an editorial opinion in the London Evening Mail on the question of neutral rights.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a note of the Secretary of State to Great Britain on the seizure of the mails and also the tentative note from Great Britain to our Government, and an editorial comment on the matter in the London Mail. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Ohio if he will please eliminate the printing of the editorial.

Mr. FESS. If it is necessary for me to have the request granted, I will.

Mr. BARNHART. I will say that the custom of printing newspaper editorials of all sorts and magazine extracts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of late years made the RECORD so voluminous that there has been a diligent effort on the part of the Printing Committee and House leaders to eliminate as much of such matter as possible. While I dislike to object, I believe I shall have to do so if the editorial is to accompany the notes. I have no objection to the others. The gentleman can get the editorial in in the way of extension of remarks, and there are other ways by which he can get in the newspaper extract.

Mr. FESS. My only desire at this time is to link up with our controversy an opinion which I think is very specific in the London Evening Mail. Of course I will withdraw that if the gentleman is inclined to object to it, but I think the matter ought to be in the RECORD.

Mr. BARNHART. The only difficulty about the matter is that if this is permitted probably to-morrow some other Member may be on the floor asking for unanimous consent to print an editorial in opposition, and then some other Member another, and so it will go. I think the gentleman from Ohio can see the difficulty.

Mr. FESS. Would the gentleman from Indiana object if I made the request to extend remarks in which I will include these articles?

Mr. BARNHART. I should have no objection to the gentleman extending his remarks. A Member of the House has that right, but I should object to extending remarks for the mere purpose of including a newspaper editorial.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I will change the request so that I may extend my remarks, and include in my remarks the Secretary of State's note to Great Britain, Great Britain's reply, and this editorial, which is an English editorial. I would not ask it if it was an American editorial.

Mr. BARNHART. I object.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the conclusion of the other special orders already entered for to-day the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RICKETTS] have leave to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE] the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RICKETTS] may address the House for 40 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PREPAREDNESS.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order for to-day the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed 10 additional minutes. I do not know that I shall want to use it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that his time be extended from 20 to 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], seized with sudden war hysteria, made a remarkable speech on the propaganda of preparedness. In his remarks he conjured up a terrible dread of an attack upon our country by some foe across the waters, and said that the conflict in Europe would probably last many years while the opposing forces are rapidly destroying one another. If his latter remark is true and the warring nations are being destroyed by this terrible conflict, common sense refutes his fear of danger to our people from invading European armies. This attack against us will not come. England desires our friendship and Germany wishes to retain it. Both these warring nations will not abandon their land and homes to cross the ocean and attack America. Each well knows that this course would leave either country open to attack and ravage by the other while engaged in war here with America. No one really believes that those countries, now becoming exhausted, their armies and navies being reduced to a minimum, are planning to attack us. In the present conflict those countries are crippling and destroying their resources for more than half a century, and must for that period remain helpless to menace us with war.

AGAINST A LARGE STANDING ARMY.

The gentleman, reaching the height of his hysteria, cries out for an Army of 250,000, 300,000—aye, for half a million men. Let me say democracy does not want such an Army and will not tolerate this demand. In my judgment, such plans of militarism have no sanction in the minds and hearts of our people. True, they demand a force for adequate defense. Who will oppose a small addition to the Regular Army for use in times of peace? We should all stand ready to develop the National Guard. Who will object to adequate methods of training officers and providing reserve officers?

Mr. Speaker, I declare myself opposed to this plan of the leader of the Republican Party in the House for a large standing Army, entailing the expenditure of billions of dollars. Democracy has never tolerated this doctrine of militarism thus pressed by the gentleman from Illinois. The Democratic Party never will embrace his wild proposal. It is abhorrent to the ideals of democracy and the genius of our republican institutions. In a recent speech by the distinguished Representative, Mr. DAVIS of Texas, who through a lifetime has defended the rights of the taxpayers and toilers, he foresaw and forewarned the people of the designs of the Republican leaders and war traffickers to burden the country with a stupendous military program.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that the Republican leaders and war trust masters are most ambitious for an era of militarism of vast proportions. It is natural for the Republican leaders to feel kindly toward the great trusts. They are the children of the Republican household. They were nurtured and fed by that party till they have become giants. They seek now to praise the President and the party in power while they betray it into the hands of the war traffickers as they magnify the stocks of their friends and allies profiting by their actions. They design to destroy democracy and return to the rule of the trusts.

AMERICA MUST BE NEUTRAL.

Mr. Speaker, this country has confidence in the integrity of purpose and patriotism of the President. It believes he is truly seeking the ways of peace. More than a year ago he warned all Americans to remain neutral in the awful contest across the seas. His warning was wise, and all who love this country should heed it, and I believe most Americans have heeded it. All Americans of whatever race, descent, and extraction should occupy a position of neutrality, but the gentleman from Illinois sounds a discordant note, and his remarks gravely imperil neutrality. Recently the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] undertook to array us against Germany and paraded that Empire before us as an immediate menace and danger to America. In an unwarrantable attack against German-Americans he sought to destroy our thoughts and acts of neutrality. Let us hope that we have heard the last of this and other deplorable and inexcusable assaults by Representatives against the German-American citizens.

FOR AN EMBARGO ON ARMS AND AMMUNITION.

And now comes the great Republican leader, Mr. MANN, and in deliberate and measured words shouts in our ears: "*I have much more fear, in the end, of war with England than I have of war with Germany!*" Ah, Mr. Speaker, what does his fear, if true, portend? *It means that this country, realizing its duty, should place an embargo on the exportation of arms and ammunition and prevent their shipment beyond our limits.* I am ready to vote for it to-day, and if the gentleman from Illinois speaks with authority, we should hasten the hour. If we must fight England, let us keep our arms and ammunition at home. [Applause.] Stop the exportation of this deadly traffic, amounting to millions and billions of dollars. If England is to attack us, it is treason to further strengthen her forces from our factories. If he prophesies rightly, must America sit idly by while the J. Pierpont Morgan Syndicate, the money changers, the war trust masters, and their ramifying institutions equip England with modern arms and guns and billions of dollars with which to turn and destroy us as a Republic? No, Mr. Speaker; a thousand times no! Rather let us quickly pass an embargo act. Inexorable logic points the way and forces us to that conclusion. Let us stop the shipment of arms and ammunition to England by proper embargo, restrain the flow of our millions of money to them, and thus diminish their power to destroy us, if we must fight them, as the gentleman from Illinois thinks.

THE PROPOSED BILLION-DOLLAR LOAN TO THE ALLIES.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Senator JAS. HAMILTON LEWIS, was right when he protested against the billion-dollar loan to the allies. He said it was unneutral and unwise, and thus took a brave, patriotic, and justifiable stand. I commended him then and congratulate him now on his glorious American spirit. The loan was scaled to half a billion dollars, and I am proud to note that the Morgan Syndicate met difficulties and the loan went below par and was far from being a success. The money and credit of the American people should never be used for such an unholy purpose. In supreme degree such acts are unneutral. By them our citizens become stockholders in that bloody carnival of war, and are thus interested, prejudiced, and made partisans for the warring allies of Europe. It is an unjustifiable thing for Americans to do. And if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is right, having supplied them with money, allowed the War Trust masters to furnish them guns and ammunition, now England is to cross the ocean and fight us with our own resources. If such be the case, the J. Pierpont Morgan Syndicate, the money trust and the war trust masters, have committed a crime against their own country by equipping and supplying an enemy to advance on us. Let this miserable traffic cease. We should no longer fill the maw of the war trust, but pray and hope for peace across the waters.

OUR RIGHTS AS A NATION TO TRADE WITH BELLIGERENTS IN COTTON AND FOODSTUFFS.

And at this point permit me to say that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] are right in their contentions, resolutions, and bills touching our rights as a neutral nation to trade with belligerents in cotton and foodstuffs, and I shall heartily support their measures. By her orders in council, her embargoes, interference with our mails, and unlawful acts England has injured our legitimate commerce in cotton and foodstuffs, and we should find a way by retaliatory enactment and otherwise to require her to vacate those proceedings and restore our lawful trade and respect our rights. It is the duty of Congress to move by resolution or law and furnish relief to our farmers and producers, whose rights have been unjustly and illegally violated by England. By my voice and vote I am ready to assert our cause and defend it through the authority of the American Congress. Let us begin by hastening a bill to prohibit the exportation of arms and ammunition in addition to what the patriotic Senators from Georgia and Oklahoma are endeavoring to accomplish. Yes, Mr. Speaker, let us hurry the passage of the ship-purchase bill. *Our farmers want cotton ships and want them now.* Their cargoes are tied up and held in our home ports. We should release them and furnish our country a merchant marine to hasten this commerce abroad. The golden opportunity is here, and we should embrace it by the immediate enactment of the Alexander ship-purchase bill and furnish an abundance of cotton ships and vessels for all kinds of lawful commerce.

OUR GERMAN-AMERICAN CITIZENS.

Mr. Speaker, to-day permit me to state my refusal to join in the invidious acrimony indulged in by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and those acting with him against our German-American citizens. Coming from a State where many men of German birth and descent reside, I am justified in bearing testimony on the floor of this House to their worth. Having resided amongst them, keeping in communication with them, and knowing their ambitions and ideals, I do not hesitate to commend their loyalty and patriotism. It is not strange that their hearts are thrilled and torn with passion and feelings of grief and emotion when their minds go across the waters to contemplate the horrors of bloody battle fields in Europe. They think and dream of their ancestral homes and the kindred left there as the souls of their people are wafted to eternity on the smoke of the bloody battle grounds. Mr. Speaker, is it strange that their minds dwell on these things and that their hearts are there with their kindred? And thus we may view the natives and descendants of any race of people from any land. In our hearts we must make just allowance for their thoughts, emotions, and actions. I shall not now or hereafter sympathize with these attacks on the German-Americans of our country, but repel them.

Mr. Speaker, by the votes of Texas constituencies two great German-Americans sat as Representatives on this floor, Hon. Gustave Schleicher and Hon. Rudolph Kleberg. They reflected credit upon the imperial State of Texas and brought honor to that Commonwealth. Their people mingled their blood with Texan-Americans and produced a noble strain of manhood. We are proud of that commingled blood, and I assert to-day that there is no nobler type of citizenship anywhere than the German-Americans of Texas. In business they are models of honor, industry, and success; in farm life their homes become the charm and admiration of the countryside. As law-abiding citizens they are unsurpassed and perhaps unequaled by any race of people. Inhabiting vast areas of Texas, richer than the Valley of the Nile and more beautiful than the Vale of Cashmere, they have made my native State blossom as the rose. They have brought wealth, happiness, contentment, and unbounded prosperity to our people.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois, the leader of his party in the House, proclaims that he has "much more fear, in the end, of war with England than of war with Germany." Let us pray that it may not come with England or with any country, but if it must come from England or any other foe, when our towns are bombarded and our land invaded you will find the German-Americans under our flag in the very front of battle locking arms and joining step with native Americans, with the Irish, the Dane, the Bohemian, the Italian, the Swede, the Jew, and those of English ancestry as well. [Applause.] Texas will furnish 50,000 German-American youths to save our honor and preserve our country. They will be found intensely loyal in the service of America. If war with England or any other nation must come, in common with all Americans the German-Americans will proudly carry the honor of their country into battle and contribute to repeat our victories of Kings Mountain, New Orleans, and many bloody fields of battle when the crest of England was laid low by our arms. [Applause.]

AGAINST STAMP TAXES AND FOR INCREASING THE INCOME TAX.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois and those acting with him are to force upon this country a vast standing army and the hateful doctrine of militarism, we must take account of the method of raising the money by taxation to meet their demands. As for me, I am against odious stamp taxes and think they should be repealed and should not be repeated. [Applause on the Republican side.] Further excise taxes at this time should be eschewed, and we should quickly amend our income-tax laws and extend their provisions and lay the burdens of taxation and great preparedness programs upon the backs of the wealthy. Now will you applaud? When gentlemen on that side of the aisle are brought face to face with a provision to increase the income tax they are as silent as the tomb. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Democratic Party is entitled to the confidence and support of the country for passing an income-tax measure which has been held constitutional by the Supreme Court and is now in full flower of efficiency and should be utilized to supply the needs of the Treasury. If $80,000,000 from this source is insufficient to meet our present demands, let us double the tax and treble it and force those who enjoy the benefits of good government to contribute their just share of the burden.

And, again, Mr. Speaker, I would levy a tax on the manufacturers of arms and munitions of war, who ship enormous quantities of their products abroad. Their wealth is increased; they are prospering beyond computation and gathering billions of gains, and should immediately bear their part of the increased taxes. They are making immense profits. Mr. Speaker, the way is open, the income-tax law is valid under the Constitution, and in this generation we should turn our thoughts to the consumer, the producer, and overburdened taxpayer and lift the load from his shoulders and place it upon those who are coining billions in war profits, who are piling their wealth to mountain heights, in many instances with ill-gotten gains, and go forward as a great Republic perpetuating equality before the law for every man. [Loud applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARD). Under the special order the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

WILLIAM M'KINLEY.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, seventy-three years ago to-day William McKinley was born in the little village of Niles in the State of Ohio. He remained there until he was about 11 years of age and then moved with his parents to Poland, in the same State, where, as his mother once said, there were better educational advantages for the children. He entered Allegheny College, and when the war broke out—then but 18 years of age—enlisted as a private soldier. He was promoted several times during the war, and at its close returned home with the commission of a brevet major "for gallant and meritorious services at the Battles of Obequan, Cedar Creek, and Fishers Hill." This commission was signed by Abraham Lincoln about one month before his death. Maj. McKinley then took up the study of law. For a time he was in the law school at Albany, N. Y., and later, returning to his native State, was admitted to the bar, and began the practice of law in the city of Canton, which remained his home until his death. He was elected prosecuting attorney of Stark County in 1871, but was defeated for reelection in 1873. In 1876 he was first elected to Congress. In 1880 he was made a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, taking the place of Gen. Garfield, who at that time had just been elected President. In 1889 he became the chairman of that great committee which drafted the McKinley tariff law. In 1890 he was defeated for Congress and in 1891 he was elected governor of Ohio. In 1893 he was reelected. In 1896 he was elected President of the United States. In 1900 he was reelected. On the 6th day of September, 1901, while attending the exposition at Buffalo, he was shot by an assassin, and there lingered between life and death until the 14th, when he died. This briefly is a sketch of his life.

AN INSPIRING CAREER.

His was an inspiring career. Every phase of it has something worthy of emulation and hope to American youth and manhood.

It would be pleasant to retrace the steps of his early boyhood and picture the American home from which he sprang; his early school life and the building of character; his participation in the debates, where he acquired that simplicity and directness of speech which, with a well-modulated voice and a strong earnestness and fervency of expression, made him later one of the most impressive orators of his time. I would like to dwell upon his career as a soldier; the brilliant achievements upon the field; that dramatic incident when, in the flame of battle, amid flying shot and bursting shell, he bore the order of his colonel, afterwards President of the United States, to a distant regiment. And then, too, when Sheridan, on his immortal ride down the valley of the Shenandoah, found him rallying his men, the first to meet him and state definitely the military situation. I would like to relate his struggles as a young lawyer waiting for clients, and later his success at the bar, and his ability as a prosecutor before the courts of Stark County. I would like to speak of him as the citizen, loyal and true, and then as the man, his gentleness and his many amiable traits of character, and particularly his constant devotion to the invalid partner of his joys and sorrows. But time would fail me to speak of the many interesting sides of his life, and so I pass on to his national career.

From 1876 down to the day of his death he was in public life, as a Member of Congress, as governor of his State, and as President of the United States. For twenty-five years he stood in the blaze of the fierce light of public criticism, and there never was a whisper of suspicion as to his integrity, his honor, or character. [Applause.]

HIS INDUSTRY.

McKinley was industrious and concentrated all of his faculties to a given purpose. When he first entered public life he threw his whole soul and energy into it. He made it his business not only to be a good Member of Congress but to be the best Member of Congress that he knew how, and it is this difference between doing a thing well and doing a thing the best you know how that makes the difference between the ordinarily successful man

and the eminently successful man. The extra effort which is applied in the latter case has laid the foundation for the great characters in history.

CONCENTRATION OF ENERGIES.

Then, too, the proper concentration of efforts along a given line of action is infinitely better than the diffusion of energies over a whole field of labor, some of which may be profitable and some unprofitable.

McKinley, in one of his speeches, said:

Labor is the only key to opportunity. You are all here to do something—to work out a destiny, to discover the forces of nature and make them serve men's uses and God's purposes.

McKinley while in Congress directed his efforts largely in one direction. He sought to do something, and he found that something to be the mastery of a great political principle which he believed meant more for the happiness of the American people than anything else—protection to American industries. [Applause.] He applied himself day and night to that one thing until he became the master of this great idea.

THE MASTER OF A GREAT PRINCIPLE.

Some of his critics have said that he was a man of one idea, and that was the argument which was frequently used against him when he was nominated for President of the United States and in the campaign following. But it is better to be a master of one thing than to be a master of none. It is better, as Josh Billings once said, "to known less than so many things that ain't so." The men who have been great in history have been masters of an idea. It is written in the Holy Writ that if one is faithful over a few things he will be made ruler over many things. McKinley became a master of the great principle of protection, and linked his personality interchangeably with it, so that when the people of this country beheld him they saw, as it were, in him the principle for which he stood. When the dark hour of financial disaster, want, misery, and unhappiness came the people called unto this man as their only Moses to lead them out of the wilderness, and the master of one idea became the ruler of many. [Applause.] But some of his critics said: "Well, wait; you will find that he only knows one thing." And yet McKinley had acquired an ability to so concentrate his whole self upon the thing immediately before him that to every great emergency during his administration he proved himself more than equal.

The master of the tariff became the master of the currency and the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, the master mind of a war between this country and Spain.

POLITICAL HONESTY.

Another characteristic of McKinley was his political honesty. He was honest in his speech; he was honest in his action—he made the one square with the other.

One of the most striking incidents in American political life occurred in the Republican national convention in 1888, held in the city of Chicago. He had come to that convention as a delegate from the State of Ohio, instructed to cast his vote for John Sherman for President. When Sherman's success seemed impossible of realization some of McKinley's friends began to vote for him. Immediately he arose, and, standing upon a chair in the convention, made this speech, so typical of the man:

Mr. President and gentlemen of the convention, I am here as one of the chosen representatives of my State. I am here by resolution of the State Republican convention, passed without a single dissenting voice, commanding me to cast my vote for John Sherman for President and to use every worthy endeavor for his nomination. I accepted the trust because my heart and judgment were in accord with the letter and spirit and purpose of that resolution. It has pleased certain delegates to cast their votes for me as President. I am not insensible to the honor they would do me, but in the presence of the duty resting upon me I can not remain silent with honor. I can not consistently with the wish of the State whose credentials I bear, and which has trusted me; I can not with honorable fidelity to John Sherman, who has trusted me in his cause and with his confidence; I can not consistently with my own views of personal integrity consent, or seem to consent, to permit my name to be used as a candidate before this convention. I would not respect myself if I could find it in my heart to do so or permit to be done that which could even be ground for anyone to suspect that I wavered in my loyalty to Ohio or my devotion to the chief of her choice and the chief of mine. I do not request—I demand—that no delegate who would not cast reflection upon me shall cast a ballot for me.

[Applause.]

After McKinley made that short speech the eyes of the country became riveted upon him. Here was a type of a public man of which the country had seen too little, and from that hour he grew in popular esteem. The people had marked the man.

HIS LOYALTY TO PARTY PRINCIPLES.

Another characteristic of McKinley was his unflinching loyalty to party principle. When other men wavered he did not. When the McKinley bill became a law and the following election brought his party to defeat, loud and angry were the criticisms all over the country against him and the measure for which he stood. But his only reply was that the people had not had time to understand the McKinley law, but they would see in it their salvation. McKinley at this time, in one of his speeches, said:

The friends of protection should not now falter. The fight is only begun. If temporarily lost, it is not to be given up. Courage was never more needed and never more expected by the people from the Representatives than now. It is the demand of the hour and the requirement of the situation.

He was loyal to the principle which he believed to be true, in defeat as well as in victory. The strongest test that comes to men is the test of loyalty to principle when seemingly engulfed in disaster, but the man who courageously stands by his guns will some day become the hero of the hour.

HIS TRUST IN THE PEOPLE.

McKinley was not only true to himself, but he was true to the people. It might be said of him, as he once said of Lincoln, that "he was of the people, for the people, but never above the people." In his speech upon the life of that great man (and does he not draw a picture even of himself) he said:

What were the traits of character which made Abraham Lincoln prophet and master, without a rival, in the greatest crisis of our history? What gave him such mighty power? To me the answer is simple—Lincoln had sublime faith in the people. He walked with and among them. He recognized the importance and power of an enlightened public sentiment and was guided by it.

HIS AMERICANISM.

McKinley was, above all things, an American. [Applause.] His whole life breathed the broad, true spirit of sterling Americanism; he was the product of the American home and was always true to it. He was the product of the American school and believed that education was one of the foundation stones of the Republic. He proved his title as an American patriot in the fierce blaze of war. He was the advocate, as I have said before, of protection to American industries. In a speech, delivered in Boston, he said:

Let England take care of herself; let France look after her interests; let Germany take care of her own people; but let Americans look after America.

[Applause.]

He believed in an Army and a Navy strong enough to protect American interests and American citizens on land and sea wherever they might be. [Applause.] In his last speech at Buffalo, in referring to our merchant marine, he said:

We must encourage our merchant marine; we must have more ships; they must be under the American flag, built, manned, and owned by Americans.

[Applause.]

He further declared in favor of building an Isthmian Canal to connect the two oceans, and also the construction of a cable to the Orient. He realized that the Spanish-American War had opened the door of enlarged responsibilities for us as a Nation; that it had made us a world power whether we liked it or not, and his great speech at Buffalo was undoubtedly his conception of the course which our Ship of State should sail on the larger sea of international opportunity.

FAITH IN GOD EXEMPLIFIED IN LIFE AND DEATH.

McKinley was a man of faith. He had faith in himself, faith in the people, and, above all, faith in God. He believed that nations as well as individuals were but the instruments of the Almighty's power and purpose. He believed that men were raised up in great national emergencies to meet the problems of the hour. He sought by earnest living and Christian prayer to keep himself so close to his Maker as to be ever receptive to the gentle droppings of Divine Will.

Great in life but magnificent in death. What artist in all the world can ever picture this Christian's death? When the assassin had accomplished his murderous intent his hand was raised to stay the angry people, and, with compassion for the wretch, he murmured, "Don't hurt him; God help him." And then the solicitude for his wife, "Don't tell her." And then, a week later, that last "Good-by—good-by, all; God's will, not ours, be done." Such a death immeasurably advanced the cause of Christianity.

HIS GREAT WORK.

He died just at the height of his career. He initiated policies on more important questions during his administration than any President since Lincoln, and he saw more of them accomplished; he saw the great doctrine which he had advocated all of his life become the law of the land; he saw the gold standard permanently established; he saw our country on a firmer financial basis and enjoying greater prosperity than it had ever known before; he saw our flag raised over Hawaii; he saw our Army and Navy victorious on the land and the sea; he saw Spanish tyranny stricken down on the island of Cuba and a new Republic come forth; he saw Porto Rico annexed to this country and

the Philippines ours—ours not for conquest but ours to hold as a sacred trust, for civilization, for liberty, and independence [applause]; he saw our Army lead the allied forces on to Pekin and place our flag first above its walls. When international greed would have strangled the Chinaman and dismembered his Empire, he saw American justice, tempered with American mercy, call a halt, and he saw American diplomacy turn the allied forces back again. [Applause.] In the full tide of American prosperity, when American art, science, and industry were at their best, and when the American name was honored and respected the world over as never before, just at that time our President died; died in the fullness of his strength of mind and heart and soul; died when it seemed that everything called unto him to live and to enjoy; died under a Providence that is greater than our own, which only the Christian faith is able to reconcile to the human heart.

When McKinley fell the Nation wept. No President was ever nearer to the hearts of the people. There was no partyism in our national sorrow. While one great party claimed him as its own, yet his great career had long since overleaped the bounds of partisanship. There was no sectionalism in our national grief. When Lincoln died, at the close of the Civil War, time had not sufficed to unite the North and the South and but half the Nation mourned him; but when McKinley died all sections of our common country paid reverence and homage to him who had been the personal embodiment of reconciliation and reunion. At the hour of his funeral, for five full minutes all the activities of the land were hushed to silence. No greater tribute was ever paid to man.

The years have swiftly passed. Many more will come and go. Generation will follow generation, but in the far-off distant future when the recording angel of history, in the clear light of impartial truth, comes to write the names of those who wrought mightily for their country and their fellow men she will place high on the scroll of eternal fame the name of George Washington, the father of the Republic, and then beneath she will write the name of our martyred Lincoln, the preserver of the American Union, and then, dipping her pen once more in the blood of martyrdom, will inscribe the name of William McKinley, the beloved of Presidents, whose life and character through all the ages will be the synonym of the purest and highest Christian statesmanship. [Loud applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. By special order the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] was to have been recognized next, but an arrangement has been made whereby the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE] is to come next. Is there objection to the recognition of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE] at this time.

There was no objection.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address this House with considerable diffidence, because I have heard that it was a tradition of this body that young Members, like children, should be seen and not heard. But on yesterday, when I heard a most excellent speech from the gentleman from Texas, attacking, at least, if not directly, by innuendo, the fundamental necessity of preparedness as enunciated by the President, the leader of the party, and when I saw, furthermore, that no member of his own party rose to his defense, but that it remained for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], not of his political faith, very gallantly to couch his lance in defense and enter the lists, I said to myself: "Since I am a recent recruit from the body of the people, I will seek an opportunity to express to this House what I believe to be the thoughts and the ideas of at least a majority of the people of the fifth congressional district of Mississippi upon this question."

I think there has been much confusion of thought and much confusion of exposition by reason of the fact that in the discussion of this subject there have been linked together several unrelated subject matters. The necessity of preparedness is one question; the sources from which we are to get the revenue to carry a preparedness program into effect is another. The subject matters that shall be taxed is a question that is totally unrelated to the question of whether a necessity exists at all for further preparation on the part of this Government to protect itself in case of war. I think that in the discussion of these questions and in their decision, if not on the floor of this House at least in our own minds, we should consider them in their due order.

If we decide that there is no necessity for further preparation on the part of this Government to maintain American institutions and American rights, then the question of how the taxes shall be raised or should be raised becomes purely academic and theoretical. If, on the other hand, we do decide that a wise public policy, patriotism, and common sense and a learning of the lessons of the current events of the day demand that this country should make further preparation, then there will arise for decision by this body the question as to how the revenue is to be raised.

Personally I am in hearty accord with the position taken by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] in his speech yesterday in that I think that money should be raised by taxing those things and those people who are best able to bear the burden. I think it is fundamentally just and right. I know it is the only practical method of carrying out the patriotic idea of putting this country in a state of so-called preparedness.

As I understand it, the gentleman from Texas spoke fundamentally on the question of whether or not there be any necessity whatsoever of any further increase in the armament of this country, and to that I shall address my remarks. As I understand the views as I have heard them expressed since I have been in Washington, gentlemen differ about this question for several reasons. Some hold to the position that no further preparation is necessary because this Government is already sufficiently prepared.

Others hold that no further preparation is necessary, because there will not be and can not be any war with any European country, advancing as an argument for that position that those countries will be exhausted when the present struggle is over, and hence they say any further preparation on the part of the Government would be a useless expenditure of public money and a useless burden placed on the shoulders of the taxpayers of the country. I am of the opinion that further preparation is absolutely necessary. I realize the fact that this is not a partisan question. I realize the fact that this is a question which presents itself to the patriotic heart of the Members of this body and to the patriotism of the citizenship of all this broad land. But I regret exceedingly to learn that while some of we Democrats are constantly saying that we do not doubt the intelligence and the patriotism of the present leader of our party, yet we, by our speeches and our insinuations and by reiterating the statement that the idea of "preparedness" is a propaganda of the great ammunition forces of the country and the great moneyed trusts and multimillionaires, thereby connect together in the minds of the American public the actions of the President with the actions of the forces seeking their own self-aggrandizement. The one is a denial of the other, a misrepresentation, unconsciously I know, of the position of the President, but one, to my mind, much to be regretted. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, my time is limited, and I must mention very briefly the considerations which lead me to the belief that further preparation is absolutely necessary on the part of the Government. I think there is a fundamental principle as a primary premise, and that is that every Government worthy of the name exists solely and alone for the purpose of protecting its citizens in their lives, their liberties, and in the possession and enjoyment of their property. No Government which does not do that can be worthy of the name, and any Government which refuses to do so in a proper case as against aggressions of foreign Governments simply abrogates all functions of government in that specific instance and denies any excuse for its existence. [Applause.] That, I believe, is a fundamental principle that will be agreed to by both sides of the House.

Understand, I do not mean that because some bandits totally unconnected with the Mexican government happened to kill several American citizens that that means that we should declare war upon Mexico. I am talking about aggressions by foreign Governments and not aggressions by individuals which were against the laws of their own country. But what I have stated, broadly speaking, as I understand it, is the fundamental principle of all government. That is the reason that government exists; that is the only excuse, as I understand it, for its existence. How can a Government do that, if that be true? There are several possible ways. One is to be prepared, if necessary, to use force in the vindication and the rights of its citizens and its institutions. Another is by persuasion through diplomatic negotiations, by the warfare of wits and reason rather than the warfare of armies and navies. Sometimes the one succeeds; sometimes the battle is won on the battle field of diplomacy, but sometimes that fails. If all men were reasonable, if all men were "moderns" in the sense that they had reached the point of the highest ethical culture, if all men were amenable to reason, if all men had "modern" consciences and a due regard for right and law, with power of moral perception to enable them to see the shadowy line that sometimes exists between what is right and true and what is wrong and false, all the battles and conflicts between individuals as well as nations could be settled by that method. But, unfortunately, while men of the present age all live in the modern time and are moderns in a sense, you can hardly find an audience composed of several hundred men where you do not find different stages of intellectual and

ethical culture, reaching from the stone age to the present. You have men to-day in American life, gigantic industrial forces they are, who have the ethical sense of a "Blue Beard" or a "Robin Hood." In almost any social assembly in Washington to-day of any size, if you could analyze the minds and ethical senses of those individuals, you would find cases of atavism, where, ethically considered, some gentlemen are living in the stone age instead of the present time, and they use the methods of the stone age in their business and in their government.

That is the actual situation, as I see it, in the world to-day. Now, you can not reason with a man unless he will reason with you. It is not possible to reason with a man and show him the right and expect anything unless at the same time that man is willing to do the right when once he sees it.

Now, what is true of individuals is true of nations. Nations do not always, unfortunately, decide their controversies on the basis of what is right and what is wrong. Most of the wars that are caused in the world are caused for financial and commercial aggrandizement, or possibly the glory of some reigning dynasty. And when a country comes in contact with forces like that, which essentially is unreasoning, that country can not accomplish its purpose and defend its rights in the name of diplomacy, because you can not reason with a man or a nation that is not willing to reason, and you can not settle disputes with a man or a nation which is not ethically willing to do what is right after the right has been decided. Hence, there come times in the history of all nations when an appeal to force or a threat to appeal to force is sometimes necessary; not always the actual appeal but the threatened appeal, the ability to appeal; for the reason that when you are dealing with a nation which does not care anything about the right, which does not care anything about reason, you must then defend your right by an appeal to some agency for which that nation has respect. [Applause.] So every nation—I lay it down as a fundamental proposition—must make some preparation to provide for those times in its history when an appeal to reason and an appeal to ethical standards are unavailing, and when the only thing that will avail is an appeal to force, either actually used or threatened. The founders of our Government and the various administrations that have followed one after another in its history have recognized this principle. Hence, we have an Army and we have a Navy. I think the use of the word "preparedness" or "unpreparedness" is an unfortunate use of terms. Every one is in favor of being prepared; no one is in favor of being unprepared. If unpreparedness be a virtue, then the more unprepared we are the better it will be, and the logical thing to do is to take our Navy out into the midst of the ocean and sink it and disband this Army we now have and be totally unprepared and entirely virtuous. [Applause.] But no one contends for anything of this character. As a matter of fact, we are in favor of being prepared. That is not where the difference lies. The difference lies in this: That some say we are prepared enough already. Others say we are not prepared but that we have no need for preparation; we will have no war, and hence preparation is unnecessary. Still others say our preparation is not sufficient.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it be a true and fundamental principle that this Government and other governments must make some preparation in the event of the contingencies arising when an appeal to reason and ethical standards will not avail, it follows logically that the preparation must be adequate in view of conditions. Now, are we sufficiently prepared? Do you know personally? No. Is there any Member of this House who knows personally? No. Is there any Member of this House who has spent as much as a week investigating the forces that this country has at its disposal? No.

Mr. DIES. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman overstates that. There are many who have spent many months studying practically this very question.

Mr. QUIN. And I desire to say that I have studied the subject constantly for three years, and spent many months on it.

Mr. VENABLE. If these are exceptions, I am very glad to hear them. [Applause.] I have spoken of the general body of this House, and my statement is but a statement of individual opinion, and if I have done the gentlemen an injustice, I most humbly apologize. Taking the body of this House as a whole, with men on other committees, engaging themselves day after day and hour after hour in the consideration of other governmental matters, as a matter of fact they do not know anything about the Army and about the Navy of this country.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENABLE. My time is very limited, sir; I would like to yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. VENABLE. They know but very little about the actual fighting and physical condition of this country. They do not know what industrial forces can be organized, and we must remember when wars come hereafter they will be wars of millions of men and millions of money. The European war has taught one lesson, and it has taught it thoroughly, that hereafter when nations go to war they are going to war by millions. No nation hereafter, a first-class power, will go to war except with the understanding that all of its resources, industrial, social, economic, and moral, shall be put behind the movement, because science has so endowed the art of killing that any nation which does not do that can not possibly survive.

Now, we Congressmen know nothing about it. I say we do not. I think it would take years of study—with all due respect to the magnificent talents of the gentleman who asked me to yield—to know much about the question, for I am not speaking of knowing a thing from magazine articles and the opinion of some other man, but I am talking about knowing the thing itself, not simply the opinion of this man and that man, but going to the original sources and knowing the actual thing as it actually is. No; the only means of knowing the present "preparedness" of this Nation are the men, the patriotic citizens, those gallant gentlemen who are soldiers and sailors by profession, who have devoted their lives to the service of this country, who daily and hourly declare in their uniforms and by the flash of their scabbards that if necessary they are willing to lay down their lives in defense of American property and American institutions. Upon their judgment we must perforce rely, and they say from their technical, accurate experience that we are not prepared to meet any first-class power of Europe.

Now, why be prepared? Is it wise to make this preparation? What is the purpose of it? I have heard arguments which said it would commit us to a policy of militarism; that soon we will be plunging into war; that the psychological effect of preparation would be such; that now, being peaceful and liberty-loving, we will then become warlike in spirit and, like Alexander, dream dreams of worlds on worlds to conquer. Sufficient preparation is the best guaranty of peace. [Applause.] That is the purpose of the fundamental idea of the President. He calls upon the country to make reasonable preparation, and he does not say that you have to adopt exactly his program. His cry is for reasonable preparation. It is for the President to suggest and Congress to enact, but he calls upon this country not as a partisan, not appealing to party, but to patriotism, calling upon Democrats and Republicans alike, as all Americans worshiping at a common altar of American institutions, to make some adequate preparation, not for the purposes of war but in order that we may have peace. [Applause.]

Now, is that true? Will it have that effect? Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure during my lifetime to be intimately and personally acquainted with two dogs. One of them was a little rat terrier who had a little tail curled over his back like a little corkscrew. That little dog's life was one long sad wail of misery. He was kicked by every man he met and whipped by every dog he ran across. I knew another dog, a magnificent gentleman of his race. His magnificent head reared itself above his shoulders as the head of a lion. He was thewed and sinewed like a gladiator, and his curved forelegs and staunch haunches spoke of tremendous strength. He lived his life respected by dogs and men. [Laughter and applause.] I owned him for five years, and I caressed him when I felt like kicking him. [Laughter.] Why? He was a prince of the house royal, a gladiator of his kind, and he was "prepared." [Applause.] As a result of that he lived his life in peace, unwhipped by any dog, and not having any dog to whip, admired of mankind, and caressed by all, and finally sank to sleep with all his institutions intact [laughter] and his personal and property rights thoroughly respected. [Laughter.]

The answer to the question of whether or not preparedness makes for peace is one of psychology. What is true of dogs is true of men. These gentlemen are from various parts of the Union, some from large cities and some from small villages. It used to be down in my country, in Mississippi, that sometimes there lived in a community two men who were known as "fighting characters," who took a pride in having whipped nearly everybody in the entire community, but the first case is to be recorded on the pages of American history where two fighters in the same community ever fought one another. They had a wholesome respect for one another's prowess. They knew what it meant, and as a result they were always for peace and for adjusting their differences on a reasonable basis.

Is it true among nations? China, poor old China, gets her coat tail kicked whenever anyone has the inclination. Maybe that is a slander on the Chinaman, because I recollect now he

does not wear a coat. [Laughter.] Whenever any country wants a port in China they take it. Has not that been the history of that country? But whoever took a German port or an English port? Why? Because those countries were prepared to defend the integrity of their territory, and as a result of it they have never been called upon to do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard much about the cost and expense. While I think the classes that should pay this cost of "preparedness"—since they get the most protection, since they have the most at stake, since they would lose the most if war should come—are those who are of wealth, upon whom fortune has smiled, who can pay the tax without reducing their standard of living, without causing suffering in the restriction of their mode of life in anywise whatever. Yet even though we had to pay, all of us, a little money, taking us in the aggregate, we would not know we had paid it. It is much better to spend a few dollars than to spend much blood. [Applause.]

Now, as I understand it, the great argument against any increase in the Army or the Navy is that it will create a great military spirit, if that is what I understand gentlemen to mean by militarism. Mr. Speaker, that question was answered nineteen hundred years ago by the greatest Teacher that the world has ever seen. He enunciated a great principle of life when He said: "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he."

Mr. Speaker, it is not the martial music nor marching of tens of thousands of troops; it is not the roar of cannon; it is not the bugle call; it is not the military airs wafted on the breeze that creates a military spirit; it is the "thinking of men." I grant if we armed this country with thoughts of aggression; I grant you that if we played martial music while having in our minds and hearts the idea of taking territory and attaining military glory; I grant you that if as we drilled and heard the bugle call and martial airs we marched to the tune of this martial music dreaming dreams of conquest and of placing our heels upon the necks of subject peoples, we would cultivate in ourselves a military spirit, not because of the drilling but because of the thinking. "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he." But if, on the contrary, we listen to the martial music and the bugle call and we march in serried ranks upon the drill grounds of this Nation dreaming dreams, not of conquest, not of war, but thinking thoughts of home and fireside and peace and liberty, thinking thoughts of defense, thinking thoughts that we are doing this for the purpose of defending our homes and our firesides, thinking thoughts that we are doing this to prepare ourselves not for aggression but for defense, preparing ourselves not for conquest, but, if necessary, if need should come, to defend our homes, our firesides, our institutions, and our right to work out our own destiny in the history of the world, untrammeled by foreign powers, then instead of having inculcated in us a military spirit we will become more liberty loving. [Applause.] No man who has made up his mind that he is willing to die for liberty would ever be the man to take liberty from his fellows. [Applause.]

No man who has dedicated his life, his thoughts, and his desires to the defense of his own home and fireside will be the invader of the home and fireside of another. You have a large Navy now, comparatively speaking. Do you think the existence of that Navy has cultivated any military spirit in the American people? It has not; and yet, if we are logical, if a large Navy will cultivate it, then a smaller Navy would necessarily cultivate it—to a less extent, but still cultivate it. There have been a half million young men of this country who have been trained and drilled in the National Guard. I have been a member of it during my life. I have marched 12 or 15 or 20 miles a day sometimes, and had a pack on my back weighing 90 pounds. I have drilled; I have fought sham battles; I have gone into camp; I have listened to martial music. Half a million of us have done the same thing. Have you heard the National Guard declare that we should declare war upon somebody in order that the National Guard might have glory? No; and why? Because the central idea and purpose of the National Guard has been home defense; and while we drilled, and while we tried to equip ourselves, and while we listened to the roar of the cannon and the rattle of the machine guns there was burning in our minds the idea that we were training ourselves for the defense of home and fireside and country in order that we might have peace and the opportunity to work out our own destiny in the history of the world. [Applause.] And instead of cultivating in us a military spirit there has been cultivated in us a love of our country.

As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he.

Mr. Speaker, I come from an old-fashioned State. They still read Burns and Scott and the romances of the past. There is a degree of romanticism among my people. They are not wealthy in this world's goods, comparatively speaking, but they are pure-blooded Americans. They have never espoused a cause in their lives that they have not been willing to lay down everything for, as they have demonstrated on a thousand battle fields. When they look upon the flag that floats from the dome of this Capitol, they see in that flag a statement of the fact that behind them, protecting them, over them, and sheltering them stands the great American Nation, and they love that flag now because it symbolizes to them their Government. They are not wealthy according to the standards of other States, but I want to say that I believe I voice the sentiment of that country and the people of my State when I say that I believe that if this Congress should decide, after deliberation and with all the facts before them, that this country needs further and other preparation, you will find the Mississippians standing squarely behind the Democratic administration. [Applause.] And one thing I do know, and that is that they believe that we have in the White House the greatest President we have had since the time of Thomas Jefferson [applause on the Democratic side], and I do know that the people down there, and I believe in the South generally, expect their Representatives here to hold up his hands. [Prolonged applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the temporary absence of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], who has the next allotment of time, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RICKETTS] for 20 minutes.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TAXATION.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, for 40 days I have attended the sessions of this House and have answered to every roll call and listened to the many able addresses that have been delivered upon the floor of the House, touching the merits and demerits of the questions which have been brought to the attention of the House.

At the opening session of this House our distinguished and esteemed Speaker, Mr. CLARK, whom we all, universally, respect and admire for his fairness and scholarly attainments, in accepting the high honor which the majority of this House conferred upon him, said to the House that he "hoped this Congress would be a working Congress and not a talking Congress." He evidently had in mind at the time the great responsibilities that were resting upon us in our individual and collective capacity. He certainly clearly understood the critical condition of the affairs of this Nation, and the enormity of the great problems and questions with which this Congress would have to deal in providing for our present and future necessities.

Probably no Congress in years has had to do or to deal with questions that were of such vital importance to this Government, to the people of this Nation, and to our institutions. That the affairs of this Nation are in a critical condition can not be successfully denied. The facts are supported and sustained by departmental and documentary evidence, and are conclusive.

Now, it is not my purpose to criticize, personally, any person connected with the present administration. I clearly understand that political parties are necessary to good government, and I further clearly understand the wide difference of opinion between the two great parties of to-day with reference to the methods and principles upon which the affairs of this Government must be managed and directed, and with this knowledge at hand I have only in view, at this time, to present to this House some facts and figures which, in my judgment, will in a measure tend at least to support my contention with reference to the methods proposed for raising revenue by the present administration.

An important part of President Wilson's message to Congress on December 7 last dealt with the present state of the Treasury, and of the fiscal problems which the next year will probably disclose. The President said:

> Assuming that the taxes imposed by the emergency revenue act and the present duty on sugar are to be discontinued, the deficit in the general fund of the Treasury on the 30th day of June, 1917, will be nearly $235,000,000. Adding $50,000,000 for a safe working balance for the Treasury and $12,000,000 to meet the usual deficiency estimates, the total deficit would rise to $297,000,000.

How to raise sufficient revenue to meet the ordinary expense of the Government and the extraordinary expenses of the proposed plans of "preparedness" is the fiscal problem which presented itself to the President. The President's suggestions were that, "All of the present taxes or their equivalents" be continued. That is, that the present customs duty on sugar be re-

tained and the emergency revenue act be reenacted. In addition to this, retain all other revenue acts now in force. But, this plan, as the President pointed out, will still leave "a total deficit of some $112,000,000."

He asked, "How shall we obtain this new revenue of $112,000,000?" He opposed the issuing of bonds for the purpose, because, as he said, "Borrowing is shortsighted finance." Mr. Speaker, if "shortsighted finance" had not gotten in its deadly work when the Underwood-Simmons tariff law was passed the revenues of this Government would have been ample and the recent report of the Secretary of the Treasury would have shown a surplus instead of a deficit. [Applause.]

The President says that "We should pay as we go." We, the people, have been unable so far, during this administration, to "pay as we go," and now new forms of taxation are proposed, or, rather, suggested, in order to relieve us of the present financial embarrassment. With 61.6 per cent of all imports entering our ports absolutely free of duty; with the average ad valorem rate of duty on total imports only 12.8 per cent; and with $41,000,000 less of revenue from customs duties than we had in 1910, the President calmly advises Congress that "The new bills should be paid by internal taxation." He suggested that we draw the greater part of the needed revenue from income taxes, by lowering the present limits of exemption and the figures at which the surtax should begin to be imposed, and by increasing the surtax itself.

He intimated that there are many additional sources of revenue that can be resorted to, apparently forgetting for the moment that if there are numerous sources of revenue in this country it is because industries have been fostered and built up by a protective tariff.

Forms of taxation recommended are: The tax of 1 cent per gallon on gasoline and naphtha, 50 cents per horsepower on automobiles and internal-explosion engines, a stamp tax on bank checks, 25 cents per ton on pig iron and on fabricated iron and steel.

I can not agree with the plan proposed by the President. I will vote against any measure that may be presented to this House or to this Congress that even tends to increase the present burden of direct taxation upon the American people. There are other ways and means by which this revenue, so essential at this time, may be raised that will not in any way tend to increase the burden of direct taxation. The American people to-day are groaning under the great burden of taxation, and, so far as I am concerned, I shall not cast a vote for a measure that will even tend to increse that burden.

Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, believed in reducing internal taxation and that as much of our revenue as possible should be raised from customs duties. In Jefferson's time 83 per cent of the revenues of the Government was raised by customs duties. To-day less than 39 per cent of the revenues are so raised.

To place a direct tax on automobiles per horsepower is unjust and unfair. The automobile has come to stay, and is a necessity. At the time of its incipiency the automobile was more ornamental than useful, being frail and unreliable, but time has improved it until to-day it is one of the most rapid and economical means of transit and is being used by men in all stations in life. To the rich and poor alike it is advantageous and useful in numerous and various ways.

In nearly all, if not quite all, of the States of this Union a license tax is imposed upon owners of automobiles. The owner is required to pay an annual personal tax, according to its real value. He must, of course, pay for repairs and power—gasoline or electricity—and should the plans of the present administration, or the recommendations of the present administration be carried out, he will be required to pay in addition 50 cents per horsepower as an additional direct tax. In the congressional district that I have the honor to represent, there are about 6,000 registered automobiles, as shown by the records of the auditor of State, the average horsepower of which is at least 30. Now, a direct tax of 50 cents per horsepower would mean $15 per year that each and every owner of an automobile in my congressional district must pay as a direct tax for the purpose of raising revenue with which to liquidate the current expenses incident to the running of this Government. In my district alone the automobile owners would be required to pay the sum of $90,000 annually, to say nothing of the tax of 1 cent per gallon on gasoline. On the farms, where automobiles, tractors, and power machines of all kinds are found, this direct-tax proposal to tax automobiles and gasoline would be just about as welcome as a black frost in June.

In addition to the present war tax, if the tax program, as suggested and recommended in the message of the President, should be executed by Congress, it is estimated that in my State—Ohio—the taxpayers would be required to pay annually $9,834,921, and that tax would be distributed as follows: Bank checks, $2,500,000; automobiles, $2,772,790; pig iron, $1,320,856; steel, $2,352,668; and gasoline, $888,607. This estimate was arrived at by taking the figures of the United States Bureau of Commerce for the iron and steel production in Ohio; the statistics of State Automobile Registrar Walker on the horsepower of automobiles; the figures of clearing-house associations on bank checks; and the report of State oil inspectors on gasoline inspection.

The bank clearings for the eight largest cities in the State of Ohio totaled $3,263,391,813 in the year 1914. Bank officials say that this represents about one-third of the face value of checks issued each year, as many are cashed in the bank upon which they are drawn, while smaller Ohio cities, having no clearing-house associations, are not included in the above estimate. Taking $10,000,000,000 as the total clearings, the number of checks was arrived at by dividing the sum by 40. Bankers in several cities, after watching the business for a day, agreed that the face value of checks average $40. This makes 250,000,000 checks a year's output. Although the President does not stipulate the amount of the tax on bank checks, it is believed and this estimate is made upon the assumption that the tax will be 1 cent for each check.

The tax of 50 cents per horsepower on automobiles, motor cycles, and internal-explosion engines was not hard at which to arrive. Registrar Walker estimated that the average horsepower of 182,000 automobiles in Ohio is 30. Although some machines are 90 horsepower, one-third of the total number are of the make which has but 22-horsepower engines, while motor cycles average 4 horsepower.

The pig-iron production in Ohio was 5,283,426 tons in the year 1914, according to the Government statistics. At 25 cents per ton, the revenue would be $1,320,856. The last annual figures on steel production gives the total as 4,705,337 tons, which includes steel made by all processes—Bessemer, open-hearth, basic, acid, and crucible. At 25 cents per ton, this would net a tax of $2,353,668.

Ohio is hit particularly hard by the tax on steel and iron ore, as its location midway between the iron ore and coking-coal fields, its natural deposits of crude oil and natural gas, and the excellent transportation facilities afforded make Ohio one of the leading States in this industry.

The report of the State oil inspector shows 1,393,883 barrels, or 71,088,033 gallons, of gasoline and naphtha were inspected in 1914 before being sold. At 1 cent per gallon, the tax on this would be $710,880; but the output of gasoline and naphtha in Ohio for the year 1915 is nearly 25 per cent larger than it was in the year 1914, and consequently the revenue would be, in fact, $888,607.

This, of course, is an estimate, approximately correct, and these figures show just how the taxpayers of my State and of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent would be affected in dollars and cents. Think of this enormous additional burden being placed upon the taxpayers of this Nation for the sole purpose of raising revenue in order to carry out the program and plans of the present administration.

I desire here to quote from the speech made in the United States Senate by FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS, of Nevada, on January 11, 1916, in which he said:

> Mr. President, the Democratic Party, after nearly three years of power, is about to enter upon a presidential campaign, in which its acts of legislation and administration will be up for criticism or commendation. The Democratic Party is within a year of an election which will determine whether its lease of power shall continue or end. We have the time and the power before the next election to do every beneficial thing we ought to do and to undo every mistaken thing we ought not to have done. It is a time for mutual candor and counsel and for efficiency of methods in devising and carrying out a definite legislative program.

And after reviewing what this administration has done in the way of legislation, and after clearly admitting the inefficiency of the Underwood-Simmons tariff law with reference to the production of revenue, and that the apparent prosperity of this country was wholly and entirely due to the great war now raging in the Eastern Hemisphere, and after admitting that were it not for the revenue secured to this country by reason of the exports of war materials, munitions, and provisions to the belligerent countries this country would be suffering from general business depression, and after admitting that "if that war soon comes to a close and the manufacture of munitions ends, and, added to this source of unemployment, our markets, now protected by the war from invasion, are overwhelmed with the cheap products of the nations just emerging from the war and eager to get back their gold, we may have not only an aggravated industrial depression to meet, but a financial condition fruitful of paralyzing caution." And, after suggesting the many

things at are to be done by this Congress in carrying out the administration program, he says:

But where is the money to come from? My answer is additional taxation. This country is not bankrupt. It will readily respond to intelligent taxation which will be spent in a general way for the welfare of the country, and particularly if a large part of the additional taxation is for public works, which will secure employment during a period of depression. Regarding taxation, I am glad to observe that the administration favors the continuance of the existing sugar tax. The duty on sugar has always been a revenue duty. There has never been a period in the history of this Republic that a sugar duty has not existed, except during McKinley's administration, when a bounty was substituted for a tax. This will prevent our revenues from being depleted to the extent of $30,000,000 more, as is threatened by existing legislation.

I most heartily commend Senator NEWLANDS for his frank admission made in that speech. These admissions, coming from a Democratic Senator of most excellent character, whose integrity is above reproach and whose every word is as pure as gold, is certainly conclusive proof that the present administration's program has been a most complete failure.

In this same speech the Senator, in the second paragraph from the bottom of page 11, again suggests that—

The second method of increasing our revenues is to extend the area of our income tax. All incomes of single men below $3,000 and of married men below $4,000 are now exempt. The limit should be reduced to $2,000 or $1,500, and from this source fifty or sixty million dollars more revenue annually can be derived.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is true that all incomes over and above $3,000 and $4,000, respectively, are now taxable under the income-tax law. This is another method of direct taxation legislated by the present administration. To this law I am also opposed. The exemption is entirely too low. It is the man with the ordinary income, the comparatively poor man, who suffers by reason of this law. The rich man, who is able to cover up or hide away his money, escapes the operation of this law, and the burden falls upon the man who is able to earn only an ordinary salary. Every Member of this House has had a taste of the income tax. You know what it means to have your congressional incomes tolled. Please keep in mind that this is another method of direct taxation about which I am talking.

The annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1915, shows that—

The total receipts from personal income tax were $41,046,162.09, an increase of $12,792,627.24 over the preceding year. The total receipts from corporation income tax for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1915, were $39,144,531.71, a decrease of $3,983,208.18. The increase in the personal income-tax receipts was due, in a great measure, to the fact that the collections for the fiscal year 1915 were for a period of 12 months, whereas the collections for the fiscal year 1914 was for 10 months, and also to the further fact that the administration of the law is now working more smoothly.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in commenting upon this law, on page 17 of his report, says:

Many inaccurate returns are made, some deliberately and some ignorantly, and there are, without doubt, wholesale evasions of the law throughout the country.

This statement bears out my contention that the burden of the income tax is more largely borne by the man of ordinary wealth and limited means than by the rich.

In this same report, at pages 20 and 21, the Secretary says:

With the restoration of peace in Europe the customs duties collected under existing laws will gradually increase as imports from the countries now at war are gradually restored to a normal basis. How long this process will take, no one can say, nor can anyone predict when the European war will end. Our obvious duty in the meantime is to provide the revenue of the Government from sources affected as little as possible by foreign war or external disturbances. This we can readily do, as stated in another part of this report, without imposing heavy burdens upon the people of the country.

It will be observed that the Secretary of the Treasury does not suggest where in this report the remedy that he suggests can be found, but by an examination of the report you will find his recommendation on page 51, and I quote him from this page:

It is evident that the emergency revenue measure and the existing duty on raw sugar can be continued with advantage.

This being done, we now have to consider the new forms of taxation which must be resorted to for the purpose of providing the additional revenues required, the major part of which is needed to carry out the large program for national defense.

I shall have something to say on the question of "national defense" possibly later on in this session, but I do not care to mix my subjects here. I am now endeavoring to discuss internal taxation, or direct taxation, and the effect thereof upon the taxpayers of this Nation.

And, again, the Secretary says:

The total amount so required for the year 1917 is $112,806,394.22, including $25,000,000 of expenditures for the Panama Canal in each of the years 1916 and 1917.

And, again quoting from this report, the Secretary says:

With the return of peace in Europe the revenues from customs will undoubtedly increase again, and in time a large part of the customs revenues lost in the fiscal year 1915 will be restored.

But what about the customs revenues lost in the year ending August 1, 1914, when the Underwood-Simmons tariff law had been in full force and effect for about a year, and before the war had broken out? In that year the loss of revenues amounted to more than $260,000,000, and this was before the war had been declared or had begun in Europe, or before the effect of the war could have been felt in this country.

Further quoting the Secretary, he says:

The entire amount of the deficiency, estimated on the basis hereinbefore stated, for the fiscal year 1917, amounting to $112,806,394.22 (which includes payment of Panama Canal expenditures for 1916 and 1917 from the general fund, and provides for the maintenance of a general fund working balance in the Treasury of $50,000,000) can easily be raised by internal taxation without appreciable burdens upon the American people.

[Applause.]

This rank and reckless statement of the Secretary of the Treasury and conclusion of his will not be accepted by the American taxpayers as even tending toward the truth. The present methods of internal taxation are most obnoxious and distasteful to the American taxpayer without adding thereto additional tax burdens.

We have only to take the report of the Secretary of the Treasury to ascertain that during the last fiscal year, ending June 30, 1915, individuals paid income taxes to the amount of $41,046,162.09. It was no small sum to be paid by the individual taxpayers for the purpose of creating revenue. Under the emergency revenue act, or war tax in time of peace, in this same report, it is shown that the people paid the sum of $52,069,126.29. This is another example of raising revenue by the present administration—through direct or internal taxation. The corporations of the country paid an income tax of $39,155,596.77.

Under the present plan of the administration, it is proposed or suggested to place a tax of 1 cent per gallon on gasoline and naphtha, which will amount, approximately, to $10,000,000 per year; a tax of 50 cents per horsepower on automobiles and internal-explosion engines, which will amount, approximately, to $15,000,000; a stamp tax on bank checks, which will amount to approximately $18,000,000 per year; a tax of 25 cents per ton on pig iron, which will amount to approximately $10,000,000 per year; and a tax of 25 cents per ton on fabricated iron and steel, which will amount to approximately $10,000,000 per year.

The emergency or war tax in time of peace is to be continued for another year, or until January, 1917, which will mean the payment of approximately $52,069,126.29; and the individual income tax will, of course, be continued, which will, approximately, reach the sum of $50,000,000; and all of these sums, amounting to $245,270,885.15, are to be raised by internal or direct taxation upon the American taxpayers.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS). Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICKETTS. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he has made an estimate as to the amount of the tax now raised by the direct method instead of the indirect method in per cent? What per cent of the revenues of the country are direct and what per cent are indirect?

Mr. RICKETTS. I have, and I will come to that directly.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICKETTS. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. Does not the gentleman think that if we were to have a protective-tariff policy all of these revenues could be raised under the present condition of our imports by a protective tariff and not by direct taxation?

Mr. RICKETTS. I most certainly do; and I think I shall be able to prove that fact by the figures that I have collated. And I want to say to Members of this House that I have taken some time and some interest in searching the reports as to commerce and the reports of the Secretary of the Treasury, and have gone over to the Library of Congress and considered all these matters seriously, and the result is no guess of mine as to the figures that I am presenting to this House. I think it is important that the House should know all about it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. RICKETTS. Certainly.

Mr. BORLAND. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman's colleague from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON] the gentleman's answer was that all these taxes could be raised by a protective tariff, rather than by an income tax. But in that case the poorer people would pay the bulk of the tax, would they not, whereas in the case of the income tax it is the substantial people who pay?

Mr. RICKETTS. Oh, I know it is the claim of the gentleman's side of the House that the man who buys the foreign goods pays the tariff. I understand that clearly. In other words, that the Republican Party taxes the people without their knowledge and the Democratic Party taxes the people without their consent. [Applause and laughter.]

I want to say further, in answer to the gentleman's question, that if his party is right in its theory that the consumer pays the tax, I want him to answer this question: He knows and I know that the Democratic Party condemned the Payne-Aldrich tariff law in one of the planks of its platform adopted at Baltimore in the convention of 1912. They said in that platform that the high cost of living was due to the iniquitous Payne-Aldrich tariff law; that the high cost of living of the people must be reduced; and that if the Democratic Party was successful it would give them a tariff law that would relieve them of that burden and that you would reduce the high cost of living. Now, you gave them the Underwood-Simmons tariff law, and, of course, the American consumer is not to-day paying the duty that he was paying. Then I want to know why it is that the high cost of living to the laboring class of people and the people generally in the United States has not been reduced one single cent, but, on the contrary, has advanced. [Applause on the Republican side.] In the fall of 1914 I said to the people of my congressional district—to 5,000 people in the city of Lancaster, Ohio, a large percentage of whom were Democrats—that if any man present could name one single article used for domestic purposes that he could purchase more cheaply under the Underwood-Simmons tariff law than he could under the Payne-Aldrich law I would willingly leave the platform and yield to him for his statement. Not a single, solitary man was able to name one article that could be so purchased. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. RICKETTS. Oh, certainly.

Mr. RAGSDALE. The gentleman has stated that under the protective tariff you would derive a sufficient sum of money to meet all of the expenditures that are now proposed.

Mr. RICKETTS. No, sir.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I understood you to say that.

Mr. RICKETTS. I take it for granted that you are including preparedness, and the extravagant appropriations that are to be made during this Congress?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Well, aside from preparedness.

Mr. RICKETTS. Aside from preparedness and the extravagant appropriations that in all probability will be made by the majority side of this House in this session, I say that a protective-tariff revenue would be sufficient. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. Why, then, was it that when your party was in power in time of peace and prosperity they found it necessary to issue bonds, even to dig the Panama Canal? [Cries of "Oh!" on the Republican side.]

Mr. RICKETTS. That was certainly an emergency.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICKETTS. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Is it not true that we paid $232,000,000 out of current revenues, for which it was unnecessary to issue bonds?

Mr. RICKETTS. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. Out of the $375,000,000 bond issue that was authorized there was only $132,000,000 issued, because we paid the other out of current revenues.

Mr. RAGSDALE. But you authorized the other, and did sell a part of them instead of taking it all out of the fund derived from your protective tariff.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman will permit me, that statement is not correct. I hope the gentleman from Ohio will permit this interruption.

Mr. RICKETTS. Certainly.

Mr. FORDNEY. There was an authorization of $375,000,000, the proceeds to be used for the construction of the Panama Canal. Of those bonds there were sold $134,000,000, and they were sold at a premium of some $4,000,000, so that a total of $138,000,000 was realized. The sum of $191,000,000 over and above the proceeds of those bonds was paid out of the general fund, and there never was a year when any bonds were sold, but that there was a larger amount of money paid out of the general fund for that purpose than was received from the sale of the bonds. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman tell me, then——

Mr. RICKETTS. I must decline to yield further as my time is limited. I do not want to be discourteous.

In the years 1914 and 1915, ending June 30, 1915, the amount of taxes paid by the individual taxpayers under the income law was the sum of $76,064,259.75, and yet the Secretary would have you believe that this amount of internal taxation was paid by the American taxpayer for revenue purposes without any appreciable burden. It is high time that the American taxpayer wake up and study carefully and consistently the question of raising revenues with which to defray the expenses of this Government. If he stands idly by and gives this matter no personal attention, it will not be long until the burdens of internal taxation will be absolutely unbearable and beyond his ability to meet.

Every taxpayer owes it to himself, to his neighbor, and to his fellowman to analyze for himself and ascertain just who it is that is now paying the revenue in this great country of which we are so proud and of which the American loves to boast.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. How much more time does the gentleman want?

Mr. RICKETTS. I should like to have 15 or 20 minutes more.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Ohio be extended 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, although the gentleman would not yield to me even for a question, I will not object.

Mr. RICKETTS. I thank the gentleman. The total revenue collected for the year ending June 30, 1915, exclusive of postal revenue, was $720,399,782.58; of this amount $209,786,672.21 was collected from customs duties and $415,559,646 was collected as internal revenue or as a direct tax.

Now, the total amount expended by this administration for this particular period of time was $777,840,292.33, this being an expenditure of $57,442,509.77 more than the receipts.

Now, what is the trouble? A careful analysis of the foregoing figures will disclose that the present administration last year spent $57,000,000 more than it actually had on hand to disburse, and the major portion, or 61 per cent, of the amount expended was raised by internal revenue or by a direct tax upon the people. I am unequivocally against this policy. It is not good business, and it is my conviction that the business of this Government should be conducted upon a strictly business basis. Will anyone in good faith contend that the methods thus used and proposed are businesslike in their character? Would you conduct your private business in this manner?

Now, what are the methods that have been used and that are proposed? The appropriations for the last three years have been constantly increased each and every year, as shown by the following table:

Appropriations for the years 1913–1915.

1913	$988,353,340
1914	1,057,605,694
1915	1,089,408,777

During all of these years the Democratic Party has had control of Congress, and has been in the majority in Congress.

It is proposed this year to appropriate the enormous sum of $1,127,284,191.63. This is certainly an unnecessary and lavish appropriation of the people's money, and, as a representative of the people of my congressional district, I can not allow myself to stand here silent and make no protest against it.

During a 10-month period under the Payne-Aldrich tariff law the balance of trade in our favor amounted to more than $606,000,000. During the corresponding 10 months under the Underwood-Simons tariff law, and before the war, the balance in our favor was $345,000,000 only. A loss of $260,000,000, or $26,000,000 per month. That was a loss of $1,000,000 per day for every working day in each month, covering a period of 10 months, and this period was before the outbreak of the war in Europe.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. RICKETTS. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Was there not a period during the first seven months when the balance of trade was against us instead of in favor of us?

Mr. RICKETTS. As to the month, I have not investigated. I can not answer that now.

Mr. FESS. For the month of April, 1914, the balance of trade was against us.

Mr. RICKETTS. I accept the gentleman's statement as to that.

This deficit was made up in a large measure by the income-tax law, which was passed in March, 1913, the provisions of which imposed an income tax, or a direct tax, upon the people of this Nation who should earn, if married, more than $4,000, or, if unmarried, more than $3,000 annually.

That distinguished and highly esteemed Democrat, Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee,

said in his defense of the Democratic tariff law, recently published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It will be conceded by all fair-minded men, the Republicans and Democrats alike, that the just and proper way to judge and assess the value and virtue of the Underwood Act is to consider the effect of its operation from its passage on October 3, 1913, to August 1, 1914, the time of the outbreak of the European war.

I have just shown by the figures above that, during the time referred to by the gentleman of the Ways and Means Committee the balance of trade against us was $265,000,000, or $26,000,000 per month, or an average of $1,000,000 a day for every working day, and I am herewith submitting a table that shows exactly what the exports and imports were during this time in each of the corresponding years:

Merchandise.	10 months ended July 31—	
	1913 (Republican peace period).	1914 (Democratic peace period).
Imports into United States:		
Free of duty	$821,608,167	$988,187,549
Dutiable	682,218,836	617,617,233
Total imports	1,503,827,003	1,605,804,782
Exports from United States:		
Domestic	2,078,500,810	1,921,538,131
Foreign	31,965,829	30,040,165
Total exports	2,110,466,639	1,951,578,296
Excess of exports	606,639,636	345,773,514

A careful examination of these figures will disclose clearly that the Underwood-Simmons tariff law had proved a failure so far as producing revenue is concerned, prior to the outbreak of the war in Europe, and in order to meet this deficit we have the substitutes that they call the "emergency-tax" law and the "income-tax" law, both of which are a direct tax upon the people of this Nation; and I do not care what the politics of any constituent of mine may be, it is only fair for me to present to him the exact situation as it exists here at this time. I said before, and I reiterate now, that the principle of direct taxation or internal taxation is absolutely wrong.

It is now proposed to reduce the exemption, under the income-tax law, to both married and single men, making the exemption of the married man $2,000 and the exemption of the single man $1,500. This will catch the mechanic, the engineer, the professional man, the physician, the dentist, the minister of the Gospel, the professor, the lecturer, the merchant, and the railroad employee, and quite a large number of men laboring in coal and oil fields, all of whom are comparatively poor men, and who are by this method charged with double taxation on what they are able to earn, and it tends to impoverish them and to take from them that which they have earned by honest toil and persistent effort, and of which, in many instances, they are deeply in need. Besides, it tends to discourage those who are inclined to save their money by frugal living and constant effort and invest it in property. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The President suggests that we pay as we go, and under the present program we are asked to contract an indebtedness that we shall not be able to pay for a period of at least five years, and it should be kept constantly in mind that if we should do this about 61 per cent of this indebtedness will have to be paid by internal taxation, or a direct tax, upon the American people. I am, therefore, opposed to the principles of direct taxation, and shall vote against the same whenever and wherever I have an opportunity so to do.

The great question with the present administration seems to be, How can we raise the money? The question as to reducing expenses and saving money does not seem to be of much importance to it.

This attitude impels me to refer to the "economy" plank of the Democratic Party platform adopted at Baltimore in 1912, which reads as follows:

We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toil. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

What offices have been eliminated?

No reverence or respect has been paid to this plank in the Baltimore platform since March 4, 1913, the beginning of this administration.

The total appropriations of the first Democratic Congress were, in round numbers, about $2,200,000,000, or $113,000,000 larger than its predecessor, and about $197,000,000 larger than the last Republican Congress, whose "profligate waste of money through lavish appropriations" was so soundly denounced by the national Democratic platform.

The appropriations for 1914 would have been $43,000,000 higher than they were had the Republican minority in the Senate not fought the iniquitous river and harbor bill, which carried large sums for the "improvement" of small creeks and unnavigable rivers in the South, and compelled its reduction by $43,000,000 before permitting it to become a law.

In 1915 the appropriations would have been $11,593,000 more than for 1914 had the Post Office and Indian bills not failed to pass.

Does this appeal to you as economical on the part of this administration? No, no; it is not economy. It is "profligate waste," a reckless disbursement of the finances of the American people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Further comment is unnecessary, but I do want to call the attention of this House to a speech delivered by one of the most able and conscientious workers in Congress, Mr. FITZGERALD, of Brooklyn, N. Y., who, in a speech delivered in Congress, said:

We charged the Republicans for 12 years of my service in the House under Republican administration with being grossly extravagant and reckless in the expenditure of the public money. I believed that charge to be true. I believed that my party when placed in power would demonstrate that the charges we had made in good faith were true. We are entitled to the help and support of the Members on this side of the House in honest efforts to carry out the pledges of the Democratic Party and in our attempts to show that what we charged in order to get into power were true. We have not had that support. Our Democratic colleagues have not given that support to us thus far during this session of Congress. They have unnecessarily piled up public expenditures until the Democratic Party is becoming the laughingstock of the country.

No more able and conscientious Congressman ever graced a seat on the Democratic side of this House. He was objecting to the extravagant appropriations that were about to be made, fully appreciating that the extravagance proposed by his party would eventually subject it to severe criticism by the American people, and would ultimately result in its complete overthrow; and I concede that he was correct in his conclusions. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Let me suggest here and now to the Members of this House that too much time is spent on the floor of this Chamber in extracting oxygen from the air and not enough time spent by us in studying economy and the ways and means by which the practice of raising revenue by internal or direct taxation on the American people may be eliminated. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The proper method of raising revenue is the tariff duty upon a protective basis. It will not be done by the Underwood law. That law is a dismal disappointment, even to its proponents. Its failure is conceded by the President in his request to suspend its operation upon the item of sugar. I shall vote to suspend its operation on sugar. I am heartily in accord with this notion of the President as to the method of raising revenue, and I ask him to suspend its operation on wool, and thereby raise $21,970,499.81; upon lumber, and thereby raise a revenue of $1,962,560.16; and upon agricultural products, fruits, and so forth. In this way abundant revenue will be raised and, as I said before, no one will feel the burden, and especially will the taxpayer be relieved and American industries and American labor will be stimulated and encouraged.

The revenue under the Payne-Aldrich tariff law for the year ending June 30, 1913, on cattle, lumber, eggs, fruit, sheep, horses, hay, sugar, and wool is shown by the following table, to wit:

Cattle	$1,764,659.58
Lumber	1,962,560.16
Eggs	63,588.28
Fruit	5,364,220.19
Sheep	13,909.50
Horses	79,330.25
Hay	621,526.98
Wool	21,970,499.81
Sugar	53,134,243.63

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has again expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 10 minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Ohio may be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICKETTS. Under the Underwood-Simmons tariff law these articles are imported into the United States practically

free of duty, and the Government loses in revenue the sum of $84,974,538.38 annually.

The claim is made that because of the loss of customs duties on imports, due to a great falling off of imports during the European war, is the sole reason of continuing the emergency war tax measure and for the proposed increased taxation of the American people. This claim is absurd, as the following facts will substantiate:

For the 10 months of the fiscal year 1915, ending the last of April, our total imports were $6,000,000 less than they were for the same months of 1912, when a protective tariff was in force. The reports of the Department of Commerce for this period of time show tariff imports amount to $1,516,000,000. For the same months in 1912, under the Payne-Aldrich law, the imports were $1,522,000,000. So the record for 10 months shows that total imports, in spite of the war, were almost as large as they were during the corresponding months of the last fiscal year of the Payne-Aldrich law.

These important figures give an excellent opportunity to compare some of the features of the Underwood-Simmons law with those of the Payne-Aldrich law.

In 1912, for the period mentioned, 53.5 per cent of the total imports were free of duty; in 1915, 61.6 per cent of all imports were free of duty, and only 38.4 per cent of our imports paid any duty at all. The average ad valorem rate of duty in 1912 was a little over 18 per cent. In 1915 it was only 12.8 per cent.

In 1912, $1,522,000,000 worth of imports paid into the United States Treasury in customs duties $285,000,000; in 1915, $1,516,000,000 worth of imports paid into the Treasury only $191,000,000 in duties. With the Payne-Aldrich rate of duty in force in 1915, instead of the Underwood-Simmons rate, the Government would have received nearly $100,000,000 more in revenue from customs duties, a deficit would have been avoided, and the so-called "war tax" would have been unnecessary, and we would not have had to resort to an "income tax."

If it had not been for the European war, industrial distress in the United States would have assumed alarming proportions. The war did not shut off all imports, but it greatly curtailed them. It has been stated in the report of the Secretary of Commerce that imports for 11 months of the fiscal year 1915 were $1,516,000,000. For the same months in 1914, before the outbreak of the war, imports were $1,736,000,000.

If the war had not intervened, the distress which marked the year 1914 as one of the most trying years in the industrial history of the country would have resulted in a Nation-wide calamity in the year 1915.

When in the course of time the war shall end we will find, if the Underwood-Simmons law remains in force, that we are as unprepared for the pursuits of peace as our present military organization leaves us unprepared for the stern business of war. The door of the past is locked and bolted. We can not undo the mischief that has been done, but we can do our part to prevent the repetition of such mischief in the future.

In conclusion let me say that I again here and now reiterate that the principle of direct taxation of the American people for the purpose of raising revenue with which to meet the financial demands of this Government is absolutely wrong, and I am unalterably and forever opposed to this method of raising revenue.

Why not revise the Underwood-Simmons tariff law so that it will meet the conditions that prevail and produce the revenue needed, and why not repeal the income-tax and the emergency-tax laws and relieve the American people from the bondage of direct taxation?

CHILD LABOR.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, with the consent of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], that I may proceed for two minutes to correct a statement in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RICKETTS], I want to say that in an extension of his remarks in the RECORD, which appears on page 1845, I call attention that about the middle of the second column the gentleman says:

> It has been said on the floor of this House by a gentleman from Georgia, who has the honor of representing a district in his State, that children 11 years old, both white and black, are being worked 13 hours per day in the cotton and knitting factories of North Carolina; that in some instances white children going to work pass colored children going to school; that the conditions surrounding the children who are thus required to toil day after day are anything but favorable. And in this State of North Carolina there is no such a thing as factory inspection.

The gentleman did not name the gentleman from Georgia to whom he attributes these remarks, and while I do not wish to be understood as making any apology to anybody from any section of the country for what I really did say, which the gentleman will find in the RECORD, on page 1761, I do want to say that if the gentleman referred to me, and I presume he did, because I was the only one from Georgia in favor of this bill who took the opposite side, that he must have got his information from some one other than myself. I made no such statement. As a matter of fact, I am sure the gentleman would not find the conditions in North Carolina that he portrayed in his speech, because I think the cotton mills there have found the labor of the negro children very unprofitable. I say this in justice to the State of North Carolina, and under their law now in existence they could not work a child under 12 years old. Their hours are 11 hours and not 13. I made no such statement as the gentleman attributed to me. He was in error. Such a statement might have been made by others on the floor of the House.

MARKETING OF FARM PRODUCTS.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, with the consent of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], that I may address the House for two minutes on the subject of the marketing of farm products.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at the meeting of the Southern Commercial Congress in the city of Muskogee, Okla., in my district, held from April 26 to 30, 1915, among other addresses delivered on that occasion was a speech by Hon. WILLIAM S. GOODWIN, of the seventh congressional district of Arkansas, upon the subject of Marketing or the Distribution of Farm Products.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, no question is of more immediate and pressing importance than the solution of a proper distribution of farm products. Much has been done to teach the American people how to produce, but Congress thus far has done but little to find a market for that which is grown upon the farm, and, as we know, many hundreds of millions of dollars worth of products go to waste annually for a lack of marketing facilities.

For the past year Mr. GOODWIN has been actively engaged in an effort to solve this problem, and a bill introduced by him at the last session of Congress has received general indorsement by the great agricultural people and their organizations throughout the country.

On account of Mr. GOODWIN's active interest in an effort to solve this vexing question he was chosen by the managers of the Southern Commercial Congress, that great organization that is doing so much to develop the South agriculturally and commercially, to deliver the address referred to and which I ask may be published herewith in an extension of my remarks upon this occasion. The address of Mr. GOODWIN follows:

MARKETING FARM PRODUCTS.

[An address by Hon. WILLIAM S. GOODWIN, Member of Congress from Arkansas, at the Sixth Annual Convention of the Southern Commercial Congress, Muskogee, Okla., Apr. 26 to 30, 1915.]

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, the pleasure to me is very great to be privileged to address this splendid gathering of the builders of the new South, whose purpose is so finely expressed in the motto of your great organization, "A Greater Nation through a Greater South." Since it was organized in 1908 the Southern Commercial Congress has speedily moved forward, with splendid achievement following splendid achievement to the accomplishment of this high resolve.

From the northernmost New England State of Maine to the North Pacific Commonwealth of Washington the people of the North as well as we of the South have been richly benefited by your activities, thus making the Nation your debtor for having already produced a greater financial freedom, a sounder commercial and a better agricultural development, and creating, finally, a broader and more sympathetic national understanding.

You have succeeded as an organization because all your work for a greater South is based on a recognition of the fact that the solid, enduring foundation on which a greater commercial South must be built is a greater agricultural South. And so the prosperity of the farmer thus far has been and, I venture to assert, always will be a matter of prime concern with you and occupy a leading place in your councils.

It is because of this interest in and devotion to a greater and more prosperous agriculture that I was invited to briefly outline to you the purpose and scope of the National Marketing Committee and the stupendous work for the advancement of agriculture it has undertaken.

The acknowledged obstacle in the way of the development of a better agriculture and the building up all through the South, as, indeed, elsewhere, of prosperous farming communities is the enormous wastes in handling and distributing farm products. These wastes are due to many causes, all of which by the adoption of more scientific methods in gathering, grading, standardizing, warehousing, together with a national cooperative system in quest of markets, can be eliminated or greatly reduced. These wastes, taking the Nation as a whole, run into billions of dollars annually; and the saving of even a small part of this enormous amount means not only a tremendous increase in the prosperity of the producers but, necessarily, a corresponding gain in commerce and manufacturing.

The farmers of this country produce annually a crop for which they receive $9,600,000,000, and for which, it is said, the ultimate consumer pays $27,000,000,000; or, to express it in this wise, the American farmer to-day is doing business on a 35-cent dollar and the consumer of his products pays 100 cents for the same amount of agricultural products for which the producer receives but 35 cents. Owing to the lack of some central directing intelligence there is an enormous amount of waste, especially in perishable products. At times 100 cars of fruit or vegetables are sent to a market which can consume but 10, and 10 are sent to a market that can use 100. Foodstuffs are shipped for long distances, only to be reshipped and consumed in the vicinity in which they were grown. Our storage and transportation facilities are first swamped, then starved; markets are unsteady and demoralized; produce is allowed to waste and rot in the fields and consumers are compelled to pay exorbitant prices.

There have been times when corn has been burned for fuel here in Oklahoma, when your coal-mines were closed for want of orders of miners, while oil from your wells flowed like water in your branches and hungry workingmen in idleness, begging for bread, were walking the streets of near-by cities, and the railroads were threatened with bankruptcy for want of traffic, and all simultaneously. Surely this is an unhealthy and unwarranted condition. Any system of distribution which permits one peck of potatoes to rot while one hungry man goes unfed is an obsolete and inadequate system. You farmers, who fail to receive an adequate price for your crops; you consumers, who pay your hard-earned dollar for products for which the farmer receives but 35 cents; and you employers of labor—none, none need to be told there is something wrong with our present methods when the high cost of living alone reduces the workingmen's wage and ofttime devours his income.

Under the present manner of marketing the producer receives too little, hence he seeks to lessen his losses by producing less; the consumer pays too much, and tries to cut down his expenses by consuming less; the railroads, having less to transport, charge more to make up for the loss of tonnage; the dealer charges a larger profit to make up for the smaller sale; and here we go round and round in a vicious circle, getting nowhere, the circle growing more vicious all the while.

Permit me to say just here, Mr. President, that neither the railroads nor the commission men nor the wholesalers nor the retailers should be charged with all the blame. Both the producer and consumer are entitled to their share of it. The producer needs to be taught the best manner, place, and time to market his crop; how to classify, arrange, grade, and pack it to meet the requirements of the trade; and the consumer needs to be taught better purchasing methods and to distinguish between high prices and expensive service.

If we as a Nation were pioneers in the work of attempting to scientifically systematize the handling and marketing of farm products, the practicability of our plans might be questioned; but, far from being pioneers, investigation shows that we are a quarter of a century behind the methods employed in Europe. In Germany, in particular, the system of handling and distributing farm products is carried to such perfection that investigators are unanimous in testifying that the foundation on which the commercial and military greatness of the German Empire is built is her wonderful system of handling and distributing farm products for the benefit and protection of her producers.

The supreme importance of improving the methods of marketing farm products has long been recognized, but efforts in that direction have been isolated and without definiteness of plan considering the subject as a whole. To Mr. David Lubin, that great man whose life is dedicated to the cause of agricultural betterment, the United States delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture, Rome, Italy, is due the idea that we should study the German system with the view of adapting it to American conditions and of organizing to secure its adoption in this country. When he was in America last year many conferences were held with him in Washington and the question thoroughly considered. Finally, before Mr. Lubin left Washington last fall, a special meeting of certain Senators and Representatives in Congress, representatives of farm organizations, and members of the farm press was held, and the national marketing committee was organized. Your president, Senator FLETCHER, who is never so happy as when doing good and great things, was elected president of the committee. Its first vice president is William T. Creasy, for many years the head of the great grange organization of Pennsylvania and at present secretary of the National Dairy Union. The second vice president is that well-known westerner of large commercial and agricultural enterprises and magnificent public service, Congressman WILLIAM KENT, of California. Our secretary and managing director is that tireless, able, and loyal representative of organized farmers, George P. Hampton, of New York, a man of the highest standing as a student of the problems of distribution. On its executive board, of which I have the honor to be a member, is a man for whose executive and constructive ability all of us have the highest admiration, your own able managing director, Dr. Clarence J. Owens. Associated with us on this board are P. D. NORTON, of North Dakota, and J. A. Falconer, of Washington, both Members of the Sixty-third Congress, whose consistent activity in furthering agricultural interests especially is reflected by their record; also former United States Senator Obadiah Gardner, of Maine, the great grange builder of that State, and now chairman of the International Joint Commission; C. B. Kegley, the master of the Washington State Grange and president of the Rural Credit League of America; H. S. Mobley, the president of the Farmers' Union of Arkansas, and others of the ablest executives of the leading farm organizations.

The purpose of the national marketing committee is set forth in its prospectus, from which I quote:

1. To create an enlightened public opinion concerning the waste and unnecessary expense in handling and distributing farm products; and to assist in bringing before the country the information secured by the Federal Office of Markets and other National and State agencies.

2. To promote and foster proper marketing organizations and methods, to encourage and secure the standardization of agricultural products, to secure proper warehouse systems, to promote expert marketing services in the several States, to secure uniformity in methods by States in inaugurating investigational and demonstrational work in marketing, and to secure changes in Federal and State laws to these ends.

3. To secure, either through appointment by the President or by act of Congress, the establishment of a national marketing commission.

In the development of this program, resolutions were prepared and introduced in the United States Senate by Senator FLETCHER and in the House of Representatives by myself. These resolutions provide for the establishment of a national marketing commission by act of Congress.

The proposed legislation has received the indorsement of the legislative committee of the National Farmers' Union, representatives of various granges and farm organizations, the Farmers' Union of Arkansas and California, a half million people in California aside from the Farmers' Union of that State, and by many of the great farm journals throughout the country, as well as boards of trade and commercial organizations. Throughout the Pacific Coast States, where cooperative marketing is better developed than in other sections, the plan has received the most enthusiastic indorsement by agricultural and consumers' organizations generally.

This spring, promptly upon the adjournment of Congress, the committee took hold of the plan of securing the appointment by the President of an advisory marketing commission. A number of conferences were held with the Secretary of Agriculture, who showed an appreciative understanding of the need of such a commission; the matter was discussed by the Cabinet, and on April 16 a conference was had with the President. The press dispatches of the following day and since have informed the public that the appointment of such an advisory body is being most favorably considered by the President and his advisers.

This shows the widespread concern in the need and the keen interest taken in the plans to meet that need. No movement was ever taken hold of more spontaneously or with greater enthusiasm by the producers. This interest and enthusiasm has developed since the middle of last September and is most encouraging evidence of what can be accomplished when the nation-wide campaign of education planned by our committee is in full operation.

Gentlemen of the Southern Commercial Congress, I have thus briefly outlined to you the plan and scope of the work of the national marketing committee. It has a special work to do in eliminating the untold wastes in distribution which in every move toward its accomplishment means an enormous increase in the prosperity and consequent purchasing power of our own people and an expansion of the home market for American manufactures and dwarfs into comparative insignificance the possibilities of the foreign markets, as important as these are and as heartily as all of us favor the extension of our foreign trade.

You will be called on to consider, and rightly so, the development of our foreign commerce and to participate in movements to secure a larger share to our merchants and manufacturers of the markets of South America, of Asia, Africa, and Europe. Germany, last year, supplied $341,000,000 of the exports to Russia, and a great part of that business can be ours if we put forth the proper efforts. This question of capturing the world's markets is worthy of the most careful study and determined effort. I shall do all I can, as will you, to encourage and speed forward such undertaking, but I feel that I would fall short of my duty here did I not utter a word of caution and point out to you not only the far greater market right at your very door which the national marketing committee is organized to assist in opening up, but to impress upon you the stability and permanence of this enlargement of the home market and the absolute certainty it offers of belonging to our own farmers, merchants, and manufacturers for all time. This certainty may not apply to foreign markets, no matter how attractive or desirable they may be. In commerce between nations no fact is more clearly established than that the final settlement of all exchanges must be in the products of the trading nations. We sell manufactured goods to Russia. What has Russia to give in return? Mainly farm products. We have small need for these. But England and France have large demands. Germany and Austria, the most nearly self-sustaining of the large European States, also import considerable food supplies. Therefore, when peace is restored the irresistible logic of hard economic conditions will inevitably swing Russian imports from those nations that can most profitably accept Russia's agricultural exports in return.

You business men of our beloved South, whatever else you do, don't neglect the opportunity the national marketing committee offers you to increase the prosperity of our producers, thus building a solid, enduring foundation on which home markets can be enlarged, and enlarged again and again. The problems of economic distribution must be solved that there may be an end to the waste between the farm and the table, to the advantage of both producer and consumer. The opportunity is here. The national marketing committee will help this Congress create a greater Nation through a greater South. The South is well represented on its executive board. The officers of your own great organization, gentlemen of the congress, are leaders in the movement, thus insuring perfect harmony and coordination of these two large undertakings. And more than that, gentlemen, affirmative action taken by you in this will be the keynote for similar action by commercial, agricultural, and consumers' organizations throughout the entire United States. I do not speak for myself alone, but for the national marketing committee and for the commercial and farm organizations already affiliated with it. The committee will hold a meeting in Muskogee at the close of this convention, and may I not hope that this congress, so preeminently representative of the South, will give its approval to the work already accomplished and by suitable action give strength and encouragement to the work ahead? May I not even hope that every one of you gentlemen, whose devotion to the ideal of a greater Nation through a great South is shown by your presence here, will join with us and on your return home make the national marketing committee and its plans known and aid in making your community the center of an affiliated activity, earnestly determined that this great purpose shall be speedily consummated?

A TARIFF COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, for more than half a century the tariff has been the football of partisan politics in this country. In fact it has furnished the stock in trade of speakers for national office in both parties, and has even been employed by candidates for purely local offices whose views on the tariff could not by the remotest possibility have any bearing upon their qualifications for the position they sought.

I presume no man was ever elected to this House, or even became seriously a candidate for Congress, who did not have his stock speech on the subject of the tariff. We have just listened to one of those old-fashioned, stand-pat, Republican, rock-bottomed, copper-riveted speeches about the blessings of the tariff, in which it was unquestionably demonstrated that money could be extracted from the American people by means of a tariff without anyone's feeling it at all, and that, therefore, it was greatly better than any possible form of direct taxation where the taxpayer could see how much he paid in his tax bill.

I have heard those arguments ever since I was a boy. I think that I made my first, last, and only tariff speech on the floor of this House two weeks after I became a Member, and, unless I was charged as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means with some special concern in making a tariff bill, I do not know any occasion that would induce me to make a tariff speech. I remember the first time that I went down to Panama our old friend, Senator Joe Blackburn, of Kentucky, was civil governor, and he told us this story. He said when he was a young lawyer in Kentucky he had a very high ambition to become a candidate for Congress. Therefore he loaded himself up with all of the great issues of the day and prepared some magnificent speeches, but, for some reason or other, he never found a fitting and appropriate occasion on which to deliver these speeches. He never could get himself before the people in the capacity of a candidate for Congress. He sought all kinds of public occasions and public gatherings, but never happened to get started exactly right. He said on one occasion he noticed in the paper that there was going to be a hanging down in the county seat; so, conjecturing correctly that there would be a very large crowd down there, he went down. Sure enough, there was the gallows in the square of the courthouse and around it five or six thousand people. He stationed himself right under the corner of the gallows.

When the sheriff brought the condemned out and stood him on the gallows he turned to the condemned and said, "Now, this is the last chance that you will have to speak any words to your fellow citizens, and I will give you time now to do so." The poor fellow shook his head and said that he did not believe he had anything to say. The sheriff said, "Now, Jim, I have known you since you were a boy and I am disposed to be as liberal with you as my duties will permit, and if you have anything to say I will give you 10 minutes now in which to make your last speech." The fellow said he was much obliged, but that he did not believe he would say anything at that time. By that time Joe Blackburn was climbing up the corner of the gallows and he said, "Hold on. If my friend here does not want to use the time allotted to him, and he will yield it to me, I would like to address my fellow citizens of Nelson County upon the subject of the tariff." The condemned turned to the sheriff and said, "Mr. Sheriff, go ahead with the hanging, for I would rather be hung and in hell than listen to Joe Blackburn talk about the tariff." [Laughter.]

The politicians have always taken themselves seriously, but the saving sense of humor of the American press has pointed out so frequently the absurdity of a candidate for constable or coroner lathering himself into a foam over the iniquities of a tariff that we are at length in danger of regarding the tariff as the stock joke of politics. The truth is that the tariff lies at the base of our whole fiscal system. The Federal Constitution gives the General Government power to sustain itself by two forms of taxation; duties on imports, and excises, or internal revenue. The exercise of its taxing power by the Federal Government must inevitably have a far-reaching influence upon the business conditions and prosperity of the country. The tariff, whether viewed as a means of raising revenue for the Federal Government, or for its incidental effect upon industrial conditions, is one of the greatest, if not the greatest, question of internal policy, but is purely a business question. The time has come to take the tariff out of politics and politics out of the tariff. This can only be done by the creation of a nonpartisan tariff commission clothed with sufficient powers to aid in the construction of a scientific revenue law.

The methods which we have pursued in the construction and enactment of tariff laws in the past have been the most unscientific, illogical, and wasteful that can be imagined. Every general revision of the tariff and even the agitation in preparation for a general revision have caused widespread business disturbance. Where nothing is certain but uncertainty business men can not adjust their affairs, invest their capital, or enlarge their enterprises. The most conservative and sound among them will curtail in every possible way their business activities until the uncertainty is turned into some form of certainty, and this causes idleness of capital, idleness of workers, and a diminished industrial power throughout the country. But bad as conditions are which precede a general revision of the tariff, the revision itself is a very carnival of confusion. Milton must have been thinking of a general revision of the tariff when he wrote:

> Chaos umpire sits, and by decision more embroils the fray by which it reigns.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. What do you want of a tariff commission if you do not propose to revise the tariff?

Mr. BORLAND. If the gentleman will bear with me, I will show him what we want with it. I think a tariff commission can suggest changes from time to time and prevent a general revision.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman says his party does not propose to revise the tariff?

Mr. BORLAND. I want to emphasize the danger that the gentleman and his party are now threatening the country with, and that is another general revision, which would simply mean a question of bargain and sale as to who should get the advantages out of a tariff law. Yet the gentleman's party is deliberately threatening the country with another general revision.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. We had a tariff board or tariff commission in every sense when the gentleman's party came into power, and you abolished it. Why do you want another?

Mr. BORLAND. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. We never had a tariff board, and I will show him why. And the gentleman was distinctly opposed to it and fought the tariff commission in the Sixty-first Congress.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit me to again interrupt him?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman is just as near right on that as he is on any statement. I was always in favor of it and am now.

Mr. BORLAND. In favor of a tariff commission?

Mr. FORDNEY. A tariff board or a tariff commission or whatever you may call it, a committee to collect information for the benefit of Congress in framing a tariff law.

Mr. BORLAND. I am glad to welcome the gentleman to our ranks.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman from Michigan probably would not insist that he is in favor of the kind of nonpartisan tariff board or commission that would be appointed by a partisan President?

Mr. BORLAND. Why, of course not.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman from Indiana and myself are perfectly familiar with what the gentleman from Michigan is talking about. Some gentlemen were appointed by President Taft under a clause in the Payne-Aldrich bill giving him power to determine whether nations were discriminating against us and to enforce the maximum and minimum clause. That board, so called, was to report to the President and nobody else, and the gentleman is calling that, and has called it in the past, a tariff commission. It is as far removed from a tariff commission as it could possibly be, and it is only an imposition upon the business public when you call that a tariff commission.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. The law itself provided that the tariff board should gather information and submit the same to the President.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; to the President.

Mr. FORDNEY. And the President in turn submitted it to Congress.

Mr. BORLAND. Oh, no; there is no such provision in the law.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes——

Mr. BORLAND. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the law provided no such thing.

Mr. FORDNEY. Pardon me, my friend, if the gentleman will permit me——

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; I will permit the gentleman.

Mr. FORDNEY. The President did submit to Congress each and every report made by the tariff board——

Mr. BORLAND. But the law did not compel him.

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me state the question—each and every report made by that board, and the gentleman's party declined to use that information when it framed the Underwood tariff law, from a nonpartisan board, consisting of two Democrats and three Republicans.

Mr. BORLAND. The President submitted only what he saw fit.

Mr. FORDNEY. He submitted all of the reports the board made.

Mr. BORLAND. Not a bit was under the control of Congress, but under the control of a partisan President.

Mr. FORDNEY. Every word reported by that tariff board was reported to Congress. I have a copy of those reports, and the gentleman can get them.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will yield, although I am not making the speech.

Mr. BORLAND. I will yield.

Mr. BARNHART. Was there anything in that law that required the President of the United States to report to Congress what the tariff commission reported to him?

Mr. FORDNEY. Whether it was in the law or not, the President did do so.

Mr. BARNHART. But I am just asking for information. Was there anything——

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not think the language is in the law compelling him to submit the board's findings to Congress, but he did submit them.

Mr. BORLAND. I can say the law did not compel him.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not think it did——

Mr. BORLAND. Of course——

Mr. FORDNEY (continuing). But the President did make reports of what was reported to him.

Mr. BORLAND. It was for the information of the President, and what the President did with that was entirely within his own volition, and the amount of information laid before the board was entirely within the control of the board and the President.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Congress had no power over it. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. For just a brief statement of the facts.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The tariff law gave to the President certain power, and an item in the sundry civil bill was reported to the House by the Committee on Appropriations a good deal broader than the power given in the tariff law. I happened to be Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union at the time, and a point of order was made upon the item in the sundry civil bill to create a tariff board, and I sustained the point of order. There was no provision of law for it. An amendment was then offered again for another provision to create a tariff board, and another point of order was made, and, as I recall, again sustained. I then, I think, probably indicated in rendering the decision what would be in order, and that item went into the bill, and thereby the tariff board was created, so far as the law provided for it.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has concluded——

Mr. MANN. I have.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a brief observation?

Mr. BORLAND. Certainly.

Mr. BARNHART. That is the difficulty about a tariff-commission enactment which enables the President to name all the members of the board—it does not quiet the general apprehension in the country that politics is engaged in the formation of tariff bills. When this one tariff board was appointed, as I remember, three members of the Republican Party were named who were good, stiff, high-tariff protectionists, and the members credited to the Democratic Party were composed of one excellent gentleman, a former Member of Congress, who had been thoroughly discredited by his party in his own district because he had stood with the Republicans for high protection, and the other a veterinary surgeon, of somewhere, who declared that he had not voted the Democratic ticket since 1892. These two represented, or misrepresented, the Democrats on that tariff commission, and the same might be true if a Democratic President were to appoint a tariff commission. The danger of it is that if you do not have a bipartisan tariff commission you will be left exactly where we were under the Taft commission, with the party in power doubting what the commission has done for those numerically opposed to it and business suffering the same old doubt and hesitancy.

Mr. BORLAND. I hope to show the House further the difference between the so-called Tariff Board and what is now proposed.

I have served in Congress during two general revisions of the tariff and hope never to see another general revision in this country. These revisions were framed upon opposing theories, but the incidental confusion was almost as great in producing a tariff for revenue as a tariff designed for protection. In this respect, however, the tariff for protection is a shade worse than the other, for during the construction of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law business men were not only agitated on the subject of what duty should be levied upon the goods which they produced, but were further distressed and alarmed for fear that by ignorance or craft some jokers would be slipped into the bill which would injuriously affect them by discrimination against their products or by increasing the cost of production or conferring some unjust advantage upon competing lines of business. The proposal to levy a tariff upon zinc ore not only agitated the miner, but was desperately fought at one time by the smelters and at another time by the manufacturers of brass goods and galvanized cornices. No business man felt safe in attending strictly to his own business, but was dragged, willingly or unwillingly, into the political maelstrom by what he feared might be a lurking danger to his commercial life.

I favored a tariff commission at that time. I favored it again when the Democrats had carried the National Congress in 1910, and I voted for the bill which then passed Congress, and I favor it more at the present time in view of the world-wide changes which we can all see are impending in commercial affairs. To-day the American business men are almost a unit in demanding a nonpartisan tariff commission. Such a commission is not only necessary to the construction of a tariff which is avowedly designed for the purpose of protection, but it is even more necessary to the proper formation of one which shall be a steady and scientific source of revenue.

Unfortunately in the creation of such a commission we have very little to guide us at the present time for the reason that no commission exists in this country or any other which fits the present conception of the American business world. When Germany was engaged in constructing the tariff of 1902 the first step was the appointment of a commission of 30 members, 5 of whom were representatives of the Association of Chambers of Commerce, 5 of the Central Association of Manufacturers, 5 of the German Agrarian Association, and the remaining 15 appointed by the chancellor. No attempt was made to secure a nonpartisan membership on this commission. It engaged in the collection of statistics upon the cost and facilities for production of the various commodities in Germany, including the cost of raw material, whether agricultural or mineral, and the factors which entered into the extension of German trade into foreign countries. After their data were collected they worked in conjunction with the federal council upon the formation of schedules, classifications, and rates. The tentative law thus prepared was submitted to the study of the various States and free cities comprising the German Empire, and after more than two years' of work and various modifications, after ample information and opportunity for discussion, the revenue law was adopted. Possibly this is the nearest approach to the really scientific construction of a tariff law.

France, in December, 1907, referred its present tariff law to the local councils in the various Provinces. In 1914 Great Britain was on the point of entering upon a tariff revision and appointed a commission consisting of 60 representatives of important industries. According to Mr. Chamberlain, the author of the tariff-reform program, the three main objects were: First, to stimulate industry and invention by giving it greater security; second, to defend the commerce of the country against unfair competition; and, third, to place the Government in a position to deal on more equal terms with foreign nations.

In our own country a tariff commission was created under the act of 1882, with rather vague and general powers. Like many other temporary commissions created by Congress, this commission made a voluminous report after the usual expenditure of time and money, but no official sanction was attached to this report and no particular use was made of it. When Congress was about to enter upon the revision of the tariff which resulted in the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, a proposal was made by the progressive element of the Republican Party to create a tariff commission. The Republican leaders indignantly and forcibly rejected this proposal and proceeded to construct the bill in the same old way. Washington was filled with alleged experts, business representatives, and many self-confessed and possibly pretended lobbyists, who spent their time in inducing business men to believe that in some way they could secure them special advantages in the proposed law or protect them against acts of threatened discrimination. Business men swarmed to the Capitol in large numbers in an attempt either to secure advantages which they believed, or pretended to believe, were necessary for their business, or to see that they got a fair deal in the distribution of favors. It was jokingly said at that time that most of the business houses of the country were left in charge of the office boy and the office cat, the head of the firm and most of his principal subordinates being engaged in dangling around the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee. The testimony given at these hearings would aston-

ish, shock, and confuse the ordinary observer. It consisted in a mass of unreliable hearsay, much of which was doubtless honestly believed by its propounders, but which was flatly contradictory in character and without the slightest attempt at justification in fact. The bill as finally constructed and passed by the House of Representatives was entirely rewritten in the Senate, as a result, it is claimed, of various compromises and trades which were almost exclusively in the hands of a single Senator. The methods and results so shocked the country that the demand for a nonpartisan tariff commission gained substantial headway among business men. The Payne-Aldrich tariff bill contained a clause providing for a maximum and minimum tariff, and giving the President power to enforce the maximum against any country found to be discriminating against American products. Under this provision he was authorized to employ certain persons.

The language of the bill was—

To secure information to assist the President in the discharge of the duties imposed upon him by this section, and the officers of the Government in the administration of the customs law, the President is hereby authorized to employ such persons as may be required.

Under this authority President Taft appointed a board alleged to be experts, but who were clearly partisan in character from the very nature of their employment, and who were utterly without either the power or warrant of law to perform any act except to aid in the enforcement of the maximum and minimum tariff. It was soon found that this particular provision was unenforceable, and thereupon an attempt was made to turn this body into a tariff commission, it being naturally anxious to perpetuate itself. The impression was given to the business public that it was, in fact, a tariff commission when nothing could have been further from the truth.

In January, 1911, however, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives unanimously reported a bill to create a tariff commission and to give it proper powers and duties. This bill passed the House of Representatives, was amended in the Senate, and filibustered to death on the last day of the session, March 4, 1911.

Mind you, in January, 1911, the Ways and Means Committee unanimously reported this bill to create a tariff commission. That was after the November election of 1910, when the Democrats had carried the House for the first time in 16 years. Up to that time the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, which was Republican and headed by the distinguished gentleman from New York, the late Mr. Payne, had never brought in a bill for the creation of a tariff commission, but in January, 1911, after the people had spoken at the polls in November, 1910, the Ways and Means Committee brought in a bill for the creation of a tariff commission.

When the Democrats were coming into power there was a strong disposition in certain quarters that we should have a tariff commission.

The Underwood tariff bill was constructed in the special session of 1913, having the immediate advantage of all of the prior hearings quite recent in date and the ample discussion and analysis of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law. To some extent the same agitation preceded and accompanied the drafting of the Underwood law, although, as it was not constructed upon the theory of giving special advantages and privileges to particular businesses, a large factor in the agitation was eliminated. During the 10 months that the Underwood law was in operation preceding the outbreak of the war in Europe its results as a revenue producer were satisfactory, and no glaring mistakes were found in its schedules even by those most bitterly opposed to it.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I wanted to know what are the factors that enter into tariff legislation that you want a commission to study.

Mr. BORLAND. It depends, as the gentleman knows, on the theory of the tariff law. If we abide by the Constitution and raise revenue by the tariff, there are certain factors that enter into it. If we seek to use that revenue law as a means of discouraging the free interchange of commodities, there is a certain other set of conditions that enters it.

Mr. FESS. That is precisely what I wanted to know. Is it your idea that the tariff commission should take into consideration the factors of the cost of labor in Europe?

Mr. BORLAND. I would not limit the tariff commission to factors which I regard as important in the construction of a revenue law, I concede that to the gentleman. I would not regard it as a nonpartisan tariff commission if it were limited. The original tariff commission law was to ascertain the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. That is the sole element, apparently, that the Republican theory of tariff demands.

Mr. FESS. Not the sole. It is one of the chief elements.

Mr. BORLAND. It is one of the chief elements. But I would not limit it to my own theory of tariff, because if I did it would not be a nonpartisan tariff commission. I want to assure the gentleman that I am trying to argue for a real nonpartisan commission.

Mr. FESS. It has been said on your side of the House that the element of cost of production does not enter into tariff legislation. We think it does. Now, would your tariff commission that you want created take into consideration that element that you say does not enter into legislation on the tariff question?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Would you take it in?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes, personally. If you are asking for my personal view.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. As the Constitution does not permit any body of men to make our tariff laws except the Congress of the United States, what power would you confer upon the tariff commission except to gather information upon which Congress might base its candid opinion in fixing rates in a tariff law?

Mr. BORLAND. Well, I was about to discuss that, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan. The suggestion at the present time does not proceed further than the collection of information, reliable data, governing these subjects, but I am not so sure that this is the full limit of power that Congress can confer upon a commission. I think that Congress might constitutionally go further, but there is no such suggestion now before the public. The suggestion at present is limited to the collection of data and report to Congress to permit Congress exclusively to make the schedules.

Mr. FESS. Would the gentleman yield there? Here is a statement that was given out yesterday as to what the commission was expected to do, and I wanted an explanation of this one paragraph:

To determine the relations between the rates of duties on raw materials and rates on finished or partially finished products.

I think the element of labor enters there.

Mr. BORLAND. I will tell you what enters there. There was an agitation before the election of 1908, a very strong agitation, in New England for a tariff reform, and governors of States were elected there upon the tariff-reform wave. This was a very remarkable thing, but when we came to analyze tariff reform in New England it was limited to this, that the duty should be taken off of raw material and put a little bit higher on the finished product. That was the tariff reform demanded by New England. If you take the duty off of raw material you are adding automatically to the duty on the finished product. If you are going to have a tariff at all you must have a tariff graduated up from the raw material to the partially finished product, and on up to the complete product for consumption. That is what that means, and there is not a worse joker in a tariff bill than taking the duty off the raw material and leaving it upon the finished product. I can only think of one thing worse, and that is taking it off the finished product and leaving it on the raw material. One is just as unscientific as the other and perhaps as defenseless.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman will permit, that is just exactly what is in the Underwood law now. It puts the finished products from Canada on the free list and duty on the raw material.

I do not want to take too much of your time, but will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. I would like to read just what Mr. Taft said about the make-up of the tariff board, in answer to what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] said.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman has been so long on the Committee on Ways and Means and is such a distinguished leader on his side that I am glad to be courteous to him, but I may have to ask for a little additional time.

Mr. FORDNEY. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] spoke of the make-up of the tariff board by Mr. Taft. Here is what Mr. Taft said about it. I take this from the Republican campaign text-book:

I put at the head of this board Prof. Henry C. Emery, upon the recommendation of the presidents of a number of universities who were consulted. Mr. Alvin Sanders was the editor of the Breeders' Gazette, a man of the highest standing, who had devoted his life to the study of the agricultural interests of this country, while Mr. Reynolds has been for years an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury under Mr. Roosevelt, in charge of customs, and had become very familiar with the operation of the existing tariff and its construction. To these three I added Prof. Page, of the University of California, and then of the University of Virginia, a well-known economist, with the same general standing as

that of Prof. Emery; and Mr. W. M. Howard, a former Democratic Congressman from Georgia and admittedly one of the ablest and fairest Members of the half dozen Congresses in which he served. The make-up of the board insures nonpartisan action. The truth is that, with the exception of Mr. Howard and Mr. Reynolds, the board may be said to have no political affiliations at all.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BORLAND. I feel now that I ought to yield to my friend from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

Mr. BARNHART. I listened to the reading of the report of former President Taft very attentively, and I agree with the statement of the former President therein that one of the members of that board was a former prominent Member of this House and that he was a man of great ability; but, somehow, he got out of line with his party on the tariff question to such an extent that after he had the nomination by the party in his home district the people arose—and they were practically all Democrats down there—and nominated an independent and overwhelmingly defeated the Member of Congress. That is my recollection. Then the President put him on as a representative of the Democratic Party on the tariff commission.

It will be observed that in his reference to this Virginia professor Mr. Taft says he put him on because of his ability. I think he makes no reference to his politics, and I simply called attention to that, not to criticize former President Taft, but to show the fact and the possibility that no President elected by any political party can name a tariff commission that is going to be satisfactory to the opposition, and tariff agitation will go on and on as it ever has. If you give each party representation on a tariff commission, by their own selection, they will have to abide by the results they get in the commission's reports.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman from Missouri permit me to answer?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. In all sincerity, if the tariff board or tariff commission is permitted or expected to do more than gather information and submit it to the Congress, how is it possible to obtain a nonpartisan board? The gentleman as a Democrat sincerely and conscientiously believes in free trade or a low tariff. I as a Republican believe in a protective tariff. The gentleman and I each have our views. If you are a Democrat or a Republican, you must have an opinion or you are an imbecile. How is it possible to create a nonpartisan tariff board and select it from the two great parties?

Mr. BARNHART. I believe I have not used the word "nonpartisan." If I did, I should have said "a bipartisan board." I believe the agitation of a tariff commission comes very largely from business men of the United States who misunderstand what they are talking about.

I received some letters this morning from business men, saying that they were gratified that I had introduced at the beginning of this Congress a bipartisan tariff commission bill, and saying that they hoped it would go further and take the tariff entirely out of the hands of Congress and out of the power of politics, so that business could go on without interruption. But that can not be done under the Constitution of the United States, and it ought not to be done, for the reason that the people elect their Representatives every two years to levy taxes and make appropriations, and that gives the people the opportunity of regulating their own affairs every two years. That is the theory upon which the Constitution of the United States was founded, as I understand it. But so long as one political party, or two, for that matter, feel that they have no representation on the tariff board or tariff commission, a doubt is going to prevail in the minds of such party that the other side is not dealing squarely with them.

Mr. FORDNEY. I agree with the gentleman, and I thank him.

Mr. BORLAND. I will say, in that connection, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that even under a partisan tariff board, if it existed and was clothed with sufficient power, a great deal of information could be gathered and a great deal of difficulty could be eliminated in the formation of a tariff. I do not believe a man's views on the tariff ought to color his reports on facts which he ascertains; and, while I am arguing for a nonpartisan board, I feel that a board could be constituted, even of a partisan character, that could honestly and fairly and fully report the facts, so that I would not feel, not having given the tariff board any further powers in the last analysis, that their political complexion would be absolutely fatal to their usefulness.

It is apparent that even in times of peace when the world conditions of commerce are normal, the factors entering into the formation of tariff schedules change with more or less rapidity. New enterprises are formed and grow into commanding proportions, new sources of raw material and new methods of adapting existing material are discovered; new and improved means of transportation are opened; new markets are created. There is a constant shifting of the courses of capital, labor, and raw material, a constant improvement both in mechanical devices and in methods of marketing. A rate of duty which would have one effect to-day may have a totally different effect in a year. A duty which would be negligible under some circumstances may by continued reduction of the margin of profit become prohibitive. A rate which would produce a substantial revenue at one stage of the world's commerce may by successive changes result in no revenue at all. So that, even if it could be relieved from all of the disgusting incidents of greed and politics a general revision of the tariff when more than 4,000 schedules are changed at the same time is the most unscientific, unsatisfactory, and disastrous method that could possibly be devised. It is both burdensome and unnecessary. A permanent tariff commission should be engaged in the constant study of all of the factors which effect the levying of duties, and these factors are as diverse as those which enter into every phase of commercial life from the individual success of a single merchant to the commercial dominance of a nation. Such a commission should have full power to gather the necessary information and should give a fair opportunity to all business men liable to be affected, either favorably or adversely, to be heard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for 20 minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. I have heard men time after time gravely and vociferously argue upon this floor about an alleged difference in the cost of labor in this country and in foreign countries that they have named—countries they have never been in—where the information they invoked was purely hearsay. They assumed that was the sole factor entering into the question of making a tariff bill. As a matter of fact there are many factors entering into the construction of a tariff bill. Often the duty exceeds the total cost of labor entering into the production of the article. We know that in most articles the vital question is not only that of labor, but of raw material, of fuel, of overhead charges, and of selling cost. I could name article after article where the selling cost is the largest percentage of the whole ultimate price.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Would not the element of cost in fuel and selling cost and other items you mention be labor?

Mr. BORLAND. No; not necessarily. How much is the percentage of selling cost in automobiles? It runs up to nearly 70 per cent in many cases. What does that include? It includes full page advertisements in the magazines; it includes exhibitions at shows; it includes joy rides for prospective customers, and it includes plate-glass windows on prominent streets. A little of it is labor, and much of it is commission. Everything on earth is figured in that selling cost.

Mr. FESS. How much of the fuel cost is labor?

Mr. BORLAND. When you speak of labor, you speak of the labor specific to that item. If you have a mind to make that kind of a sweeping classification, of course you can trace every cost down to labor, except interest and profits.

Mr. FESS. I thought you would lead us to believe that labor has not anything to do with this.

Mr. BORLAND. I thought I tried to make myself clear about that. Perhaps I was unfortunate. When I speak of labor and raw material I speak of leather coming in as raw material, and by the labor I mean the labor used in turning the leather into shoes. Of course we understand that the leather could not have been produced without labor. So there is a labor cost in the leather and also a labor cost in the cow, but the leather is the raw material as far as that particular factory is concerned.

Changes should be made from time to time in the revenue laws as necessity appears, not by any method of bargain and trade or as the reward of or punishment for political action, but upon reasons affecting the commercial development of the country. The advantages of a tariff law constructed under such auspices should be first a scientific classification of schedules to avoid confusion in administering the customs laws and to simplify the law and aid the business men in understanding it; second, an adjustment of rates in accordance with the revenue to be raised and the results to be accomplished; third, a strengthening of the National Government in the intelligent promotion of foreign

trade; fourth, adequate provision for the construction and change of commercial treaties.

I believe that a tariff commission is necessary even from the standpoint of one who believes in the fiction of protection, but it is more necessary in the successful construction of a bill to provide revenue.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman said a moment ago that the rates should be adjusted in accordance with the revenue to be raised and the results to be accomplished. What results other than revenue are to be accomplished under the theory of a Democratic tariff for revenue only?

Mr. BORLAND. I will say to the gentleman that a great many results can be accomplished.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If it is a tariff for revenue only—and you have used the word "only" in your platform—if you levy a tariff for the purposes of revenue only, for what other results do you levy it? Does the gentleman mean protection to American industry?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; you can put it that way if you choose, from the standpoint of a protective tariff.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Then you must strike out the "only" from your platform.

Mr. BORLAND. I will try to answer the gentleman fairly. I am not a protectionist; but when I speak of the possibilities of a tariff board I do not eliminate that factor, so that when the gentleman smiles and sits down he has not quite got my answer. He asked me if in the results obtained I meant protection. That is what a Republican would mean in voting for a tariff board.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit another interruption?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman said a moment ago that we should levy the duties with a view to securing revenue and other results.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What other results are to be secured under a Democratic tariff when the Democratic platform declares that it shall be levied for revenue only?

Mr. BORLAND. I will answer the gentleman. I said "other results," as far as the Republicans are concerned, would mean protection. As far as the Democrats are concerned, the gentleman asks me whether there would be other results. Unquestionably there would, and nobody except a man who is talking about the tariff in a purely superficial political sense on the stump would pretend that there is not. No revenue duty can be levied——

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin again rose.

Mr. BORLAND. Just a moment. Let me finish my answer. No revenue duty can be levied without having some effect of incidental protection. You can not levy any duty for any purpose that it does not have some effect on the question of protection. And if the gentleman will pardon me, he has asked what other results would follow, and I think I have a right to answer his question in my own way. There is another result. If you have a choice of two or more commodities upon which you may levy a duty, a great question of policy would arise as to which you would choose, even from a revenue standpoint.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says that I have asked whether other results would follow. I did not ask that. I asked an interpretation of the gentleman's own statement when he spoke of the rates which he said should be levied with a view to securing revenue and with an eye to other results. What are the other results to secure which a Democratic tariff is levied? If it must be for purposes of revenue only, then there must be no looking for other results. The Democratic Party has repeatedly declared that a tariff levied for any other purpose than to secure revenue—that is, for the protection of American industry—violates the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BORLAND. Now, I think I have answered the gentleman's question, but if I have not made it clear to him I will. I have learned by experience here in this House, in the last seven years, that even in levying a revenue tariff it is impossible to eliminate all incidental protection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is true; but——

Mr. BORLAND. Now, will the gentleman just pardon me——

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I want to say that the gentleman has not answered my question. Of course there is incidental protection, but do you levy it for that purpose?

Mr. BORLAND. No.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. You levy it for revenue only, but you said a moment ago that it should be levied with a view to securing revenue, and with an eye to the other results.

Mr. BORLAND. The other results; yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is, you levy it for two purposes—for revenue purposes and for the other results. What are the other results? That is my question.

Mr. BORLAND. Now, let me answer the gentleman's question again. If I believed in protection as a theory, I might seek to lay even a revenue duty so as to produce the highest possible amount of protection; but if I were distinctly opposed to protection, as I am, and desired to eliminate it as far as possible from a revenue law, I might have another set of results in mind; but I can not eliminate that result entirely, and neither can the gentleman. Nobody can construct a tariff law, and nobody ever did construct a tariff law, that did not have some incidental effect upon particular lines of business. If there is any Democrat who believes that can be done, all he has got to do is to give the matter a little more study. I have no doubt that men, before they come to this House and when they are on the stump running for constable or coroner, will get out and talk about there being no protection in a tariff law; but no tariff law can be framed which will not give some incidental protection. We are talking now as a matter of scientific study.

Mr. SIMS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman refers to the question of policy, and asks whether we should levy a revenue duty on one thing or another.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman mean that any tariff board is to report to this House upon a question of policy?

Mr. BORLAND. No; but I will say what I do mean. We might have a very grave doubt in our minds as to the levying of a duty on wool or sugar. We might find that the revenue produced might be equal, but when we ascertained what the result would be from the facts reported by the tariff board, we might resolve that doubt in favor of one or the other.

Mr. SIMS. Is it not the policy of the tariff for revenue only to get the greatest amount of revenue with the least protection, and is it not the policy of the protectionists to get the greatest amount of protection with the least revenue, and does it take a board to let us know what that means?

Mr. BORLAND No; but I will tell the gentleman why I favor a tariff board. I have seen duties levied on articles, under a Republican tariff law at least, where there was absolutely no necessity for protection, no chance for protection, where they were entirely prohibitive in character and intended to be so.

Mr. SIMS. And would have been if we had 40 tariff boards?

Mr. BORLAND. No, they would not. If they had been the public would have had ample information as to what that political party was doing.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I will.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman has stated that in the tariff for revenue only there is a purpose of incidental protection. If you are going to put me out of life by drowning me, all that is necessary is to put me one-half an inch under water, and I will drown as quickly as if I were 10 feet under water, for you shut off my breath and I am gone. Now, as the labor cost in production in any article, no matter what it is, is at least 90 per cent of the total cost, and when our labor cost is double in this country what it is in any other country in the world, unless you give enough protection to our industries to make up the difference in cost of labor between here and abroad, you will put the man out of business in this country unless he can get his labor as cheaply as they get it in other countries. Is that not right?

Mr. BORLAND. No; if that were true, or if any part of it was true, we would not be able to sell any goods outside of our own country. We would have to erect a Chinese wall around our country to keep the commercial pirates from getting in here. The fact that we are able to sell abroad demonstrates one of two things—either that the manufacturer is paying less for labor and raw material than he ought to in view of the protection he claims and therefore is able to compete with the foreign competitor in a foreign market or else he is deceiving the American people as to the conditions in foreign countries and that labor cost is not so cheap and conditions are not so poor for labor in the foreign countries that we have got to erect a tariff wall to keep their products out of the country. If what the gentleman says is so, it follows by inevitable logic that we can not go outside of this country and sell in competition with those countries. The minute that we enter the markets of the world we do it on one of two bases—either that the man who demands protection of these goods has lied about the conditions abroad that he had to compete with or he is paying an

unjust low scale of wages and for raw material in this country. That is the inevitable logic of facts as to what the protected manufacturer does to labor in this country.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the gentleman think that the price of labor must take into consideration the element of efficiency?

Mr. BORLAND. Unquestionably. Figuring out the cost of goods the criterion is not the price paid for labor but the units produced. If the factory turns out more units of product, even though it pays higher wages, the cost is correspondingly less. If wages were any criterion, why do you not go to Hindustan and make linoleum and oilcloth where the jute is raised? Why do you bring it here for our workmen, if they are not superior? Why do you not go there where they pay 18 cents a day on the Ganges? You would not bring all of the jute from Hindustan here if it was only a question of 18 cents a day wages. But you do bring it here and pay $2.50 and $3 a day for labor. Why? Because our workmen are more able to make the goods and you are able to put the goods down in the foreign markets in competition with the goods of other countries.

Mr. FORDNEY. Was not this done under the Payne-Aldrich tariff law?

Mr. BORLAND. Of course, goods were sold cheaper abroad than at home.

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me finish my question. Was it not true that there was a protective tariff on these goods we produced, jute and everything else?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; I suppose that is true.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman may be right in some of his theories; I do not say that he is not. Prior to the war in Europe, Germany sold abroad her fabricated steel as low as $18 a ton, and yet she sold to her own people in Germany that same fabricated steel for $30 a ton. She dumped her surplus abroad, crushing out of existence her competitors.

Mr. BORLAND. Well, I am going to take the statement of the gentleman from Michigan as being absolutely correct. Then, upon what basis do the German manufacturers pay wages; on the basis of $18 a ton, or on the basis of $30 a ton?

Mr. FORDNEY. It was shown by the testimony furnished the Ways and Means Committee that the German scale of wages, although her labor is the most efficient in the world, is less by one-half than that paid in the steel mills of the United States.

Mr. BORLAND. The wage scale then was fixed on a basis of a sale at $18 a ton outside of Germany. Therefore the price of $30 at home did not put a nickel into the pockets of the German workmen.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not contend that it did.

Mr. BORLAND. But that is the contention of the gentleman's party, that part of this tariff goes into the pockets of the workingman.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know what their actual cost per ton is, but I do know what the actual cost per ton in this country is, and that the cost of labor in the production of a ton of steel in the United States is 80 per cent of its total cost.

Mr. BORLAND. Can we not compete with Germany in the production of steel?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; and we do not. The testimony given by Mr. Schwab under oath was to the effect that there had not been one pound of steel rails sold by any American steel manufacturer in any steel-producing country in the world in 10 years, except a little that was sold in northwestern Canada, and that steel brought to the American manufacturer $2 per ton above the price that it was sold for in the United States.

Mr. BORLAND. Is the gentleman confessing now that he makes a tariff on the testimony of Mr. Schwab? That is exactly what we want a tariff commission for.

Mr. FORDNEY. I would take his word under oath as quickly as I would that of anyone else.

Mr. BORLAND. Is it not a fact that American steel is sold abroad?

Mr. FORDNEY. Can the gentleman give me any reason why I should not believe Mr. Schwab under oath?

Mr. BORLAND. I can; and that is that the facts are to be ascertained entirely from nonprejudiced and disinterested sources.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, be fair.

Mr. BORLAND. I am sincere about that. I do not think the sworn statement of a manufacturer is the only evidence.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will tell my friend that I am just enough of a Christian believer that I will believe any man under oath until it can be proven that he is a falsifier.

Mr. BORLAND. Then it would be necessary to prove that he is a liar.

Mr. FORDNEY. Can the gentleman prove that Mr. Schwab was mistaken when he made that statement? If so, I want him to prove it to me.

Mr. BORLAND. My Christianity leads me to hear both sides before I judge, and not to accept an ex parte statement of an interested witness.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I want to state the other side.

Mr. BORLAND. But I will have to have more time.

Mr. RAINEY. I will ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

Mr. BORLAND. Make it 15.

Mr. RAINEY. Make it 15 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I must reserve the right to object. We have some reports from the Committee on Printing that are of importance to the House, and I doubt whether we can settle the whole tariff question this afternoon.

Mr. RAINEY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri may proceed for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection for five minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. I would like to have the five minutes for myself.

Mr. MANN. But we gave the gentleman 15 minutes and he would not use it. We have horse books and cow books that are of much more importance to the House than an academic discussion of the tariff, which no one will agree with on either side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Missouri may be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. RAINEY. I want to say to my friend from Michigan that if Mr. Schwab did make a statement of that kind—I do not remember it—the proof can be easily ascertained that he was stating what was not true. At that time there was a world trust in steel prices, an agreement throughout the world that the steel-producing countries would not interfere with each other; that no American steel was to be sold in Germany and no German fabricated steel in the United States. They divided up between them the debatable ground in the countries of South America and Africa, where there were no steel industries.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, the gentleman is wrong in that.

Mr. RAINEY. I think not.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman furnish some evidence of that combination or trust that he speaks of? I never heard of it except from the lips of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I must decline to yield further.

As to the powers of such a commission, the suggestion goes no further than that it be clothed with power to ascertain and determine the facts upon which the schedules should be based. The present method of determining the facts by hearings before the committees of Congress at rare intervals is bound to be burdensome, unscientific, and unsatisfactory. The cost of such a commission would be saved to the American business man in time, expense, and gain of productive power. There are two factors in the present situation of the civilized world which make imperative the creation of such a commission at this time. The first is the existence of the European war and the second is the necessity for the expansion of American foreign commerce. No economist doubts that immediately after the conclusion of peace in Europe each of the great nations must begin a reconstruction of its entire fiscal policy, and especially that with relation to tariff duties.

It is freely predicted that the clash of arms will be followed by a commercial warfare in which the ammunition will be legislation authorizing or encouraging commercial reprisals. Wisdom dictates that among our other plans of preparedness we should be prepared for this commercial struggle. Commercial treaties the world over must all be recast. Commercial discriminations must be expected and relentless competition encouraged by national power may easily become the settled policy of nations which find their industries impoverished by the long struggle. Not only will the neutral markets of the world be the prey of these forces but even our own markets will be attacked. There may be no open door in China, and, in fact, no open door anywhere that any nation has the power to close. The doors of national trade may open only to the skillfully constructed key of a commercial treaty, and such a treaty must be founded upon an intelligent grasp of the commercial and industrial possibilities of the country which offers

it and the country to which it is offered. We in America are woefully deficient not only in our grasp of foreign trade conditions but even of our own commercial possibilities. Our long adherence to the protective tariff has made us provincial and for more than two generations limited the bulk of our foreign trade to exports of raw material which we sold at highly competitive prices.

This leads to the second thought, which is that, even if the war had not come but certainly in view of the present world situation, America must prepare to expand her foreign commerce. The babes in the woods were not more helpless than we have been in the past in writing commercial treaties. I may be mistaken, but I do not know of a single commercial treaty in which we have not been placed at a disadvantage. In the last decade American trade has undergone a great change. From an exporter of raw material we have become an exporter of manufactured goods. Manufactured goods are upon a different basis of competition from raw material. Foreign nations would always take our cotton and our wheat at some price, but no nation will buy our manufactured goods unless we not only meet our competitors in quality and price but cultivate some of the arts of salesmanship. The neutral markets of the world lie ready for our enterprise, but we can not blindly and blunderingly erect a tariff wall around our country keeping out the products of all other nations and expect them to come and buy our goods when we buy nothing from them.

International trade is reciprocal; even a line of steamers or other transportation facilities must have a load each way. If we expect South America to buy from us, we must be prepared to take some of their products at prices and under conditions which are attractive to them. The great question, therefore, affecting the future of American prosperity in securing a foreign trade in neutral markets is what products of foreign countries can we safely take. What can we use in this country to the advantage of our own capital and our own labor and what may we give in exchange of the output of our own industries. It is an economic loss for us to send abroad wheat in competition with some of the South American countries when with our supply of fuel, capital, and labor we could manufacture the wheat into flour or, better still, into packed biscuits and breadstuffs and sell it to many of the same South American countries. If we take the rubber, hardwood, and forest products of South America, are we not providing the raw material upon which to use our capital and our labor, and can not we sell to them furniture, pianos, automobiles, belting, mining machinery, and other products of our factories?

It is not suggested at this time that the tariff commission should be given the power to fix rates or even to suggest them. Congress has exclusive power of legislation and is charged by the Federal Constitution with levying taxes, including duties upon imports. There are some who urge that the tariff commission is unconstitutional as a delegation of legislative power which Congress can not make. No such charge can be leveled against the suggested plan. In fact, the plan could go much further and still be within the constitutional powers of Congress. It would be possible for Congress to prescribe a series of alternative rates or a maximum and minimum schedule of rates and confer power upon the commission, upon the ascertainment of certain facts, to put in force or to suspend from operation certain portions of the law. This is now well settled by the decision of the Supreme Court. A provision which occurred in the McKinley tariff law of 1890, authorizing the President to suspend the free admission of sugar when he deemed the United States discriminated against by any country, was sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States in Field against Clark (143 U. S., 649–692), Lamar and Fuller dissenting.

The Congress may not delegate its purely legislative power to a commission, but having laid down the general rules of action under which a commission shall proceed it may require of that commission the application of such rules to particular situations and the investigation of facts with a view to making orders in a particular matter within the rules laid down by the Congress (I. C. C. *v.* Goodrich Transit Co., 224 U. S., 194–214; K. C. S. Ry. *v.* U. S., 231 U. S., 423–443.)

It would seem that Congress might enact a standard schedule of tariff rates and provide for the increase or reduction of rates according to a sliding scale depending either on revenue receipts on or the rates of imports to domestic consumption, or on some other principle, while delegating to a commission the work of determining the facts and applying the law to them. The orders of a tariff commission would be reviewable by the courts on questions of law only, not on questions of fact. They would be analogous in this respect to regulations of the Treasury Department under the present tariff law, or to tariff provisions contingent upon the determination of certain facts by the President as was provided in the Payne-Aldrich law.

I know that the proposal to establish a permanent tariff commission and take the tariff out of politics will come as a distinct shock to some gentlemen who think that the tariff is the only bond of party unity and must be preserved as a partisan issue. However, the time has gone by when the American business public will tolerate that brand of politics. Business men, large or small, throughout the country to-day are demanding a tariff commission. The cry is let there be light, and any statesman or politician who opposes a nonpartisan tariff commission lays himself under the suspicion of playing politics with a great business question. The present session of Congress will, I believe, pass a bill providing for such a commission, and in so doing will place another star in the diadem of Democracy as an exponent of progressive American Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

DISEASES OF THE HORSE.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 13 (H. Rept. 88).

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse, the same to be first revised and brought to date under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, 70,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 30,000 for the use of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

SPECIAL REPORT ON DISEASES OF CATTLE.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer another privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 14 (H. Rept. 89).

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle, the same to be first revised and brought to date under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, 70,000 copies for use of the House of Representatives and 30,000 copies for use of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

REPORT OF ALASKAN ENGINEERING COMMISSION.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 11 (H. Rept. 91).

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, in two volumes, for the period from March 12, 1914, to December 31, 1915, inclusive, together with accompanying maps, charts, and profiles, be printed as a House document, and that 5,000 additional copies be printed, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 1,500 copies for the use of the Senate, and 1,500 copies for the use of the commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana what this report will cost?

Mr. BARNHART. The Clerk has the report of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Printing having had under consideration the House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 11) providing for the printing of 5,000 copies of the reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, reports the same back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be agreed to. The estimated cost will be $7,851.39. The unencumbered balance of the allotment for printing and binding for Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, is $789,378.26.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if this report has been printed by the department?

Mr. BARNHART. It has not.

Mr. FOSTER. Then may I inquire what particular advantage there will be in getting this report printed at this time as a House document?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON], who is the author of the bill.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois I want to say that the act providing for the construction of the Alaska Railway provided that the agents and officers appointed by the President to build and construct that railroad should make an annual report of their doings in the premises, of their work, to the President of the United States, and that report should be submitted to Congress annually, and oftener if it was required by the President. This is an annual report made, and it is a showing that it is important that every Member of the House should see and also every Member of the Senate. It is carrying out a law which involves a new work in a new field on which the Government has embarked. It fully sets forth what has been accomplished already, and it will acquaint the Members of Congress as to what has been done with the money that Congress has appropriated for this purpose. And I think it very important, in order that Congress may understand thoroughly what has been done in this great enterprise, that this report be put in the hands of Congress.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the gentleman inform the House in reference to the maps which it is stated shall be printed in this report? What kind of maps are they, and how many of them, and what is likely to be the cost of printing?

Mr. MANN. It can not be very large if the whole amount is $7,800.

Mr. HOUSTON. I can not give the exact proportion, but it provides for the printing of maps, charts, and profiles in such forms that will be serviceable. Now, it is very important, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, that we have those maps and these charts, because it will be impossible to understand thoroughly what they are doing and what work is accomplished, and its character without these maps and charts in order to get the location and geographical situation in order to give a clear conception of just what has been done.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I take it this first report shows the line of road they have purchased up there, and also as far as they have got the line of the continuation of that road?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes, sir. This report shows that. It shows the road, and it shows the condition of the road they purchased; it states fully as to the purchase of that road just what it cost, and so forth. It states also the cost of construction of the road that has been built beyond the end of its line that has been bought.

Mr. MANN. What is the total limit of cost of this Alaska road?

Mr. HOUSTON. Thirty-five million dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say—I think my colleague anticipated something what I was going to say when he interrupted with his question—I want to say this: That this road is to cost $35,000,000 and the commission has to report to Congress the first annual report that is to be made, I do not know whether we ought each year to print a report of this kind or not, but I do believe that at least at this time we should know something of what is being done and I shall not object under those circumstances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer an amendment to the resolution. I move to amend by striking out the word "two," in line 8, and insert the word "three" instead; and by striking out the words "five hundred," in lines 9 and 10; and by striking out the words "five hundred," in line 11, thereby allowing 3,000 to the House, 1,000 to the Senate, and 1,000 to the commission.

Mr. MANN. Would not the gentleman be willing to increase the number from 5,000 to 6,000 and give that additional number to the House without interfering with the balance? This is one of the most interesting things that the Government has ever undertaken, something akin to the construction of the Panama Canal.

I am very sure that there are many people in the country—engineers, librarians, and so forth—very much interested in a report like this. It never will be reprinted. I think the department ought to have 1,500 copies, and as the resolution provided for 2,000 copies for the House and 1,500 for the Senate, and we are at least entitled to twice the number the Senate has, I think we ought to increase our number to 3,000, and even then each Member will receive a very small quota of a document that in many places will be very greatly in demand.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask to withdraw the amendment and offer the following instead:

Amend by inserting the word "six" instead of "five" in line 7.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARNHART. And also by inserting the word "three" instead of "two," in line 8, and by striking out "five hundred" in line 11.

Mr. MANN. You do not have to strike out anything.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the resolution reported as amended, so that we will know exactly what it is.

The SPEAKER. We will have the amendment read first, and then we will have the whole thing read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "six."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "two" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution with the amendments included.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 11.

Resolved, etc., That the reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, in two volumes, for the period from March 12, 1914, to December 31, 1915, inclusive, together with accompanying maps, charts, and profiles, be printed as a House Document, and that 6,000 additional copies be printed, of which 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 1,500 for the use of the Senate, and 1,500 copies for the use of the commission.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

MEDICO-MILITARY ASPECTS OF THE EUROPEAN WAR.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 12 (H. Rept. 92).

Resolved, etc., That there be printed and bound 10,000 copies of the Report on the Medico-Military Aspects of the European War by Surg. A. M. Fauntleroy, United States Navy, 6,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 3,000 for the use of the Senate and an additional 1,000 copies for the use of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the Navy Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] if the department has the money for printing these reports; and, if so, why the necessity for coming to the House and printing them out of the amount appropriated for the printing for Congress?

Mr. BARNHART. This is out of the usual work of the Navy Department, because it will not be used for the Navy Department alone, but for the benefit of the War Department and for the benefit of the people of the country generally. I thought of that phase of the situation, but it seemed to me that this is an exceptional case, and I believe that at this time, when we are talking so much of preparation and the great necessity of getting ready, we can not have too much information, inasmuch as it is as inexpensive as this seems to be.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that I think it is an important document and ought to be printed. The only thing is that we get the departments in the habit of coming to Congress and having a lot of printing done.

Mr. MANN. The department did not ask for this.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not mean that, possibly, but I mean it is done by Congress out of an appropriation allowed it for printing instead of the amount that was appropriated to the department for printing. However, I am not going to object to this.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee what rule his committee follows in the apportionment of volumes for the use of the Members of the House and those of the Senate? This resolution, I notice, is reported as introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS], granting to the House only twice the number allotted to the Senate, whereas our membership is more than four times as large.

Mr. BARNHART. In reply to the gentleman I will say that the usual proportion is 70 to 30, and if he desires to offer an amendment in that proportion, it will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will it be satisfactory to make it 8 to 2?

Mr. MANN. The usual proportion ever since I have been here has been 2 to 1.

Mr. BARNHART. Two to one.

Mr. STAFFORD. The usual proportion ever since the gentleman has been here has been 2 to 1, but the membership of the House has been changing more greatly than the membership of the Senate.

Mr. MANN. I am not so sure there has been so much difference since I have been here.

Mr. STAFFORD. The membership when the gentleman came here was 356, and now it is 435.

Another matter I would like to direct the attention of the gentleman to is as to whether the resolution as introduced provides for the printing of 10,000 or 11,000 copies. I direct his attention to the phraseology in next to the last line, which says, "And an additional 1,000 copies"; there being in the body of the resolution provision made for the distribution of 9,000, and an additional 1,000 for the use of the Navy Department.

Mr. BARNHART. I think in order to make it perfect the word "additional" should be stricken out, and if there is no objection, I shall ask that it be done.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the suggestion as to the distribution, because I really think the House ought to have a larger quota than the 2 to 1?

Mr. BARNHART. I am just submitting to the gentleman that if he wants to offer an amendment I will not offer any objection, but this is the proportion the gentleman used in writing the bill. He evidently had made some investigation, and it is a document that will be of nation-wide importance, and doubtless all called for, however it may be distributed. If they can not get them from a Member of the House, they can get them from a Senator.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will not in this instance offer an amendment, but I do hope that when gentlemen introduce resolutions in the future they will bear in mind the fact of the larger membership of the House and the demand upon Members for documents.

Mr. MANN. The Senate and the House do not always agree about these things. The Senate passed some resolutions the other day for a horse book and a cattle book, and they proposed to take, I will not say most of them, but about half of them. Now, the House is sending over a proposition to the Senate, and we in turn are trying to "hog" it. Ever since I have been here my experience has been that once in a while such a resolution gets in inadvertently, but if it is important the House gets two-thirds and the Senate one-third.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the other resolutions we are getting more than two-thirds.

Mr. MANN. That has not passed the Senate yet. They have taken nearly half themselves.

Mr. BARNHART. The committee just wanted to show a strong front.

The SPEAKER. Does any gentleman offer another amendment?

Mr. BARNHART. I did not know that unanimous consent had been granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the words "an additional," in line 7.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 7 of the resolution strike out the words "an additional."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution was agreed to.

REPORT OF INVESTIGATION OF CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND & PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 80 (H. Rept. 93).

Resolution for printing 10,000 copies of the report of the investigation of the Interstate Commerce Commission of the financial affairs of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.

Resolved, That there be printed 10,000 copies of the report of the investigation of the Interstate Commerce Commission with reference to the financial transactions, history, and operation of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., being No. 6834 of the docket of said commission.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BARNHART, from the Committee on Printing, makes the following report (to accompany H. Res. 80):

The Committee on Printing, having had under consideration the House resolution (H. Res. 80) providing for the printing of 10,000 copies of the report of the investigation of the Interstate Commerce Commission of the financial affairs of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., reports the same back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be agreed to.

The estimated cost will be $107.92.

The unencumbered balance of the allotment for printing and binding for Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, is $787,378.26.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FOSTER. In the urgent deficiency bill there was given the Interstate Commerce Commission $10,000 for additional printing. It seems to me that this is a case purely of Congress providing out of its appropriation for printing a document that comes from the Interstate Commerce Commission; and, so far as I am concerned at this time, in view of the fact that we have appropriated $10,000 as an urgent deficiency for the Interstate Commerce Commission, unless it is shown that this amount to print these reports on the Rock Island Railroad investigation is a proper thing, I could not this afternoon permit this to go through without some further explanation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I was in hope of inducing the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] to withdraw any objection he might have.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is not the Interstate Commerce Commission that is asking for the printing of the report of this investigation. This report was printed in the same manner as the report of other decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission. There were something like three or four thousand copies printed originally, which were sent to its mailing list and Members of Congress and used up in that manner, until only about 150 copies remained, being used in the ordinary and customary manner of the Interstate Commerce Commission. There was a good deal of demand for the report, and, although I wrote down at once for some twenty copies of the report, I was unable to obtain them.

The importance of having the report printed lies in this, that it is an official record condensed of the evidence taken before the Interstate Commerce Commission showing the most gigantic robberies ever committed on any corporation engaged in interstate commerce. It shows facts utterly unbelievable. If a man went out on the stump or stated it on the floor of this House he would not be believed if he was not backed up by the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission after proper investigation and hearings on both sides in relation to the matter.

In the further consideration of the matters before this House there undoubtedly will come bills for issuance of securities, bills for the control of corporation carriers in interstate commerce, bills in relation to holding companies, especially involved in this investigation, and other matters which may all be combined in one bill or may be brought before this House by several bills. The Members of the House, I am satisfied, and the country at large want to absolutely know what are the real facts in the case, and it is impossible that they should be informed unless we have some such method as this. The amount involved is trifling; it is less than $100. I think that the committee states the cost is $101, but I had supposed it would only cost $75. If we can not get 10,000 copies printed, I would take 5,000. This is of the highest importance, and the report should be printed. I know, when I went before the Committee on Interstate Commerce and stated to them that the reports which were being issued by the directors of that company at that time were not within $10,000,000 of being correct, that there had been stolen between seven and eigth million dollars out of the treasury of the company, they looked at me with incredulity.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. ADAMSON. I understand from the gentleman that he is asking for a print here because it is impossible to secure the print from the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ADAMSON. I remember that the gentleman applied to me, and I advised him to introduce a resolution and have it referred to the Committee on Printing. I take great pleasure

in stating for the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois that if it had come within my jurisdiction I should have recognized the necessity and advised the printing.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman that I have had a communication from two Senators asking if there would be a favorable report on this resolution, and if not, they would introduce it in the Senate, so that it makes little difference whether it is printed here or not, except that if it is printed here the Members of the House will have the use of it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I wish to say that the Senate has ordered 10,000 copies of the investigation of the New Haven Railroad printed and 1,000 additional for some special purpose, making a total of 11,000 in all, and of the two this is the more important.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I want to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] if this is the subject about which he made a speech in the House some time ago?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The same subject on which I made the speech in the House.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Then permit me to say that I heard that speech, in which the gentleman narrated in detail frauds of corporate management which, as he said, were almost unbelievable. I believed that they had been perpetrated because many of the things the gentleman stated in great detail as a part of his own personal knowledge and experience. This report being the result of the investigation by the Interstate Commerce Commission of a subject so important to the shippers of the West and to the Congress of the United States in perfecting the legislation it is expected to enact, I sincerely hope that the report will be printed and made accessible.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I yield.

Mr. FOSTER. I fully agree with all the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Wisconsin have said. In my judgment, there has been no greater fraud committed on the American people than the looting of the Rock Island Railroad. It has been a scandal and a disgrace to the business world. They ruined the great Rock Island Railroad that ran through a section of the Western States. This road at one time was the finest in Illinois. But a lot of men got hold of that property and stole from it until there came the great crash, which has brought such a disastrous result to it. There is no question about that. The only thing to which I wish to call the attention of the House at this time is that not many days ago we gave an additional appropriation for printing, which can be used by the Interstate Commerce Commission for this very purpose. We gave them $10,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. FOSTER. Just a moment. It seems to me that under circumstances of this kind the resolution ought not to pass; and while I agree with all that gentlemen have said, and while I would agree to more than they have said—because I have known something about the management of the Rock Island Railroad—yet I do not believe this is a proper way to get these reports printed. It should be done by the Interstate Commerce Commission. One day we give this commission $10,000, and they have charge of these matters and can print these reports if they will and if they are of such great importance, as I know they are.

Mr. ADAMSON. If my friend from Illinois will yield, I wish to say to him that the resolution for an investigation came to our committee. We had exhaustive hearings, and developed things as bad or worse than gentlemen have intimated here this afternoon. To show the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] that I have the question of economy at heart as much as he has, I will state to him that our committee suggested to the Interstate Commerce Commission that instead of duplicating the expense by having a long and expensive special investigation they expedite the investigation of this railroad in their physical valuation proceedings. They agreed with us, and did that. They have made the investigation and have printed the ordinary quota of this report—as many copies as they ever print in ordinary cases. Now they have taken the position that they ought not to print any more. The amount allowed them in the urgent deficiency bill is to cover the expense of their ordinary printing, and they absolutely refuse to print a larger number of copies of the reoprt. So the only remedy of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] was to come to the House and ask us to print, for the benefit of Members, the necessary copies which the Interstate Commerce Commission refused to print. The expense is very small in comparison with the amount that our committee saved to the Government by refusing a special investigation and adopting the other expedient. So I think the gentleman from Illinois ought not to object.

Mr. FOSTER. That situation came up and the gentleman managed it the way he states, which I think was a wise thing to do. We have this evidence, which is valuable to the House. But that is not the question I am discussing. There are a thousand things that are valuable to the House, and yet it seems to me there is a right way to get at them. I am not saying a thing in the world against the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] for bringing in this report, because I think he did what he believed to be the right thing to do, and he is careful as to expenditures for printing. I do not like to object to these things that the House thinks necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FOSTER. In just a moment. Let me finish what I am going to say and then I shall be through. I wish to say this, that I am not going to make any serious objection to the passage of this resolution, as I might do at this time by raising the point of no quorum, at this late hour in the evening, when there are so few Members here, and so prevent the passage of the resolution to-night. But, so far as I am concerned, in the future, unless a very exceptional reason can be shown, when Congress makes an appropriation for printing, as it has done in this case, and then gives an additional $10,000 in an urgent deficiency appropriation bill—and I do not know how much more will be appropriated in the general deficiency bill—I shall object to every one of these resolutions going through and shall do whatever I can to defeat them.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the remarks just made by the gentleman from Illinois, with which I agree in a general way, I want to state for the information of the gentleman and for the information of the House, that the Committee on Printing has been as diligent as possible in attempting to prevent the reporting of resolutions of the kind to which the gentleman from Illinois refers. The chairman of the Printing Committee has from time to time objected to unanimous consent for resolutions providing for the printing of reports for departments when such resolutions have been offered on the floor of the House. But here comes a little report, the cost of printing of which will be inconsequential, a report which is important for the information of the country, which the committee believes the Interstate Commerce Commission probably would not distribute as well as the Members of the House, and therefore we decided to report favorably the resolution, and I hope that the resolution will pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, January 31, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting list of cases which were dismissed by the court under the act of March 4, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 630); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting facts relating to estimates of appropriations (p. 806, Book of Estimates for 1917) for printing and binding for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 631); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting draft of a proposed joint resolution authorizing the Department of Labor to edit and publish certain studies turned over to said department by the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations (H. Doc. No. 632); to the Committee on Printing and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting that the Navy Department has considered, ascertained, and adjusted and determined that $155.06 is due G. W. Webber and J. H. Thomas for damages for which a vessel of the Navy was responsible (H. Doc. No. 633); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required for the service

of the War Department for barracks and quarters, Philippine Islands, repair and restoration of buildings destroyed by storms (H. Doc. No. 634); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (S. J. Res. 76) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan 1,000 tents and 1,000 cots for the use of the encampment of the United Confederate Veterans, to be held at Birmingham, Ala., in May, 1916, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 90), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3415) granting a pension to Maggie Barron; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4361) granting an increase of pension to Michael Nolan; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2779) granting a pension to John R. Malone; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 10384) to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10385) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 10386) to tax munitions of war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCRACKEN: A bill (H. R. 10387) for the improvement of the Columbia River to the mouth of Snake River within the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho; for the improvement of the Snake River to Pittsburg Landing, on said river; and for the improvement of the Clearwater River from its mouth to Orofino, in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10388) permitting railroad companies to grant half-fare rates over their lines to Union soldiers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KINKAID (by request): A bill (H. R. 10389) to provide for pensions for surviving soldiers of the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 10390) to provide for the giving of notice of suits and proceedings in courts of the United States affecting the title to real property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 10391) prescribing the procedure in the courts of the United States in actions at law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10392) in relation to the service of process by United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 10393) to redistribute jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture over the protection of fur-bearing animals in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 10394) providing for cooperation with the State of New Mexico in the construction of roads within the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10395) making appropriation for the repair and preservation of the Rio Grande in certain counties in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 10396) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the establishment of a naval and aviation academy on the Pacific coast of the United States within 150 miles of San Francisco, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 10397) to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10398) to provide for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other benefits and purposes in connection therewith; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 10399) authorizing postmasters to give information as to addresses of patrons of their office in certain cases; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 10400) to provide for the advancement of funds to survey, construct, and maintain roads and trails within any State or the Territory of Alaska within which national forests are located; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10401) to regulate the use of public lands of the United States in certain counties in Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 10402) granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAGSDALE: A bill (H. R. 10403) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Dillon, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 10404) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Two Rivers, in the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 10405) for securing the uniform grading of grain, preventing deception in transactions in grain, and regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 10406) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Menasha, in the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10407) providing for the erection of a suitable memorial to John Fitch; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. RAGSDALE: A bill (H. R. 10408) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Conway, Horry County, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10409) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Hartsville, Darlington County, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10410) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Kingstree, Williamsburg County, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 10411) to establish a fish-cultural station in the county of Koochiching, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 10412) creating an Army reserve; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 10413) to appropriate $150,000 for the improvement of navigation on Red River in Louisiana and Arkansas; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 10414) to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 10415) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the establishment of a military aviation academy within the State of Utah, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10416) granting to the State of Utah the Fort Duchesne Reservation for its use as a branch agricultural college; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 10417) creating and establishing a commission to be known as the Merchant Marine Commission, prescribing its duties and powers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAYES: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 122) amending the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. CARY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 123) authorizing the Sergeants at Arms of the House and Senate to supply each Member of Congress with an identification insignia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: Resolution (H. Res. 113) taxing munitions of war, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of Legislature of State of Rhode Island, urging upon the Congress of the United States the duty of adequately increasing the naval and military forces of this Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: Memorial of Legislature of Rhode Island, urging upon the Congress of the United States the duty of adequately increasing the naval and military forces of this Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial urging upon the Congress of the United States the duty of adequately increasing the military and naval forces of this Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 10418) granting an increase of pension to George Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 10419) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Leach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10420) for the relief of the legal representatives of O. M. Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURGESS: A bill (H. R. 10421) for the relief of A. J. Hodges, T. W. Hodges, and C. C. Hodges; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURKE: A bill (H. R. 10422) granting an increase of pension to Janet Lamoreux; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10423) granting a pension to Marietta Brewer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 10424) for the relief of the legal representatives of Samuel Waldrop; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10425) granting a pension to Pollock T. Harbold; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 10426) for the relief of B. S. Pearsall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 10427) to reimburse William Blair for losses and damages sustained by him by the negligent dipping of his cattle by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 10428) granting a pension to Susan A. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10429) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 10430) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Joseph Houser; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 10431) granting a pension to Ellen J. Lehew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 10432) granting a pension to Frank B. Norris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 10433) granting a pension to Mary B. Chatfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 10434) for the relief of the estate of Absa Sherrill; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 10435) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Birley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 10436) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Fiero; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 10437) to correct the military record of Lewis Ludwig; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 10438) for the relief of Philip A. Hertz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILL: A bill (H. R. 10439) granting a pension to Alicia J. Flynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 10440) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Harlan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10441) for the relief of T. M. Marsh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 10442) granting an increase of pension to Jane Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10443) granting an increase of pension to James W. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 10444) granting an increase of pension to Margaret B. Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 10445) granting an increase of pension to Matilda C. Boulden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 10446) to restore the name of Mrs. C. A. Bennett to the pension roll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 10447) granting a pension to Alice A. Masters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 10448) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10449) granting a pension to Allen E. Gabbard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10450) granting an increase of pension to Mourning Sizemore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10451) granting an increase of pension to Emeline Senters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10452) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 10453) granting an increase of pension to Spencer Philipps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10454) granting an increase of pension to Charles T. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 10455) granting a pension to Mary P. E. Hale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 10456) granting a pension to Emma J. De Yoe Bassett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 10457) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OGLESBY: A bill (H. R. 10458) granting a pension to William A. M. Streeter, alias Henry Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAGSDALE: A bill (H. R. 10459) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of Beaverdam Baptist Church, Marlboro County, S. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 10460) granting a pension to Sarah J. Challoner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10461) to remove the charge of desertion against Joseph Scharbonaugh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 10462) granting a pension to Henry Padoult; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10463) for the relief of Clarence F. Birkett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 10464) granting a pension to Julia A. Dugan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10465) granting an increase of pension to William H. Surridge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10466) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Trapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10467) granting an increase of pension to Orlando D. Rowe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10468) granting a pension to Augustus Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10469) granting a pension to George M. Laquey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10470) for the relief of Michael Feeler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10471) granting an increase of pension to Ezra A. Bristol; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10472) granting an increase of pension to Amanda M. Eaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10473) granting a pension to Cab Acuff; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10474) for the relief of Andrew J. Sutton, alias Sedney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10475) granting an increase of pension to Gambriella Ware; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 10476) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 10477) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Donohoe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10478) granting a pension to Carrie H. Moffatt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGUE: A bill (H. R. 10479) granting a pension to George G. Spurr, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 10480) granting a pension to Gertrude H. Bird; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10481) granting a pension to Anna Wehle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 10482) granting an increase of pension to Abel Longworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10483) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Fields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of St. Louis, urging the adoption of national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, urging that the railway mail pay controversy be referred to the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), memorial of Travelers' Protective Association, indorsing the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petitions of John Schaab and 450,000 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring embargo on munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against increase of tax on beer, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany the bill (H. R. 9144) for relief of John Irvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 10321, for relief of John R. Tallentire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE: Petition of Better Sox Knitting Mills, of Fort Atkinson, Wis., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of directors of Fox Lake Public Library and members of Randolph (Wis.) Public Library, protesting against the Ayres bill (H. R. 4715); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petition of depositors in banks of Kansas, against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petitions of Hon. John K. Stewart, of Amsterdam, and United States Silk Co., of Gloversville, N. Y., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: Resolutions by the Church Federation of Sacramento, Cal., favoring bills creating a national play bureau and appropriation for its maintenance, and creating the Grand Canyon, Mount Baker, and Sequoia National Parks; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions by the Society of the Sons of the Revolution, in the State of California, favoring the development of a practicable system of national preparedness against war and a system of military training for all able-bodied male pupils under the age of 18 years in our public schools; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of Vermont: Petition of Fitzgerald (Vt.) Paper Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., relative to railway-mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, relative to erection of statue to nuns on battlefield; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of Edgar F. Luckenbach, of New York, relative to bill to amend section 4444, United States Revised Statutes, relating to regulation of steam vessels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Kings County (N. Y.) Pharmaceutical Society, favoring passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Kingston (N. Y.) Local, No. 251, favoring passage of workmen's compensation bill (H. R. 476); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of United Spanish War Veterans, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DEWALT: Petitions of Mohnton Knitting Mill, Allentown Silk Co., James H. Wagner Co., Stony Creek Mills, Louis Kraemer & Co., all of Pennsylvania, favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Memorial of Cigar Makers' Union No. 44, of St. Louis, in favor of the Keating-Owen bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of William McKinley Camp, No. 33, of West Hoboken, N. J., in favor of House bill 54; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Kingston Local, No. 251, favoring the workingmen's compensation bill—H. R. 476; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., favoring submitting the question of railway mail pay to the Interstate Commerce Commission for investigation and report to Congress; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of United Spanish War Veterans, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Corporal William White Camp, No. 4, of Denver, Colo., in favor of House bill 54; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of Chamber of Commerce, Sacramento, Cal., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of American Association for Labor Legislation, New York, favoring House bill 476, workmen's bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Travelers' Protective Association, favoring passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of grape growers of twenty-second district of Ohio, against the Overmyer bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of United Spanish War Veterans, St. Louis, Mo., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce, Sacramento, Cal., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FARR: Petition of Miss F. Roos, corresponding secretary of the City Improvement Association, favoring the enactment of the Keating-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Mrs. R. P. Gleason, president of Century Club, Scranton, Pa., favoring child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of N. K. Younis, M. E. Comerford, L. A. De Groff, and L. A. Larrell, of Scranton, Pa., against censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of Travelers' Protective Association of America, favoring the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of United Spanish War Veterans, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Central Union Labor Council of Greater New York, favoring passage of House bill 6871, relative to convict-labor goods; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of independent retail merchants of Kings County, in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Edgar F. Luckenbach, of New York, favoring bill for regulation of steam vessels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Department of Betterment, of Brooklyn Bureau of Charities, favoring passage of House bill 476, workmen's compensation law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Woman's Republican Club of New York, favoring Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of women of Seventy-six Chapter, Daughters of American Revolution, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Theatrical Protective Union of New York, protesting against tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hins & Frond Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of piano manufacturers of New York, favoring passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Pacific Fisheries Society, of Portland, Oreg., relative to appropriation for commercial fisheries of the Pacific coast; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of Ransom, Ill., favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Free Methodist Church, Belvidere, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARR: Petition of sundry citizens of Scranton, Pa., against Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Association of Eastern Foresters, favoring reenactment of the Weeks law relative to forests of New England; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Ladies' Auxiliary Ancient Order of Hibernians of America, of Holyoke and Revere, Mass., relative to erection of monument in memory of the nuns of the battle field; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GARRETT: Petition of 25 people of Kenton County, Tenn., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Methodist Episcopal Church of Kenton, Tenn., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of the State of Tennessee, favoring enactment of a law prohibiting the sale of whisky in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GORDON: Memorial of J. R. Johnson, protesting against censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Petition of Bennington Hosiery Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS: Petition of Western Implement, Vehicle & Hardware Association, relative to sisal fiber output in Yucatan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAY: Petitions of 538 people of Dayton, Va., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of Santa Cruz Chamber of Commerce, for an emergency appropriation for construction of Government railroad in Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Santa Cruz, relative to congestion of freight at ocean docks; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWELL: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Matilda C. Boulden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: Memorial of Robert Lansing, St. Louis Chapter, American Institute of Architects, protesting against House bill 743; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions of John O. Feeney, of Providence; and Hope Council, No. 398, Knights of Columbus, favoring passage of House bill 4699, to make October 12 of each year a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Universal Winding Co., protesting against Dietrick amendment to the Army appropriation bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID: Petition of citizens of Comstock, Nebr., favoring House joint resolution for congress of neutral nations to promote peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of citizens of Boelus and St. Libory, Nebr., against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of United Spanish War Veterans, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Watertown Chamber of Commerce and Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LOUD: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Charles W. Van Valkenburg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKENZIE: Petitions of 350 people of Polo, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Delaware: Memorial of board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Wilmington, Del., favoring passage of House bill 9673, relative to compulsory pilotage of barges; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Memorial of McFarland Lumber Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., and Howard L. Neff, of Philadelphia, in favor of the Small bill in reference to pilotage of barges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), memorial of James H. Martin and H. C. Deasdorf, of Pittsburgh, against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of Edward A. Pumely, of New York, favoring a change of international law in reference to freedom of the seas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of United Spanish War Veterans, of St. Louis, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of Joseph P. Byers, of Philadelphia, favoring establishment of a home for feeble-minded persons in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), memorial of Travelers' Protective Association, of Omaha, Nebr., and American Fair Trade League, in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), memorial of John B. Andrews, A. A. for L. L., in favor of House bill 476; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of National Pipe and Supplies Association, in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of J. W. Brooker, in favor of changing the pension laws; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also (by request), memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., in favor of submitting the railway mail pay controversy to the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of 75 people of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Painted Post, N. Y., favoring national constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 50 people of the First Baptist Church of Painted Post, N. Y., favoring national constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWE: Petition of Stockton Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Henry Street Settlement, New York, favoring the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SANFORD: Papers to accompany House bill 10195, granting an increase of pension to Merritt D. En Earl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: Memorial of J. H. Layton, Asbury Park; M. L. Pyle, Bradley Beach; P. M. Tague, Asbury Park; L. T. Bennett, Jamesburg; and W. M. Appleby & Son, Old Bridge, all in the State of New Jersey, favoring Stevens-Ayres bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Richard J. Gmen, Long Branch, N. J., favoring resolution ordering embargo upon further shipments of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of Mrs. W. F. Roberts, Mrs. W. H. Harrington, Mrs. Ella McCay, Mrs. Clara M. Wilson, Mrs. Mabel Brannock, Mrs. Annie Jenkins, Mrs. E. B. Hay, Mrs. M. Trimble, Mrs. M. E. Taylor, Lottie Allen, Miss Eveline Delameter, Mrs. R. M. Hinckley, all of Saranac Lake, N. Y., in behalf of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions of Woman's Christian Temperance Association, in Rome and Westmoreland, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: Petition of 502 people of Storm Lake, Iowa, for a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINESS: Memorial of New England Shoe and Leather Association, favoring a nonpartisan tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hope Council, No. 398, Knights of Columbus, of Providence, R. I., favoring the bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of United Spanish War Veterans, favoring national preparedness and an adequate national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Universal Winding Co., of Providence, R. I., protesting against abolishing the Taylor system in Government establishments; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Providence, R. I., favoring extension of the appropriation to continue the purchase of Federal forest reserves in New England; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of citizens of Minnesota, favoring House joint resolution 81, for embargo on munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of sundry citizens of Pasadena, Los Angeles, and Intercollegiate Socialist Society of Los Angeles, Cal., against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Stockton (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway-mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce and Commercial Club of Oakland, Cal., favoring appropriation for two new vessels, for carrying on work of surveying Pacific coast; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Pauline Ames, of Pasadena, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Christopher F. Sweeney, of Boston, Mass., asking for the impeachment of Judge George A. Carpenter, of the United States district court of northern Illinois, eastern division; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Rev. W. C. Lyon and others, of Valley City, N. Dak., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *January 31, 1916.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, millions of hearts turn to Thee day by day in the confident expectation that Thou wilt keep our Nation in safety and in peace. We thank Thee that the heart of the people still beats true to its ancient ideals. We thank Thee for the moral heroism of the people that answer to the challenge of spiritual supremacy. We pray that we may still keep true to those great spiritual revelations that Thou hast made to men and understand that the highest honor lies in the higher realm of life. Do Thou guide us this day and keep us true to the precepts of Thy word. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN GAS LIGHT CO. (S. DOC. NO. 266).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Georgetown Gas Light Co. for the year ended December 31, 1915, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

EAST WASHINGTON HEIGHTS TRACTION CO. (S. DOC. NO. 267).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Co. for the year ended December 31, 1915, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10037) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution providing for the printing or the reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, in two volumes, for the period from March 12, 1914, to December 31, 1915, inclusive, etc., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution providing for the printing and binding of 10,000 copies of the report of the medico-military aspects of the European war, by Surg. A. M. Fauntleroy, United States Navy, etc., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution providing for the printing and binding of 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse, etc., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution providing for the printing and binding of 100,000 copies of the special report on the diseases of cattle, etc., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a memorial to the Congress of the United States from the Corby Co., a yeast manufactory in the District of Columbia. The Chair is in doubt as to the proper disposition of the memorial and will therefore order it to lie on the table.

Mr. WORKS. I have a telegram from William Bayard Hale, of New York, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

NEW YORK, *January 30, 1916.*

Senator WORKS,
Bellevue Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

If the President does not know, as he declared at Cleveland, what any day, yes, or hour, may bring forth, can Congress be too quick in taking action to prepare for crisis? First step would necessarily be to keep ammunition and war supplies at home. If peril of which the President warns country is from direction of England or Japan, we are criminally foolish to continue shipping ammunition to allies. If it is from Germany that peril threatens, it would be absolutely averted if exportation of ammunition to Germany enemies were stopped. In either case, therefore, our own safety and best interests demand immediate embargo on ammunition. If the President feels crisis so imminent as to necessitate dramatic appeal to the people, does it not lie upon Congress to take instant action to conserve the Nation's military resources by forbidding exportation?

WILLIAM BAYARD HALE,
362 Riverside Drive.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I present a resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland, which I ask may be read.

There being no objection, the resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States is engaged in the discussion of ways and means necessary to place and keep the United States of America in its proper position among the first powers of the world; and

Whereas the passage of H. R. 7617 of the House of Representatives of the United States, hereinafter referred to, may result in the construction of one or more post roads through the State of Maryland, much to the benefit of the citizens and taxpayers thereof: Therefore be it

Resolved by the members of the House of the General Assembly of Maryland, That the United States Senators and Members of Congress from this State be, and are hereby, urged and requested to aid and cooperate in the passage by Congress of H. R. 7617, known as the rural post roads bill:

Further resolved, That the chief clerk of this house be, and he is hereby, instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each United States Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from this State.

Mr. MYERS. I present a petition signed by the teacher and pupils of the Spring Hill School, Polson, Mont., for an appropriation of $1,000,000 for the Flathead reclamation project in that State. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD, together with the name of the teacher of the school, and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the President and Congress of the United States:

We the undersigned members of the Spring Hill Schoolhouse do respectfully petition the President and Congress of the United States that an appropriation of at least $1,000,000 be granted by this session of Congress for work on the Flathead irrigation project for the ensuing year. It is quite essential that a substantial appropriation be made for this purpose so that the work may be expedited and an early completion of the project be assured.

We most earnestly urge that the settlers and Indians holding land under this project get the appropriation they are asking for.

Respectfully submitted.

GRACE GADARD, *Teacher*
(And many others).

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of Jeannette Mathew Lord, of Hanover, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the petition of E. E. Wells, of Lebanon Springs, N. Y., praying for a continuation of the appropriations for the purchase of forest reserves in the Appalachian Mountains, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of Joseph Wild & Co., of New York City, N. Y., and a petition of the Nassau Felt Mills, of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a petition of 600 citizens of Elkhart, Ind., and a petition of 400 citizens of Plainfield, Ind., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of Kent Chapter, Michigan Society Sons of the American Revolution, of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for an appropriation for the construction of a national archives building in Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of Grand Traverse Grange, No. 379, Patrons of Husbandry, of Traverse City, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide Government inspec-

tion of the quantity and quality of fruit at shipping point, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Minnesota Historical Society, praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a national archives building at Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. LANE presented a telegram, in the nature of a petition, from the City Council of Portland, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the disposition of certain land grants in the Bull Run Reserve, Oreg., which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. KENYON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Dyersville, Iowa, praying for the placing of an embargo on munitions of war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of Lady Sherman Council, No. 15, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, of Shelton, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the Connecticut Retail Wine, Liquor & Beer Dealers' Association, of New Haven, Conn., remonstrating against an increase in the tax on intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the German-American Alliance of New Haven, Conn., remonstrating against the seizures of American mail by the British Government, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Admiral Bunce Section, Navy League of the United States, of Hartford, Conn., praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Finance, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 53) for the relief of the Eldredge Bros. Live Stock Co., a corporation (Rept. No. 98); and

A bill (S. 54) to provide for the refunding of certain moneys illegally assessed and collected in the district of Utah (Rept. No. 99).

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to present a favorable report from the Committee on Education and Labor upon the bill (S. 703) to provide for the promotion of vocational education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture and the trades and industries; to provide for cooperation with the States in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure; and I submit a report (No. 97) thereon.

In this connection I wish to call attention to the fact that in the report we express especially our appreciation of the splendid work that has been done for this measure by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER POWER.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I desire to submit the views of the minority (S. Rept. 66, pt. 2) on the bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes, which I ask may be received and printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be printed.

REPORT ON AERONAUTICS.

Mr. FLETCHER. From the Committee on Printing I report back favorably, with amendments, Senate resolution 44 to provide for the printing of the appendices to the report of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The amendments were, in line 1, before the word "Report," to strike out the words "appendices to the," and in line 4, after the word "document," to insert a comma and the words "together with the accompanying appendices and illustrations," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the report of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitted with the President's message of December 15, 1915, be printed as a Senate document, together with the accompanying appendices and illustrations.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 4071) to establish the University of the United States; to the Committee on the University of the United States.

By Mr. FALL:

A bill (S. 4072) authorizing the State of New Mexico to convey to the United States lands in the national forests in said State and select other lands therefor; and

A bill (S. 4073) granting certain lands within the State of New Mexico to said State for specific purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 4074) granting a pension to Miguel Archuleta (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4075) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Messer (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4076) granting a pension to John C. Wolters (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 4077) granting a pension to Charles H. Craddock (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4078) granting a pension to Herman L. Shank (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 4079) for the relief of William Ramsey and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 4080) granting a pension to Einer Bjarnson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4081) granting a pension to Charles Groves (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 4082) for the relief of the heirs of J. A. Reece; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4083) granting a pension to A. J. Holden; and

A bill (S. 4084) granting a pension to Augusta P. Marrs; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 4085) to establish a Coast Guard station on the coast of Louisiana, in the vicinity of Barataria Bay; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 4086) to provide for the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy, and to prevent the spread of leprosy in the United States; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 4087) for the relief of James L. McCulloch; and

A bill (S. 4088) to provide for the exchange with the State of Oregon of certain school lands and indemnity rights within the national forests of that State for an equal area of national-forest land; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 4089) granting an increase of pension to Henry Collett (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 4090) granting an increase of pension to Diantha K. Dickey (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4091) granting a pension to Virginia R. Coates (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 4092) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Bugbey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Maryland:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 93) authorizing the erection on the public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a statue of James Buchanan, a former President of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

OIL AND GAS LANDS.

Mr. PHELAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 406) to authorize the exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SUTHERLAND submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $1,683.96 to reimburse the board of education of Boxelder County, Utah, for the education of 23 Indian pupils at the Waskakie School, Boxelder County, during the school year 1913–1914, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appro-

priation bill (H. R. 10385), which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESS BY HON. PAUL M. WARBURG.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a public document the speech of Hon. Paul M. Warburg, delivered before the New York Credit Men's Association, in New York City, on the evening of January 25, 1916. I ask that the address be referred to the Committee on Printing with a view to its publication.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The address will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 10037. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORTS OF THE ALASKAN ENGINEERING COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 610, PT. 2).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (No. 11) of the House of Representatives, which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, in two volumes, for the period from March 12, 1914, to December 31, 1915, inclusive, together with accompanying maps, charts, and profiles, be printed as a House document and that 6,000 additional copies be printed, of which 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 1,500 copies for the use of the Senate, and 1,500 copies for the use of the commission.

MEDICO-MILITARY ASPECTS OF EUROPEAN WAR.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (No. 12) of the House of Representatives, which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound 10,000 copies of the Report on the Medico-Military Aspects of the European War, by Surg. A. M. Fauntleroy, United States Navy, 6,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 3,000 for the use of the Senate and 1,000 copies for the use of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the Navy Department.

REPORT ON DISEASES OF THE HORSE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (No. 13) of the House of Representatives, which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse, the same to be first revised and brought to date under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, 70,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 30,000 for the use of the Senate.

REPORT ON DISEASES OF CATTLE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (No. 14) of the House of Representatives, which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle, the same to be first revised and brought to date under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, 70,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 30,000 copies for the use of the Senate.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS—EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, Senate resolution 74, authorizing the Senate Committee on Public Lands at any time during the session, or any subcommittee thereof, to have hearings and have the hearings taken down by a stenographer, as it may see fit, is on the calendar. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution. The services may be needed at any time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate resolution 74?

Mr. SMOOT. In this connection, I wish to ask the Senator from Montana if he will allow me to include all similar resolutions on the calendar authorizing committees of the Senate to employ stenographers?

Mr. MYERS. I have no objection whatever.

Mr. SMOOT. There are quite a number of them on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Senate proceeded to consider Senate resolution 74, which had been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with an amendment, to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*" and insert:

That the Committee on Public Lands, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The Senate proceeded to consider Senate resolution 69, which had been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with an amendment to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*" and insert:

That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The Senate proceeded to consider Senate resolution 73, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor with an amendment, to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*" and insert:

That the Committee on Education and Labor, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The Senate proceeded to consider Senate resolution 63, which had been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with an amendment, to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*" and insert:

That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to inquire whether there is a limitation as to the price to be paid per printed page?

The VICE PRESIDENT. One dollar per printed page.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That clause is in all the substitutes, I understand?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in all of them. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The Senate proceeded to consider Senate resolution 46, which had been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with an amendment, to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*" and insert:

That the Committee on Woman Suffrage, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The Senate proceeded to consider Senate resolution 49, which had been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with an amendment, to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*" and insert:

That the Committee on Appropriations, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution 43, which is a resolution introduced by myself some time ago, providing for an investigation into the freight congestion at the port of New York.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I move to substitute for that a motion to take up Senate joint resolution 60, Order of Business 33, which has been under consideration for some time. It is a joint resolution creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee.

I will state, Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. A motion to amend the motion of the Senator from Montana is not in order. The only question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Montana to proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution 43, and that must be voted on.

Mr. SMOOT. Unanimous consent was not given.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it is a motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, of course the motion is not debatable, and I do not undertake to debate it. I should like to know what is the subject matter of the resolution in order to vote intelligently.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is Senate resolution 43, for the appointment of a committee to investigate and inquire into the causes of the existing freight blockade and embargoes on the trunk-line railroads entering into the port of New York. The question is on the motion to take up the resolution.

The question being put, there were on a division—ayes 12, noes 22.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is lost.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2520.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the first bill on the calendar, and it is the regular order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask the Senator to withhold his motion until I get a unanimous-consent agreement, if possible, concerning the unfinished business.

I ask unanimous consent that beginning to-morrow all speeches on the Philippine government bill, and amendments thereto, shall be limited to 10 minutes each.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I demand the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, in view of that objection, I must state now that I shall take every proper parliamentary method to press the bill to an early vote. I certainly have been as easy-going as possible——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, that is not the regular order. I have asked for the regular order. I do not think the Senator ought to be allowed to make a speech after the regular order has been demanded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will proceed with the calendar under Rule VIII.

LANDS IN NEVADA.

The bill (S. 2520) granting to the State of Nevada 7,000,000 acres of land in said State for the use and benefit of the public schools of Nevada and the State University of the State of Nevada was announced as first in order on the calendar.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah objects to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. PITTMAN. I imagine that the Senator's objection is made on the ground that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] desires to speak on the bill. I want to say to the Senator from Utah that I have seen the Senator from New Mexico since the last objection was made by the Senator from Utah, and the Senator from New Mexico stated that he had no further objection to the bill coming up, and that he did not intend to speak on it.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, Mr. President, I shall not object to its consideration; but I want to speak on the bill itself, and I might as well do so now as at any other time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be, and are hereby, granted to the State of Nevada 7,000,000 acres of land in said State for the use and benefit of the public schools of Nevada and the State university of the State of Nevada.

SEC. 2. That the lands herein granted shall be selected by the State authorities of said State from any unappropriated nonmineral public land in said State in quantities not less than the smallest legal subdivision; and when selected in conformity with the terms of this act the same shall be duly certified to said State by the Commissioner of the General Land Office and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Upon such certification the title to such land shall be deemed to have vested in the State of Nevada as of the date of selection.

SEC. 3. That the land herein granted shall be disposed of under such laws, rules, and regulations as may now or hereafter be prescribed by the Legislature of the State of Nevada not inconsistent herewith: *Provided*, That any citizen of the United States shall be entitled to purchase not more than 640 acres and not less than 40 acres of such land.

SEC. 4. That the proceeds arising from the use, disposal, or sale of said lands, or any part thereof, shall be for the use and benefit of the public schools of Nevada and the State university of the State of Nevada in the following proportion, to wit: Eighty per cent of such proceeds for the use and benefit of the public schools of Nevada and 20 per cent of such proceeds for the use and benefit of the State university of the State of Nevada.

SEC. 5. That the proceeds of such sale shall be placed in a special fund for the sole use and benefit of the public schools of Nevada and the State university of the State of Nevada, and whenever there are $20,000 in the fund such moneys shall be immediately invested in interest-bearing bonds, notes, or securities of the United States, the State of Nevada, or any other State of the Union, or of any county in the State of Nevada, subject to the supervision and approval of the State board of revenue.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the bill in order to perfect it before its consideration is proceeded with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. In section 3, page 2, line 7, after the words "disposed of," I move to insert "to citizens of the United States by sale to the highest bidder at public auction upon due notice"; and at the end of the section I move also to add the words "under the terms and in the manner provided in this bill."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me that that is an unwise provision to put into the law. If the lands shall be sold in that way, they will be forced upon the market; and it occurs to me that in a great many instances they will be apt to bring a very small price.

Mr. PITTMAN. It is my intention to also offer a further amendment to the bill limiting the price to $1.25 an acre.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is, that no land shall be sold for less than $1.25 an acre?

Mr. PITTMAN. That no land shall be sold for less than $1.25 an acre. I will insert the amendment at the same point at which I have proposed my first amendment, though I had intended to offer it in another place. I move to add to my amendment the words "and at not less than $1.25 an acre."

Mr. WALSH. I desire to inquire of the Senator from Nevada if he thinks the limitation on the price which he has offered is sufficiently high? When the four States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington were admitted to the Union they got the usual grants of land. By the provisions of the acts of admission they were prohibited from disposing of any of those lands at less than $10 an acre. That act was passed in the year 1889, now nearly 27 years ago. The grant has been handled with very wise economy, so that the grant to our university has produced for the State—and only about one-half of it has been disposed of—something over $16 per acre.

Now, it occurs to me that Nevada would be placed at a most decided disadvantage by this proposition. I do not now recall what limit was placed in the enabling act admitting the State of Utah or of Idaho, but my recollection is that the same limitation was placed in those acts.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As I recall, there was no limitation in the enabling act admitting Utah, but I think personally that it was a very unfortunate thing that there was not such limitation.

Mr. SMOOT. There was, however, a limitation of $10 per acre in Idaho.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I decline to yield until I answer the question of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. Then I shall be very glad to yield for any other statement or for any other question.

The conditions in the State of Montana are entirely different from the conditions in the State of Nevada. The climatic conditions are entirely different, in the first place, as is shown by the Geological Survey and by the Department of Agriculture. The rainfall in Montana is much greater than it is in the State of Nevada. The number of flowing streams in Montana is much greater than in the State of Nevada. The State of Nevada unfortunately has a very limited quantity of water. The best land in that State has been selected heretofore. In fact, as I had occasion once before to state to this body, most of the land in the State at the present time is only valuable for grazing purposes, unless through the aid of private capital we are enabled to develop our unknown supplies of subsurface water.

It is true that some of this land may be worth more than $1.25 an acre. The State will undoubtedly make rules and regulations governing the sale of this land. I have included in the bill a provision for a sale at public auction, because there

is nothing that determines the value of land so much as competitive bidding. While a great deal of this land may be worth more than $1.25 an acre, I am afraid that a large quantity of it will only be worth $1.25 an acre or less, so far as that is concerned.

The State is as sincerely interested in this matter as is this Congress. If the State can be protected in the disposal of that land until it has an opportunity to legislate with regard to it, then no Member of this body need fear that the State of Nevada is going to sacrifice its public domain. I want to say that I have absolute confidence in the ability and integrity of the people of the State of Nevada. I am satisfied that they know more concerning the value of the public lands in that State than any Member of this body knows, and therefore I do not think it is right for us, without any knowledge of the character of the land, without any knowledge of the conditions in that State, to attempt to impose a condition upon them that may make this grant absolutely useless.

It seems to me that when you put a minimum of $1.25 an acre on the land and, in addition to that, provide that when there is an application under this bill to purchase 640 acres, those 640 acres shall be put up at public auction on due notice, there is little chance of a man getting 640 acres for less than its value. That is my theory of it, and I hope that it will be left in this way, because I should dislike very much to find that probably half of this land was only fit for grazing land and was only worth $1.25 an acre, and that there should be a limit put on it under which we could not sell it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Montana whether the limitation to which he referred was in the Federal act making the grant to Montana or in the State legislation of Montana?

Mr. WALSH. It was in the Federal act making the grant. It is in the enabling act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there is another matter in this connection that I desire to suggest to the Senator from Nevada, which will perhaps be of more particular interest to him.

The grant is of land nonmineral in character, and only land so classified at the time of the selection will pass by virtue of the grant; yet we all know that in the case of many acres of these lands it is subsequently discovered that they are mineral in character. The State of Montana, for instance, has acquired a large area of lands which were in fact nonmineral at the time they were selected. The title has passed to the State, but it has since been discovered that many of these lands are mineral in character, and we have endeavored in our State to give a preference right to those who make discoveries upon these lands, the same as is granted to those who make discoveries upon the general body of the public domain. Under the provision of the amendment which the Senator now proposes, his State will be without power to do that, because the lands must be put up for sale at public auction, and they must go to the one who bids the highest. The result will be that, if a prospector goes on this body of State land and after laborious effort discovers a body of valuable minerals, he can not acquire title to the land; but the State must put it up for sale at public auction; and some man who is richer in the world's goods than he is gets away with the result of his enterprise and his energy. I have no doubt in the world that many acres of these lands that are now classified as agricultural and are agricultural, or rather nonmineral, will be found to contain valuable deposits of nonmetallic minerals, such as potash and other deposits of that character. I should think the Senator would like to preserve to the prospectors of his State the opportunity to locate those lands substantially as lands upon the public domain are located.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, this bill preserves any rights that a prospector might have. The bill goes on further and provides for the selection of 7,000,000 acres of land. After that is done a citizen of the United States may make a selection of 640 acres; and when the selection of that land is made its mineral character is determined. If it is mineral in character it is not subject to the grant; if it is not found to be mineral in character at that time, there is no prospector on there with any mining rights and no prospector can be injured. If subsequent to the purchase of this ground it is determined to be mineral ground, the discovery is due to the man who purchases and not to any prospector.

This bill goes on further and provides that the land may be sold, subject to such rules, regulations, and laws as the legislature may make, with a limitation that it shall not be sold for less than $1.25 an acre, that there shall not be over 640 acres sold to any one person, that it shall be sold to citizens of the United States, and that it shall be sold at public auction to the highest bidder whenever an application for a certain tract is made. It does not mean that this whole body of 7,000,000 acres of land is to be put up at public auction and sold; it simply means that when a selection of 640 acres is made by a citizen of the United States, before he or she shall be allowed to purchase it it shall be advertised and he shall be compelled to pay the competitive price for those 640 acres.

If a prospector has discovered mineral on that ground, it is not subject to selection. If there are some undiscovered minerals in that ground, the purchaser acquires them; but if a purchaser could never acquire any ground by reason of the fact that there might be some undiscovered minerals under it, it would be practically impossible for us to ever operate in our public-land States.

I have just as much interest for the prospector as has the Senator from Montana; and if I could conceive in any way that any prospector in our State was going to be injured by any provision of this bill I would gladly remedy it, just as the Senator from Montana would; but I do not see that it affects the prospector at all.

So far as the possibility of obtaining mineral land under this bill is concerned, I want to say that in my opinion it is negligible. The minerals in our State are found in the mountains of our State; they are not found in the valleys. The mountains of our State to-day are nearly every one of them in a timber reserve, and none of the land under this bill can be selected from a timber reserve.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I listened to the reading of the amendment, and at the present moment I am not in harmony with the amendment. It occurs to me that the section as drawn and in the bill is preferable to the section as it would be if amended. Certainly, if the State is to be trusted with these lands, it seems to me the legislature of the State is the proper body to deal with them; and it seems to me this is a limitation on the legislature that ought not to be in the bill. I very much prefer the bill as it was originally drawn and reported from the committee.

Mr. PITTMAN. It was my intention, in drawing the bill, to leave the matter entirely to the management of the State authorities—the legislature, in other words. I find, however, that there is upon the statute books of the State of Nevada at the present time a law which is active in futuro, under which this 7,000,000 acres of land might be taken possession of and disposed of before the legislature could again meet. The amendment that I have placed there would protect the land until the next meeting of the legislature, because there would be no provision except for its sale at public auction.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, could not that be remedied by making the operation of the act take place at some future date?

Mr. PITTMAN. It could be done, yes; but instead of delaying this matter for a year, until the legislature can meet, I would prefer that, at least, we work under the old law, which simply provides a system of selection and sale, by imposing upon that statutory law the limitation as to price and as to competitive bidding.

I do not think this competitive system of purchase is objectionable to any of the people of my State. It is a matter that has been discussed there for years. Every one in the State realizes that we made a mistake in the disposal of the 2,000,000 acres of land that we have heretofore received from the United States. We made a mistake in the method. We know we could have gotten more; and I may say to the Senator that unless I had been satisfied that the competitive system of fixing the price of land was satisfactory to the people in our State I would not have offered the amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Nevada, if he will yield to me. Is it the purpose of the bill to allow an alien, or a corporation not a citizen of the United States, to purchase land in any quantity?

Mr. PITTMAN. No; it is not.

Mr. CUMMINS. That would be the effect of the bill as it is now written.

Mr. PITTMAN. If it is, I should like to have the Senator correct it.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator will observe that the proviso of section 3 is as follows:

Provided, That any citizen of the United States shall be entitled to purchase not more than 640 acres and not less than 40 acres of such land.

I assume that that means that no citizen of the United States shall be entitled to purchase more than 640 acres, but there is no limitation or restriction upon the right of the State to sell to an alien, or a corporation not a citizen of the United States, any amount.

Mr. PITTMAN. I will state to the Senator that that portion of this bill is contained in nearly every other grant in all the States, and I assumed that it had had a legal construction. The language is not original in this bill. It is copied from the prior grants.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa perhaps has not heard the pending amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. No; I have heard the pending amendment only so far as it relates to the notice and auction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will restate the pending amendment.

The SECRETARY. Section 3 reads:

That the land herein granted shall be disposed of—

After the word "of," it is proposed to insert—

To citizens of the United States, by sale to the highest bidder at public auction, upon due notice, and at not less than $1.25 per acre.

Mr. CUMMINS. The amendment would correct the defect that I thought was plainly obvious in the proviso, although it seems to me the proviso ought to be changed so as to read "that no citizen of the United States shall be entitled to purchase more than 640 acres," instead of saying "that any citizen of the United States shall be entitled to purchase not more than 640 acres." It is not true that any citizen is entitled to purchase 640 acres. It could not be true.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PITTMAN. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I will state to the Senator from Iowa that the land, if granted to the State under this bill, will not be subject to the land laws of the United States, and therefore it could be that any citizen of the United States shall be entitled to purchase any specified quantity. But what I wanted particularly to call the Senator's attention to was that the bill does not prohibit 20 different citizens of the United States from buying 640 acres of land each, and immediately transferring their purchases to any citizen of the United States or to any corporation.

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly not; but the future consolidation of the land was not in my mind when I made the objection. I did not know anything about that; but it was plain to me that there was no limitation in the bill as reported, except as against a citizen, and of course it is not true that any citizen is entitled to buy 640 acres, because we have something like 100,000,000 citizens, and there are only 7,000,000 acres of this land. I assume that it was meant that no citizen shall buy more than 640 acres.

Mr. PITTMAN. As I stated to the Senator, I never gave any careful consideration to this part of the proviso, as it had been included in the original draft of the bill, and has been in operation for some 25 or 30 years, and I imagined that its construction was understood. I would suggest this amendment to that proviso:

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is an amendment pending now.

Mr. PITTMAN. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that I will correct that with an amendment later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must inquire whether this debate is to proceed under the five-minute rule, or whether the Senate will just set the rule aside and permit discussion ad libitum. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada a question. I understand that this bill is a proposition to turn over 7,000,000 acres of Government land to the State of Nevada, the proceeds of the sale of the land to be used for specific purposes. That is the purpose of the bill, is it not?

Mr. PITTMAN. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. WEEKS. Is there any reason why similar legislation should not apply to every State where there are Government lands?

Mr. PITTMAN. It has been done already, and in about three times the quantity that this bill asks for.

Mr. WEEKS. Is there any reason why the Government should turn over to the State of Nevada, we will say, the equivalent of $7,000,000, which would not apply to its turning that amount of money over to any State for educational purposes?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes, sir; there is every reason, which I will endeavor to explain a little bit farther along in my remarks on this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I might as well say what I have to say on this bill now as at any other time.

The Senators will notice in the report the statement that the object of the bill is—

To grant to the State of Nevada sufficient lands to make up a deficiency in the land grants heretofore made to the State under the policies and practices of the Government. The bill simply seeks to have the State of Nevada, with regard to the public lands within its borders, treated with the same justice that has been meted out to the other public-land States.

In the same report, Mr. President, on page 2, are given the grants in acres to Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

The Senator has just made the statement that if the grant of 7,000,000 acres were made to Nevada at this time, it would not be equal to the grant to any other State, and that all other States had been granted three times as much. Of course, I think the Senator spoke hurriedly, without due consideration.

Mr. PITTMAN. I think I said approximately three times as much had been granted to the other States.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator will notice that as to some of the States named here that statement would not be accurate. For instance, Washington was granted 3,000,000 acres; Wyoming, 4,000,000 acres; Oregon, 4,000,000 acres; South Dakota, 3,000,000 acres; and I could go on with all of the other States, but it is not necessary.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one moment?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, sir.

Mr. FALL. In this same table there is shown as a donation to the State of New Mexico something like 12,000,000 acres. That is not entirely correct. It is, however, only following along the general plan of bookkeeping or memorandom making in the Department of the Interior. As a matter of fact, the direct appropriations to New Mexico were less than one-third that amount.

As it happened, in New Mexico there were numerous Spanish land grants which had been confirmed by the Congress of the United States long prior to the admission of the State, and long before the State had any voice on the floor of this branch of Congress, and only a voice in the House. In lieu of the school sections upon those Spanish grants, and in lieu of the school sections embraced in Indian reserves and other reserves, certain lands were granted to New Mexico; the usual State grants being certain designated sections in the townships, going to all the States equally, and not included in this table with reference to the other States as are the direct donations. But in the case of New Mexico and Arizona, both, the department here has included not only the donations but also the lieu-land selections. But it is just as absolutely incorrect, as showing a comparison of the donations of land, as are all the methods of bookkeeping and all the other statements of the Department of the Interior, as far as I have been able to discover by a pretty thorough research of the reports of the department.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question before he sits down?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield for a question.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Do I understand the Senator to say that the Department of the Interior has included certain lands twice over? For instance, where sections 16 and 36 are included in a reserve, is that counted as 1,280 acres, and in addition to that 1,280 acres outside?

Mr. FALL. No; I do not mean that. The Senator misunderstood me. What I mean is that in this tabulation, which is taken from a tabulation of the Department of the Interior, they are shown as donations to the State.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. But I understand that that is true of all the other States.

Mr. FALL. No; I think not.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. For instance, I understand that the school lands are included in each of these States.

Mr. FALL. No; not in many of them which I have examined. In many of them the tabulation does not include the school lands at all.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, just let me interrupt there. The tabulation that we have here was made under the direction of the Commissioner of the General Land Office at my request and contains every form of disposal to the State of public lands. I do not care in what form it was, whether it was lieu-land selection or not. Then there is a system of percentages worked out as to the amount of the public lands that the States have acquired in proportion to the total area of the States.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Then, if the Senator will allow me, my impression was correct that in each one of these States the table includes the so-called school sections.

Mr. PITTMAN. It does.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That is what I understood, and for that reason I asked the question.

Mr. FALL. I do not so understand.

Mr. PITTMAN. I think the Senator is mistaken, because I have investigated that since, and it is the statement they gave me.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Members of the Senate now will look on page 2 of the report, they will find the amount of acres granted to each of the States. The State of Colorado received 4,000,000 acres, the State of Idaho 3,000,000, the State of Montana 5,000,000, the State of Nebraska 3,000,000. Far be it from me to try to withhold from the State of Nevada anything that would place her on an equal footing with other States; but I do not believe it is the proper and right thing to pass a bill granting her lands far exceeding that of every other State in the way of land grants, which this bill will do if it passes, granting 7,000,000 acres.

Not only that, Mr. President; the bill itself gives privileges to the State in the selection of the land that no other State in the Union has had. I call attention to section 2:

> The lands herein granted shall be selected by the State authorities of said State from any unappropriated nonmineral public land in said State in quantities not less than the smallest legal subdivision.

The Senator made the statement a while ago that they could not select timbered lands under this bill. Mr. President, they can select timbered lands under this bill.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator undoubtedly does not intend to misconstrue the bill there; but it says, "Unappropriated public lands," and God knows everything in our State that has got a sagebrush on it has been put in a forest reserve.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I did not say anything about the forest reserves; and I want to say to the Senator here that all the lands that are prohibited from being selected by the State under this bill are nonmineral lands. Again, in that same section, it says:

> Upon such certification the title to such land shall be deemed to have vested in the State of Nevada as of the date of selection.

Mr. President, the school lands granted to the State of Utah and to all of the other Western States are lands in place. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that certain of these school lands have been sold by the State of Utah to individuals 10 or more years ago, and no one suspected that there were minerals in them; and to-day in the courts of the United States there are suits brought by the United States claiming that those lands never should have passed to the State, and the Government is trying to recover them after they have been developed by individuals who purchased the land from the State.

Mr. PITTMAN. Does the Senator know any way by which we can prevent a suit from being brought? Can the Senator suggest any language?

Mr. SMOOT. I know that this bill provides that as soon as the lands are selected the certificates of title to the land shall be deemed to have been vested in the State of Nevada as of the date of selection.

Mr. PITTMAN. What other language has ever been used in a grant?

Mr. SMOOT. This has never been used in any grant.

Mr. PITTMAN. When does the title vest under any grant?

Mr. SMOOT. That all depends on the wording of the grant.

Mr. PITTMAN. When did the railroad land grant vest title? When did the title of the State lands in your State vest?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Government is successful in its suit, we can not tell when title of school lands will vest.

Mr. PITTMAN. You tried to have them vested at some time, did you not?

Mr. SMOOT. We thought that they were vested in the States, and now the Government says they are not.

Mr. PITTMAN. I know, but you did your best to have the title vest in some definite period. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. I am only saying that this bill gives to Nevada, as far as that provision is concerned, an advantage over every Western State receiving land grants. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. PITTMAN. Would you not like to have your State——

Mr. SMOOT. If that was the intention, I would like to have had it.

Mr. PITTMAN. In the case of the grants made heretofore you would like to have had it, would you not?

Mr. SMOOT. I think it ought to be.

Mr. PITTMAN. You are complaining now because suit has been brought against some of this land on the ground that the title has not passed.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Nevada is asking for a grant of 7,000,000 acres, in order, as he says, that Nevada may be equal with the other land-grant States, but with the provision referred to she would not only be equal but more than equal in securing title from the Government, but the number of acres granted will be greater.

Mr. PITTMAN. I do not know that I understand the Senator, but is the Senator objecting to the number of acres that are requested to be granted to Nevada on the ground that Nevada does not need it or on the ground that his State has not been treated as well?

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; I am objecting for this reason: In any legislation that the Government grants additional land to the public-land States it ought to treat all public-land States alike. I do not think the Senator will deny that.

Mr. PITTMAN. I have not.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, let us see, Mr. President, if this bill does that. We will consider it first on the basis of population. There were 81,875 people in Nevada.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. When?

Mr. SMOOT. In 1910, the last census. There were 74,206 whites, 513 negroes, 5,240 Indians, 927 Chinese, 864 Japanese, and 55 nonclassified.

This means, Mr. President, that for every white man, woman, and child in the State of Nevada the grant would be on a basis of 95 acres for each. This, Mr. President, means that 7,000,000 acres of land granted to the State of Nevada, in which there are 23,677 families, will amount to 296 acres for every family in the State.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Utah, I suppose, recognizes that Nevada has only the title of 2,723,000 acres, as against about 6,000,000 acres for the State of Idaho, 6,000,000 acres for my own State, and 7,414,000 acres for the State represented by the Senator now speaking. About how many acres does the Senator from Utah think it would be fair to accord to Nevada?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will wait a moment, I am coming to that.

Mr. President, in relation to the 7,000,000 acres granted to the State of Utah that grant included sections 2, 16, 32, and 36 within the State, and most of the land is mountainous land. The Senator from Montana knows that the greater portion of the State of Utah is mountainous. The grant included those four sections, and as stated before the greater part is mountainous land, whereas if this bill passes and 7,000,000 acres of land are granted to Nevada the State of Nevada can select any lands within the State that are nonmineral, giving it every advantage in selections over grants to all the other Western States. The State of Montana was granted sections 16 and 36 in place, and was compelled to take the land within those sections whether they were in the valley or on the mountain tops. Montana had no right to select her granted land in the way provided for in this bill. Therefore this bill is not placing Nevada upon the same footing with other Western States. It is placing Nevada in a much more favorable position.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if he can inform us what percentage of the grant to Utah or to the other States was of the specified sections that required no selection? There were something over 7,000,000 acres of land granted to the State of Utah. In that grant there were included four sections in each township for school purposes.

Mr. WALSH. I have the figures here.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. What proportion of the whole grant was included in the school sections?

Mr. SMOOT. I have not the exact figures here.

Mr. WALSH. The State of Utah got sections 2, 16, 32, and 36. That aggregates 5,444,000. The total number of acres is 7,414,000.

Mr. SMOOT. So the State of Utah, outside of the school sections, got about 2,000,000 acres of land. The University of Utah thought it was granted the saline lands within the State. The University of Utah has been denied them. The university made a selection, through the State, for the saline lands of the State. They were denied by the Government. A suit was started and carried to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Supreme Court held that the saline lands should not go to the university.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, then, under this bill, it is perfectly evident we can not get any saline land, is it not?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. PITTMAN. That is that much protection.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not discussing the question of the protection to the Government.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, so that we may understand the matter clearly, the State of Utah got the poor sections for

school purposes, and, as the Senator rightly says, much of it is mountainous; but my understanding is that the great portion of it is within forest reserves in the State of the Senator, and under the ruling of the department they would be entitled to select, in lieu of those, valley lands, would they not?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, no law has been passed granting that right. Before the Public Lands Committee several times there were bills to that effect, and also in the House of Representatives, but none has ever been passed.

Mr. WALSH. I understood the Senator to say that the ruling of the department has thus far been that the grant did not pass to the State, and therefore these areas could be included within forest reserves, giving the State the right to select lands. If that is correct, then the State of Utah has the opportunity to select lands that may aggregate 5,000,000 acres.

Mr. SMOOT. The mineral lands that I spoke of were within the school sections, and they were sold by the State to individuals who developed coal mines upon them, and they have been in operation for 10 or 12 years.

Mr. WALSH. But the question I addressed to the Senator is——

Mr. SMOOT. They would have no right to make a selection outside even if the Forest Service was in favor of it.

I think, Mr. President, the Senator knows that wherever there is a piece of land within a forest reserve that is owned by an individual there has to be a special act of Congress in order to have it exchanged for public lands outside the forest reserve. There is a bill upon the calendar now that I reported to this body on Saturday for that very purpose. We have passed at least a dozen in the Senate of the United States within the last two or three years. That is the only way the exchange can be made. There is no law to-day under which the Secretary of the Interior can give title to a piece of land outside of a forest reserve on the public domain for land within a forest reserve owned by an individual.

Mr. WALSH. Then, as I understand the Senator, he contends that under the present practice the State of Utah is not entitled to select lands in lieu of those in a forest reserve.

Mr. SMOOT. The State of Utah is not entitled to do so.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wish to ask the Senator if this is to allow the State authorities themselves to make the selection without any reference to what the owner of the public land might think about it? In other words——

Mr. SMOOT. There are land grants to State institutions outside of the school sections. In such cases the individual citizen makes his selection, and then the request by the State is made to the Interior Department that his selection be approved and charged to the particular State institution's grant the selection is made under——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Then the process by which the result is accomplished is not that 7,000,000 acres are selected at once by the State authorities, and then certified by the commissioner of the land office, but nothing is done until the individual selects the part he wants to buy from the State, and then the State selects it. Would not that process have some bearing as to when the title ought to vest in the State?

Mr. SMOOT. This bill provides when it shall vest.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I know it does; but there is a difference of opinion between the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Utah as to whether the title shall pass as of the time of the selection or of the time of certification. I gather that the Senator from Nevada wanted some definite time fixed when the title should vest. It occurred to me, as this process is one perhaps of a considerable period of time, it would suit the purpose of the Senator from Nevada and obviate the objection of the Senator from Utah, if the bill should provide that the title shall vest as of the time when the certification by the Commissioner of the Land Office was filed.

Mr. PITTMAN. It would make no difference.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understand the Senator now to say that it would make no difference. It seems to me it would be better to have the title remain in the Government until the Commissioner of the Land Office had certified that it was approved by the Government at the request of the State.

Mr. BORAH and Mr. FALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SIMMONS in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. FALL. I desire to refer to the matter to which the Senator from Connecticut called attention.

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FALL. I simply desire to say that the courts of the United States have passed upon this identical proposition, that these are grants in presenti, and that the approval of the Secretary of the Interior of the selection, as made by the State authorities, is the acceptance of the title that is of the State, and to obtain that approval it is necessary that the location of the lands should have the approval of different departments of the Government, particularly the Geologic Department, which has charge of the mining industry.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Then the Senator agrees with me that the present provisions of the bill would be a departure from the ordinary procedure?

Mr. FALL. I think it might be possibly. I have not studied that part out.

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I think that the present provision of the bill is in exact accord with the decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. FALL. That is my impression.

Mr. BORAH. The first decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on this subject was one which came up from Nevada, in which a similar provision of the law was included, and they held that the title vested as of the date of the selection on the part of the State.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If that is true, then it would do so without the provision in the bill. If it is the usual provision, I have no objection to it. I was asking for information, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, what I do say is that this land grant to the State of Nevada gives Nevada an advantage, for this reason: All other land-grant States had to take the school sections in place wherever they fell, and the Government of the United States holds now that if the school sections are sold by a State to an individual and it develops later that the lands are mineral in character, the title never passed to the State, and the sale void, even after the lapse of 10 years. There is a suit now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States involving this very question. I will say to the Senator that the lower courts have so held; and if the Supreme Court of the United States sustains the lower courts in their contention, of course the result will be as I stated.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; if the Supreme Court should do so.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that is what the Supreme Court will do.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If I do not interrupt the Senator. If I do I will not ask the question.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I have no objection.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am seeking the information because I am not so familiar with this question as a Senator who comes from a public-land State. Is it usual to allow the States themselves to make the selections entirely without the Government doing it?

Mr. SMOOT. The State makes the selection upon application of a citizen. The selection is referred to the Interior Department for approval, and an examination is made by the Interior Department and then by the Forest Service and then by the Geological Survey, and so forth.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I know it comes down here, but I did not know whether it was usual to allow the State to select any of the public land it would want.

Mr. SMOOT. Any land which fell within the description of the enabling act.

Mr. STONE. I will be obliged to the Senator if he will allow me to ask him a question for information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. I understand that about 7,000,000 acres of land have been given by the United States to Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. That is correct.

Mr. STONE. And Nevada is now asking for 7,000,000 acres to be given to that State.

Mr. SMOOT. Besides what she has already had.

Mr. STONE. How much has she already received?

Mr. SMOOT. Nevada has received about 3,000,000 acres, I think.

Mr. PITTMAN. Two million seven hundred thousand acres.

Mr. STONE. Seven million acres is the total area granted to the State of Utah. How much land has been given to Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. Seven million four hundred and eight thousand acres.

Mr. STONE. There would be a somewhat larger area then deeded to Nevada if this bill passed.

Mr. SMOOT. Nearly 3,000,000 acres more. It is not altogether that that I am complaining of. The grant here of 7,000,000 acres in the way that it is given gives every advantage in the disposition of the land to Nevada over every other Western

State. Utah and other Western States had to take grants of mountainous lands. This bill grants 7,000,000 acres of valley land and nothing else.

Mr. STONE. The Senator's objection then is that when we, the people of the United States, donate these lands to States, the land that Nevada would have been able to pick up under this grant would have been more valuable than those Utah has been able to pick up.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; or any of the other of the mountainous States.

Mr. STONE. Does not the Senator think it would be a pretty good solution of this whole question to offer an amendment to transfer all the public lands to the States?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah would be glad to do that if he had any hope whatever of passing such a measure in the House of Representatives; but I have no hope whatever. I do believe this, I will say to the Senator, that whatever is granted to Nevada there ought to be granted to the other Western States lands similar in character to place them upon the same footing with Nevada.

Mr. STONE. Oh, I suppose it is not all of the same character in different States.

Mr. SMOOT. It is almost of the same character if it be taken in the valleys. These are valley lands, and the selections will only be taken in the valleys and not in the mountains, as the Senator from Nevada states.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to say, relative to the proposition the Senator has advanced of turning these lands over to the States, that I have introduced a bill of that kind, which is now before the Committee on Public Lands. I hope it may receive due consideration. I brought the matter up many years ago in this body and it had a fair start. In the meantime, however, those who were following it up left the Senate, and I do not know that it has since been considered.

From what the Senator from Utah says, if he will permit me a moment further, I think in these selections—my State, for instance, had the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections and I think Utah had the sixteenth, the thirty-sixth, the thirty-third, and the thirteenth.

Mr. SMOOT. No; Utah had the second, the sixteenth, the thirty-second, and the thirty-sixth.

Mr. WARREN. That is, taking land in place as it happens to come in the sections so numbered. It is not selected, and therefore not nearly as valuable, acre for acre, as carefully selected land. I feel generously about all these things. The lands lie there unimproved and paying no taxes, and they ought to pass into private hands, whether through State governments or otherwise. Of course, this bill could be arranged for lands in place as these others were, four sections in each township, for the State, but there ought to be some of it in selections. I think all of the States had a certain amount of land selected by the State in addition to the numbered sections taken in place. That is true, is it not?

Mr. SMOOT. It is.

Mr. WARREN. And, of course, Nevada could be treated likewise.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. If I understand, Mr. President, without having accurate information, there are about 70,000,000 acres of public lands undisposed of at the present time. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. SMOOT. There are some 700,000,000 acres undisposed of.

Mr. GALLINGER. And those lands lie in how many States?

Mr. SMOOT. They lie practically in 13 public-land States.

Mr. WARREN. No; in 17 States.

Mr. SMOOT. There is but very little public land in other than 13 States. It all practically lies in 13 States.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course those lands belong to the people of the United States at the present time?

Mr. SMOOT. They do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have been reading an article in a local newspaper recently which pointed out the fact that there are bills now before the Senate disposing of 30,000,000 acres of land; among others, it says the Senator from Utah has a bill asking for a million acres for Utah, and other States are enumerated. I do not know how accurate that may be. I have heard it contended here that the Government ought to relinquish its claim to those lands and give them to the States in which they are located. I have never thought that was a very wise contention, but is it not rather a reckless way of disposing of property that belongs to the people of the United States, tossing 7,000,000-acre lots of land to the several States? Of course that means that after you have gone around three or four times you will have all the public lands appropriated.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in answer to that suggestion I wish to say to the Senator that I believe it would be a great advantage to the Government of the United States and to the people of the United States if all of those lands were utilized, and it would be a wonderful advantage to the States themselves. For instance, take my own State of Utah. We have to maintain all of the institutions of every kind and every sort in the State from taxes raised on 21 per cent of the area of the State. The balance of the land in the State is nontaxable. I want to say, Mr. President, that I have here a petition, received this morning, from a meeting of the New York Zoological Society, at which certain resolutions were passed, and one of them is as follows:

Now therefore be it further resolved, That the New York Zoological Society recommends that the Federal Government take immediate steps to convert any and all of the forest reserves of the United States into game refuges for such period and to such extent as is necessary to assure the preservation of threatened species and the continuance of the game supply of the surrounding districts.

Mr. BORAH. Mr, President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator——

Mr. BORAH. I merely desire to say that it seems incredible that any body of men would pass that kind of a resolution. Do not these men know that there are thousands of acres in these reserves that are as good agricultural land as can be found, and that hundreds and thousands of homeless people want them? I have no language with which to express my view of a body of men who would turn such lands over to game reserves.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say that that resolution is sent out in the hope of even western Representatives and Senators agreeing to it. It means, Mr. President, that about 79 per cent of my State is to be tied up for a game preserve!

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what it means.

Mr. BORAH. For these distinguished gentlemen to come out there and hunt game in, while poor people are yearning for a place to build a home.

Mr. SMOOT. The resolution virtually says so.

Mr. BORAH. And hundreds of thousands of settlers, who really want to make homes, are driven into the adjoining country of Canada for the purpose of finding homes.

Mr. President, may I say just a word if the Senator from New Hampshire is through?

Mr. GALLINGER. I should like to listen to the Senator from Idaho, and then perhaps I shall have some observations to make later on.

Mr. BORAH. I want to interrupt the Senator from Utah for just a moment.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator may proceed, if he so desires.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have a great deal of sympathy with this bill. The only objection that I have to the bill is that it is not quite wide enough in its reach. It ought to include more States.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I say.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, some time ago the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] made a statement—and I know that he is always accurate in these matters—showing the amount of lands in these different States which were not subject to entry and therefore not subject to taxation. The Western States are doing precisely what the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] says, undertaking to build up great Commonwealths upon a taxable area of from 10, 15, 20, and 25 per cent of their entire area.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator refers to Nevada.

Mr. BORAH. That is the average of the different Western States.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think the taxable area is even less than that.

Mr. BORAH. Perhaps it is less.

Mr. SHAFROTH. In Nevada I do not believe it is 10 per cent.

Mr. BORAH. Perhaps so. I did not suppose it was quite so bad as that, but it is bad enough.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. We have large counties in some of these States where they have had to sustain their schools by private con-

tributions, while distinguished gentlemen throughout the country are petitioning for the creation of hunting reserves in that region of territory, where they have as good agricultural land as lies outdoors.

I am in favor of any movement which will put those lands into the hands of bona fide settlers and of bona fide home builders. We can not build States, or maintain them, unless we are to have something of that kind. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] has been chided because he is in part representing a State which has only so many voters. Well, where is the voter going to stay? He can not stay on reserve land. The only way to get voters and home builders into those States is to open these lands to entry. My sympathy is with the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say that I based what I have said upon a report that was made to the Senate which undertook to show that Nevada had been discriminated against and that this bill was simply to put her on an equal footing with other Western States. I believe the Senator from Nevada himself will admit that if this bill passes in the shape in which it now is, Nevada would not be on an equal footing with other States.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I can not allow that suggestion to go by without denying it. If the distinguished Senator had waited until we got through perfecting this bill by amendment, I think in about five minutes I would have shown exactly what we contend for in the report; but he is now fighting this bill, for some reason that so far has not been disclosed. I imagine, however, that it is for the purpose of forcing some legislation for Utah; and, if that be true, the motive may be very good. I want to say, though, that in this particular case it seems a very uncertain method of legislation to fight something that you approve of in order to force in the same bill something that is desired to be granted to another State.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, of course the little lecture of the Senator may be all right; but I want to say to the Senator that it would not make a particle of difference to me whether my own State was involved or not, if I felt that what was being asked for was unjust. I would never stand for it. I say to the Senator, in answer to the statement that he could not let go by the opportunity of denying the statement I made just previous to his interruption and his statement that what I had said was not true, let us see if it be not true. I make the statement upon the report made by the Senator himself and submitted to the Senate.

California had 8,331,878 acres of public land granted to her. If this bill passes, Nevada will have more than California. Colorado had 4,432,169 acres granted to her. If this bill passes, Nevada will have 5,000,000 acres more than Colorado. Idaho had 3,628,827 acres granted to her. If this bill passes, Nevada will have over 6,000,000 acres more than the State of Idaho. Montana had 5,869,004 acres granted to her. If this bill passes, Nevada will have over 4,000,000 acres more than the State of Montana. Nebraska had 3,456,809 acres granted to her. If this bill passes, Nevada will have nearly 6,000,000 acres more than the State of Nebraska. North Dakota had 3,163,084 acres granted to her, which would give Nevada over 6,000,000 acres more than North Dakota. Oklahoma had 3,004,000 acres granted to her, which would give nearly 7,000,000 acres more to Nevada than Oklahoma received.

Mr. FALL. And Oklahoma received $5,000,000 in cash at the same time, did she not?

Mr. SMOOT. That was for Indian lands.

Mr. FALL. Yes, sir; and because a portion of Oklahoma, like New Mexico, was already taken up and in lieu of a larger land grant she was given $5,000,000 in cash.

Mr. SMOOT. She received $5,000,000. Of course, if these 7,000,000 acres of land in Nevada were sold at $2.50 an acre, the amount received would be $17,500,000.

Oregon had granted to her 4,355,324 acres, vastly less than is proposed to be given to Nevada. South Dakota had 3,433,153 acres granted to her, which would give over 6,000,000 acres more to the State of Nevada than to South Dakota. Washington had 3,042,906 acres granted to her, which would give nearly 7,000,000 more to the State of Nevada than to the State of Washington.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. FALL. I merely want to ask the Senator a question. I have been listening with a good deal of interest to the Senator; I can not understand upon what ground he is objecting to this bill, and I would like to understand him. Is it because the Senator is convinced that no further donations should be given to any of the States, or is it because this is a donation to one State?

Mr. SMOOT. I thought I had stated that in my opening remarks.

Mr. FALL. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not averse to the Government of the United States making appropriations of public lands to the public-land States; and, as I have said time and time again, I would very gladly vote for a bill transferring all of the public lands within all of the Western States to the respective States. I believe myself, Mr. President, that such a bill could perhaps pass this body, but I am quite sure it could not be passed in the House of Representatives. My opinion is, I will say to the Senator, that I do not believe that it is proper to give a donation of 7,000,000 acres of land to one State, thus giving that State double and more than double and sometimes three times as much as has been donated to other States.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, then let me ask the Senator this question. He has been on the Public Lands Committee for very many years and has been a very prominent member of that committee. Does not the Senator from Utah know perfectly well, as do the Senators from New Mexico, from Idaho, and from every other Western State now having public lands within its borders—does he not know that there are peculiar conditions in each of these States? Does he not know that in the State of Nevada to-day such lands as are being given there would not amount in value, although the acreage may be double or treble the amount which has been donated to other States, to one-fiftieth or one one-hundredth of the donations which have been made to other States?

Mr. SMOOT. In all the States now that are known as public-land States——

Mr. FALL. I will call the Senator's attention to his own State, as shown in one of the tables I have here, and would like to ask him what this means.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, if the Senator had reference to the swamp act, some of those lands were a great deal more valuable.

Mr. FALL. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. But what I mean to say is that if you take what is known as the intermountain States, the land-grant States, taking the land as it was granted to them, most of it being mountain land, will not be more valuable than the land that is proposed to be granted under this bill to the State of Nevada.

Mr. FALL. I disagree with the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. All I know is this——

Mr. FALL. Here is a table, and I want to ask the Senator what the meaning of this table is. I have here before me the report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office for this year showing the desert-land entries made since 1877 in the various States of the Union. In four States, and only in four States, as shown in this table, has the amount of money received on final payment, at the rate of $1 per acre on such final payment, equaled the amount of the first payment at 25 cents per acre. What does that mean? It means that not one-fourth, only about one-fifth, of the lands taken up by the settlers under the desert-land acts have been patented. They have lost the money which they have spent on four-fifths of it; they have lost all amounts paid to the Government, and also $3 per acre which they must expend under the rules and regulations, less their time, less the land, and over half of the money.

Now, I notice that in the State of Utah there has been a little more money paid in on the final payment than was paid in on the first payment; in other words, to read the figures—I desire to ask a question and this is preliminary to the question—in Utah of the total desert-land entries there have been approximately one-third which have gone to final patent; in New Mexico from one-eighth to one-tenth; in Nevada one-tenth. What does that mean?

Mr. SMOOT. I can tell the Senator if he wants me to tell him now.

Mr. FALL. I certainly should like to have the question answered.

Mr. SMOOT. I will tell the Senator now.

Mr. FALL. Very well.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator's statement that not one-fifth of the desert-land entries go to patent is true. The reason for that is because it is impossible for the entrymen to comply with the law.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, that is not the question. The Senator understands me. Now, let me repeat it. Why is the proportion so different in Utah and in Nevada of the lands going to patent? What is the reason?

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, Mr. President, I do not know what the reason for the nonpatenting of desert-land entries in Ne-

vada may be, but I suppose it is because of the fact that they have found out that it would not pay to carry the entries to patent.

Mr. FALL. Exactly; it would pay in Utah and would not pay in Nevada.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that is not necessarily so.

Mr. FALL. That is the Senator's own answer.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not necessarily so. I think the State of Utah, as far as the State is concerned, is as short of water as the State of Nevada.

Mr. FALL. The answer which is given is undoubtedly the answer from the table itself, is it not?—because it would pay to go to patent with a desert-land entry as an agricultural entry in Utah, while it would not pay to go to patent with a desert-land entry in New Mexico or Nevada.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, there may be some other conditions about which I could not say, but I want to say this: As far as the State of Utah is concerned, there are now, I think, thousands of acres that have been entered under desert-land entries, and the entrymen find themselves in this condition: When they made the entry a water company was organized for the purpose of bringing water to that very land; he has done everything in his power to comply with the law, he has made his improvements, he has fenced his land, he has built his home, and the irrigation company has failed to furnish him with the water. I have now before the Interior Department a long petition, signed by the people who have entered lands in the Uintah Basin, who find themselves exactly in that condition, and they can not get title to their land under the law.

There may have been more cases like that in Nevada than there have been in the State of Utah, and that may be the reason why they have not carried their entries to patent—because of the fact that it was absolutely impossible for them to do so, because other people and other sources that they depended upon failed.

Mr. FALL. Then that same answer would apply to all the other cases in the public-land States, if the table shows that, including Utah, there are four States in which the percentage of final proofs would amount to from one-half to one-third, while in the others they run on an average of about one-eighth to one-tenth.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, of course it could not all be charged up to this one reason; because, as the Senator knows, even with the ordinary homestead not a very much larger percentage than the one named by him in the case of the desert-land entries go to patent.

Mr. FALL. Oh, yes; they do, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, somewhat larger percentage. I do not remember just what it is.

Mr. FALL. Now, I want to ask the Senator from Utah if he thinks that in a Rocky Mountain State, which has a rainfall of from 16 inches to 21 or 23 inches, the lands are not much more valuable than those of exactly a similar character in a State where the annual rainfall is less than 16 inches?

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt of it, Mr. President.

Mr. FALL. Then, if it is true that in a majority of the States of the Rocky Mountain region the rainfall is 16 inches, while it is equally true that in Nevada, for instance, the rainfall on an average is very much less than 12 inches, the difference between 12 and 16 inches meaning the difference between desert lands susceptible of cultivation in dry farming and those not so suscpetible, in the one instance a desert is worth nothing, while in the other it may be of great value. In other words, instead of the proportion being as suggested by the Senator, 20,000,000 acres in the State of Nevada might not amount to as much as in value as 2,000,000 in the State of Montana.

Mr. SMOOT. I would not agree to that, Mr. President. Wherever there is a rainfall of 12 inches, if properly farmed, they can make dry farming a success.

Mr. FALL. Then the Senator of course knows, Mr. President, that he is in opposition to every Government report and every expert report made upon the subject of which I have any knowledge.

Mr. SMOOT. We have no hesitation at all, in the State of Utah, in undertaking dry farming wherever there is a 12-inch rainfall.

Mr. FALL. Then there are peculiar conditions existing in Utah which does not exist in Nevada or in New Mexico or in Arizona, which would render the lands susceptible of cultivation in the Senator's own State where they are not susceptible of cultivation in the States I have mentioned.

Mr. SMOOT. I can tell the Senator of districts in the State of Nevada that are dry farming to-day and doing it successfully.

Mr. FALL. Oh, that is where the rainfall is, as I have said and the public reports say, above 16 inches. About one year in three, with a 16-inch rainfall, it is possible to make fair crops, while with a 21-inch rainfall it is possible to make some sort of a forage crop every year.

Mr. SMOOT. I know the State of Utah does not have 16 inches of rainfall on an average, and I know that we have dry farmed there for 35 years, and I know that when dry farming was first started it took many, many years to find out just how to conduct it. It used to be the habit of the dry farmer to roll the surface of his land, thinking in that he could keep the moisture in the ground. Now they never do that. They harrow the land now, even after the grain is up. The object is to keep the land from baking and allow the sun to draw the moisture to the roots of the grain. I say now, Mr. President, that the State of Utah does not have 16 inches of rainfall, and there is not a State in the Union that is more successful in dry farming than that State.

Mr. FALL. Then, if it is possible to cultivate land with 12 inches of rainfall in Utah, and because of want of sagacity or energy on the part of the people of the State of Nevada and the State of New Mexico, it is not possible to cultivate the land successfully with a 12-inch rainfall in those States—and I announce absolutely as a fact that it is impossible in my State—if the facts are so different, then I will admit cheerfully that 1 acre of the Senator's land is worth 10 acres of New Mexico land.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course I have not made any such statement, and have made no such claim, and do not admit it now, because I think, of course, the lands in the State of Nevada are just as fertile where cultivated as those of other States; and I think the people of New Mexico can cultivate their lands just as well and just as highly as the people of any other State; but that does not change the provisions of the bill nor the object of the bill one iota. There is no question but that the bill itself, if passed, will place the State of Nevada in a far more advantageous situation than any other of the Western States.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if all of these donations to the States have not been individual donations? I concede that the States ought to be upon an equal basis; but the legislation in this Congress has always been in behalf of granting to each State separately. That being the case, it seems to me it is no ground of objection to this bill that the amount it carries exceeds the amount granted to some other State. When Utah's bill was passed, it was far in excess of that of Colorado. We got only two sections, 16 and 36. Utah got four sections.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, the Senator knows why that was done—because everybody admitted that the great bulk of the land so granted would be mountainous land. There is not a person in Congress, in either the House or the Senate, who has ever been through the State who does not know that to be the fact.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think it has arisen very largely from the fact that there has been a feeling upon the part of the people of the United States that the States should have more of this land for school purposes; and therefore I think the general rule has been to double the quantity of land which was given to the earlier States.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will go back and look at the debates, both in the House and in the Senate, he will quickly learn why those four sections were given.

Mr. FALL. What was the reason?

Mr. SMOOT. The reason was because of the mountainous lands in which the school sections would fall, and four sections of those lands were worth no more than two sections of valley land. I want to say, as far as the State of Utah is concerned, that 10 sections of mountainous land, all within a forest reserve, are not equal to one section of valley land without the reserve; and the Senator knows that the valley lands in the State of Utah are very limited indeed.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I do not know what the Senator calls valley lands; but I want to ask him this question, following his statement to its logical conclusion:

Utah has running through it the great Rocky Mountain Range, with a few offshoots from it, and is very mountainous. In the State of New Mexico, on the south boundary of Colorado, this great Rocky Mountain Range breaks into five main ranges, running practically parallel north and south through the State, and cutting it up entirely by mountain ranges from the north to the south into narrow valleys, without any water at all, or practically no water. If the Senator's State, with one mountain range, should have four school sections, why did he not, when he had the power, give to New Mexico at least eight?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator speaks as though there were only one range of mountains in the State of Utah. As a matter of fact, there are many. As far as the valley lands are concerned, I want to say to the Senator that I mean by valley lands the lands that lie at the foot of the mountains, between two mountain ranges.

Mr. FALL. Generally with a watercourse.

Mr. SMOOT. Generally with a watercourse.

Mr. FALL. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Sometimes in our State they have no watercourse. The water is sometimes stored in the mountains.

Mr. FALL. With a 12-inch rainfall?

Mr. SMOOT. With a 12-inch rainfall.

Mr. FALL. They do?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. Of course what I mean by rainfall, and what everybody means, is that amount of moisture, whether it is in rain or whether it is in snow. In those districts where the mountains are it is always in snow, but it is measured in inches just the same as if it fell in the summer or in the spring or in the fall in the form of rain. That is always understood by everybody.

Mr. President, I want to say that I believe the Senator from Nevada ought to amend this bill, and he ought to reduce the amount of 7,000,000 acres to a reasonable amount, so that Nevada will be on the same footing as other States. I do not think she ought to be put in any different position; but giving her 7,000,000 acres is not placing Nevada on the same footing as the other States, and that is why I rose to discuss this measure.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah states that there is an error in stating that Nevada has not been as well treated as the other Western States. This has been worked out on a percentage basis. The percentage basis is as follows:

Utah has received 14 per cent of all the public lands in that State. She has received that percentage in several separate grants. Nevada has received less than 4 per cent of the public lands in the State of Nevada. I want to know if the Senator from Utah denies that. I take it that he does not deny it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have not the figures here to show, offhand, just what the percentages are.

Mr. PITTMAN. I will give the Senator the figures, then, and he can be making the computation a little later.

The land area of the surface of the State of Utah is 52,597,760 acres. The amount of grant to Utah of the public lands has been 7,408,018 acres.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. PITTMAN. Just a second, until I finish this statement. The percentage of the grant to Utah is 14 per cent plus. Now, just wait until I get through with Nevada. Nevada has 70,285,440 acres. The total grant to Nevada has been 2,723,647 acres, which is less than 4 per cent. Now, I refer the Senator to the relation of 4 per cent to 14 per cent.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. PITTMAN. I do for a question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The figures that the Senator has just quoted were printed in the report of the committee accompanying the bill, were they not?

Mr. PITTMAN. They were.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I was very much impressed by the point made by the Senator from Utah as to the effect of giving the State of Nevada the right to select 7,000,000 acres of land instead of allowing it to take the land as it came in the numbered sections. I will ask the Senator from Nevada this question: Has not the State of Nevada already been granted sections 16 and 36 for school purposes?

Mr. PITTMAN. They were so granted; yes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. And is it not also true that the State of Nevada made a bargain, as it might be called, with the United States, by which it surrendered that land grant in exchange for the right to select 2,000,000 acres of land?

Mr. PITTMAN. That is true.

Mr. POINDEXTER. So that the calculation which the Senator is making as to the acreage of land received by the different States and the percentage of that grant to the entire acreage of the State is scarcely a fair comparison, because the State of Nevada has surrendered that grant for what it regarded—no doubt very wisely—as the great advantage of being able to select from the best lands there were in the entire public area of the State to the extent of 2,000,000 acres.

Now, I just want to add a word. I am not opposed——

Mr. PITTMAN. If the Senator wants to speak on this question, I wish he would wait until I conclude. If he wants to ask a question, I should like to have a chance to answer it. Now, I want to answer the question he has asked.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Very well.

Mr. PITTMAN. Referring to the condition of the State of Utah, the State of Utah had a selection of nearly 2,000,000 acres, in addition to about 5,000,000 acres in place. It had about 2,000,000 acres selective, the same as the State of Nevada. In other words, the State of Nevada had 2,000,000 selective acres; the State of Utah had approximately 2,000,000 selective acres and 5,000,000 acres in place. Now, when you come down to the proposition, Congress itself preferred that Nevada should select that land rather than to take it in the other way, because most of our land is mountainous. The mountains of Nevada are richer in minerals than those of any other State in this Union. The mineral lands are far more valuable than any other character of land in our State, and in granting lands to the States it was the object of the Congress not to grant the minerals; and in endeavoring to exclude all possibility of granting minerals, for the purpose of preventing any fraud upon the Government, as was said in some of the arguments at that time, it was considered wise that these should be selected rather than granted in place.

But be that as it may, here is a peculiar condition, and I may say it seems a peculiar system of argument that a western Senator should stand here and argue not as to whether a bill is proper, but whether his State is as well taken care of.

GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS in the chair). Will the Senator from Nevada suspend for a moment? The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 381.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] offered as a substitute for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Gallinger	Myers	Smoot
Beckham	Gore	Nelson	Sterling
Borah	Gronna	Norris	Stone
Brandegee	Harding	Oliver	Sutherland
Broussard	Hitchcock	Overman	Thomas
Bryan	Husting	Page	Tillman
Catron	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Townsend
Chamberlain	Jones	Pittman	Underwood
Chilton	Kenyon	Poindexter	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Clarke, Ark.	Lane	Ransdell	Walsh
Cummins	Lee, Md.	Reed	Warren
Curtis	Lewis	Shafroth	Weeks
Dillingham	Lodge	Sheppard	Williams
du Pont	McCumber	Shields	
Fall	McLean	Simmons	

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. He is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. CHILTON. My colleague [Mr. GOFF], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], and the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] are absent on account of illness. All of them are paired. The junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING]; my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]; and the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH].

Mr. BORAH. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. BRADY] is absent on account of illness. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] is absent on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I wish also to announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] is absent on account of illness and is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY]. I desire that this announcement shall stand for the day.

Mr. STONE. I should like to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is detained on account of sickness and that he is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss the bill that has just been laid aside while the unfinished business is under consideration. I realize that, having the floor, I have a right to discuss anything I see fit and that I have a right to answer the argument of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] and others with regard to this measure. I have this morning done everything I could to facilitate the debate on this matter, so that we could come to a vote. I have been unable to do so, and the unfinished business has come on at 2 o'clock.

While I should like at this time to submit to the Senate matters that would absolutely refute, in my opinion, every proposition the Senator from Utah has brought forward, I believe it would be trespassing upon the Senate unless the Senator who has charge of the unfinished business would consent to temporarily lay the unfinished business aside.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I am in sympathy with the bill the passage of which the Senator from Nevada is struggling so hard to secure, and I regret that he has not been able to finish it; but I can not now consent to allow anything to interfere with the unfinished business, which has already been too often postponed. I hope the Senator will not press his request.

I am going to ask the Senate to-night instead of adjourning to take a recess until to-morrow, in order that the unfinished business may be constantly before the Senate from now on until it is completed. I tried to get a unanimous-consent agreement to shorten the debate, and I have not been able to do so. I am now going to ask the Senate to do the next best thing, and that is to keep this business constantly before the body until it is disposed of.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, after that statement, and believing that the Senate will not object to the calendar coming up—the bill which has been before the Senate being the first on the calendar, and will come up to-morrow morning at the close of the morning business—I shall not ask any further to have the unfinished business set aside, but will then go on with the remarks I was making when the hour of 2 o'clock arrived.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the question immediately before the Senate, as I understand the parliamentary situation, is the substitute offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. It therefore is a question in voting to decide which of these two proposed amendments to the bill is the most desirable in the mind of the person voting.

I have a great deal of sympathy, Mr. President, with the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, because I think in a great measure it is a proper settlement of the Philippine question, but it has some things that it seems to me are very objectionable. It provides that the President of the United States shall undertake to get an agreement with other nations in regard to the independence of those islands, and that upon a failure to get such agreements with all he applies to, to make agreements with those who are willing to enter into them. If none are willing to enter into such an agreement, then the United States alone shall guarantee the independence of the Philippine Islands for five years. It is true he provides in his redrafted amendment that during those five years the United States shall maintain sufficient force there to preserve order, and so forth.

Another objectionable feature, to my mind, is that it provides for retaining perpetually coaling stations and naval bases in the islands. The substitute proposed by the Senator from North Dakota is very short, and I want to read it as it has been modified by the Senator who introduced it. It seems to me to be preferable to the amendment introduced by the Senator from Arkansas, inasmuch as it omits the two objectionable features, or at least what appear to me to be objectionable features. The amendment of the Senator from North Dakota reads as follows:

> The President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to indicate to the great powers of the world the desire of this Government to extend to the Philippine Islands and the Philippine people full and complete independence so soon as it shall be warranted in the belief that such independence will be respected by the other powers of the world. The President is further authorized and requested to secure from such other powers such agreements as will insure the independence of said islands, and when such agreements have been made he shall forthwith direct a convention to be held in such islands for the purpose of adopting a constitution providing for a republican form of government, and as soon as such constitution has been adopted and officers have been elected and a government inaugurated thereunder he shall, by proclamation, declare such islands and the people thereof to be a free and independent state, with all the powers of complete sovereignty.

It will be observed, Mr. President, that if this should be added to the bill under consideration as an amendment it would not interfere in any way with the bill itself, and should the President of the United States find that it was impossible to get agreements from the other leading nations of the world in regard to the independence of the Philippine Islands the bill would be effective just as though this amendment had not been attached to it. Of course this amendment would have no legal effect until such agreements were entered into.

So, it seems to me, from the point of one supporting the bill itself, there could be no objection if the person believed that we ought to give to the Filipino people independence, and that to bring about such independence at as early a date as possible it would be desirable to have other nations acquiesce in the scheme.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will ask the Senator whether he has taken into consideration that the amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from North Dakota is an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Clarke amendment?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But the difficulty is this: If it takes the place of the Clarke amendment, it has a provision in it which makes it inoperative in regard to independence until there has been an agreement between the nations of the world. It makes our conduct simply depend upon the action of some foreign country.

Mr. NORRIS. As far as this particular amendment is concerned that is true. In other words, the amendment itself would have no legal effect if all the other powers of the world refused to negotiate with us or refused to enter into an agreement by which they would respect the independence of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does the Senator——

Mr. NORRIS. But that would not defeat the bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; but it seems to me it is very unfortunate that it is so worded, because we can not afford to tie our hands by what some foreign nation may do——

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Or what a number of foreign nations would do.

Mr. NORRIS. No, I would not do that; but there is a difference of opinion among honest men who have studied the subject in detail as to whether the Philippine Islands ought to be independent now, whether their independence would last if it were granted now, and whether we ought to grant it in 10 years from now, or whether they would be able to control and rule themselves in a hundred years from now. But I think most of the objections which are made against granting independence now are coupled with the proposition that if we turn them loose among the nations they will become the prey of other nations. I think there may be some ground for that belief. I would feel differently about simply declaring them independent and turning them loose now without any such agreement than I would if we had an agreement upon the part of the leading nations that they would respect their independence.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Of course we would all rather have an agreement with the leading nations.

Mr. NORRIS. That is the object of this amendment, and that is what we are trying to get.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; further than that it would make it impossible for the President of the United States to act or to recognize the independence of the Filipinos themselves unless the leading nations of the world agreed.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I admit that. Now, let me answer that suggestion. If this were not adopted and the bill was passed just as the Senator and his committee reported it to the Senate, that same objection, if it be an objection, would lie. There would have to be further action by Congress. I do not believe it will be true, but suppose the other nations refuse to enter into such an agreement, this amendment becomes a dead letter. It comes back and Congress can legislate in the future just the same as it can, the same as it probably will, if we pass the bill without this amendment.

In the first place, In do not believe that there is any question but what every nation that we take the question up with will agree with us and will agree to recognize the independence of those islands. I do not believe there is any doubt about it. I believe if this amendment is put on the bill it means the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as this agreement can be brought about. But if it should not, then we are placed in the same situation—at least as I see it—as though we had passed the bill without this amendment, because we would have to legislate to give them independence. We could start out next year, if we wanted, and give them their independence at once, or we could do it at a later date, whenever it was decided that they could take care of themselves if we gave them independence.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The difficulty with the situation is that if this were simply an amendment to the bill, without being a sub-

stitute for the Clarke amendment, there might be great force in what the Senator says.

Mr. NORRIS. That is all it is, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no.

Mr. NORRIS. The Clarke amendment is a new section to the bill. If this substitute for the Clarke amendment should be adopted, it would become a new section of the bill. It would not modify a single sentence in the bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Whenever you move a certain amendment as a substitute for an amendment the natural inquiry and consideration is to contrast the two, so as to ascertain which of the amendments is the best.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I have not any doubt that the Clarke amendment is better and fairer, both to the Philippine people and to the United States, than the McCumber amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, I have not any doubt that this is better. Of course the Senator, feeling as he does, will vote against this amendment. That is all there is of that.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That is true.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator has placed it there fairly and just as I want him to place it. It is a question as to whether a Senator, in voting, prefers to have enacted into law the McCumber amendment or the Clarke amendment.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The contrast and the argument ought to be, then, as to which is the better amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what I am trying to bring about. I pointed out some objections to the Clarke amendment as I look at it. I want to take them up briefly.

The Clarke amendment provides that when we go out we shall retain in the Philippine Islands coaling stations and naval bases. I am opposed to both those propositions. I believe when we leave the Philippine Islands, whenever that time may be—this year or in a hundred years from now—we ought to go out without any strings tied to our departure. If we do not want to retain the Philippine Islands, we would have that liability. In my judgment, we might just as well retain the islands as to retain a coaling station and a naval base.

In the first place, why do we want a naval base there in Asia if we do not have the Philippine Islands? Why do we want a coaling station there if we do not have the Philippine Islands? The only object in having a naval base and coaling station is to be able to better defend our territory in the vicinity of such base. If we give up the Philippine Islands, we will have no territory on that side of the world to defend, and hence no earthly use for a naval base. If we retain a naval base and coaling station, then we must defend the naval base, we must defend the coaling station, to the same extent that we must defend the Philippine Islands as long as we retain them.

I believe that it would be more burdensome to defend a coaling station and a naval base when the sovereignty of the Philippine Islands has been turned over to the Philippines than it would be to defend them now, when we retain the sovereignty, because if we are going to defend them now we can at any time we see fit place an army on the islands to defend any shore on the other side or any place around them. If the Philippine Islands are independent and we want to defend a coaling station or a naval base, the island lying by the side of it will be a country over which we have no sovereignty and over which we have no control, and we would find it more difficult, in my judgment, to defend that than though we retained the islands themselves.

Mr. President, it is not fair that we should retain a coaling station and a naval base over in Asia if we go out of the Philippine Islands. If we give them their independence, we ought to go out absolutely. We ought no more to attempt to retain a coaling station and a naval base in Asia than we would permit an Asiatic country to maintain a naval base on the shores of Mexico, and everyone knows that would create an eruption at once in the United States.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I would suggest to the Senator that if the islands should be turned over and the Filipinos be given their independence and if at any time in the near or remote future the United States determined to abandon that little coaling station it would be a very simple matter to get out.

Mr. NORRIS. It is not a simple matter of getting out. We could get out now if it were just a matter of getting out.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If we are going to remain there five years and guarantee the integrity of the islands it would not be a bad idea to keep a coaling station in the islands.

Mr. NORRIS. If we are going to remain there five years and want to retain possession during all that time or for any length of time, I do not think we ought to get out until we go out bag and baggage.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The matter of that little coaling station is entirely in the hands of Congress, which is sitting almost continuously, and it can be done without any difficulty at all.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator will find a great deal of difficulty.

Now, let me ask the Senator, if we turn over the Philippine Islands and declare them independent and acknowledge their independence, why should we retain a coaling station anywhere around the islands?

Mr. VARDAMAN. As far as I am personally concerned, I say frankly to the Senator that I would prefer packing up our bags and coming away absolutely. I should like to have come away yesterday. I should like just to brush the dust off of our feet and come away, but that does not seem to be the opinion of a great many Senators; there are a great many American people who think that there is a moral obligation devolving upon the United States to train those people a little bit longer. That is the purpose of it. It is one of those compromise measures.

Mr. NORRIS. It is not the purpose of the Clarke amendment to train the people a little bit longer.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Yes; the purpose is that the enactment of this law shall give them an autonomous form of government and that they may be trained, and then gradually and gracefully we will retire.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that is the purpose of the bill, I understand, but not of the Clarke amendment. This is only offered as a substitute for the Clarke amendment.

Mr. VARDAMAN. As a matter of fact, the bill will be in operation for not less than two and not more than four years, which ought to give ample time to install it and start it out on its good work.

Mr. NORRIS. If we adopt the Clarke amendment, there will not be much delay in the President undertaking to negotiate with other powers and bringing about our departure. If we adopt this amendment, in some respects the same procedure will be had, although we would not retain a naval base or a coaling station. We would not guarantee their independence after we left.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. In just a moment. I have a great deal of sympathy with the class of people mentioned by the Senator from Mississippi, who think we ought to stay there and teach them a little bit longer. There is not any doubt but what a great many people, perhaps the majority of them, I have no way of determining, believe in that theory. I do not want to get out of the Philippines until we can do so with honor and with credit. I do not want to do anything that would not be fair to the Philippine Islands, to the Filipino people, to our own Government, or to our own people; but I believe, first, that the Filipino people do not want to become citizens of the United States; that they have no desire to become citizens of the United States; that they are anxious for an independent citizenship of their own; and, further, that the retention of the islands can do us no good; that it is a constant menace, and in the case of war would be a liability that would mean that we would have to spend thousands of lives and millions of property in the defense of the islands. I should like to get out as soon as we possibly can, and I sympathize with the Filipino who wants a country of his own. The Filipinos are entirely different; they are a different class, a different race; and they will never assimilate with us. That is no disrespect to them, nor to us. They ought to be independent and to be working out their own salvation, and just as quickly as we can get away, and do it honorably and fairly, I want to do it.

Now I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I, like the Senator from Nebraska, am in favor of getting out of the Philippine Islands as soon as possible with honor both to ourselves and to them; but I notice one provision in the McCumber amendment which I do not quite understand. In line 7 it reads:

> The President is further authorized and requested to secure from such other powers such agreements as will insure the independence of said islands in perpetuity.

"In perpetuity" means forever.

Mr. NORRIS. The words "in perpetuity" have been stricken out.

Mr. LANE. I am glad to hear it, for it seems to me that nobody could legislate in that manner.

Mr. NORRIS. It would probably be difficult for the President to know how long that would mean; but those words have been stricken out.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I want to say to the Senator from Nebraska that he has made a powerful speech in the last three minutes, giving nearly all the reasons why the United States Government should surrender sovereignty to the Philippine Islands. I want to ask him, after noting his sympathy in this matter—it is really practically the same as mine—whether, if the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] were modified to the extent of saying that the President "may" retain a coaling station instead of using the word "shall," which is now the language of the amendment, that would not modify the Senator's views and cause him to support the Clarke amendment?

Mr. NORRIS. That would materially modify my views; but, Mr. President, it strikes me that that would not be fair to the President; that would be shifting a responsibility from our own shoulders that we ought not to try to shift onto somebody else. It seems to me it is peculiarly a question that Congress ought to decide, as to whether we should retain a coaling station and a naval base in the Philippine Islands. If the change were made which has been suggested by the Senator, and I knew the President would say, "I will not retain anything," I would not, of course, have much objection to the provision; but, at the same time, I do not believe that we ought to try to put that responsibility on the President. We ought to decide it for ourselves.

Mr. McCUMBER. Suppose the President should say the opposite?

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, he might say the opposite.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, the difficulty about that situation is this: I do not see the necessity for a coaling station or for a naval base at the present time; but I am not a military expert; I do not know whether conditions might be such that it would be desirable, and not only desirable but to the great advantage of this country to have them. According to my present information they would be of no value, but I do not want to decide that question now, because I have not the evidence before me nor is it likely that we can get it soon; but at the time we are about to surrender the islands to the Philippine people it seems to me we can vest the discretion very wisely in the President, and let the President determine whether or not we should have such a naval base and coaling station there. The President would then have to come to Congress in order to get the provision through, I should think, because if we were to retain such stations it would require appropriations for the purpose of making the necessary improvements there, either for a naval base or for a coaling station.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; the President would have to get the appropriation from Congress; but the Senator from Colorado knows, and I think we all understand, that if the President exercised his discretion under that kind of a law and retained a coaling station, there would be very few of us who would vote against the proper appropriation. I know I should not, although I am opposed to keeping it. If, however, we decide, whether through the President or through Congress, to retain a coaling station and retain a naval base, then I should be in favor of voting whatever appropriation was necessary to keep them in proper shape and in first-class condition.

I do not want to submit this question to anybody. In the first place, it requires no evidence—I do not mean now that I am right and that everybody else is wrong—but it requires no evidence to decide whether we are in favor of keeping up a governmental establishment over in Asia; whether we are or whether we are not, it is a governmental policy, and whether we keep a coaling station and a naval base over there is a question of governmental policy on the part of the United States. Those who believe we ought to do so of course would favor that kind of a provision, while those who believe we ought to get away from Asia, that we are out of place over there, that we are misunderstood over there, and that there is danger lurking to our own welfare in staying there are in favor of deciding as a governmental policy that we ought to go out without any strings tied to our departure.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does the Senator from Nebraska think we ought to abandon our trade in the Orient?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I would not abandon it if I could retain it by any honorable means.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does the Senator from Nebraska think that we ought to have our merchant vessels going from this country to Japan and China?

Mr. NORRIS. I would be very glad to have them go there. I think some of them go there now.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then, if that be so, is it not advisable that we should have a cruiser or two in that locality now and then?

Mr. NORRIS. In my judgment, it is not. If we are going to build up a Navy and start out a merchant vessel and convoy it with a battleship in order to get trade, then we would need a naval base; but that is no way to get trade.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No, Mr. President; and, so far as I am concerned, I do not want to do anything of the sort; but if we are going to trade in China and if we are going to have trade in other parts of the world, it is almost inevitable that now and then we shall have trouble.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me ask the Senator from Utah, is he in favor of having trade with Brazil, with Argentina, with Ecuador, or with Peru? If he is, then is he in favor of maintaining naval stations all around those shores?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is hardly the question. Of course I am in favor of having trade with Brazil.

Mr. NORRIS. I thought the Senator was.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. And of having trade with every country that will trade with us; but that does not mean that we should have a naval station in every country with which we trade. But let me suggest this to the Senator: At the time of the Spanish-American War part of our fleet was in oriental waters. It became a vital necessity that the Spanish fleet at Manila should be at once sought out, captured, and destroyed, because so long as that fleet was free to come and go it threatened us anywhere we might be. If we had not succeeded—if the situation had been such that we could not have succeeded in destroying the Spanish fleet with the utmost promptness—we should have been obliged to entirely abandon oriental waters. It would have been necessary for Commodore Dewey's fleet to go something like 5,000 miles before it could have obtained coal.

Mr. NORRIS. No; it would not. Commodore Dewey's fleet could have gotten coal at any station in Asia, except a Spanish station. We have a right under international law to get coal.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But we would have had to get out in 24 hours.

Mr. NORRIS. We would only have had to get out as soon as we could have gotten our coal. We would have obtained the coal and then got out; and why should we not have done so? Why would our fleet have wanted to lie around in Asiatic waters if there were not any Spanish vessels to fight?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It might have been of the utmost importance to us at that time that our fleet should have had a place where it could rendezvous and remain longer than 24 hours.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I conceive such a thing might have happened; but let me tell the Senator from Utah, that if we retain the coaling station and naval base in the Philippine Islands, this is what is likely to occur: We shall have our fleet over there; war might break out; and then the fleet would be 7,000 miles from home. In case that naval base or coaling station were captured, then the vessels which we had in the vicinity would be left out in the cold, and they would be much worse off than they would have been if we had not had such a coaling station, because in that case they would not have depended upon our coaling station.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, if we have a naval base over there, we must take steps to defend it and fortify it.

Mr. NORRIS. That is one of the objections I have to retaining a coaling station and naval base. That will be used as an argument on every naval appropriation bill we shall have under consideration. If we retain a naval base, it will be said: "Here is a naval base in the Philippine Islands right next to Japan; Japan is likely to have a war with us, and the naval base is 7,000 miles away from our shores, therefore, we must have men; we must have ammunition; we must have fortifications; and we must have more battleships and more of all kinds of ships in order to defend that naval base.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, of course we have to do that. We have to do that as to the Hawaiian Islands and we have to do it as to Guam.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly; and it will be the same as to all of them—we will have to do that. That is one of the reasons why I do not want to keep the islands. They are a source of danger and so would be a coaling station, and they would invite attack. They are too far away. If we get out of the Philippine Islands, we shall then have no territory in that section of the world to defend. Therefore we shall not need a Navy over there in case of war. Of course if we waged a war of conquest it would be different.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If we are going to eternally take counsel of our fears, the Senator from Nebraska is right.

Mr. NORRIS. We do take counsel of our fears every time we make an appropriation for a battleship, and every time we pro-

vide for a fortification anywhere we are taking counsel of our fears. There is not any other reason why we are doing it except through fear.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. We had better take steps to defend ourselves than to run away from these propositions, as it seems to me.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what I think, that we had better defend ourselves, and we had better not place ourselves in a position where we have something on our hands that we can not defend except at a great disadvantage; and something that will be of no good to us after we shall have defended it.

Mr. President, that is one of the principal objections that I have to the Clarke amendment, and that is one of the respects in which I think the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota meets my idea as to what ought to be done to meet the situation.

The other objection, that after we have acknowledged the independence of the Philippine Islands we should defend them for five years, is, it seems to me, one of danger. We ought not to do it, and there is no reason why we should do it. If we acknowledge the independence of the Philippine Islands, that country becomes a new nation, one entitled to as much respect as any other nation. There would be no more reason why we should then defend it than there is why we should defend some other nation. If we must be responsible for its international relations—and that is what it means—we ought to stay there and keep possession not only of a coaling station but of the entire islands in order better to carry out the objects of our stay.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he thinks that by relinquishing our sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and giving them independence we do thereby get out of the Philippines?

Mr. NORRIS. Is the Senator through with the question?

Mr. STERLING. I am through with that question.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I think we would get out of them. I think I understand that what the Senator means by the question—and there is something in it—is that we have been there and we will have an interest in them, of course, after we are out. We will naturally look with suspicion upon any other country that would try to take advantage of them, and all that; but, Mr. President, the longer we stay the greater becomes that idea. If we stay there five years from now and then go out, we will go out with the same reluctance; we will have the same fear, that we are somewhat responsible for them and ought to look after them; and I share in that feeling, I will say to the Senator. I should look with a good deal of jealousy upon their independence, and I would want to see that they were properly treated; I would want to see that no advantage was taken of them; but we will have that feeling whenever we go out, if we go out. The reason why I particularly think the provisions of the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] are good is because we avoid, as much as human action can avoid, that very objection by entering into an agreement with the other nations of the world that they will respect the independence of the islands.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. Just a moment and I will yield again. It seems to me we naturally have a right to believe that when the other nations enter into such an agreement with us they will respect it much more than they would if we were keeping in the islands a coaling station and a naval base or obtaining any advantage there that the other nations did not possess. I doubt whether any nation would enter into an agreement with us except on terms of absolute equality. As suggested by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] himself, we must enter into this negotiation on the theory that the nations are all equals. If we enter into negotiations with other nations and say to them, "We want you to acknowledge and guard the independence of the Philippine Islands with us; we will retain a coaling station and a naval base and you will have nothing," we would hardly be putting up a fair proposition to the other Governments. If we say to them that we want such advantages, they might properly talk back to us and say, "We want the same advantage there that you have if we are going in on this agreement, and if you retain a coaling station and a naval base we, too, want them." It would not be right to give every nation in the world a coaling station and a naval base in the Philippine Islands; and yet, as I look at it, there is just as much reason why some other nation should have a coaling station and a naval base there as we if we want to acknowledge the independence of the islands. Now, I yield further to the Senator.

Mr. STERLING. To my mind, Mr. President, the proposition involved in my question to the Senator from Nebraska is one of the most vital and important in this whole discussion. I say we are in the Philippine Islands and have been there for the last 17 years. The independence of the Philippine Islands will not take us out of the Philippines. Our trade and commerce are there; our teachers by the thousands have been there; our merchants have been there; and they have established such interests and attachments in the Philippines that they will last forever in connection with the trade that we will carry on there in the future, whether the islands are independent or not.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, I should like to ask the Senator a question there. If the objection which the Senator has just raised is a sufficient reason why we should not leave the Philippines now, I want to ask the Senator, in all candor, whether the same objection will not exist at all times in the future? If we can not go out now on that account, we never can go out.

Mr. STERLING. But, Mr. President, we are likely to have less difficulty, less friction with other nations by reason of our retention of the Philippines than if we were to grant them independence. Such a nation will necessarily be weak for many years to come; there will be contentions among different nations for different privileges and spheres of influence there, for the trade and commerce of the islands, and there may be now and then—and I think it more than a possibility—oppression of the islanders and undue advantage sought to be taken of them. Because of the attachment, because of the interest we feel in them, because they have been under our guardianship for all these years we as Americans will resent some of these activities, and trouble or war is more likely to arise out of that condition of things than if we were to retain the Philippines with full rights there which other nations would be bound to respect.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator's argument is a very good one from the standpoint of one who believes that we ought to always keep the islands; but, Mr. President, if we are not to keep them, then it follows that there must come a time when we will leave, and when that time comes we will necessarily desire to see the Philippines prosper after we leave. We will look upon them with jealous care, and perhaps we will interfere where we can in a friendly way to prevent them from getting into trouble. I have no doubt we will all feel that way, and that feeling will exist whether we go out to-morrow, whether we go out one year from now, or whether we go out a hundred years from now; the only difference being that it will increase the longer we stay.

I do not believe in the theory that we have any right, in the first place, to govern the Philippine people without their consent. I do not believe it is right to the Filipinos to try to make them citizens of the United States; and I am not in favor of keeping forever any people under our control and under our subjection unless they can at some time be made citizens free and equal with the rest of us. On the other hand, the Philippine people have a history of their own. They are a different race from us. The things that we perhaps think ought to be done by the Government they might not agree with. In the first place, they are 7,000 miles away. Everybody knows that if we should have war with any nation in the world of any considerable prominence and power the Philippine Islands would be the first place that would be attacked. If they were independent, of course, they would not be attacked. If we had a naval base there it would be the first place that would have to meet an attack. They are the source of the greatest weakness we have in our National Government.

Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] have suggested that we should retain the Philippines in order to keep our trade.

In my judgment, the keeping of a coaling station and a naval base would not give us the trade of the islands. We do not have any naval base in England, and yet we have a very great trade with England; we do not have a naval base in Italy, nor in Norway, nor in Sweden, nor in Denmark, nor in any country of South America, and yet we have more trade with many of those countries than we have with the Philippines, where we not only have a coaling station but have the entire country. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] suggests that we have a coaling station at Guam, but we have not had any very great trade with Guam on that account.

Mr. President, I do not want to keep trade by backing it up with guns. In the end that will not work. I do not want to make any attempt by sending warships to a country to compel its people to trade with us. That will not work in the end. We can not get trade with the Philippine Islands by sending warships along with our merchant vessels; and, Mr. President, it is not right, in my judgment, in the next place, to insist that we should keep the islands simply to build up trade with us. Such

an idea is founded on an illogical and unfair basis. No nation has the right to hold another nation in subjection and under its sovereignty simply to make dollars and cents for its people. That would be true even if we were making money by retaining the Philippines; but it has been demonstrated over and over again that we are losing money every day, and have been ever since we have been in the Philippine Islands, on account of their retention.

I believe that the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota will bring about an easy and wise solution of the difficulty. It is equivalent to saying to all the world, "We are going out as soon as you will agree with us that these people shall have their independence respected, and we are going out without any advantage over you; we are going to place them upon the world's surface as an independent nation, and the rights of other nations shall be the same as ours, and the duties of the Filipinos toward other nations shall be the same as toward us." That is fair; that is a square deal; that is honest, not only to ourselves and to the Filipinos but to the remainder of the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, before voting on the amendment I want to say a word. I should like very much to vote to give the people of the Philippine Islands their independence for the reason, among others, to avoid complications; and in proportion as I should like to see the Filipinos independent to relieve us of complications, I hesitate to vote for either of these amendments that make new and additional complications. My view of this matter is somewhat different from that of others perhaps. The morning before Dewey sailed into Manila Bay, had some other nation sought to subdue the Filipinos, I can not understand that we would then have been under any obligations to have fought any nation for the independence of the Filipinos any more than to-day if some nation should attempt to overrun Siam, we would be under obligation to go there and prevent Siam from being conquered by some other nation. If on that morning we were under no obligation to sacrifice the lives of our young men to prevent some other nation from taking the Philippine Islands, we certainly are under no obligation to-day, unless in those 17 years our tutelage of those people, our government of those people has been such as to make them less capable, less likely to get along and maintain their independence than they were before we went there. If it is true that 17 years of American tutelage and guidance have rendered those people less competent, less able to take care of themselves, then we, being responsible for that kind of tutelage, there would be a responsibility resting on us to repair the wrong which we had done them. If, on the other hand, those 17 years have been years of education, years of building up of the individuality of the inhabitants of those islands; if, in other words, those 17 years have added to the capacity and the ability of the Filipinos to take care of themselves, surely there is no obligation resting upon us at this time.

Mr. President, a great deal of evidence has been offered here to prove whether the Filipinos want or do not want independence. There are some things so well known, so universal as a part of human nature, that it is a waste of time to read the testimony of this man or that man upon some great fundamental question. The moment we reached the Philippine Islands we reached there with a flag around which clusters the traditions of freedom, the traditions of independence, and that flag would fall short of its purpose and its mission as a symbol of freedom to humanity if 17 years of its presence did not in itself develop a desire for independence. The moment we reached those islands we carried to those people the American history and the American schoolbook—the American history replete with the traditions of freedom and of independence; and American history fails in its mission to teach its lesson if 17 years of study would not develop in the minds of any people a desire for independence and a desire for freedom.

It was my sad duty to help convey from Washington to Canton the remains of that great Christian statesman, William McKinley. Along that whole distance a Nation was in mourning, not because McKinley had been a soldier, for this Nation then was filled with men who were illustrious for their achievements on the field of battle; not because McKinley had been a particularly great statesman, because the greater part of McKinley's activities had been along economic lines; but that mourning Nation stood there, bowed in grief, because it felt that a great Christian character had passed from earth. McKinley's declaration to the Filipinos was, "This is for the Filipinos"; and I believe to-day he would hardly recognize as compatible with his character, as compatible with his purpose, as compatible with his high purpose, a declaration reversed now, and that we should say, "This is for America instead of the Filipinos."

When from the lips of the great McKinley there fell the declaration, "This is for the Filipinos," it meant that the interests, the rights, the obligations should be measured not by the interests of the American people, but by what would be best for the Philippine Islanders. There can be no question of that. We would do violence to his implied promise to say now, We never intend to give you your independence. From that day to this the utterance of those who have gone to those islands representing our Government has been the thought that sooner or later those people would be free.

It may be said that these men spoke beyond the warrant of the Constitution; that Congress alone, not Executives, could give them independence. Undoubtedly they did. Unfortunately, Senators, more and more it has become of late years the habit of those who use the function of the executive office to speak beyond the warrant of the Constitution in the assumption of authority which the fathers vested in Congress. But if an officer of this Nation exceeds his constitutional warrant in holding out promises and inducements, shall a people who know of our Government only by the conduct of our officials be held to a strict constitutional knowledge of the limitations of an executive officer when that executive himself disregards those limitations? High officials have held out to them the suggestion of their ultimate independence.

Then we come down to the declarations of political parties. Those people have a right to accept the verdict of 1912, when a party on a platform declaring for their independence was placed in power by the American voters, as the declaration of the American people that they would give the Filipinos their independence.

While justice to them demands we should keep what they had a right to understand as our promise, the welfare and best interests of our people requires that we should give them their independence, and stop before we go any further in the dangerous, new policy of holding over-sea territory.

For all history has demonstrated one truth, and that is that over-sea territory is always a liability and never an asset of a nation. We may go back to the history of ancient Empires; we may go back to the history of Rome as a Republic, grand and glorious on the surface as a Republic, but decadent under the Empire. But decay itself is never anything but the evidence of conditions which precede the decay; and it was in those centuries of the Roman Republic, grand and glorious as it seemed on the surface, holding foreign conquests, that there were sown the seeds of that decay and rottenness which brought fruitage when the nation became an Empire. The story of Rome is the story of the folly of over-sea colonial possessions. The story of Rome is the story of the folly of a nation seeking to govern people who do not ask for that government.

Spain followed in the same course. History on that subject reads but one lesson, and that is that when a nation holds territory against the wish of the people of that territory, as in every other instance in human activities, when a wrong is done that wrong does its injury to the wrongdoer rather than to the victim of the wrong; and if for no other purpose than to free our own people of the reflex action of holding an alien race against its will and against its rights, we ought to let the Filipinos go, and we ought to bid them Godspeed, at the earliest moment.

No people can be free from this effect upon the nature of a people. This great war in Europe to-day is callousing even the American heart. We read of it and we read of it until the slaughter of thousands scarce stirs the blood in our veins. Exercising a power and a dominion over an alien people makes us callous of the rights of others; and if for no other reason than to protect ourselves from the insidious growth of that spirit, we ought to stop this suggestion of embarking upon a reversal of the traditions of this Republic in the holding of distant alien races by power.

While we have acquired territory by peaceful means, while we have acquired territory by settlement, the acquisition of foreign territory against the will of a people was a reversal, not a continuation, of the traditional policy of this Nation, and the sooner we get through with that reversal, the sooner we return to the old traditional policy of the fathers, the better it will be for all concerned. The holding of the Philippines, an alien distant race, against their will is the reversal of the spirit of our Government, is the reversal of the traditional policy of our people.

Now, in regard to these people learning the lesson of freedom and independence from our flag and from our schoolbooks and our history, no man can question the desire of these people to be free; and there is no warrant in any suggestion, brought from any source where truth asserts her supremacy, that one nation has the right to assert its superiority and its function to govern another nation against its will and against its desire.

And so, while I believe that while that struggle was on years ago to restore order in the islands, it had to be carried on until the supremacy of order was restored. Having asserted that supremacy, having given them 17 years of American tutelage, we have but one duty left to discharge, and that is to give them the independence they desire and which they have a right to expect from us.

There is one phase of this question that I have several times interjected into the debate, and yet it seems to be usually forgotten and ignored by those who discuss the question, and that is this: We are constantly told here that the possession of the Philippine Islands by our Government is a menace to our Government. There can be no question of that. It is a menace to us in the upbuilding of American ideals. It is a menace to us in the tendency to enlarge our Army and Navy because we must protect those islands. It is a menace to us because, so far from our shores, we can not easily protect them. If there is anything in all this clamor to day for war—I do not know who it is proposed that we shall go to war with at once—but if there is anything in this talk of war the Philippine Islands are a menace and a weakness to us.

But, Mr. President, we have a duty and an obligation resting upon us. We have a right and we have a duty to take into account whether or not this relation is a menace to the Philippine Islands themselves. If there is anything in all this continued talk of war that seems to be a world-wide craze to-day, just in proportion as there is a danger of war we impose a menace and a danger upon the Philippine Islands and upon the islanders themselves. All that we have to do, sir, is to look to the record of the genesis of our own relation with those islands. They would not have been touched by the war with Spain had they not been a part of the Spanish Kingdom. Being under the American Government as surely as we had war we would put those people to the risk of an attack, of having the islands ravaged by war, when if the islands were not under our control there would be no occasion for their invasion by this imaginary foe that is supposed to land shortly upon the American shores and desolate this fair land of ours. I say "imaginary" for at present, at least, it can only be imaginary.

So, Mr. President, not only are those distant islands a menace and a weakness to us, but so long as they are held by us, if there is any such thing as danger of war, the fact that they belong to us is an additional danger and menace to the Filipinos themselves; and it is as much our duty to consider those people in their relation to being menaced by a war which we may get into as it is our duty to consider that they are a liability to us in case we get into war.

Mr. President, believing that once and for all we should redeem the promise that first came from the lips of McKinley when he said "This is for the Filipinos"—a promise repeated year in and year out by officials in the Philippine Islands, a promise repeated by the American people in the election of 1912—I believe we should grant the Filipinos their independence. One of my reasons for that, as I have said, is that I think we should avoid complications; and, desiring to avoid the complications involved in our continued possession of the islands, I am loath to vote for either of these amendments, because they continue and multiply the complications.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, with very much of what the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] has said I agree. The difference between the Senator from Minnesota and myself is that he thinks, as I understand him, that the time has now come when in the discharge of our duty and responsibility we can get out of the Philippine Islands. If I believed, as he seems to believe, that the Philippine people themselves would be better off under a government established by themselves, I should entirely agree with what the Senator has said, and I should be in favor of granting them independence now.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, I agree with what Mr. McKinley said, that we are not and ought not to be in the Philippine Islands for the purpose of exploiting them. I think we are there with a great moral responsibility; I think we have a duty of a very high character to discharge with reference to those people. I for one am not in favor of abandoning them, of "scuttling" and running away, until they are in a position to take care of themselves, and I think very clearly that that time has not yet come.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon an interruption?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. I simply want to say that I honor the position taken by the Senator. I have no quarrel with anyone who says "we must retain the Philippine Islands so long as it is for the best interests of the people of those islands," and I have no quarrel with one who believes that that time has not come. That is a matter of judgment about which the Senator from Utah may be right and I may be wrong; but I honor his position, and I agree with the position that this matter should be discussed from the standpoint of the interests of the people of those islands.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Precisely. The Senator from Minnesota and I agree about that. In other words, I think we are in the Philippine Islands not for our sake but for the sake of the people of the islands.

Mr. CLAPP. That is right.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think, too, that the people of the Philippine Islands are no more fitted for self-government to-day than are 8,000,000 children being educated in the primary schools of the United States. It would be a futile and a vain thing to undertake to set up 8,000,000 school children in the business of carrying on a government; and yet I think that number of American children, educated in the grammar schools of the United States would be better fitted to carry on an independent government than the people of the Philippine Islands, as a whole, are to-day.

While I am not a prophet, and not much given to prophecy, I do not hesitate for one moment to predict that if we leave the Philippine Islands, and those people set up a government of their own, riot and bloodshed and anarchy will run from one end of the archipelago to the other. We will have abandoned a trust, and some other great nation will be obliged to take up the work that we have been too cowardly to finish. Japan or some other country will go into the Philippine Islands. They will not permit a condition to exist such as I have indicated I believe will exist.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon another interruption?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Surely.

Mr. CLAPP. I hardly think the Senator means to use the expression "cowardly." Suppose that 10 years from now the Senator himself should feel that the people of those islands had reached the point where they could take care of themselves, but some one else, equally interested from the viewpoint of what was best for the islands, should think they had not reached that point. Surely the Senator would not want his judgment that the time had been reached, and his action based on that judgment, characterized as the cowardly leaving of the islands. It is a matter of opinion.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh, I do not mean that the Senator is cowardly.

Mr. CLAPP. No; I know the Senator does not mean that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. And I do not mean that anybody who votes for this legislation is cowardly.

Mr. CLAPP. I knew the Senator did not mean that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But I characterized the act, from my point of view, as being a cowardly act, because I think it is running away from a plain duty.

Now, let me call the Senator's attention and the attention of the Senate to a statement contained in an article in the Army and Navy Journal of five years ago upon the occasion of the visit to those islands of the then Secretary of War, Mr. Dickinson. The article goes on to give an account of a meeting on the Island of Mindanao, at Zamboango, where the Secretary met a number of the Moros and some of the Filipinos. As I understand, in the island of Mindanao and the two or three surrounding islands, Sulu and others, there are to-day something like 600,000 Moros, and in those islands perhaps six or seven thousand Filipinos. In the course of the speech making some suggestion was made about turning over the islands to the Filipinos, and that brought out some very vigorous objections from the Moro chiefs. Let me read the account of that part of the meeting:

> In the speech making that followed at a meeting in the Zamboanga Theater the friction between the Moros and the Filipino elements of the population was much in evidence. Señors Mendoza and Lim were the Filipino speakers. Stripped of their profusion of rhetorical figures, these addresses were a plea for taking the Moro Province from under the dominion of the military and placing it under the Philippine civil government.

Of course, they did not attempt to go as far as we now propose to go by this bill.

> Then Dato Mandi, chief of the Zamboanga Moros, took the platform. He said that the Filipinos on the general reception committee had sought to prevent the Moros from going out in their native boats to greet Mr. Dickinson, as he might get the impression there were only Moros in the Province. "As I look about me," said the dato dramatically, "I see more Moros than Filipinos, and that is why it is called the Moro Province. [Tremendous applause.] I have heard a rumor that we Moros are to be placed in the hands of the Filipinos. If the American Government does not want the Moro Province any more it should give it back to us."
>
> Mandi was followed by another dato named Sakaludan, who said: "I am an old man. I do not want any more trouble, but if it should come to that, that we are to be given over to the Filipinos, I still would fight." [Applause.] He was succeeded by Hadki Nunyo, who explained the difference in race and religion between the Moros and

Filipinos. "And if we should be given over to the Filipinos," he asked, "how much worse would they treat us when they treated even the Spanish badly? We far prefer to be in the hands of the Americans, who are father and mother to us now, than to be turned over to another people."

At a meeting of the Moro datos on August 24 Secretary Dickinson made a speech through an interpreter. He assured them that the Americans had no intention of "exploiting" the Moros. If their necessities compelled them to use anything belonging to the Moros the latter would be paid in full. The Americans would never interfere with their religion or religious customs. "All the money the Moros will have to pay the Government will be used among them for their own benefit." Secretary Dickinson said he agreed with them that it was a bad plan to change governors often and believed the wisest thing would be to keep a good governor as long as possible. If at any time a governor should be unfair or unjust all the Moros had to do would be to make it known to Gen. Pershing, who would see that justice was done. This speech made a decidedly favorable impression upon the native chiefs, who doubtless took back to their people complimentary reports on the intentions of the Americans.

Mr. President, it is now proposed to turn over these islands to the self-government of a people 90 per cent of whom have no understanding of the principles of government—far less capable of carrying on a government than the people of Mexico, where only 80 per cent of them are not trained in governmental matters.

Can it be otherwise than that the condition would follow that I have indicated—that quarrels would result—that these people of various tribes and races, of different religions, different languages, different degrees of intelligence, would be fighting one another? Can there be the slightest doubt that that would result? If that is to be the case, upon what theory of national responsibility can we withdraw our protecting hand from them?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The same prediction which is contained in that statement was made when it was said that if the Filipinos attempted to exercise any governmental powers over the Moros they would immediately begin fighting each other. Mr. Frank Carpenter was appointed governor of the Mindanao district. He went down there. He solicited the aid and assistance of the Moros. He granted to them commissoins for such offices as justice of the peace. There are no American soldiers, strictly in the sense of Americans, there. They have never gotten along as well as in the last two years and a half, since that has been done. They are living together in numbers. Six colonies were sent from Cebu down to Mindanao, and the Filipinos of three of those colonies were located upon 40-acre tracts of land almost alternately with the Moros, and the other Filipinos of the colonies were located almost in the heart of the Moro district. There has been no insurrection. There has been nothing in the nature of an uprising. There has been nothing in the the way of a clash between classes. There has been nothing in the way of a disturbance that would be indicative of religious opposition or hostility.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I understand all that, Mr. President; but the Governor is an American. The American Government is there. We are governing both classes of people. It would be a far different situation if the Filipinos were undertaking to govern the Moros instead of the Americans undertaking to govern both of them. The strong hand of the American Government is over them all the time—not only the strong hand, but the just hand. Five years ago that was the attitude of these Moro chiefs, that they would not trust the Filipinos; they would not trust the Filipinos to govern them. They were willing to live side by side with the Filipinos so long as the American Government undertook to govern both of them, but neither would submit to the government of the other.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, you can get expressions of opinion expressed during the last three years by Datos themselves directly opposed to that which the Senator has just read. They assemble and meet all the people who visit there. The most harmonious relations exist between the Filipinos and the Moros, and Gov. Carpenter is the man who accomplished it. He has told them that he is there to have them help govern with the Filipinos, and almost an entire revolution of sentiment has taken place.

The difficulty with the situation is that whenever we as a Nation say, "We will determine this thing just as we want it," "We will give you independence when we get ready; we will give you independence 50 years or a hundred years from now," we crush the hopes and aspirations of that people. They read our Declaration of Independence; they read our American history, as the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] has said; and when they do they get the same spirit of liberty infused into their veins as we did in ours, and we would not want anyone to say to us, "We will give you independence when we want you to have it."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, what proportion of the native inhabitants of the Philippine Islands does the Senator think ever heard of the American Declaration of Independence?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Why, Mr. President, there is hardly a schoolboy but has read the Declaration of Independence. Whenever people visit there, a young man rises and makes a speech to the visiting crowd in behalf of independence, and it is always with relation to the fact that we have gotten our liberty and they are entitled to theirs. Right in the Moro district, where I visited a school, a young man 14 years old delivered an address of welcome to us in the English language.

Now, of course, if we say that we are going to give them independence at the end of 50 years, if they are then capable of self-government, you can make the same statement then, that they are not prepared for it. There ought to be some limitation on it. Seventeen years—long years to them—have elapsed since promises of independence, which they supposed were authoritative, were made to them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Now, Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me——

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator allow me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In a moment. The Senator bears out what I have been saying. We are educating the children, but I imagine the Senator would not contend that the children are able to carry on the government. This young man of 14 years of age, who knew so much about the Declaration of Independence, is hardly fitted to go into the legislature or to carry on the government.

My position is that if we will go on with that sort of thing for another generation, if we will educate those people, if we will build into their very existence the principles of Anglo-Saxon self-government, then they will be ready to carry on a government; but my whole argument is that they are not ready for it now.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I have thought that whenever a people have an educated class, college graduates, by the hundreds and thousands and they are the persons who are elected to the general assembly of those islands they are capable of passing goods laws, especially when we consider that being twitted by the Americans as not being capable of self-government they have set the example to the world so far as sending graduates of universities to their general assembly. Out of 81 members there are 81 graduates of universities there.

Is it possible that those people are not capable of making good laws? Is it possible that the men who are attending to the duties of the executive offices of the Government there would lose their power to control in the administration of affairs as soon as they were selected by their people instead of being appointed by our Government? I think not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh, no. I have said several times during the course of this debate that there are people, limited in number, in the Philippine Islands who are educated, who understand matters of government, and who are probably capable of self-government; but the testimony, as has been said here over and over again, has been to the effect, and I have not heard it contradicted, that not to exceed 10 per cent of them occupy that status; that not to exceed 10 per cent of them are capable of discharging the functions of government. Ninety per cent of them are to be governed. Does the Senator want to set up an autocracy over there?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does he want to have a governing class?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; Mr. President.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In our own country, if 90 per cent of our own people were of the character that 90 per cent of the Philippine people are and only 10 per cent of our own people were educated and capable of discharging the functions of government, we could not carry on a popular government here. It is because the great body of the people are schooled in the lessons of government that we can carry on a popular government. That is the only reason. You can not have a democracy without a substantial foundation of that kind. You can not have a democracy with a ruling class of 10 per cent and 90 per cent incapable of participating in the government. It is absurd to talk about it, as it seems to me.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Look at the South American countries. It seems to me that no one can question but that Argentina is making a success of independent government, that Brazil and Chile are doing the same, and yet their percentage of illiterates is as great as that of the Filipinos, and in some instances

greater. Is it possible that we alone are to judge? If we go to the Declaration of Independence, we at least should assume the truths therein expressed, as applicable to all people. If there are any exceptions, the burden should be upon those who are opposed to independence. If a people have an inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; if in order to attain these ends, governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, anyone who makes an exception must show to me clearly that the people excepted are not capable of self-government in order to get me on his side of the controversy.

Mr. President——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let me ask the Senator a question. I have the floor, and I do not want to have that fact overlooked, and I am anxious to proceed. He is in favor of this bill reported from the committee, I understand.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I am in favor of the Clarke amendment, and I am supporting the Clarke amendment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am not speaking of the preamble. I am speaking of the body of the bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What proportion of the people of the Philippine Islands will be permitted to vote under this bill?

Mr. SHAFROTH. In this bill under the franchise which we are giving to those who either read or write their native tongue, 750,000 to 900,000 people is the estimate which has been made.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is about 10 per cent.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; probably 10 per cent.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield, and to whom?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Colorado does not mean 10 per cent. That would be 10 per cent of the whole population, including women and children.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; it would be 10 per cent of the entire population. I thank the Senato. for his suggestion.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not think it could be 10 per cent of the men of mature age.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator may be right about that, but it is not my information.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The estimate by Gen. McIntyre was that in 1903 those who were capable of reading and writing constituted 32.4 per cent of those over 21 years of age. He estimated that, by reason of the extension of education since 1903, the percentage was now 50 per cent.

I want to say this, Mr. President, and then I will not interrupt the Senator any more. Whenever a people have the power to give self-government to another, it is often resisted by people from one cause or another, and honestly too, upon their own part, so that independence will not come unless there is almost a universal sentiment in favor of it, and this thing of treating the people of different classes in a different way is not fair to them.

I want to read just one sentence——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let the Senator do that in his own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah declines to yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have been reasonably generous to the Senator, and I want to conclude what I have to say.

Mr. CUMMINS. I would like to ask the Senator from Utah a question, and it shall be a question.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Very well.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator from Utah intend to train the people of the Philippine Islands to become citizens of the United States?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No, Mr. President; I do not.

Mr. CUMMINS. What does he intend to train them to do?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator does not intend to do anything about it himself, but I am in favor of retaining possession of the Philippine Islands until the people are measurably capable of carrying on a government of their own, a condition which I do not think exists to-day.

Mr. CUMMINS. Did the Senator ever know a master who thought his slave would be better off in freedom than in slavery?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the Senator's question hardly requires an answer. We do not occupy that relationship in the Philippine Islands. We are not treating them as slaves. We are not treating ourselves as masters. I think, and I believe that the Senator will agree with me, that there never has been in the history of all the world a more magnificent, a more unselfish service rendered to any people than has been rendered by the American Government to those people in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I agree to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I agree to the statement just made by the Senator from Utah. It has been a wonderful service, but it has been the service of a master to a subject, for so long as the Congress of the United States has the sole power of determining the fortunes of the people of the Philippine Islands so long they do not enjoy the essence of freedom.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator thinks that, then he must think that the service we render to our own children in this country when we insist they shall live with us for 21 years, that they shall be educated, that they shall fit themselves for the duties of citizenship before they undertake to discharge the duties of citizenship, involves the relation of master and slave. The service which we have rendered those people over there has been as tender and as altruistic as the service we render to our own children here at home.

Mr. CUMMINS. Of course, the Senator from Utah recognizes the difference between the relation of our own country to a subject colony and the relation of a parent to a child, and I need not enlarge upon that, but analytically and accurately a child who must obey the wish of his parents is not a free person.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He is not a slave. The Senator would hardly contend that.

Mr. CUMMINS. There are certainly incidents connected with the relation between a master and a slave that are not found in the relation between a parent and a child, but the Senator from Utah must admit that if the child is bound to obey the will of another he is not a free person.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He has not all the powers of the adult citizen. The Senator admits that, of course.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I never knew before that our children up to the time they were 21 were serfs or slaves until it was implied by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. No.

Mr. NELSON. Because they owe obedience to their parents; because they owe obedience——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. NELSON. Because they owe obedience to the Government of the United States, that stands in the place of parent, they are to be called slaves.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield to the Senator from Iowa for a moment.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota did not understand me to say, because I did not say, that the relation between parent and child was the relation of a master to a slave, but I still insist that the child is not free. However tender the relation may be, however careful the parent may be, the child is not free.

The Senator from Utah puts the people of the Philippine Islands in the same relation to the United States that a child is to the parent. If he is right about that, then of course they not only should not be free but we should not give them the power to legislate as has been given heretofore and as is further given in the bill before us.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator understood perfectly well that I was using that as a mere illustration. I did not mean that the conditions were precisely similar. Of course they are not. But the fact remains, as I view it, that the people of the islands as a whole are not to-day capable of carrying on a government of their own. If we undertake to intrust them with a government of their own, disaster will inevitably follow and some other country will take possession of them and they will lose their independence.

Now, I intended to say just a word with reference——

Mr. McCUMBER. Before the Senator leaves that point——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let me finish the sentence first, and then I will yield. I intended to say a word with reference to the provision of the Clarke amendment which requires us for five years to guarantee the independence of the islands after we have gotten out and to defend them against outside force. When I have said that I am through. In the meantime I will yield to the Senator from North Dakota for a question.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to ask the Senator, because he has shown considerable familiarity with the Filipinos, what is the predominant racial blood of those people?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know what is the predominant racial blood.

Mr. McCUMBER. Are they not of Malayan extraction?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think that predominates, although I am not sure about it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to ask the Senator if in the whole history of Asia it is not a fact that the Malayans have been able to maintain self-government? Are not these people as well educated, are they not as docile as the Siamese people, and have not the people of the nearest blood to the Filipinos been able for centuries to maintain self-government when they were left alone? As a matter of fact, does not that apply to all the Malayan peninsula and to those southern countries?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As I understand the situation in the Philippine Islands, it is altogether different from the situation in Siam, Japan, or any of those other countries. There is no homeogeneity in the Philippine Islands. There is in the Philippines a great variety of people and a great variety of languages and dialects. They never have had a nationality. They were under the control of Spain for 300 years, during which time they were not permitted to exercise any of the functions of local government. They had no opportunity of learning the lessons of government. They are a heterogeneous lot of misfit units, who, as I view it—the Senator is welcome to his own opinion about it—are utterly incapable of coming together and carrying on a government. There is not a single element that makes them one people neither historically nor from having an opportunity to carry on together the functions of government.

But now, Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas proposes what to me is the most dangerous proposition in the whole amendment, namely, that after having sailed away and permitted those people to set up a government of their own, which, as I think, will inevitably result in disaster, we must still from a distance of 7,000 miles guarantee their independence and defend them against attack from any outside force. The five years that are specified in the amendment constitute precisely the time when they are most likely to fail in their government. If they get along for five years, and carry on a government acceptably, there is some hope of their continuing for the future, but the critical time is during the first year or two or four or five years. I think it is as inevitable as that the sun will continue to rise and set that within that five years they will give occasion for some great civilized power to intervene. If a condition arises such as I think will arise, such as has arisen in Mexico, Japan would be fully justified in intervening, just as I think we would have been justified, although for prudential reasons we have kept out, in intervening in Mexico.

Conditions will be as bad there. The chances are that the Japanese will undertake to intervene. But no matter what the cause may be, no matter how the intervention of Japan may be, or of any other country, we have bound ourselves, at the cost of no one knows how many lives or how much money, to defend them against any intervention from the outside. As it seems to me, that situation is inevitable; and being inevitable, the only wise thing for us to do is to stay there and prevent the condition from arising.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator does he believe that we would send over there and defend and protect the Philippine citizens if the islands were attacked?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That might depend upon what sort of an administration we have in power at the time. We have been setting some examples which justify that inquiry on the part of the Senator. We had better not make such a provision anyhow.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not want to yield for a speech. I will yield for a question.

Mr. REED. Is there anything so ominous in my rising as to indicate a speech? The result of the colloquy just had is that we have not defended our people and have not gone to war for them. Do either of the Senators who have taken their seats think we ought to have gone to war? Are they in favor of it now; and if so, what particular nation do they propose to have us attack?

Mr. KENYON. If the Senator is directing that question to me——

Mr. REED. I am directing it to both Senators, because the colloquy leads directly to the innuendo that if we had the right President we would have gone to war to protect our people.

Mr. KENYON. I do not want to disturb the Senator from Utah, but I will say that the principal difficulty I have about the Clarke amendment is whether, if the Philippines should be attacked in the future, the people of this country would be willing to send our Army and Navy there to protect the people of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then let me say to the Senator from Iowa we ought not to make a promise we are not going to keep.

Mr. KENYON. I wish the promise was eliminated from the Clarke amendment. I could support it with much more readiness.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My argument is entirely in favor of eliminating that provision.

Now, in answer to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], I do not believe in going to war unless it becomes necessary. If it is necessary and that is the only way we can protect our citizens in foreign countries, then I am in favor of going to war. I think, since the Senator has asked me the question, that a firmer and a different policy on the part of the present administration with reference to our affairs in Mexico would have straightened out the situation without putting us in the place we now occupy, where we are in constant danger of armed intervention. I think the greater part of the trouble in Mexico has been due to the vacillating policy of the administration, and a firmer stand with reference to the situation would have obviated the danger of armed intervention.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the answer of the Senator is a mere generality; it gets us nowhere. The import of the colloquy I referred to was that even if our Government should solemnly agree to maintain the independence of the Philippine people we would not go to war to redeem that pledge. The reason alleged was that we will not now make war to protect our own people. There was the implication that our Government had been very derelict in the latter respect. My inquiry, then, whether the Senators were themselves willing to adopt a policy of war was pertinent. It is very easy for any man to say that if we had "adopted a firmer policy," without defining the policy, a better result would have obtained. Such an assertion proves nothing. Possibly if that policy which the Senator has in mind, and which is still in nebula so far as our knowledge of its is concerned, had been adopted we might have involved ourselves in war. Perhaps such a policy might have served only to multiply the murders in Mexico. Perhaps the "firmer policy" spoken of by the Senator would only have brought misery and death. Who shall answer? I do, however, make bold to declare that the Senator will not now and here say that we ought to have invaded and conquered Mexico.

We hear a good deal about what the Government ought to do with reference to our foreign relations with other countries than Mexico. Every once in a while some gentleman gets up and says, "We ought to enforce our rights; we ought to preserve our dignity as a Nation more thoroughly than we are doing," the innuendo being that we ought to go to war. Yet there is not a man in this Chamber who would vote for a declaration of war against any European power to-day.

The truth is, there is a good deal of cheap politics being played by gentlemen who sit in the grand stand and who say, in effect, that if they were captain of the team there would be nothing but wonderful errorless games, whereas, like most grand-stand critics, the probabilities are if they were put into the game they could not catch a ball as big as a balloon and could not "field" it home in a week.

I am getting just a little out of patience with constant carping criticism, upon the one hand, because we have insisted too strenuously upon our rights, and, upon the other hand, because we have not with fire and sword enforced our demands. It is a very happy thing for this country that the extremists to whom I am referring have not been controlling the destinies of the Nation. It is a very fortunate thing that there has been by the President a constant and determined insistence upon the rights of the American Republic so that our rights have not been surrendered. It is equally fortunate that a hot-headed, ambitious demagogue, willing to plunge the country into war in order to further his political fortunes, has not occupied the White House. There are a great many valiant men who are brave when they have no opportunity to put their courage to the test of execution. The peaceful banks of Oyster Bay are about the safest place in the world from which to issue a declaration of war.

I make no invidious comparison when I call attention to what almost every boy has observed, namely, the difference between the ferocity of a dog securely chained in his own yard and one that is at liberty upon the streets where his challenge of battle can be accepted.

Mr. FALL. Does the Senator mean——

Mr. REED. In a moment. I once owned a fighting dog of that variety. He was the best I was able to accumulate. He never manifested any great degree of courage until after he was accused of stealing chickens and I had tied him up to save his worthless life, whereupon my yellow animal was transformed into a raging lion. Let a stray canine pass along the streets, instantly my warrior would draw back malicious lips, displaying dangerous, gleaming fangs; his eyes glared like the head-

lights of a locomotive; his red tongue lapped out for gore; his hair stood on end and he filled the air with roarings and growlings typically Rooseveltian. But unchain the brute and tabby cat might twitch his tail with perfect impunity. Indeed, his natural habitat was under the porch. [Laughter.]

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. REED. Yes; I think I am through now with that.

Mr. FALL. I hope the Senator will not conclude with that phase until he answers a question. I should like to know whether in 1898 he thought Oyster Bay was a safer place than Kansas City?

Mr. REED. Oh, no; I did not think anything of the kind. I understand the innuendo of the gallant knight from the Southwest; but, since the Senator has asked me the question, I will say to him that I had a regiment raised and the promise of the governor of my State that it should be the next to be mustered in. The only reason I did not go was because the war was over before Missouri was assigned any more troops. I have, however, not been in the habit of parading my modest efforts. I would not mention the circumstance now, except for the somewhat contemptuous and insulting remark the Senator has passed over to this side of the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let us be careful not to violate the rules of the Senate.

Mr. FALL. If the Senator can construe my question to be an insult, he is welcome to such construction as he desires to place upon it.

Mr. REED. I understood the Senator would come back with his usual courtesy and repeat what he had already said; that has happened often in the Chamber, and it has no more effect on me now than it has had in the past.

I pass from that fruitless topic to remark that much cheap politics are these days being played. Men who, if they were charged with the grave duties devolving upon the head of this Government, would observe a discreet silence are very voluble and highly critical. These knights of forum and sanctum talk all the braver because they only fight with words and bear small measure of responsibility, else they might not be so often heard carping. I declare that it is my humble judgment that the man who at this crisis of the world's affairs will intentionally do anything to aggravate the international situation is a bad man, a dangerous citizen, and the worst kind of a demagogue. What we ought to be trying to do is to preserve our calm, our deliberation, and to keep ourselves as nearly as possible before all the world as a Nation standing impartial, desiring only to see the European conflict brought to an end.

It may be that we ought to have invaded Mexico with an Army of 200,000 men; it may be that we ought to have imposed a debt of two or three billion dollars upon our people; but I repeat that if the question were put to a vote in this Chamber to-day the men who have so often criticized our Mexican policy would not dare to vote a declaration of war against Mexico. I have said that much simply because the intimation was rather broad, as I understood it, that, after all, if we really had a red-blooded President, we would have better maintained the dignity of this country and we would have better protected our citizens.

I conclude with this remark, that I trust even those who did not go into the Spanish War, as did the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], may be permitted in this Chamber to express an opinion with reference to our national or international matters and even to speak the sacred name of a Roosevelt without any further intimations that they are lacking in personal courage or in patriotism. The quality of courage is not limited to any one race or to any one man. It is therefore possible that courage may be sometimes associated with great vehemence of speech or even a contemptuous intolerance for the opinions of others.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, having settled the Mexican question for all time, I am now ready to bring my amendment up to the slaughter. I understand very well that this amendment is sandwiched in between a determination on the part of a great many on this side that they will vote for nothing except to retain the Philippine Islands and on the other side by a determination of what seems to be a majority that we will kick the Filipinos out of our house unceremoniously and let them take care of themselves. I appreciate the little show that an amendment of this kind will therefore have as between these predetermined forces.

I am now going to discuss for a moment the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] and the amendment which is offered as a substitute for it. I need not take more than five minutes more upon that subject. The amendment which we have before us, for which I offer a substitute, is an amendment that says we shall throw out the Philippine Islands without the protecting influence of this country after a given number of a few years and then let them take care of themselves. Both these amendments propose to give independence to the Philippine Islands. The real difference between them is whether, when we walk out of the Philippines we go out of the front door honorably and fairly, showing our belief that we were there for their own good, or whether we sneak out of the back door like a burglar who has found nothing of value on the premises. The difference, in my opinion, is a difference between performing a duty toward them and failing to perform that duty.

It is a very simple proposition, and I am going to put the question right up to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] and let him answer it. I think I have his idea. I have a conviction—and no argument that I have heard so far can remove that conviction from my mind—that unless before we cease our control over those islands we have an agreement with the great nations of the world that their independence will be respected, they will not hold their independence very long against some of those countries. If the Senator from Colorado should believe that within a comparatively short time after we had ceased our control over the Philippine Islands they would be taken possession of by some other great power, would he still be in favor of granting them their independence to-day and letting them take their chances?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, the first premise of the Senator from North Dakota is something in which I do not believe. When we put to the Filipino people the proposition as to whether or not they want their independence without a protectorate, and they say that they do—and it is the intelligent people over there who are saying that—it is a matter of which they and not we should judge.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am not talking of a protectorate now.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, even an international protectorate.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I am not talking of a protectorate of any kind. The provision of my amendment avoids the protectorate; it asks no country to protect them; it simply proposes to enter into an agreement beforehand, negative in its character, that those countries will merely respect the independence of the Philippines—not that they will guarantee it against each other. Those two propositions are as far apart as are the two poles.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I concede that there is a good deal of merit in the position which the Senator from North Dakota takes in his amendment; but the difficulty with it is that it makes our action as to the independence of the islands dependent upon what other nations may do. If we want to grant them independence, and we can not get this agreement with other nations, according to the Senator's substitute for the Clarke amendment, we would have to quit and say to the Filipinos, "We can not give you independence at all without a new act of Congress."

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, Mr. President, if we can not get their agreement that they will respect the independence of the islands before they pass out of our control, we can not get their agreement that they will respect it or guarantee it afterwards. If we can not get their agreement beforehand that they will respect the independence of those islands, then, I am frank to say, I would say to them our duty toward those islands is such that we will hold control over them until you do consent.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That would be all right if the Filipinos were willing to agree to it; but it is not all right without their consent to make independence contingent upon the action of some outside nation.

Mr. President, the situation of the Senator's amendment is simply this: He wants the nations to guarantee——

Mr. McCUMBER. No.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Or he wants them to agree not to occupy any of the territory of the Philippine Islands, and to make their independence contingent upon that agreement, irrespective as to how capable we think they are; irrespective of their wishes as to whether they should have independence or not; irrespective as to whether or not they could maintain their independence.

On the other hand, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] the other day objected to the Clarke amendment, on the ground that it was attempting to get an indorsement from the nations of the world before there was any government established. He said no nation would entertain any kind of an agreement either to guarantee or to respect the neutrality of what? Of something not formed, of something not made, of something that is not in existence? His objection was that the Clarke amendment was too strong and that it should not be framed in that way, whereas the position of the Senator from North Dakota is that we should make this agreement in advance,

before there is a government established, and before there is any independent government to recognize.

Mr. President, it seems to me there should be a middle ground taken. Neither one of these Senators, in my judgment, is correct. I sympathize with much the Senator has said, but when the position is taken on one side that we must negotiate an agreement with foreign powers before any independent government is established in the Philippines, and then, on the other side, have it asserted that the independent government must be established before any negotiations are undertaken, it seems to me the wisdom is demonstrated of having something in the nature of the Clarke amendment. That gives a certain length of time for carrying out the purposes contemplated, and provides that not earlier than two years, and not later than four years, independence may be granted, unless in the meantime conditions should arise or disturbances ensue which would make it appear unwise to give independence in that time, in which event the time can be extended for a year and a half more. That provision will give the Filipinos independence within a reasonable time.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the question was rather short; the answer has been decidedly long; and yet the Senator has not answered the question. The question in its simplicity was this: If the Senator believes that those islands would be taken possession of by any other great power in a short time after we let go of them, would he still believe that we should grant them their independence? I know the Senator said that he believed they would not be interfered with.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. But I ask if the Senator believed that they would, would he still be in favor of letting them go to take their chances?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I would leave that entirely to the Filipinos. They are the ones who are capable of deciding that question. They may take their choice as to whether they would run the risk of some other nation taking them, or whether they prefer an iron-hand policy which might be invoked by our own Government. They might well say, "We would rather take the chances of foreign interference than of an iron-hand policy imposed by the Government which now controls the islands."

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, if I had taken a child into my own family and educated him for some time, I would have no right to keep him—I admit that—but if I were going to turn him out into the world, I would want to know that I was not turning him out among a pack of wolves. I would want to know that before I opened the door for him to pass out. We are governed by altruistic motives if we act at all in releasing the Philippine Islands. I am not certain that every other country in the world would be governed by the same motives, and I am fearful that the Philippine people would lose their independence. They do not want to be freed from dependence upon one nation simply to become the dependency of another; and if I feel they are in danger, is it not my duty first to try, at least—I may fail—but is it not my duty at least to try to see if I can not get an agreement from the other nations of the world before I turn them loose to their tender mercies? I feel if I have lost anything, I have only lost the period of time occupied in attempting to secure what I thought was for their benefit. Then if another Congress saw fit to take action, and if the Philippine people were still willing to take their chances, I would probably be willing to vote for the same proposition that the Senator contends for now; but I would make the attempt, at least, to secure such an agreement as I have indicated.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I recognize that the very highest motives prompt the Senator from North Dakota in offering his substitute and in all his views upon the Philippine question, but I want to say to the Senator that there are many who have not that altruistic feeling with respect to this matter. There are Senators in this Chamber who believe in keeping the islands forever, no matter whether the Filipino people are capable of self-government or not. There are people who believe that the islands are rich and might become of great value to the United States. I do not attribute such motives to the Senator from North Dakota; but what will be the situation if, after years of negotiation with other nations, it is determined that they will not grant this request upon the part of the United States? There may be in power then those who do not want to ever give up the islands. Therefore I would take the chances now of giving a reasonable time to bring about Philippine independence without requiring another act of Congress—that is, permitting them to become independent automatically, when the time expires. It seems to me that course is much better and safer for them and much better and safer for us.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, if I thought for a single moment that we could not secure within a very short time an agreement with other nations that they would respect the independence which we propose to grant to those islands, I might be influenced by the argument of the Senator; but I am satisfied that we would have no difficulty whatever in securing such an arrangement with every Government of the world. I am satisfied that we never could secure from any Government a guaranty that that Government should look after the independence of the islands. We could not secure it before, and we could not secure it after we had granted independence. We differ upon that simple proposition.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment to let me introduce a resolution regarding the sessions of the Senate?

Mr. McCUMBER. I would yield if the Senator could do that under the rules of the Senate, but I am a little inclined to think the Chair would rule him out of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a plain rule, which the Chair is required to enforce, that no Senator can be interrupted to introduce a bill, resolution, or other business of that character.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to say just a word, in closing, about the capability of the Filipino people for self-government. I determine the capability of any people for self-government more by their racial characteristics than anything else. I think if we will look over the history of the countries of Asia we will find that, while they are not capable of continuing and maintaining our form of government, they have been capable of maintaining a pretty fair government, and one that was adapted to their civilization. The Filipino people are Malayan in character and in blood. As a rule they are a docile people; as a rule they may be willing to be governed by 10 per cent of their citizenship.

If the 10 per cent are capable of governing and the people desire that kind of government, very well; I have no objection whatever to their conducting that kind of a government. Believing that they are capable of maintaining self-government, I am willing to let them, in the first instance, try to carry on the government which I would propose to establish for them, namely, a republican form of government. If it should drift into a monarchy, that is a question for them, and not for us.

The only argument that has been made against that is the argument that was made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], in which he stated that the Moros, constituting less than one-tenth of the population, fear that they may not be treated fairly by the other inhabitants of the islands, having a different religion. Mr. President, if that were the measurement by which we were to determine the right of people to self-government, I am afraid we would not have it in the United States. There was a time along about the sixties and running on to 1865, when there was a portion of the people of this country who feared the prejudices of the people of another section of the country. The Senator would not claim that that in any way militated against the ability of those people for self-government. If I cross the ocean to-day, I will find in the next great self-governing country that there has been pending in their parliament a bill to grant a certain autonomy of government to one of the islands of Great Britain, and I will find that several of the counties in that island—some five of them in the northwestern part—believe that the others would be so prejudiced against them that they would not be safe in their hands; and yet we would not question the right of the British or the Irish people to have self-government, because there might be racial prejudices or there might be political prejudices or there might be religious prejudices. That is not the measure. I believe that the people of the Philippines are capable of self-government; and the only thing about which I differ from the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Colorado is that I can not vote to give them their independence immediately without some kind of an understanding that that independence will be respected. If Senators vote down this amendment, as they have a right to do and as they undoubtedly will do, on account of divergent views, my own vote will be that we shall hold them until we can be assured of that fact.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, I move that at not later than 6 o'clock the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is that proposed as an order?

Mr. CHILTON. No; it is presented as a motion. The present standing order is that, unless otherwise ordered, the Senate shall adjourn at 5 o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator's motion would "otherwise order."

Mr. CHILTON. The motion is to otherwise order that, instead of that order, to-day at not later than 6 o'clock the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I understood that the motion of the Senator from West Virginia to take a recess was agreed to, but I did not understand at what time the recess was to be taken.

Mr. CHILTON. At not later than 6 o'clock we shall take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock. It is a change of the standing order for to-day.

Mr. LANE. I should like an opportunity to make a few remarks on the pending amendment before it is submitted to a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is in order now.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, once each year, in honor of the attainment of our own independence, we set aside a day of celebration of that event, at which time we indulge in much self-praise as a free and independent Nation, and furnish children with explosive, noise-making devices, with which they incidentally blow off their little fingers or put their eyes out or acquire lockjaw, and whoop it up generally about the sacred rights of liberty and independence.

I purpose voting for that amendment to this bill, which will most nearly and quickly give independence to the people of the Philippine Islands. If that amendment fails to pass, I am then going to vote for the next amendment which gives the best promise of accomplishing that result, and so on down the line.

It is not going to make any difference to me who offers the amendment or what his politics are. I am not favorably impressed with the theory advanced by those who contend that it is our duty to pilot the Filipinos up to some undefined standard of education, of citizenship, or capacity for self-government; nor do I feel that it is our duty to supervise the building of roads in that country "the while" hundreds of thousands of our own people, farmers and others, have to drag their products through the mire to market and thousands of others are marooned entirely from market on account of impassable roads.

If it were possible to arouse an equal amount of enthusiasm in the gentle bosoms of those who are urging our duty to the Filipinos in such matters and divert it to the betterment of highways and additional school facilities in this country, it would result in great good to this Nation. It would greatly benefit those who are now taxed to pay for maintaining troops in the country of another people whose ways are not ours, yet a good people withal, but who love us not and have no reason to do so.

Before we become too seriously engaged in irritating the eyes and feelings of the Filipinos in an attempt to rid them of some of their motes, we had best set about getting some of the beams out of our own and purge ourselves and live cleanly.

I have no great confidence in the benefits which they will derive from our guardianship of their affairs, and if it should prove to be no better in its results than that which we have exercised over the affairs of the Indians it will prove anything but a blessing to them.

I have no great amount of patience, either, with the attempt now being made to compel the Filipinos to remain in subjection to us until such time as they reach an arbitrary standard of mental and political qualification which will be pleasing to us, and for which no other standard is set, but which must needs make them conform to a sliding scale of indefinite length, manipulated by an interested referee. I have been around too many logging camps not to know what happens when a scaling rod is used in such hands. The proposition is refreshing, however, and I have no doubt but what it would be interesting to watch the misguided Filipinos while they were trying to catch that will-o'-the-wisp.

If this Nation continues that policy, their only hope of ever attaining their independence will rest upon a successful revolution. To make such a proposal can not be accepted by the people of those islands except as an insult, and it deceives neither them nor anybody else. The proposal to hold them in subjection until, in "our" judgment, they become fit for self-government is coolly insulting, and is, in my opinion, a self-righteous assumption of superiority which, whether based on facts or not, can not with good taste be urged by a people who acquired their own independence only after a bloody revolt against a country which urged the same reasons for not freeing us from their subjection.

It has cropped out that behind the dread that the Filipinos may not govern themselves with that sedateness and nicely balanced poise which seem so desirable to some, lies the fear that some goodly profits will be cut off from those who have speculated in properties and grants in that country, and forsooth we are under obligation to keep them under subjection and spend millions of dollars in maintaining an army over there in order that they may realize and fully appreciate the beauties of our enlightenment.

This Nation, if it does its duty by its own citizens, can find plenty to occupy its full time in looking after their welfare, which in many ways is suffering from neglect; also, it can find use for all and more money than this Congress will appropriate for much-needed improvements, for the lack of which its progress is being impeded, and the homes of many thousands are being lost to them, with the result that families are being broken up and scattered throughout the country, thereby bringing the level of want and poverty to a higher level than it would otherwise reach if we expended it as our duty demands that we expend it. If we are, as we claim to be, a people intelligent enough and wise and just and broad enough to govern an alien race for their best interests, we will deal with some of the evils to which our attention has been called by the Vice Commission which has just been in session in Chicago, the summing up of which show that hundreds upon hundreds of working girls, from their inability to derive a living wage, a wage sufficient to keep body and soul together, are being forced out upon the public streets into a life of prostitution. A nation that allows that kind of a cancer upon its bosom, that sort of a social disease to grow up in its own body and within its own vitals, is not a nation in a position to strike too high a tone of righteousness to a people with whose ways and affairs the majority of the people of this country are entirely unfamiliar.

In time of stress we will have to part with the Philippines, whether we wish to do so or not. To retain them, in the event of war, will prove costly and result in the loss of no man knows how many lives or how much money; and to the exact extent of that loss of lives and the expenditure of that money will the defenses of this country be depleted.

Seven thousand miles from our nearest coast is too far to safely or economically transport troops, foodstuffs, and munitions of war with safety.

Half the nations of the world seem to have gone insane, and most of those of Europe are at war now. If this Nation should become involved, the Philippine Islands will be the most vulnerable point of attack upon this country; and through and by its possession and our inability to take care of it and to defend the coasts of this country this Nation may lose its own liberty.

I heard with a good deal of interest one gentleman say that we have constructed upon those islands—near Cavite, I suppose; I never was there—another Gibraltar, an impregnable fortress. That is very good, and I am glad to hear it. I am proud of our ability to have done it; but I question the wisdom of having erected a Gibraltar of defense over in that far-away country and at the same time having neglected to erect at least one, if not more, along our own unprotected coasts. It is possible that if we are real nice and polite in our parting with the Philippines we may be able to trade that impregnable fortress off to the Filipinos for something with which we can defend ourselves nearer at home if we go to war or become entangled in war with some other nation.

I do not believe that any nation, however wise or just it may be, can govern another people, an alien people, as well as they can govern themselves. I do not think any nation in the world, no matter what its state of civilization may be nor what its wealth may be, has the right in justice to impose subjection upon another country which wishes to be free, and, for all we know, would have been a free and independent and a prosperous nation, in the case of the Filipinos, 200 years ago if the Spanish blight had not fallen upon it. We are not skulking out of that country. It is our humane and just duty to them and to ourselves to part with them in good will and in kindness, and it is to their best interests and to ours to do so at as early a date as possible; and I am going to vote for any amendment to this bill which will accomplish that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

The amendment was rejected.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. Unless some other Senator wishes to go on further with the Philippine bill at this time, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] contemplated presenting an amendment, now that the pending amendment has been disposed of; and it is also his purpose to address the Senate. He is out of the Chamber at this time, under the belief that the remarks submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] would consume

more time than has been the case. I hope the motion of the Senator from Missouri will prevail.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 8 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 1, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 31, 1916.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Dennis B. Lucey, of Ogdensburg, N. Y., to be United States attorney, northern district of New York, vice John H. Gleason, resigned.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Walter D. Neilson to be postmaster at Del Monte, Cal., in place of Walter D. Neilson. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

CONNECTICUT.

Daniel A. Smith to be postmaster at Moosup, Conn., in place of W. F. Sheldon. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1916.

FLORIDA.

John H. Collins to be postmaster at Milton, Fla., in place of Lawrence Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1916.

E. L. Powe to be postmaster at De Land, Fla., in place of W. A. Allen. Incumbent's commission expires February 8, 1916.

GEORGIA.

Louis J. Leavy, jr., to be postmaster at Brunswick, Ga., in place of C. L. Elliot. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1915.

KANSAS.

Vardie V. Goeden to be postmaster at Lakin, Kans., in place of I. L. Cason. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1916.

D. G. M. Keen to be postmaster at Greenleaf, Kans., in place of C. B. Scott. Incumbent's commission expires February 20, 1916.

L. M. Rich to be postmaster at Coldwater, Kans., in place of Z. P. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1916.

MARYLAND.

W. J. Woodford to be postmaster at Centerville, Md., in place of W. C. Orrell. Incumbent's commission expires February 8, 1916.

MASSACHUSETTS.

James J. Murtaugh to be postmaster at Hopkinton, Mass., in place of J. F. Phipps. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1915.

MICHIGAN.

Howard W. Brown to be postmaster at Plymouth, Mich., in place of M. H. Ladd. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1915.

MINNESOTA.

F. L. Frye to be postmaster at Elk River, Minn., in place of F. N. Corey. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1916.

W. R. Hodges to be postmaster at Sleepy Eye, Minn., in place of J. P. Graff. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

James Lynch to be postmaster at Lanesboro, Minn., in place of H. E. Glasoe. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1916.

NEBRASKA.

William A. Nyrop to be postmaster at Elgin, Nebr., in place of C. B. Guffy. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1916.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

John H. Dowd to be postmaster at Portsmouth, N. H., in place of J. P. Conner. Incumbent's commission expires February 20, 1916.

NEW JERSEY.

John H. Lindemann to be postmaster at Closter, N. J., in place of William Tate. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1916.

OKLAHOMA.

C. C. Kidd to be postmaster at Wanette, Okla., in place of F. C. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1916.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Ellison Capers to be postmaster at Summerton, S. C., in place of Ellison Capers, jr. Incumbent's commission expires February 21, 1916.

Landrum Padgett to be postmaster at Pelzer, S. C., in place of Landrum Padgett. Incumbent's commission expires February 20, 1916.

TEXAS.

August Kleinecke to be postmaster at Hitchcock, Tex., in place of Robert Dempster. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1915.

WASHINGTON.

J. F. Lavigne to be postmaster at Chewelah, Wash., in place of J. W. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1915.

WYOMING.

F. E. Godfrey to be postmaster at Lander, Wyo., in place of H. A. Bucher. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1915.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 31, 1916.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Dennis B. Lucey to be United States attorney, northern district of New York.

POSTMASTERS.

FLORIDA.

George J. Dykes, Eustis.
Arthur A. Jones, Lake Worth.

MINNESOTA.

Julia A. Keefe, Morton.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John J. McCormick, Bridgeport.

RHODE ISLAND.

Emory H. Desilets, Manville.

TENNESSEE.

L. N. Alley, Oakdale.

VIRGINIA.

William A. Coates, South Washington.
John L. Henley, Tappahannock.

WISCONSIN.

Henry Knapstein, New London.
A. H. Tarnutzer, Prairie du Sac.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate January 31, 1916.

Pearl P. McCarroll to be postmaster at Walnut Ridge, Ark.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn January 31, 1916.

Robert O. Mimmack to be postmaster at Plymouth, Mich.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *January 31, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who, from the heights of Thy glory, dost look down into the hearts of men and from whose all-seeing eye nothing is hid, cleanse our minds and hearts from all unholiness and so prepare us to meet the duties and responsibilities of the new week opening before us. The gravity of the new conditions, the questions involved, the possible conclusions, call for clear thought, wise deliberations, and unanimity of action. To this end let Thy spirit come mightily upon these Thy servants that they may be guided to do Thy will after the similitude of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 29, 1916, was read and approved.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Immigration has directed the report of the immigration bill and have also directed me to ask unanimous consent that the minority may have until Tuesday of next week, including that day, in which to file their views.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, asks unanimous consent that the minority have until Tuesday of next week in which to file their views. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chairs hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 9416. An act making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3344. An act to authorize George H. Hervey, of Pensacola, Fla., to construct and operate an electric railway line on the Fort Barrancas and Fort McRee Military Reservations, Fla., and for other purposes.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 3344. An act to authorize George H. Hervey, of Pensacola, Fla., to construct and operate an electric railway line on the Fort Barrancas and Fort McRee Military Reservation, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MOON, by direction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, reported the bill (H. R. 10484) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 94), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota reserves all points of order on the bill.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, is on the Speaker's table, with Senate amendments thereto. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] will be here a little later, and I also notice that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON], who is on the subcommittee, is not present. I suggest that the Chair let the bill remain upon the table but order the Senate amendments printed. I understand, after inquiry, that that has been the practice.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, in the last House the Chair always ordered these appropriation bills with Senate amendments printed, although they remained on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr CANNON] asks unanimous consent that the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 9416) be printed, with the Senate amendments, and at the same time lie on the Speaker's table. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10385, the Indian appropriation bill. Pending that, I desire to reach some agreement or understanding with gentlemen on the other side as to the time for general debate. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and myself have reached a tentative agreement of two hours and a half on a side, and I ask unanimous consent that general debate be confined to five hours, one-half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and one-half by myself.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to an arrangement of that kind provided we do not take the bill up for consideration under the five-minute rule to-day.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think that five hours will cover the day. It is understood that it will not be taken up under the five-minute rule to-day, but that we will have five hours for general debate, one-half to be controlled by myself and one-half by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if the general debate is to be concluded to-day, then I suggest that one-half of the time be controlled by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] instead of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], who is not present. The gentleman from Kansas asked that that be done.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill, and pending that asks unanimous consent that general debate upon the bill be confined to five hours, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON]. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I suggest also that it be understood that the general debate close to-day.

Mr. MANN. No such request as that has been made.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman from Texas ask unanimous consent that debate be closed to-day?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is my opinion that we can close it to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is that the request?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Very well, I will make that request.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, then I renew my original request and motion.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understood the gentleman to say that he would not take up the bill under the five-minute rule to-day.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, in that connection, if no one desires to talk on this bill at the end of an hour, after we go into the Committee of the Whole, with an agreement that we would not take it up under the five-minute rule, what would we do the balance of the day?

Mr. MANN. We could call committees.

The SPEAKER. Whenever we run out of anything to do in this House, the Chair is going to order a call of the committees.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we could afford to agree not to read any of this bill under the five-minute rule to-day, if general debate should cease to-day.

Mr. GARNER. If nobody desires to talk upon it under general debate, we ought to go on with its consideration under the five-minute rule.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think we should at least read one section of the bill.

The SPEAKER. What is the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That general debate be limited to five hours, one half to be controlled by myself and the other half by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be limited to five hours, half of which time to be controlled by himself and half by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on resolving the House into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10385, the Indian appropriation bill, with Mr. FOSTER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10385, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10385) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a brief statement of the matters contained in this bill. We have presented a bill making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917. I desire to state that we have followed the order in the Book of Estimates in the preparation of this bill. The amount appropriated in this bill for the year ending June 30, 1917, as carried in the joint resolution passed extending the previous law, aggregates the sum of $10,175,036.66. The estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, exceed the current law by

$1,249,581.66. We have recommended in the accompanying bill appropriations of $9,357,146.66, reducing the department's estimates in the amount of $817,890, exclusive of the trust funds.

The bill recommended aggregates an appropriation payable from the Federal Treasury amounting to $6,993,266.66; reimbursable from the Indian fund, $1,518,520. We have treaty items amounting to $845,360. The department estimates, submitted to us by the department, contain many claims—several claims—which are not recommended for payment. The committee refused to do so, except in the matter of one claim, that was only $20, and that was clearly due by the United States to an individual Indian. We have found it necessary to strike from the bill many items of legislation, as we did not desire to bring into the House items of legislation upon this appropriation bill. We expect at a later date to bring in an omnibus bill composed of several items which have been stricken from the bill by our committee. These items, many of them, are just, recommended by the department, but for the sake of good legislation we eliminated from this bill matters of legislation; and, as I say, we expect at a later day to pass upon those items submitted by the department to our committee. We have endeavored to give sufficient funds to the reservation and nonreservation schools for the purpose of keeping the schools up to the present standard, and for the additional purpose of keeping the school buildings in repair, having in mind the policy that was adopted a few years ago, which is a very just policy, in my opinion, and that is to build up the reservation schools, spend the money upon the reservation in boarding schools, and also in day schools, and not to extend the number of pupils to any great extent in nonreservation schools, the opinion of the committee being that Indians can be better educated in their own reservations and among their own people than to be carried far away from home to nonreservation boarding schools. We have adopted another policy, and that is this: Where Indians have had allotments made to them, Indian families living among white families, these white persons having bought part of the Indian lands on the reservation, and they establish schools in the various States, we are sending Indian children to those schools under an agreement between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the State authorities, and we find in the various States very few objections are raised against this means of educating their Indian children. We have gratifying reports from all of those schools; that they are of vast benefit to the Indians themselves; that the children make greater advancement than when educated in their own schools.

In the last few years many journals over the United States and many magazine writers have complained greatly and raised quite a question as to whether or not the Indian Bureau was taking care of the health and morals of the Indians. We provided two years ago for 12 additional hospitals, and we have inaugurated that system now so that we take care of all insane Indians and Indians that have no way of being provided in hospital matters on their own reservation. Some of these are nonreservation hospitals and many of them are reservation hospitals. The only two items we have increased the amount appropriated over last year is one for the hospitals to take care of the health of Indians and the other is for the education of the Indians. All other items, I believe, have been reduced, as is shown by the itemized statement that we shall present and ask to be printed.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I do.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman has referred to the policy of permitting Indian children to attend public schools—the common schools.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes; that is right; the common white schools.

Mr. STEENERSON. Now, in my district there is a school at Mahnomen, the county seat of Mahnomen County—a good public school—maintaining an agricultural department, and about two-fifths of the children are Indian children and three-fifths are white, and they get along very harmoniously; but the Indian lands are untaxed, they are contributing nothing. The Indian Bureau has for many years maintained a day school upon an 80-acre tract within half a mile of the schoolhouse, but which they abandoned two years ago. Four-fifths of land in that school district has ceased to be Indian land and has gone into private ownership of white settlers.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Was it an Indian school entirely?

Mr. STEENERSON. It was an Indian school entirely. The Indian children preferred to go to the mixed school, to the common school, and therefore they abandoned the school especially set aside for the Indians, which was perfectly satisfactory. There is absolutely no race feeling amongst them, and the Indian children and the white children get along splendidly together.

Now, the district officers desire to give the use of that 80 acres for the agricultural experiment farm, to be used in connection with this school, and the department here in reporting on the bill refuse to recommend it. I can not understand why, when the Indian children get the advantage of the public school free, their lands being untaxed, that the department should refuse to set aside that 80 acres, as long as the school was willing to use it for agricultural experiment purposes, inasmuch as Congress had given that land to the Indians for school purposes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is it the desire of the Indians that it should be used for the purpose mentioned by you?

The STEENERSON. The desire of the Indians?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Well, I do not know about that. There are, of course, a few Indians that would like to get that land diverted from school purposes to private ownership. I presume there is opposition from those who try to get these 80 acres as an allotment, but that would be devoting it to private purposes instead of school purposes, and I understand Congress has set it aside for purposes of Indian education.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I understand you have a bill for that purpose before the Committee on Indian Affairs?

Mr. STEENERSON. But the Indian Bureau does not recommend it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The Indian Bureau does not control the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. STEENERSON. I hope when it comes before the Committee on Indian Affairs and they consider the separate legislation they will bear this in mind.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will say that the reports made on these bills are only advisory. We try to advise with the department before we report any bill.

Mr. DILLON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DILLON. I observed your statement that you proposed to bring in an omnibus bill later.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Later; yes.

Mr. DILLON. What features will that cover? Will they be simply claims?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Claims of all kinds and character in favor of the Indians and against them, where our committee has jurisdiction.

Mr. DILLON. Will the intention be to cover matters where there might be a recommendation for a transfer to some town or city of a block of lots?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. From the Indians for the purpose of selling the lots in blocks?

Mr. DILLON. To turn over ground for the benefit of the Indians.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think the Indian Committee would have jurisdiction of that matter without question.

Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the balance of my time unless some gentleman desires to ask further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves the balance of his time.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON], if he is present.

Mr. MANN. He will be here presently.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to ask a question.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Very well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I notice, Mr. Chairman, in glancing hastily at the report, that in at least one instance an Indian school receives an additional sum over the previous year's appropriation. What method can be used in an effort to enlarge the appropriation for another important Indian school?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I do not know of any nonreservation Indian school having been established in the last few years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not refer to a new school. I have particular reference to the Cushman School. It hangs along on $50,000 a year.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That school was authorized a few years ago at the instance of a very splendid citizen of the State of Washington, Francis W. Cushman. It is a nonreservation school, and it is the most available one for the scattered bands of Indian around there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. For 100 miles around.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. For 100 miles around.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The point is this: The buildings at this school are poor and going into decay; the grounds are poorly kept up and are not beautified for lack of money. The city of Tacoma has grown until it embraces these grounds. The buildings are an eyesore to all the people. Our citizens travel quite a bit. They have seen the Sherman Indian School, for instance, at Riverside, Cal., which is one of the show places

of Riverside, with beautiful grounds and beautiful buildings. They return from there and see our poor, dilapidated, worn, frame-built school buildings for the Indians and wonder why. The entire population of that community hopes that some time some Congress, some Committee on Indian Affairs, or some Commissioner of Indian Affairs will do something to enable that school to take rank, at least in appearance, with its standing in achievement and ability.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Doubtless all the statements made by the gentleman are correct, but the department and the committee, after having adopted the policy I mentioned a few minutes ago, of not building up nonreservation schools further than keeping them in good condition for the convenience of the children there, can not spend more money unless we change our views on the matter. We think those Indians should be educated on the reservations in the day schools, if possible, and then in boarding schools on the reservations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In the district which I have the honor to represent and the adjoining district there are, all told, 19 scattered tribes of Indians and nearly as many reservations, large and small.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I understand that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Indian children are assembled from a distance of 100 miles west of Tacoma and sent to that school. Under the present policy it would seem that the buildings must go year after year without sufficient repair.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Did you ask for that this year?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What was the result?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I find that the estimate for the appropriation was the same as in previous years, based on attendance.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And you have the same amount as given you last year for repairs and improvements. You will find that in every bill it is estimated by the teacher in charge, by the agent in charge at that place, that the amount was sufficient for the repairs and improvements in that school or else it would not have been recommended by the department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But even if he had recommended otherwise, the probabilities are he would not get more.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. You better try and see.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think he has done so. I understand he asked and requested it. The agents who visit that place continually ask for repairs and betterments to the buildings and grounds. I do not want to ask of the chairman what he can not give, and I realize that amendments to increase the appropriations are subject to points of order, but I state now the necessity for these repairs for the benefit of Congress and of the department, in the hope that these buildings may some day be brought up to conditions in keeping with their surroundings.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think if the gentleman will try it this fall, he will get it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have been trying it for some time.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER].

RURAL CREDIT AND BANK DEPOSITS.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, a rural-credits bill has been reported to this Congress from the Committee on Banking and Currency. I expect to support the committee bill with my vote when given the opportunity to do so. At the proper time, however, I expect to offer an amendment to section 18 of the bill, which has been reported and which provides for a savings-bank department as a part of the Federal farm banks system. In order that this department may start out with a profitable and dependable depositor, I shall move that the postal savings funds shall be deposited in the Federal farm banks instead of in the commercial banks of the country, as at present. The postal savings funds should be deposited in the Federal farm banks for two reasons: First, the reports of the Comptroller of the Currency show that the commercial banking institutions of the country can not use these funds, because they already have excess reserves of about nine hundred millions now idle and unused in their hands; second, the farm banks to be established under the proposed rural-credits bill will require the postal deposits to give them at the outset in the savings-bank department cheap funds that can be loaned upon comparatively short time to the farmers of the country at a rate that will warrant safe borrowers in using the money. Of course, the prime purpose of rural-credit legislation is to assist agriculture. The big problem that confronts the farmer in America is no longer one of experimental work or scientific study as to how best he may improve crop production, but that of securing capital in sufficient quantities for his needs at a rate of interest that will warrant its use.

The ability to secure capital at a low rate of interest is essential to the success of any business, and farming is no exception to the rule. The railroads of the country have appealed to the Interstate Commerce Commission for years to allow them to raise the traffic rates they charge the public because they can not secure capital unless they can show ability to pay interest, and unless they can acquire capital, they tell us they must go into bankruptcy. The large corporations engaged in the packing industry, one of the tremendous business organizations of the country, are notoriously big borrowers and at low rates, because they command the whole field of credit for their needs. This same condition as to credit requirements applies, without exception, to all great manufacturing and mining enterprises. The railroads, the packers, the manufacturers, and the miners under modern business conditions must be able to secure large volumes of money or credit when needed at low rates of interest or failure is the result. Though some seem to believe to the contrary, the farmer is no exception to this rule.

The amount of capital required for owning and operating a farm of 160 acres in much of agricultural America is little considered by men in other lines of business. I know something of the problem in the Central West from personal experience. In northern Illinois, where I was born, the investment in the land alone is from $30,000 to $40,000. With the addition of the liquid working capital required, the aggregate amount of the investment becomes $50,000 or more. In Iowa the land is almost as high in price, and hence the total capital required is about the same as in Illinois. In Nebraska at present the capital required for owning and operating a farm of the size indicated is somewhat smaller. In the farming section of Nebraska, however, the man who would own and successfully operate a quarter section of agricultural land needs more capital and has a larger investment than the average capitalization of the 800 State banks of the Commonwealth.

The farmer has not enjoyed equality as to interest rates with other lines of business in America. With reference to the need for equality with other lines of business as to interest rates in America, I will say that in Nebraska the farmers have now purchased and erected many silos for the purpose of storing their forage crops. One of the largest silo-selling concerns in America has its headquarters in Nebraska's capital, the city of Lincoln. The business manager of this concern happens to be an acquaintance of my own. During the summer of 1914, just before the beginning of the European war, I happened to be in Lincoln, and the manager told me something of the immensity of the volume of their sales. He said to me that it required a great deal of money to carry the business of the institution through the active selling season, but he also said, "We get our money very cheaply. We are borrowing all we need right now in the city of New York upon our company notes at 3½ per cent per annum." I subsequently looked up the quotations upon prime commercial paper in New York at that time and found that the rate quoted was common to everyone who had accepted credit there. Now, I know of my own knowledge that at the same time the farmer in Nebraska who purchased the silo and gave his note for it at the bank was paying from 8 to 10 per cent for the credit that he needed. The farmer's solvency was essential to the success and the solidity of the entire business transaction. In other words, the farmer, who supported the whole structure of credit, was paying about two and a half times as much for his capital as was the Nebraska business man who had access to the great accumulation of credit and loanable funds in New York City.

Rural-credit legislation appeals especially to the people of Nebraska, because we are unique among all the States of this Union in that we are more dependent upon agriculture for our material prosperity than any other State. We have no mines that produce a pound of coal or iron or lead or zinc or any useful minerals whatever. We do not produce an ounce of gold or silver or jewels or precious metals of any kind whatever. We have no forests from which we cut any lumber. We value our trees for their beauty and their shade, and will not cut them down for use. We have little of manufacture when compared to many other States. Our wealth is primarily dug from the soil, and we have only a million of people to produce it. But so rich our soil, so matchless the industry of our people, that each year we dig more than $400,000,000 of actual wealth out of our soil in corn and wheat, in pork and beef, and mutton and wool—those things that mankind can not live without, the essentials of life itself. We send these products eastward across the Atlantic and westward beyond the Pacific, and with them we lay hold upon the gold and the silver of the world. We sweep it across these mighty seas and pour it into the lap of American industry and help to build up the great balance of trade in our favor, the largest ever known in the history of

the country, and which is to-day the source and support of the prosperity of the Nation. It is because we do these things that we ask from Congress this long-deferred legislation so essential to the farmer. [Applause.]

Postal-savings funds amount to $67,000,000. We have just passed the bill to increase the amount of deposits that is permitted to each depositor to $2,000. The Postmaster General tells us that we can fairly expect that under these new conditions the postal-savings deposits will double in amount in a short time. I voted in this House the other day to remove all limits as to the amount which might be deposited in a post-office savings bank. While the matter was defeated for the time, I am satisfied that sooner or later all limit will be removed. Only the desire to go slowly, as the able chairman of the Post Office Committee indicated to the House, postponed such action at this time. When the limit as to deposits is removed the Post Office Department, having behind it all the power and credit of the Government, will become a great organization for gathering the savings of the thrifty and industrious toilers of the Nation into a place where the funds will be absolutely safe and at the same time make them available for the use of other men who sweat and toil in the fields that the rest of the world may be fed. So little consideration has been given to the necessity for this sort of legislation that Congress has left rural credits as the last financial legislation to be considered in our efforts to mobilize and develop the potential strength of the Nation by increasing its productive capacity.

We have heard a great deal of late about the necessity of preparedness, but here is a preparation that is more essential to our national existence and progress than battleships or cannon, whether in peace or war. The war strength of every nation is primarily dependent upon the productive capacity of its people. We have a concrete example of this displayed for our consideration upon the other side of the Atlantic. Following the Franco-Prussian War the German nation entered upon a period of great national development in every department of human endeavor. Its wise men thought that by developing to the utmost every department of production they made for greater national strength and efficiency, whether in peace or war. Her wise men also knew that if ever the tocsin of war should again sound throughout Europe and England became involved she would sweep the seven seas of the world, as she had done for a thousand years.

For 20 years Napoleon Bonaparte, the greatest warrior the white race ever knew, marched his victorious armies back and forth across Germany until finally he taught her how to fight as well as he. One of the sayings of Bonaparte, so often quoted, was that "Every army moves upon its stomach." What he meant was that the bravest man can not fight unless he is fed. Many a battle has been won by cold steel after the ammunition has all been shot away, but the men in the trenches have to be fed, and fed every day, or they can not fight. The central powers of Europe have said to us, in substance, that they do not object to our selling arms and ammunition to the allies if we would only arrange with England so we could sell them something to eat.

Understanding how all important the ability of a nation to feed itself becomes in time of war, the German Government a generation ago began to study the problem of increasing the production of the farms of Germany. They, of course, soon learned that the essential requisite for agricultural development is a proper system of rural credits. It is not alone enough that we shall provide organizations to administer the details of the business. The great essential is that there shall be loanable funds, obtainable at a rate that will warrant their proper use, available. Our Government has, as yet, not seemed to realize how important this is as a factor in cheapening the cost of living. In prior times we have shown a disposition to cheapen credit by the deposit of Government funds in sections of the country where necessity seemed to require it. When the panic of 1907 came upon us the Government had on deposit in the banks of the principal cities of the Nation $228,000,000, which they had placed there in order that the banks that received the deposits might grant to the business men in the cities the credit they needed. I am not here to criticize this action, but to urge that we should now undertake to apply, in some measure, the same favor to the rural communities of the country when the Government has on hand cheap funds to deposit and the farmers are in need of the money at lower rates of interest than are now being charged, and the further fact being apparent that the commercial banks in the large centers are now gorged to overflowing with idle funds. This policy, which I am now urging to be applied to our proposed system of rural-credit banks, is exactly the same as that which the Government of Germany has adopted and applied to the farm banks of the Empire, and is one of the prime features in the successful development of the system there. As a result of a proper rural-credits system the agricultural development of Germany began to draw the attention of the entire world. She doubled her production of wheat per acre; she doubled her yield of rye; she greatly increased her oat crop; and in potato production she now leads the world. Make a map 6 feet square and the spot that the Teutonic Empires would make upon it you could cover with your hand, yet one-third of all the potatoes in the world are produced in this region. The wise men of Germany prepared well when they encouraged the farmers of the Empire to fill her war-chest with food. The hope of the allies for victory in this war now rests upon the well-known power of starvation to bring even strong men to their knees; but if the farmers of Germany have done their work as well as seems indicated, they have armed the nation against the greatest danger that yet confronts it.

There is no paternalism nor favoritism contemplated in the rural-credit policy which is proposed in this bill now before the House or in the deposit of postal savings funds as advocated by myself. It is only to do tardily the thing which the business experience of other nations and the sound sense of our own should have caused us to have done long ago.

One more point and I am done. We will all agree, I think, that in addition to providing banks for the accumulation of capital, where borrowers may find loanable funds at a reasonable rate, Congress should also seek earnestly to make the money of depositors absolutely safe in all the banking institutions which it authorizes by its laws to receive deposits and endows with its name to lend them credit. The deposits in the banks constitute the great volume of the loanable funds of the Nation; and, therefore, because it receives such vast benefits, because of their availability, it is required, in equity and justice, to make them secure. In the matter of affording the best possible protection to depositors in banks chartered under its laws, the Nation lags behind many of the States. A short time ago, in the fifth congressional district of Nebraska, where I reside, two banks chartered by this Government, each given the alluring title of First National Bank, with gilt signs upon their windows advertising the fact that they were depositories of national funds, closed their doors, with consequent loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars to innocent people who could ill afford it, and who had no other protection than the Government's seeming warrant that the institutions were solvent and worthy of credit. Such a disaster should no longer be permitted to occur in this country. I have introduced a bill at this session providing for an amendment to the present Federal reserve banking act which authorizes the establishment of a depositor's guaranty fund in any Federal reserve district wherein a majority of the member banks vote for the establishment of such a fund. The guaranty fund is provided for by the levy of an assessment of one-tenth of 1 per cent upon the deposits in the member banks. This would insure the depositors in failed national banks against the possibility of loss. It is a shame and a disgrace to our financial legislation that any man or woman who has trusted a dollar to a bank chartered under the laws of this Nation should have lost it. I say this because it is shown by reports of the Comptroller of the Currency that if from the foundation of the national banking system down to this hour a tax of one-thirtieth of 1 per cent had been levied upon the deposits in the national banks of the United States, the assessment would have provided a guaranty fund so big that no depositor who trusted his money to a national bank would have experienced the loss of a single dollar, and this in spite of the panics of 1873, 1893, and 1907. The distress and suffering caused by the panics which I have mentioned have only been exceeded by the calamity of war itself. Like every good thing in this world, such a provision of law would be helpful to every interest concerned. It would insure the depositor against the possibility of loss and at the same time increase materially the profit of the banking business of the banks affected. We can state this advisedly, because of the result already achieved in Nebraska under its guaranty of deposits law.

When the First National Bank of Superior failed, with hundreds of thousands of dollars of the peoples' money on hand, it pulled down with it the First States Savings Bank, which had its place of business in the same room with the national bank and was conducted by the same people. The funds of the State bank were in the vaults of the national bank, but the depositors of the State bank were not in the least concerned. After a period of three years the national bank has paid 10 per cent only to its depositors, but the State bank, under the guaranty law, was ready in three days to pay a hundred cents on the dollar to every depositor, and did so pay them as fast as they called for their money. Now, it requires no ghost to come from the grave to tell us that the guaranty-of-deposits law was a good thing for the depositors of that bank; but we have evidence that it is also a profitable measure for the banks that

are subject to the act and have paid in the guaranty fund, as required by law. There are a little more than a million dollars now in the depositors' guaranty fund in the State banks of Nebraska. It stands like a stone wall between the depositors in those banks and the possibility of loss. The guaranty law has been in operation something more than five years. A large number of national banks have denationalized because of the pressure of State-bank competition, and have taken out charters under the State law. The increase of deposits in the State banks since this law was enacted, in comparison with the national banks during the same period, shows that more than $10,000,000 of deposits have been added to the State banks by reason of the popularity of the guaranty system. The average rate of interest charged for money by the banks of Nebraska, as shown by Government investigation, is about 8 per cent per annum. The interest, therefore, upon the increase of deposits caused by the guaranty law to the State banks would amount to more than three times the assessment levied upon them to provide the guaranty fund, and the banks already have the guaranty fund fully paid under the law, and are not required to pay any further assessment, unless it should be needed, because of failures of banking institutions.

The equity of the whole guaranty-of-deposits proposition is contained in the proven fact that it provides the safety that the depositor is entitled to and, at the same time, results in added profits and solidity to the banking business; and, furthermore, the protection which it insures to the depositor is warranted, because he is the foundation of the whole banking business. Without the depositor there would be very little, if any, banking done. Banks are not established or organized to make money in the loaning of the bank capital. They are organized to make money out of the depositors' funds which are intrusted to their care. There would not be a bank in Nebraska, nor in any other State, practically, if the people of those Commonwealths did not deposit their money in the institution. The guaranty-of-deposits law simply provides that a little of the profit derived from the use of the depositors' money shall be set aside as a guaranty fund to insure against the possibility of loss the man whose money makes possible all the profits of the banking business. Congress will not have done its full duty to the people it represents until it shall have afforded them every opportunity to obtain capital at the lowest possible rate in any line of business, and, in addition, made the banks of our country so secure that no man who trusts a dollar to an institution chartered by the Nation shall, by any possibility, be in danger of losing it. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise for the purpose of opposing in any way the provisions of this bill, for I am heartily in sympathy with the work that has been done so industrially and so well by this committee. Nor do I rise merely for the purpose of taking the time of the House to make a speech upon a subject that is not relevant to the provisions of the bill. However, I desire to refer to a practice which has grown up under the appropriations carried in previous bills upon this subject and continued in this bill, a practice which, it seems to me, is abhorrent and repugnant to every person who is imbued with the spirit of our free institutions. I refer to the practice that exists in the northern part of Minnesota at the present time, where, except in certain isolated sections, an Indian is as much of a rarity as he would be if he would come in with war paint and feathers on the floor of this House at the present time, and that is the practice of arbitrarily searching the personal effects and private baggage of men and women who go to this country upon legitimate business or who may seek pleasure in the wonderful lake resorts there found.

In 1855 there was executed an Indian treaty which relinquished the rights of the Indians to about one-half of the northern part of Minnesota. By this treaty the provisions of the Federal law were extended, that provided that liquor should not be taken into the Indian country. I do not stand in opposition to that provision. It is a matter of profound and absolute indifference to me whether that section of the country is wet or dry. If my private opinion should be asked, I do think that the question of whether that country should be wet or dry should be a question for the people of that section of the States to settle for themselves, but that has been denied by the provisions of the treaty and its construction by the courts.

A short time ago, so that you may understand my interest in the matter, the daughter of one of the prominent families of the South, who had been a roommate of my daughter at a certain southern school, had occasion to travel into that country. Her baggage, consisting of a trunk from her home, was searched, and her personal and most intimate belongings were rifled. A sweater which was given to her brother for athletic achievement at Washington and Lee University was stolen, and part of her effects were taken. Seeking to investigate, I wired to United States Marshal Grimshaw, at Duluth, calling his attention to the condition of affairs. He informed me that it had not been done by officers of his department, but that it probably was done by officers from the Indian Department, for whom $315,000 are appropriated by the provisions of this bill, in order that they may carry on such searches under the guise of enforcing the provisions of an obsolete Indian treaty, in violation of the constitutional rights of men and women to be protected from unusual and unfair search as to their persons, property, and effects. He also said he had called the matter of my complaint to the attention of these Indian officers, and they had made the statement that they had been so searching the baggage of men and women going into this country, and not only that, but that they intended to keep it up. I do not claim that they admitted the searching of this particular baggage. In the northern part of Minnesota there are seven or eight thousand Indians. The population of that part of Minnesota is from 400,000 to 500,000. Indians are not prevalent there, except upon certain reservations. These Indian agents, for the purpose of providing places and work for themselves, go up and down the State of Minnesota and search the houses, the offices, the safes, and the effects and belongings of men and women who reside there. They are a band of thugs, carrying revolvers prominently displayed, as I personally know. While engaged in this work, they will go into a man's office and say, "Open up your safe until I can see if there is any whisky there," and this without reference to whether an Indian is within a hundred miles or not. They intrude themselves into the private chambers and apartments of men and women, and do the same thing. They make a practice of searching the baggage and personal effects of travelers going into that country, and if they have not a key that happens to fit a particular trunk, they will take a hammer or a coupling pin and knock the lock off the trunk and then make the search.

I have in my possession here a card which is carried by one of these humorous gentry, and I want you all to note the unspeakable impudence, the absolute effrontery, and total misconception of official duties to be found in the wording of the card. I am reminded of a sentence of Tourgee, speaking of the Federal officeholders, who went down to the South after the war, when he said, referring to such appointees, that they understood merely the insolence of their power and not its responsibilities. I read the card for your edification:

> You can't always, perhaps not even often, tell by the looks of a — well, say a suit case—what may be inside. And it's always interesting, at least, and sometimes exciting, to look in and find out.
>
> W. W. THOMASON,
> *Deputy United States Special Officer, Denver, Colo.*

Armed with this card, he boards the railroad trains of northern Minnesota, goes to the men and women upon the cars, and demands that they exhibit to his gaze their belongings and personal effects. In the town of Akely there was spread upon one of the baggage trucks of the public station certain wearing apparel of a woman in order that this officer, under the guise of a United States inspector, might exercise his arbitrary power. They have gone the length and breadth of this territory infringing upon the rights of men and women who reside there, men and women who have a legitimate right to be there, men and women who hate the liquor traffic and would not be a party to it in any way, and when the attention of the department is called to it the reply is, "Yes; we are doing this thing, and we intend to keep on doing it."

There is nothing partisan about this. It has been the same thing under Republican administration and under Democratic administration, and one has been no better than the other. By the Constitution of the United States an individual is guaranteed a reasonable degree of protection. The officers who bear the insignia of the United States should cultivate a reverence for the law. A brief time ago a man was traveling toward the Canadian border, a man who represents one of the largest concerns in the United States. It was about the hour of 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning. He and his wife and daughter occupied a drawing room upon one of the trains. A knock was heard upon the door, and when he responded an officer with brazen impudence and somewhat violent language inquired why he had his door locked at that time of night. He replied it was because he always kept it locked at night.

The man said, "I am a United States customs officer, and if you answer me in that impudent way again I will take you off the train." A short time ago, in the town where I reside,

was a lodge composed of the most reputable gentlemen of the community. I do not belong to the lodge, so I have no personal interest in it. It was the Order of the Moose. A revenue officer came to that town for the purpose of ascertaining if a revenue stamp was required for the business done by that lodge. He knocked at the door, and the porter told him to wait a minute, that he would call the steward. There were three of these men, and while the steward was answering the door these three men burst open the door of the lodge room; and when I made complaint to the Treasury Department I was told that one of these gentleman was a Christian and he resided at the Young Men's Christian Association. That is the only answer I obtained. Officers in the customhouses at our entry ports and in our customs towns are being guilty of the most oppressive and arbitrary acts toward our men and our women. It is not only oppressive, but is bringing the acts of the bureaucratic gentlemen into great disrepute and causing the United States Government to be condemned for its laws. For that reason I protest. I said to these gentlemen when I was told that there was no relief for me that I would make my complaint upon the floor of this House. In pursuance of that statement I keep the promise that I made.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, if in the two covers of this bill there are appropriations which are making vexatious the life, the safety, and the security of the citizens, and being arbitrarily used, it occurs to me at the proper time they should be stricken out. I care not for the interests that might wish to have this country wet. I have no concern in them, nor have I ever been concerned in them, but I have an old-fashioned regard for the Constitution of the United States that says that men and women may freely travel up and down this land in security and be protected against vexatious, irritating, and annoying seizures and searches of their personal baggage and effects, and for that reason I am protesting against these acts that are being committed under the appropriations that are being made by this House to better the Indian service rather than to annoy citizens. [Applause.]

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TILLMAN], a member of the committee.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope that gentlemen present will understand fully the nature of the complaint made by the distinguished gentleman who has just taken his seat, and understand the attitude of the committee in its efforts to do what it considered the laudable thing by attempting to carry out the treaty with this Indian tribe made more than 50 years ago. That treaty provided that, without the consent of either the President or Congress, no liquor should be allowed to be introduced or sold in certain territory of which the gentleman speaks. The Committee on Indian Affairs desires to carry out in good faith the provisions of that treaty. The gentleman would seem to want to abrogate a treaty more than 50 years of age. It is a well-known fact that the Indian has been robbed by being plied with whisky since 1492. He has thus lost his property, his money, his health. Now, you can not have a liquor law of any kind without its working hardship in some instances. Down in Oklahoma, which State adjoins mine, and to which many Arkansas people have gone, they have this same search law. If any man goes into Oklahoma where there are many Indians, and it is suspected that he has whisky in his grip or in his pocket, an officer is allowed to make a search without the filing of an affidavit. The liquor law could not be enforced in Oklahoma, and it can not be enforced elsewhere, without a search law. A very suave and able gentleman appeared before our committee representing a certain brewery in Minnesota. The people who want the liquor law enforced were not present by attorney or otherwise. This gentleman frankly said that he was there representing a brewery, and that he wanted the wet territory extended. So far as the majority of the Indian Committee are concerned, they prefer to see dry territory extended and wet territory limited. Now, the object of the gentleman who has just spoken and others is really to extend this wet territory so as to embrace a portion of the land that the Indians ceded to the United States many years ago on condition that whisky should no longer be sold or introduced within the limits of that territory. The law is bigger than any man, whether he comes from the North or the South; the law is bigger than any woman, whether she comes from the North or the South.

The bureau tells the committee that, as a general proposition, the men who are charged with the enforcement of these liquor laws have done their duty in such a way as to justify their continuance in the service.

Mr. MEEKER. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. On the point the gentleman is on, I would like to ask if it is the gentleman's opinion that a man has no rights which the law is bound to respect?

Mr. TILLMAN. When a law is placed on the statute books, my dear sir, it ought to be enforced.

Mr. MEEKER. Always?

Mr. TILLMAN. Oh, yes; certainly.

Mr. MEEKER. He has no rights of his own at all?

Mr. TILLMAN. He has no right if the law comes in conflict with him, because the law is bigger than he is. If it were not, any man charged with law violation would insist that the law traversed his "rights" and therefore should be ignored.

Mr. MEEKER. The law is greater than any man's individual right?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes, sir. No individual has the right to assume that he is superior to the law. You can not enforce the law against larceny, against illegal liquor sales, or other crime if the man accused is entitled to determine for himself whether or not the law comes in conflict with his rights.

Mr. MEEKER. It is on the point of right of search and seizure. It was the practice that started the revolutionary trouble. I want to know if the gentleman is insisting that there is no individual right which an American citizen possesses that the law is not bound to respect?

Mr. TILLMAN. This law was enacted for the purpose of suppressing a certain traffic or declaring a certain thing criminal, and the law ought to be enforced against all alike.

Mr. MEEKER. I would ask another question on the same point, the point suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota, that some officer of the law suspects that some individual is violating a right, does that give him the right of search and seizure?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes; and an officer may make a mistake, but that does not necessarily reflect on the officer, and certainly this would not discredit the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TILLMAN] has expired.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman from Arkansas desire more time?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes, sir; five minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I yield five minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILLMAN. I will.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Is it the opinion of the distinguished member of the committee that because this is a treaty country that that would give the right to any Indian officer to search the baggage of respectable women traveling from remote points into that country, where there is not an Indian, perhaps, within 50 miles, and where there could not be any basis whatever for the supposition or suspicion that her trunk was carrying this kind of contraband? And another question——

Mr. TILLMAN. Let me answer the first one.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. You can answer them both at the same time, for they are connected with each other. And does not the gentleman recognize that under the laws of the United States, where there is a basis for suspicion, that there are proper search proceedings provided upon affidavit, and regular court proceedings, instead of an arbitrary exercise of power?

Mr. TILLMAN. I will answer the last question first. The law, usually, not always, requires that before an officer can make a search for prohibited liquors an affidavit must be made. But often the law, and properly so, vests the officer with the right to search for contraband liquors without affidavit. An officer has more rights than an individual in the matter of search and seizures.

Now, the other question. Will you repeat it?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. The substance of it is this, and I think I know what your answer will be. You can not make the search of ladies who are traveling on legitimate business.

Mr. TILLMAN. Oh, no; and it is equally reprehensible for an officer to make a search of men's baggage without reasonable cause. But here is the trouble with people who insist on doing what the gentleman seems to want to do, to criticize or dispense with the Indian police charged with the duty of enforcing these wholesome laws designed to protect the Indian from the sale of liquors.

The trouble with an argument of the kind just heard is that gentlemen always select some seemingly outrageous case of the kind mentioned by the gentleman. If an officer makes a mistake, the law is not at fault. He sometimes does that and is not at fault himself, but this does not argue that the law is bad. Now, so far as I am personally concerned, I would not justify any officer, without excuse, without an affidavit, or without reasonable ground for believing that liquor is contained in baggage, to search the same. But officers must act with the lights before them, and if they make a mistake occasionally it does not justfy Congress in repealing a wholesome treaty regulation,

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Will the gentleman allow me to suggest that the last thing I would want to do would be to take away the Indian police. I want their activities so restricted that they can not take the course I have stated.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is a matter of administration. I think the bureau can be depended upon to see that they act within decent limits. The committee thinks the attempt to enforce the lipuor laws in Oklahoma and elsewhere by proper search and by the use of special detectives and special agents should continue. I would not for a moment justify an officer making a search of a woman's baggage or the baggage of men unless they have reasonable ground for doing so.

The gentleman also spoke about the oppression by certain customhouse officials in making searches and seizures. For many years it was the cheerful habit of men and women coming from Europe to smuggle valuable goods through the customhouses. Recent customhouse officers by carefully searching all baggage have discovered valuable gems and other property coming into this country from Europe, the owners of which, both men and women, sought to escape the custom duties. So I apprehend there are but few searches made in bad faith under this liquor law. I apprehend that these officers do their duty 9 times out of 10 in making these searches and that they are prompted by the best of motives, and that their work is to be commended rather than criticized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] desire to use any time now? If not, I have a man who desires to us 20 minutes.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I will yield 20 minutes to myself.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. All right.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, the question of the education and the civilization of the Indians of this country is a very large and important one. The management of the Bureau of Indian Affairs by the Government is criticized frequently, and it is criticized more, I believe, by those who know little or nothing of Indian affairs than by those who are well acquainted with the subject.

I am very glad that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] made the remarks that he did. I believe the more discussion there is of Indian affairs, the better the service will be. The gentleman made rather a general criticism of a branch of the Indian Bureau service. I trust that for better efficiency in the service that the gentleman complains of, he will place in the RECORD specific charges against definite officials of the Indian Service, so that the men who were guilty of these violations of common courtesy and of common decent performance of their official duties may be brought properly before the Interior Department for hearing and separated from the service if these charges against them are substantiated.

In the short time that I have served on the Committee on Indian Affairs I have heard a great many general complaints made against this branch and that branch of the Indian Service, but when the parties complaining were asked to specify, in most cases they had no bill of particulars. It is easy, gentlemen, to complain of a great department like the Bureau of Indian Affairs in a general way. I do not want to be understood as supporting the proposition that there are no practices and no policies carried on by the Bureau of Indian Affairs against which just and well founded complaint can not be specifically made; but if we are going to arrive at a better condition in that bureau we must have complaint and criticisms backed by and founded upon facts.

The other day a party of Indians and representatives of the Chippewa Tribe in northern Minnesota appeared before the committee, and they made complaint of the annual appropriation expenditure of $185,000, or approximately that amount, of the funds of the Indians for the supervision of the Indians in that territory. Their attorney represented that about everything connected with the expenditure of this sum for the civilization and self-support of these Indians was outrageously wrong. I interrogated the attorney and requested him to name, to begin with, one specific thing that was wrong, and then to name as many other specific criticisms as he might be able. Well, he named only one, and said that that was all he could name at that time. That was a complaint against the superintendent of one of the day schools on the reservation, who was receiving a salary of $1,000 a year. When I asked the delegation if they desired that that position be removed from the list of salaried positions, they said no; they did not want that. It developed that that superintendent had some personal trouble with the sister of one of the delegates appearing before the committee, and that the delegates really familiar with the facts did not think there was any good cause for complaint against the superintendent. And so it is with so many of these complaints and criticisms.

There are in the United States at the present time, according to the reports of the Bureau of the Census and the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, about 300,000 Indians. The number of Indians in the United States is increasing, as will appear from the following reports of the Bureau of the Census and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs:

Report of the Census Bureau of Indian population in the United States for 10-year periods from 1870 to 1910.

	United States.		Alaska (census returns).
	Census returns.	Reports of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.[1]	
1910	265,683	279,023	25,331
1900	237,196	250,000	29,536
1890	248,253	228,000	32,996
1880	.....	244,000	.....
1870	.....	278,000	.....

[1] Figures are exclusive of freedmen and intermarried whites, as follows: 1910, 25,927; 1900, 20,000 (estimate); 1890, 16,000 (estimate); 1880, 12,000 (estimate); 1870, 10,000 (estimate).

The report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs gives the following report of the Indian population of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915:

Indian population of the United States, exclusive of Alaska, June 30, 1915.

[Figures compiled from reports of Indian school superintendents, supplemented by information from 1910 census for localities in which no Indian Office representative is located.]

Grand total		333,010
Five Civilized Tribes, including freedmen and intermarried whites		101,521
By blood	75,534	
By intermarriage	2,582	
Freedmen	23,405	
Exclusive of Five Civilized Tribes		231,489

In the brief time I shall address the House this afternoon I shall attempt to bring before gentlemen of the House some facts that will show the past conditions of the Indians in this country and their present conditions; some facts that will show you the amount of money that has in past years been expended for the civilization and education of the Indians, and the amount that is being expended now and the use to which it is being put.

In the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, the commissioner makes this statement, to show the importance and growth of the bureau: In 1899 there were received 59,797 communications by his department pertaining to Indian affairs; in 1915 that number had increased to 292,140. That is, the per cent of increase had been nearly 400. The number of employees in the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1899—that is, 16 years ago—was 101. The number to-day in that bureau is 260.

The following table from the commissioner's report presents the subject quite clearly:

Comparative statement of work and force in Office of Indian Affairs since 1899.

Year.	Work.		Employees.	
	Communications received.	Increase over preceding year.	Total number employed in Indian Office.	Increase (+) or decrease (−) over preceding year.
		Per cent.		*Per cent.*
1899	59,707	.....	101	.....
1900	62,601	4.84	115	+13.86
1901	67,376	7.62	119	+ 3.48
1902	79,237	17.60	132	+10.92
1903	79,115	.22	131	− .75
1904	86,588	9.03	142	+ 8.39
1905	98,322	13.55	149	+ 4.93
1906	106,533	8.35	145	− 2.68
1907	117,556	10.34	160	+10.34
1908	152,995	30.14	179	+11.87
1909	176,765	15.53	189	+ 5.58
1910	194,241	9.88	203	+ 7.40
1911	197,637	1.74	227	+11.82
1912	222,187	12.37	224	− 1.32
1913	275,452	23.97	237	+ 5.80
1914	280,744	1.92	245	+ 3.37
1915	298,240	6.23	260	+ 6.12

	Per cent.
Increase in work, 1915 over 1899	399.51
Increase in force, 1915 over 1899	157.43

In 1906 the United States Government expended $181,420 to maintain the Indian Bureau. That was but 10 years ago.

Last year we expended $327,433.34. In 1906 there was appropriated for the Indian Service $13,404,615.55; in 1907, in round numbers, $9,000,000; in 1908, $11,000,000; in 1909, in round numbers, $9,000,000; in 1910, $11,000,000; in 1911, $10,000,000, in round numbers; in 1912, $8,000,000; in 1913, $12,000,000; in 1914, $9,000,000; in 1915, $9,855,164.86.

I shall place in the RECORD the memorandum I have here, giving the exact figures covering the appropriations for the Indian Office, the appropriations for the Indian Service, and the amount expended by the Indian Service for the fiscal years 1906 to 1915, inclusive:

Fiscal years.	Appropriations for Indian Office.	Appropriations for Indian Service.	Expended for Indian Service.
1906	$181,420.00	$13,404,615.55	$12,746,859.08
1907	193,020.00	9,648,757.14	15,163,608.41
1908	197,720.00	11,837,731.79	14,579,755.75
1909	220,870.00	9,788,915.13	15,604,618.11
1910	231,210.00	11,891,782.48	18,504,131.69
1911	236,210.00	10,136,017.71	20,936,757.46
1912	232,210.00	8,948,454.30	20,134,839.80
1913	236,710.00	12,406,167.06	20,306,158.90
1914	310,950.00	9,895,553.80	20,215,075.96
1915	327,433.34	9,855,164.86	20,592,322.48
Total	2,367,753.34	107,813,159.82	[1] 178,874,127.55

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
ALBUQUERQUE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Albuquerque, N. Mex., 1915	$26,698.77		$442.56	$1,428.29	$76.54	$9.00	$16,715.30	$9,488.01	$2,632.31	$2,548.36
Indian school, Albuquerque, N. Mex., repairs and improvements.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			7,792.41							
Indian school, transportation, 1915		$1,047.80								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	182.70						4.16			
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor					16.20					
Indian school, Albuquerque, N. Mex., buildings.										
Indian school, Albuquerque, assembly hall and gymnasium.										
Total	26,881.47	1,047.80	8,234.97	1,428.29	92.74	9.00	16,719.46	9,488.01	2,632.31	2,548.36
ARMSTRONG BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw	10,446.99	20.06	480.93		34.95		4,675.91	1,365.08	582.47	845.82
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			622.96							
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4			3.93		3.13	18.10	23.30	9.00		
Total	10,446.99	20.06	1,107.82		38.08	18.10	4,699.21	1,374.08	582.47	845.82
BAY MILLS DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	1,680.85		23.24		20.00		28.93	172.28	67.03	68.00
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			33.42							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.	30.00									
Total	1,710.85		56.66		20.00		28.93	172.28	67.03	68.00
BISHOP AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in California, 1915	660.00	95.15	1.89	15.00			349.20		161.60	69.73
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			502.23							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,104.56						42.56	44.67	162.00	
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	780.00	265.75							210.16	
Total	2,544.56	360.90	504.12	15.00			391.76	44.67	533.76	69.73
BISHOP DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	6,250.65		105.27	61.80	129.04		855.89	174.01	24.00	827.01
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915			67.30							
Total	6,250.65		172.57	61.80	129.04		855.89	174.01	24.00	827.01
BISMARCK BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Bismarck, N. Dak., 1915	6,676.70	36.30	184.43	446.15	24.75		4,058.71	1,911.54	1,051.94	1,085.52
Indian school, Bismarck, N. Dak., repairs and improvements, 1915.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			840.42							
Indian school, transportation, 1915		216.30								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4								16.50		
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	130.00				1.44		15.85	22.50	14.00	2.19
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Total	6,806.70	252.60	1,024.85	446.15	26.19		4,074.56	1,950.54	1,065.94	1,087.71
BLACKFEET AGENCY.										
Support of Indians of Blackfeet Agency, Mont., 1915.	8,113.05	21.40	167.41		93.81		1,961.58	142.74	85.00	611.89
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	8,592.01	210.72				4.00	230.12		377.00	
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			5,587.85							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915		18.20								

[1] Includes disbursements from tribal funds for per capita payments, pro rata shares, etc.

I quote these figures to call your attention to this fact, that you will find in the present Indian appropriation bill that is before the House appropriations aggregating $9,357,146.66 for the support, education, and civilization of the Indians.

That is not by any means the total amount that is expended each year for the support and civilization of the Indians. Last year, while the appropriations provided in the Indian appropriation bill were $9,855,164.86, there was expended by the Indian Bureau over $13,000,000, exclusive of the amount for per capita payment.

I believe that it is well that the Congress should know just exactly, or as nearly as possible, for what each dollar of this money has been expended and what it has produced in the way of civilization, education, and improvement among the Indians. I believe that the time should soon come when the Indians who are competent and self-supporting should be released from any supervision or control by the Federal Government other than what is given to any white citizen of the Government. I shall place in the RECORD a detailed statement of the expenditures by the Indian Bureau of the money appropriated for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1915, in the Indian appropriation bill, and this detailed statement will include a statement of the money expended by the bureau out of trust funds belonging to the Indians, being an additional expenditure of nearly $5,000,000.

Indian Service, 1915.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									ALBUQUERQUE BOARDING SCHOOL.
$95.28	$688.45	$380.06	$6,884.79				$204.86	$68,202.58	Indian school, Albuquerque, N. Mex., 1915.
				$378.00	$4,613.37			4,991.37	Indian school, Albuquerque, N. Mex., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								7,792.41	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								1,047.80	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
			213.95		11.20			412.01	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
					73.46			89.66	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
				9,045.33				9,045.33	Indian school, Albuquerque, N. Mex., buildings.
				10,794.79				10,794.79	Indian school, Albuquerque, assembly hall and gymnasium.
95.28	688.45	380.06	7,098.74	20,218.12	4,698.03		204.86	102,465.95	Total.
									ARMSTRONG BOARDING SCHOOL.
65.00	59.96	67.38	999.24	860.22	1,758.89		125.94	22,388.84	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw.
								622.96	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
			138.82		4.88			201.16	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
65.00	59.96	67.38	1,138.06	860.22	1,763.77		125.94	23,212.96	Total.
									BAY MILLS DAY SCHOOL.
1.30	154.17	57.26	112.50					2,385.56	Indians schools, support, 1915.
								33.42	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					53.08			53.08	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
							[1] 79.76	109.76	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
1.30	154.17	57.26	112.50		53.08		79.76	2,581.82	Total.
									BISHOP AGENCY.
		102.26	130.74				36.50	1,622.07	Support of Indians in California, 1915.
								502.23	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					7.43	$172.57		180.00	Indian school, and agency buildings, 1915.
								1,353.79	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
			50.00				[2] 800.00	850.00	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
							[3] 46.50	46.50	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
			26.00					1,281.91	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
		102.26	206.74		7.43	172.57	883.00	5,836.50	Total.
									BISHOP DAY SCHOOLS.
56.06	209.52	2.60	1,405.46				57.15	10,158.46	Indian schools support, 1915.
				3,625.48	521.29	612.00	36.00	4,862.07	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
56.06	209.52	2.60	1,405.46	3,625.48	521.29	612.00	93.15	15,020.53	Total.
									BISMARCK BOARDING SCHOOL.
17.50	119.12	56.08	831.72				45.69	16,546.15	Indian school, Bismarck, N. Dak., 1915.
					1,758.74			1,758.74	Indian school, Bismarck, N. Dak., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								840.42	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								216.30	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
			9.88					26.38	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
2.25		21.05	64.42					273.70	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
							[1] 70.00	70.00	Relieving distress and prevention of diseases among Indians, 1915.
19.75	119.12	77.13	906.02		1,758.74		115.69	19,731.69	Total.
									BLACKFEET AGENCY.
78.60		1,085.60	1,512.20				475.00	14,348.19	Support of Indians of Blackfeet Agency, Mont., 1915.
28.35		34.23	3,301.84				120.00	12,898.27	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								5,587.85	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				405.52	1,159.55	40.00		1,623.27	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.

[1] Hospital expenses. [2] Owens River Canal stock. [3] Medical attention.

Detailed statement of expenditures.

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
BLACKFEET AGENCY—continued.										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 3	$230.25	$26.00							$214.09	
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,311.99							$188.51	45.00	
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Interest on Blackfeet Reservation 4 per cent fund.			$15.45				$1,052.62	240.24		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	2,205.00	27.95								
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	1,275.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M								41.12		
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.						$43.04				
Blackfeet Reservation 4 per cent fund	2,373.32		656.52				17,328.04		2,608.20	$680.41
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915						925.17				
Support of Chief Rocky Boy's Band of Chippewas, Montana, 1915.							3,670.58			
Support Rocky Boy's Band of Chippewas and other Indians, Montana, 1915.	110.00	217.32	57.73				4,252.20		138.00	
Industry among Indians, 1915		25.10								
Industry among Indians, 1915–16		17.00								
Indian schools, support, 1915 (tuition)										
Total	25,378.62	561.69	6,484.96		$93.81	972.21	28,495.14	612.60	3,467.29	1,292.21
BLACKFEET BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Blackfeet Reservation 4 per cent fund			870.99				4,868.22	2,184.18	480.00	1,474.82
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor		2.50								
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							4.40	18.72		
Indian schools, support, 1915	9,328.66				5.25		942.10	349.92	510.67	19.75
Total	9,328.66	2.50	870.99		5.25		5,814.72	2,552.82	990.67	1,494.57
HOLY FAMILY MISSION BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Interest on Blackfeet Reservation 4 per cent fund.							4,082.82			
BLACKFEET DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	1,498.00						172.18			307.25
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915		12.00								
Total	1,498.00	12.00					172.18			307.25
BLOOMFIELD BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw	2,232.60	90.00			11.16	7.30	55.93		341.55	24.75
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	74.96		3.30				19.18		93.80	
Total	2,307.56	90.00	3.30		11.16	7.30	75.11		435.35	24.75
CAMPO AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in California, 1915			52.50		36.00		151.94	45.63	292.00	46.00
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			77.98							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor							74.99			
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	161.66									
Industry among Indians, 1915										
Industry among Indinas (reimbursable)										
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	720.00		1.93						80.00	
Total	881.66		132.41		36.00		226.93	45.63	372.00	46.00
CAMPO DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	3,409.50		39.79				233.39	27.37		45.10
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	3,409.50		39.79				233.39	27.37		45.10
CAMP VERDE AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.	30.00	59.25					111.99			
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			48.69							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	720.00									
Purchase of lands for Camp Verde Indians										
Total	750.00	59.25	48.69				111.99			
CAMP VERDE DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	2,882.00	26.15	13.11				7.67	54.29	60.00	113.24
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	2,882.00	26.15	13.11				7.67	54.29	60.00	113.24
CANTON INSANE ASYLUM.										
Asylum for insane Indians, Canton, S. Dak., 1915.	11,127.91	235.22	486.51	$318.16	32.45		4,989.48	852.61	3.75	1,367.95
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies 1915.			736.47							
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
Total	11,127.91	235.22	1,222.98	318.16	32.45		4,989.48	852.61	3.75	1,367.95

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									BLACKFEET AGENCY—continued.
			$1.75					$1.75	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			7.00					477.34	Miscellaneous receipts, class 3.
								2,545.50	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
			1,694.61				$30.00	3,032.91	Interest on Blackfeet Reservation 4 per cent fund.
			322.50					2,555.45	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								1,275.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
			340.00					381.12	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
		$175.48		$14,466.67				14,685.19	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
$17.30		163.92	4,950.18				[1] 6,611.04	35,388.93	Blackfeet Reservation 4 per cent fund.
								925.17	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
							[2] 35.00	3,705.58	Support of Chief Rocky Boy's Band of Chippewas, Montana, 1915.
			241.35				[1] 181.70	5,198.30	Support Rocky Boy's Band of Chippewas and other Indians, Montana, 1915.
			74,930.57					74,955.67	Industry among Indians, 1915.
			25,594.40					25,611.40	Industry among Indians, 1915-16.
							[3] 1,296.15	1,296.15	Indian schools, support, 1915 (tuition).
124.25		1,459.23	112,896.40	14,872.19	$1,159.55	$40.00	8,748.89	206,661.04	Total.
									BLACKFEET BOARDING SCHOOL.
	$342.44		250.82		47.57			10,518.04	Blackfeet Reservation 4 per cent fund.
		35.36						37.86	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
					99.09			99.09	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			67.90					91.02	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
	14.99		230.31				36.00	11,437.65	Indian schools, support, 1915.
	357.43	35.36	549.03		146.66		36.00	22,183.66	Total.
									HOLY FAMILY MISSION BOARDING SCHOOL.
								4,082.82	Interest on Blackfeet Reservation 4 per cent fund.
									BLACKFEET DAY SCHOOLS.
								1,977.43	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					217.46		[4] 196.40	425.86	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
					217.46		196.40	2,403.29	Total.
									BLOOMFIELD BOARDING SCHOOL.
	1.50	8.15	99.47		239.30		70.41	3,162.12	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw.
	.50	1.60	55.61		2.65		4.60	256.20	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
	2.00	9.75	155.08		241.95		55.01	3,418.32	Total.
									CAMPO AGENCY.
		30.23	150.06				2.50	806.86	Support of Indians in California, 1915.
								77.98	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				459.27	37.35			496.62	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								74.99	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
							[5] 45.00	45.00	Relieving distress and prevention of diseases among Indians, 1915.
			28.00					189.66	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
			869.50					869.50	Industry among Indians, 1915.
								1.93	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
								800.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
		30.23	1,047.56	459.27	37.35		47.50	3,362.54	Total.
									CAMPO DAY SCHOOL.
	29.06	1.79	214.23					4,000.23	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					98.78			98.78	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	29.06	1.79	214.23		98.78			4,099.01	Total.
									CAMP VERDE AGENCY.
101.50			45.50				2.00	350.24	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
								48.69	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915
			.50					720.50	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
							[6] 13,000.00	13,000.00	Purchase of lands for Camp Verde Indians.
101.50			46.00				13,002.00	14,119.43	Total.
									CAMP VERDE DAY SCHOOL.
	46.67	188.58	76.05				3.50	3,471.26	Indian schools, support, 1915.
						516.00	[6] 120.00	636.00	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	46.67	188.58	76.05			516.00	123.50	4,107.26	Total.
									CANTON INSANE ASYLUM.
20.35	3.15	127.22	1,114.37	1,806.75	3,074.21		190.81	25,750.90	Asylum for insane Indians, Canton, S. Dak., 1915.
								736.47	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				350.00				350.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
20.35	3.15	127.22	1,114.37	2,156.75	3,074.21		190.81	26,837.37	Total.

[1] Seed. [2] Burial expenses. [3] Tuition. [4] Land. [5] Hospital expenses. [6] Water.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
CANTONMENT AGENCY.										
Support of Cheyennes and Arapahoes, Oklahoma, 1915.	$8,297.72	$407.20	$101.46		$7.04		$4.30	$19.11	$43.00	$340.33
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			675.34							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	600.00							41.36		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	300.00						8.09	2.46		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,400.00								163.86	
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor						$39.00				
Determining heirs of deceased, Indian allottees, 1915.	1,767.50	15.22								
Total	12,365.22	422.42	776.80		7.04	39.00	12.39	62.93	206.86	340.33
CANTONMENT BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	6,899.11	27.25	130.13		.20		2,738.74	1,904.32	212.78	951.34
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	304.60	74.66					22.70		561.59	70.84
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	617.81						135.47		362.66	
Total	7,821.52	101.91	130.13		.20		2,896.91	1,904.32	1,137.03	1,022.18
CARLISLE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Carlisle, Pa., 1915	52,769.61	1,634.18	488.82	$4,168.52	314.69		25,659.34	17,777.57	1,577.25	13,257.74
Indian school, Carlisle, Pa., repairs and improvements, 1915.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,268.40							
Indian school, transportation, 1915	7.00	10,748.27			49.59					
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	1,086.44				5.50	164.11				
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	350.22	51.17	27.66		27.12	80.65	375.71	6.00		11.37
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4, athletics	5,979.00									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4, charity		11.93								
Total	60,392.27	12,445.55	1,784.88	4,168.52	396.90	244.76	26,035.05	17,783.57	1,577.25	13,272.11
CARSON BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Carson City, Nev., 1915	18,890.72	178.08		936.66	104.89		9,357.21	5,033.13	826.35	2,374.38
Indian school, Carson City, Nev., repairs and improvements, 1915.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			5,069.87							
Indian school, transportation, 1915		1,719.82			20.34					
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	47.75		2.61		31.06		38.27	.50	4.00	
Support of Indians in Nevada, 1915	60.00	46.25	1.05		5.90		303.09			
Support of Indians in California, 1915	75.00									
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.						47.03				
Total	19,073.47	1,944.15	5,073.53	936.66	162.19	47.03	9,698.57	5,033.63	830.35	2,374.38
CARTER AGENCY.										
Support of Pottawatomies, Wisconsin, 1915	4,259.99	622.71	2.00		35.22		367.53	73.53	439.87	
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			20.52							
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.	78.25						400.80			
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Support of Pottawatomies in Wisconsin	67.10	443.83	31.00				245.94	64.85	11.10	
Purchase of allotments for Wisconsin Band of Pottawatomies, Wisconsin and Michigan (reimbursable).										
Total	4,405.34	1,066.54	53.52		35.22		1,014.27	138.38	450.97	
CASS LAKE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund	3,707.77	28.65	89.92		25.70		447.99	1,307.57	291.88	64.99
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1913	6.00	59.56					383.68		293.49	481.50
Indian schools, support, 1915	533.65								125.10	
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			293.76							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, bridge										
Total	4,247.42	88.21	293.68		25.70		831.67	1,307.57	710.47	546.49
CHEROKEE AGENCY, N. C.										
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	720.00	250.75								
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.		26.75								
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,381.38							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	600.00							17.02		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	840.00									
Payment to North Carolina Cherokees										
Industry among Indians, 1915										
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)										
Special deposits, tribal	187.50	40.25								
Total	2,347.50	317.75	1,381.38					17.02		

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									CANTONMENT AGENCY.
$238.82		$196.15	$346.06				$13.43	$10,014.62	Support of Cheyennes and Arapahoes, Oklahoma, 1915.
								675.34	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					$121.78	$294.00		415.78	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								641.36	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
			.35					310.90	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			325.00					1,888.86	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								39.00	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								1,782.72	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
238.82		196.15	671.41		121.78	294.00	13.43	15,768.58	Total.
									CANTONMENT BOARDING SCHOOL.
	$8.47	5.29	1,489.33				8.00	14,375.01	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				$6,695.73	962.57			7,658.30	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
11.40			260.66		484.51		60.12	1,851.08	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			229.80					1,345.74	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
11.40	8.47	5.29	1,979.84	6,695.73	1,447.08		68.12	25,230.13	Total.
									CARLISLE BOARDING SCHOOL.
179.95	535.92	624.21	10,999.75			400.00	958.12	131,345.67	Indian school, Carlisle, Pa., 1915.
				4,707.06	12,764.84			17,471.90	Indian school, Carlisle, Pa., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								1,268.40	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								10,804.86	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
		8.50						8.50	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
			64.40				1.00	1,321.54	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
23.15		110.96	363.43		16.43		3.37	1,650.24	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
							[1] 27,687.10	33,666.10	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4, athletics
							[2] 32.50	44.43	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4, charity.
203.10	535.92	743.67	11,427.67	4,707.06	12,781.27	400.00	28,682.09	197,581.64	Total.
									CARSON BOARDING SCHOOL.
3.56	294.28	505.73	1,991.41				221.71	40,719.11	Indian school, Carson City, Nev., 1915.
					7,397.19			7,397.19	Indian school, Carson City, Nev., repairs and and improvements, 1915.
								5,069.87	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								1,740.16	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
		25.00	407.55		2.35			559.09	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		11.35					[3] 77.17	504.81	Support of Indians in Nevada, 1915.
								75.00	Support of Indians in California, 1915.
		2.50		14,666.66			[4] 297.50	15,013.69	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
3.56	294.28	544.58	2,398.96	14,666.66	7,399.54		596.38	71,077.92	Total.
									CARTER AGENCY.
		171.57	173.35				[5] 330.00	6,475.77	Support of Pottawatomies, Wisconsin, 1915.
								20.52	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								479.05	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
						760.00		760.00	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
111.50			94.96		102.29		463.65	1,636.22	Support of Pottawatomies in Wisconsin.
							[6] 96,449.29	96,449.29	Purchase of allotments for Wisconsin Band of Pottawatomies, Wisconsin and Michigan (reimbursable).
111.50		171.57	268.31		102.29	760.00	97,242.94	105,820.85	Total.
									CASS LAKE BOARDING SCHOOL.
	99.52		337.48		11.24		7.50	6,420.21	Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund.
	.75	1.55	396.60	1,536.50	784.82		57.48	4,001.93	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915.
							66.05	724.80	Indian schools, support, 1915.
								203.76	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					2,201.39			2,201.39	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
				4,210.97				4,210.97	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, bridge.
	100.27	1.55	734.08	5,747.47	2,997.45		131.03	17,763.06	Total.
									CHEROKEE AGENCY, N. C.
			10.00					980.75	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
								26.75	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
					39.95			39.95	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								1,381.38	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								617.02	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								840.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
							[7] 3,388.85	3,388.85	Payment to North Carolina Cherokees.
			4,733.15				[8] 339.35	5,072.50	Industry among Indians, 1915.
			109.00				[9] 185.30	285.30	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
							[9] 110.00	337.75	Special deposits, tribal.
			4,843.15		39.95		4,023.50	12,970.25	Total.

[1] Athletic expenses.
[2] Tuition.
[3] Burial expenses and medical attendants.
[4] Medical attendance.
[5] Hospital expenses, etc.
[6] Land, $96,430; receiving fees, $29.29.
[7] Taxes on tribal land.
[8] Seed.
[9] Cash payment to needy Indians.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel illuminants, lubricants, etc.
CHEROKEE BOARDING SCHOOL, N. C.										
Indian school, Cherokee, N. C., 1915	$14,691.42	$38.85	$84.65				$3,871.37	$3,091.29	$1,793.54	$725.67
Indian school, Cherokee, N. C., repairs and improvements, 1915.										
Indian school, Cherokee, N. C., buildings										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							3.68			
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Total	14,691.42	38.85	84.65				3,875.05	3,091.29	1,793.54	725.67
CHEROKEE DAY SCHOOL, N. C.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	1,791.00	9.50					20.75			96.44
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	1,791.00	9.50					20.75			96.44
CHEROKEE BOARDING SCHOOL, OKLA.										
Cherokee Orphan Training School, T. C. T., Okla., 1915.	8,185.74	7.92	2.42		$34.93		4,417.19	1,532.99	877.85	459.35
Cherokee Orphan Training School, T. C. T., Okla., repairs and improvements, 1915.						$109.95				
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			465.76		.15					
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4						3.00	11.55		46.76	2.95
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.					.33					
Indian school, transportation, 1915		8.92								
Total	8,185.74	16.84	468.18		35.41	112.95	4,428.74	1,532.99	924.61	462.30
CHEYENNE AND ARAPAHOE AGENCY.										
Support of Cheyennes and Arapahoes, Oklahoma, 1915.	10,681.51	107.72			114.39		12.96	39.62	502.50	365.92
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			720.68							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	286.67									
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	3,044.00									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor		67.99			138.00					
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	299.50	31.77	2.25			3.75	10.00		255.32	21.00
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						215.83				
Proceeds of Cheyenne and Arapahoe reserve lands, Oklahoma.										
Cheyennes and Arapahoes in Oklahoma 3 per cent fund.										
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	1,530.00						18.94	16.44	317.70	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	3,155.01									
Total	18,936.69	207.48	722.93		252.39	219.58	41.90	56.06	1,165.52	386.92
CHEYENNE AND ARAPAHOE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	12,856.25				100.04		4,648.87	2,639.58		2,181.58
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor		12.80								
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	316.25	52.00					207.45	102.06	815.46	29.20
Indian school, transportation, 1915		10.00								
Proceeds of Cheyenne and Arapahoe reserve lands, Oklahoma.										
Total	13,172.50	74.69			100.04		4,856.32	2,741.64	815.46	2,213.78
CHEYENNE RIVER AGENCY.										
Cheyenne River Reservation 3 per cent fund	17,071.21	1,490.01	2,628.07		49.82	8.25	16,027.68	233.31	1,802.91	1,228.01
Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915.	18,240.34									
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.		4.54	3,685.07							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	5,286.98							434.20		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	155.40									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	2,012.26	4.30			7.50	5.00			7.00	8.50
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						2.00				
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	2,700.00								27.53	
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	1,707.10	45.06								
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)			238.20							
Proceeds C. R. and S. R. Reservation, S. Dak. and N. Dak.	109.74		5.00		148.28					
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	2,766.51	193.14								[b]
Interest on Cheyenne River Reservation 3 per cent fund.		16.40								
Civilization of the Sioux										
Total	50,049.54	1,753.45	6,556.34		205.60	15.25	16,027.68	667.51	1,837.44	1,236.51

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									CHEROKEE BOARDING SCHOOL, N. C.
$211.65	$164.38	$556.24	$3,923.38				$147.61	$29,300.05	Indian school, Cherokee, N. C., 1915.
				$5,134.89	$807.08			5,941.97	Indian school, Cherokee, N. C., repairs and improvements, 1915.
				115.62				115.62	Indian school, Cherokee, N. C., buildings.
9.84			13.91				9.59	36.93	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		6.50						6.50	Relieving and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
221.49	164.38	562.74	3,937.29	5,250.51	807.08		157.11	35,401.07	Total.
									CHEROKEE DAY SCHOOL, N. C.
	87.96		183.87					2,189.52	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					14.75			14.75	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	87.96		183.87		14.75			2,204.27	Total.
									CHEROKEE BOARDING SCHOOL, OKLA.
1.56	271.28	158.73	1,591.57				70.10	17,611.63	Cherokee Orphan Training School, T. C. T., Okla., 1915.
				4,887.33	3,943.21		[1]500.00	9,440.49	Cherokee Orphanage Training School, T. C. T., Okla., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								465.91	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
	3.60		92.37	71.52	29.38	$20.00	41.84	322.97	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		21.90						22.23	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								8.92	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
1.56	274.88	180.63	1,683.94	4,958.85	3,972.59	20.00	611.94	27,872.15	Total.
									CHEYENNE AND ARAPAHOE AGENCY.
		89.24	51.23				33.22	12,088.31	Support of Cheyennes and Arapahoes, Oklahoma, 1915.
								720.68	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					15.69	801.50		817.19	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								286.67	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								3,044.00	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
								205.99	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			148.40					148.40	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
356.07			353.67		322.15		16.50	1,611.98	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
							215.83	215.83	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
							[2]83.60	83.60	Proceeds of Cheyenne and Arapahoe reserve lands, Oklahoma.
							[2]27.36	27.36	Cheyennes and Arapahoes in Oklahoma 3 per cent fund.
			26.54			300.00		2,209.62	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
								3,155.01	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
356.07		89.24	579.84		337.84	1,101.50	160.68	24,614.64	Total.
									CHEYENNE AND ARAPAHOE BOARDING SCHOOL.
	51.67	181.03	486.57				10.25	23,158.84	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				2,747.64	2,221.08	84.00		5,052.72	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	52.26				215.00			280.96	Indian moneys, proceed of labor.
		2.60						2.60	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
	30.94	7.90	835.96		496.90		153.30	3,047.51	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								10.00	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
				12,286.36				12,286.36	Proceeds of Cheyenne and Arapahoe reserve lands, Oklahoma.
	134.87	191.53	1,322.53	15,034.00	2,932.98	84.00	163.55	43,838.09	Total.
									CHEYENNE RIVER AGENCY.
97.99		677.22	111,944.59	34,401.64	633.10		3,384.20	191,677.92	Cheyenne River Reservation 3 per cent fund.
								18,240.34	Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915.
								3,689.61	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				993.77	1,608.99	360.00		2,962.76	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								5,721.18	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								155.40	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
77.82		19.25	398.81		446.05		59.02	3,045.51	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								2.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
		381.49					32.50	413.99	Reiieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
			300.00					3,027.53	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
75.25			1,652.88		52.40		1,285.75	4,818.44	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								238.20	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
.75		.75	31.51				22.54	318.57	Proceeds C. R. and S. R. Reservation, S. Dak. and N. Dak.
2.00			11.55				14.40	2,987.60	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
			.30					16.70	Interest on Cheyenne River Reservation 3 per cent fund.
			70,302.86				[3]21,016.88	91,319.74	Civilization of the Sioux.
253.72		1,078.71	184,642.50	35,395.41	2,740.54	360.00	25,815.29	328,635.49	Total.

[1] Land. [2] Refund H. E. [3] Treaty benefit payments.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
CHEYENNE RIVER BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Education, Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915	$6,617.15	$111.85	$1,064.58				$4,288.41	$2,603.88	$647.60	$1,531.82
Cheyenne River Reservation 3 per cent fund										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	20.25						42.68			
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Interest on Sioux fund, Cheyenne River, education.	6,516.66									
Total	13,154.06	111.85	1,063.58				4,331.09	2,603.88	647.60	1,531.82
CHEYENNE RIVER DAY SCHOOLS.										
Education, Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915	1,875.55	13.80					411.62	81.74		302.26
Cheyenne River Reservation 3 per cent fund										
Total	1,875.55	13.80					411.62	81.74		302.24
CHICAGO WAREHOUSE.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.	19,131.00	389.70	506.26		$462.15	$3.00				122.22
CHILOCCO BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Chilocco, Okla., 1915	39,444.67	2.25					20,494.85	10,131.32	56.25	9,229.60
Indian school, Chilocco, Okla., repairs and improvements, 1915.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			2,524.59							
Indian school, transportation, 1915		2,695.35								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	2,167.83	44.32	9.22		209.73	23.83	1,265.44	278.39	1,306.75	132.33
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor						107.62				
Total	41,612.50	2,741.92	2,533.81		209.73	131.45	21,760.29	10,409.71	1,363.00	9,361.93
COEUR D'ALENE AGENCY.										
Support of Coeur d'Alenes, Idaho, 1915	2,714.99									
Interest on Coeur d'Alene 3 per cent fund	6,911.44	240.26					173.99	1.20	283.64	202.34
Fulfilling treaties with Coeur d'Alenes										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			636.33							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						5.00				
Special deposits	66.00					25.60				
Pay of Indian police, 1915	865.00							65.72	74.00	
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	84.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M								7.77		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,800.00								189.09	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	758.61	47.55							47.27	
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	180.00	9.60							180.00	
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor						4.00			277.50	279.03
Reimbursement to M. P. Colgrove, superintendent, etc., Idaho.										
Coeur d'Alene 3 per cent fund	1,020.50								584.40	40.03
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							1.60			
Total	14,400.54	297.41	636.33			34.60	175.59	74.69	1,635.90	521.34
COEUR D'ALENE DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools support, 1915	748.00	38.60	8.60				206.38	461.48		408.85
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	748.00	38.60	8.60				206.38	461.48		408.85
COLORADO RIVER AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.	6,718.76	455.55	1.20		10.98	10.20	1,573.27	3.23	527.31	119.06
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			4,103.45							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,247.00							18.82	224.00	
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4						4.25				
Miscellaneous receipts, class 2										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	3,033.50	152.68	3.35		9.51		118.72		1,327.32	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	900.00								385.00	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	720.00							2.75		
Industry among Indians, 1915	3,292.87	90.30	1,218.73							
Total	15,912.13	698.53	5,326.82		20.49	14.45	1,691.99	24.80	2,463.63	119.06
COLORADO RIVER BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	9,266.01	128.00			10.00		3,884.03	1,494.71	72.00	1,015.82
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4						5.25	1.20			
Indian school, transportation, 1915		175.00								
Total	9,266.01	303.00			10.00	5.25	3,885.23	1,494.71	72.00	1,015.82

Indian Service, 1916—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									CHEYENNE RIVER BOARDING SCHOOL.
$2.60	$285.72		$957.57		$177.18			$18,287.36	Education, Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915.
		$26.73	28.11	$882.68	3,040.28		$4.60	3,982.40	Cheyenne River Reservation 3 per cent fund.
	14.62		80.72		189.33		44.02	391.62	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		13.00						13.00	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								6,516.66	Interest on Sioux fund, Cheyenne River, education.
2.60	300.34	39.73	1,066.40	882.68	3,406.79		48.62	29,191.04	Total.
									CHEYENNE RIVER DAY SCHOOLS.
3.12	258.27	12.89	327.58		91.68			3,378.51	Education, Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915.
			1.80					1.80	Cheyenne River Reservation 3 per cent fund.
3.12	258.27	12.89	329.38		91.68			3,380.31	Total.
									CHICAGO WAREHOUSE.
766.59			44.63			$4,500.00	16.95	25,542.50	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
									CHILOCCO BOARDING SCHOOL.
12.90	889.35	463.66	5,676.47				[1] 65.71	86,467.03	Indian school, Chilocco, Okla., 1915.
					6,988.00			6,988.00	Indian school, Chilocco, Okla., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								2,524.59	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								2,695.35	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
56.26	172.88	14.50	4,792.65		958.91		628.17	12,061.21	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		2.00						2.00	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
			65.69	4,382.11	48.23			4,603.65	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
69.16	1,062.23	480.16	10,534.81	4,382.11	7,995.14		693.88	115,341.83	Total.
									COEUR D'ALENE AGENCY.
		151.79						2,866.78	Support of Coeur d'Alenes, Idaho, 1915.
71.65		175.43	365.52				190.91	8,616.38	Interest on Coeur d'Alene 3 per cent fund.
		37.05						37.05	Fulfilling treaties with Coeur d'Alenes.
								636.33	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				5,168.65	96.28	70.00		5,334.93	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								5.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
								91.60	Special deposits.
								1,004.72	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								84.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
			13.61					21.38	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
								1,989.09	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			173.00					1,026.43	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
							3.75	373.35	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
369.50								930.00	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
							6.00	6.00	Reimbursement to M. P. Colgrove, superintendent, etc., Idaho.
			184.51				[2] 1,072.24	2,901.65	Coeur d'Alene 3 per cent fund.
								1.60	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
441.15		364.27	736.64	5,168.65	96.28	70.00	1,272.90	25,926.29	Total.
									COEUR D'ALENE DAY SCHOOL.
	68.83		385.97					2,326.71	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				1,239.75	117.37		[3] 126.50	1,483.62	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	68.83		385.97	1,239.75	117.37		126.50	3,810.33	Total.
									COLORADO RIVER AGENCY.
83.33		487.93	2,383.99				215.00	12,589.90	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
								4,103.45	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					550.76			550.76	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
		3.60						3.60	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								1,489.82	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
13.71			1.50					19.46	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
							12.70	12.70	Miscellaneous receipts, class 2.
11.65			2,870.20				249.00	7,775.93	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								1,285.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
		8.50	19.88					751.13	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			18,172.84				[4] 1,147.38	23,922.62	Industry among Indians, 1915.
108.69		500.03	23,448.41		550.76		1,624.58	52,504.37	Total.
									COLORADO RIVER BOARDING SCHOOL.
19.07	128.78		847.53				23.20	16,889.15	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					1,090.68			1,090.68	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	37.39		22.25					66.09	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								175.00	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
19.07	166.17		869.78		1,090.68		23.20	18,220.92	Total.

[1] Hospital expense. [2] Refunds, hospital expense. [3] Land, $125; reservation fees, $150. [4] Seed.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
COLLINS BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw	$8,963.46	$27.46	$54.88		$29.76	$1.25	$3,709.12	$255.33	$408.75	$105.94
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			422.57							
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4		7.96	14.47			7.50	31.87			
Indian school, transportation, 1915		2.50								
Total	8,963.46	37.92	491.92		29.76	8.75	3,800.99	255.33	408.75	105.94
COLVILLE AGENCY.										
Proceeds of Colville Reservation, Wash	29,326.12	869.51	1,347.73			7.05	366.38	28.05	2,103.49	894.28
Support of Indians of Colville and Puyallup, etc., 1915.	2,893.98	802.49	243.05		229.52	8.60	171.44		1,153.91	8.75
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			417.12							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915			70.36							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,793.01						112.20	215.88		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Payment to Indians of Colville Reservation for lands.		106.55	18.93							
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	638.00						29.46	2.21	85.86	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	6,695.50	13.20					468.95		365.21	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	6,660.50									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	36.00	392.72			22.81	22.50	43.14			57.98
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						15.00				
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.	150.00						214.09			
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915		117.35								
Total	48,361.11	2,301.82	2,097.19		252.33	53.15	1,405.66	246.14	3,708.47	961.01
COLVILLE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	3,520.00								190.00	
COLVILLE DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	8,336.63	216.57	154.52		15.03	8.95	650.46			277.30
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915			65.50							
Indian school, transportation, 1915		2,018.50								
Total	8,336.63	2,235.07	220.02		15.03	8.95	650.46			277.30
CROW AGENCY.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	28,033.94	1,597.77	1,927.18		104.61		2,688.08	51.71	5,387.66	6,362.91
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			2,618.86							
Fulfilling treaties with Crows, Montana, 1915	5,975.00									
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.	32.00									
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,984.99							395.18		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	197.83	12.75				11.20	7.20		20.00	10.33
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						39.50				
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	2,146.17	66.70								
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	3,698.17									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	1,259.33									
Proceeds of Crow ceded lands, benefit objects	2,895.28		2,416.65				649.88		348.82	
Proceeds of Crow ceded lands, fencing	367.00									
Proceeds of Crow ceded lands, hospital										
Proceeds of Crow ceded lands, miscellaneous	2,306.65		234.62				789.14		14,286.34	
Total	50,064.36	1,677.22	7,197.31		104.61	50.70	4,134.30	446.89	20,042.82	6,373.24
CROW BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	8,139.99	10.77					1,480.90	504.17	157.00	386.40
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	31.50						27.70	5.24		
Indian school, transportation, 1915		55.30								
Proceeds of Crow ceded lands, school buildings						80.55				
Total	8,171.49	66.07				80.55	1,508.60	509.41	157.00	386.40
FRYOR BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	5,468.28	37.25	28.58				1,233.81	853.24		620.17
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										3.00
Proceeds of Crow ceded lands, school buildings										
Total	5,468.28	37.25	28.58				1,233.81	853.24		623.17
CROW CREEK AGENCY.										
Support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, 1915.	1,748.39	274.14	1,950.42		35.64		8,885.12	13.58	1,592.50	1,191.72
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			3,965.90							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,613.34							213.82	120.00	
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915.	10,146.01									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										113.00
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	774.00							29.81		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,520.66								470.25	
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4					57					

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									COLLINS BOARDING SCHOOL.
	$56.09	$35.38	$1,264.00		$1,277.59		$156.66	$16,408.57	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw.
								422.57	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
			220.81				4.00	295.61	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								2.50	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
	56.09	35.38	1,494.71		1,277.59		162.66	17,129.25	Total.
									COLVILLE AGENCY.
$86.62		706.20	15,692.50	$1,656.60	6.50		4,614.21	57,705.24	Proceeds of Colville Reservation, Wash.
37.18			129.58				53.35	5,731.85	Support of Indians of Colville and Puyallup, etc., 1915.
								417.12	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				2,839.71	875.86	$456.00		4,241.93	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								2,121.09	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
		3.75					[1] 140.74	269.97	Payment to Indians of Colville Reservation for lands.
		.71						756.24	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			634.42					8,177.28	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
			162.75					6,823.25	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
51.50		68.69	154.67				74.78	924.79	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			7.83				32.60	40.43	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								15.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
								864.09	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								117.35	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
175.30		779.35	16,781.75	4,496.31	882.36	456.00	4,915.68	87,873.63	Total.
									COLVILLE BOARDING SCHOOL.
								3,710.00	Indian schools, support, 1915.
									COLVILLE DAY SCHOOLS.
	214.84	21.44	371.05				24.65	10,291.44	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				243.31	121.77			430.58	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								2,018.50	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
	214.84	21.44	371.05	243.31	121.77		24.65	12,740.52	Total.
									CROW AGENCY.
105.28		1,538.03	6,845.88		642.88		2,802.75	58,088.68	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								2,618.86	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								5,975.00	Fulfilling treaties with Crows, Montana, 1915.
		21.65				5.00	43.73	102.38	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
				2,141.76	860.42			3,002.18	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								3,380.17	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
120.62		2.50	573.11		104.56			1,060.10	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								30.50	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
.10								2,212.97	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
			360.00					4,058.17	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			250.00					1,509.33	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			14,713.15				[2] 2,398.01	23,421.79	Proceeds of Crow ceded lands, benefit objects.
			300.70					667.70	Proceeds of Crow ceded lands, fencing.
				2,742.12				2,742.12	Proceeds of Crow ceded lands, hospital.
			10,238.33				7,345.16	35,200.24	Proceeds of Crow ceded lands, miscellaneous.
226.00		1,562.18	33,281.17	4,883.88	1,607.86	5.00	12,589.65	144,247.19	Total.
									CROW BOARDING SCHOOL.
	91.96	2.29	742.78		631.15		[2] 65.48	12,212.89	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			92.21		1.90			158.55	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								55.30	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
					347.52			428.07	Proceeds of Crow ceded lands, school buildings.
	91.96	2.29	834.99		980.57		65.48	12,851.31	Total.
									FRYOR BOARDING SCHOOL.
	118.21	132.24	926.63		125.91		[1] 127.37	9,671.69	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			28.75		5.76		2.00	39.51	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
					995.08			995.08	Proceeds of Crow ceded lands, school buildings.
	118.21	132.24	955.38		1,126.75		129.37	10,706.28	Total.
									CROW CREEK AGENCY.
276.73		442.82	1,401.20	2,164.55			2,204.49	22,181.30	Support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, 1915.
								3,965.90	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				4,326.22	747.01			5,073.23	Indian School and agency buildings, 1915.
								1,947.16	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
								10,146.01	Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915.
				348.34			254.60	715.94	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								803.81	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			135.00					2,125.91	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
54.92		.28						55.77	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.

[1] United States Geological Survey, maintenance geological station.

[2] Seed.

Detailed statement of expenditure,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
CROW CREEK AGENCY—continued.										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						$79.50				
Crow Creek 4 per cent fund		$43.84								
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	$399.00	22.65	$1.45		$2.68					
Civilization of the Sioux										
Total	16,369.40	340.63	5,917.77		38.89	79.50	$8,885.12	$257.21	$2,182.75	$1,304.72
CROW CREEK BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Education, Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915.	6,578.07		10.80				1,963.95	2,140.05	616.50	1,445.41
Support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, 1915.			2,494.25				857.55			
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	63.00						25.10		52.17	
Interest on Sioux fund, Crow Creek education.	3,453.34									
Total	10,094.41		2,505.05				2,846.60	2,140.05	668.67	1,445.41
CUSHMAN AGENCY.										
Support of Indians of Colville and Puyallup Agencies, etc., 1915.	3,320.00	99.55			9.92		164.00		165.77	178.75
Interest on Puyallup 4 per cent school fund	80.00									
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			957.56							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	699.99									
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	15.87									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	756.67	115.20								
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,680.00									
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	225.56									
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	300.00									
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor							75.09			
Total	7,078.09	214.75	957.56		9.92		239.09		165.77	178.75
CUSHMAN BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Tacoma, Wash., 1915	22,411.61			$480.76	11.45	51.90	9,385.99	1,364.68	336.50	10,720.78
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							7.25	32.35		
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor						42.25	127.75	32.65		
Puyallup 4 per cent school fund							3,264.62	5,036.49		187.59
Interest on Puyallup 4 per cent school fund					466.00		108.00			16.50
Proceeds of sale of Puyallup surplus school lands.	5,295.70									
Indian school, transportation, 1915		768.47			6.99					
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Total	27,707.31	768.47		480.76	484.44	94.15	12,893.61	6,466.17	336.50	10,924.87
CUSHMAN DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools support, 1915	3,031.84	57.40	21.36				50.17	20.71		311.75
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	3,031.84	57.40	21.36				50.17	20.71		311.75
DIGGER AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in California, 1915	5.00	21.90	9.66				783.38	66.52	207.80	24.00
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			97.34							
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)										
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian schools support, 1915								31.80		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	720.00							2.57	79.50	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,000.00								4.60	22.75
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.		1.50								
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915		109.50								
Total	1,745.00	132.90	107.00				783.38	100.89	291.90	46.75
EUCHEE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Interest on Creek general fund, 1915	9,469.00	1.00	29.13	153.78	46.03		4,808.88	472.99	244.35	570.20
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			426.35							
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4						1.75				
Total	9,469.00	1.00	455.48	153.78	46.03	1.75	4,808.88	472.99	244.35	570.20
EUFAULA BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Interest on Creek general fund, 1915	9,338.95	80.85	13.55	331.38	69.34	6.50	4,957.16	244.27	506.71	441.50
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			381.99							
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	23.05	3.80	1.22			1.35				
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Total	9,362.00	84.65	396.76	331.38	69.34	7.85	4,957.16	244.27	506.71	441.50

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									CROW CREEK AGENCY—continued.
								$79.50	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
			$4,445.00					4,488.84	Crow Creek 4 per cent fund.
							$4.00	429.78	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
			7,155.08				[1]7,196.37	14,351.45	Civilization of the Sioux.
$331.65		$443.10	13,136.28	$6,839.11	$747.01		9,659.46	66,532.60	Total.
									CROW CREEK BOARDING SCHOOL.
	$249.10	2.10	636.89	260.78	367.56			14,231.21	Education, Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915.
								3,351.80	Support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, 1915.
	4.10		111.15				1.35	236.87	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
					39.00		[2]75.07	3,567.41	Interest on Sioux fund, Crow Creek education.
	213.20	2.10	748.04	260.78	406.56		76.42	21,407.29	Total.
									CUSHMAN AGENCY.
			25.00					3,962.99	Support of Indians of Colville and Puyallup Agencies, etc., 1915.
								80.00	Interest on Puyallup 4 per cent school fund.
								957.56	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
			34.48					734.47	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								15.87	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
191.50								1,063.37	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
			22.00					1,702.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								225.56	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
								300.00	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
							92.00	92.00	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								75.09	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
191.50			81.48				92.00	9,208.91	Total.
									CUSHMAN BOARDING SCHOOL.
238.98	554.91	157.82	1,510.17		1,831.64		98.65	49,155.84	Indian school, Tacoma, Wash., 1915.
			220.58				12.70	272.88	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
	43.46		416.23					662.34	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
	74.76	275.12	1,715.32		930.62		4.50	11,489.02	Puyallup 4 per cent school fund.
2.65		31.15	280.07		4,049.51		60.50	5,014.38	Interest on Puyallup 4 per cent school fund.
								5,295.70	Proceeds of sale of Puyallup surplus school lands.
								775.46	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
		8.00						8.00	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
241.63	673.13	472.09	4,142.37		6,811.77		176.35	72,673.62	Total.
									CUSHMAN DAY SCHOOL.
	167.79	44.86	511.41				22.75	4,240.04	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					239.80			239.80	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	167.79	44.86	511.41		239.80		22.75	4,479.84	Total.
									DIGGER AGENCY.
		26.02	179.68				225.20	1,549.16	Support of Indians in California, 1915.
								97.34	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
			152.59		6.00		[3]44.04	202.63	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
					26.25			26.25	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								31.80	Indian schools, support, 1915.
			155.75					957.82	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			2.20					1,029.55	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
		6.15						7.65	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								109.50	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
		32.17	490.22		32.25		269.24	4,011.70	Total.
									EUCHEE BOARDING SCHOOL.
10.00	226.13	76.98	1,361.95		3,478.14		35.20	20,983.76	Interest on Creek general fund, 1915.
								426.35	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
	1.00	1.25	36.16				2.00	42.16	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
10.00	227.13	78.23	1,398.11		3,478.14		37.20	21,452.27	Total.
									EUFAULA BOARDING SCHOOL.
8.93	177.08	78.56	1,642.70	819.58	2,187.84		[4]544.40	21,449.30	Interest on Creek general fund, 1915.
								381.99	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
30.00	8.91		76.50		126.83			271.66	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		3.90						3.90	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
38.93	185.99	82.46	1,719.20	819.58	2,314.67		544.40	22,106.85	Total.

[1] Treaty benefit payments. [2] Seed. [3] Fruit trees. [4] Insurance, $412.00.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
FALLON AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Nevada, 1915	$157.50	$36.90								$41.54
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915		5.50								
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			$252.81							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	592.34							$23.28		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	840.00									
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)			4.18							
Total	1,589.84	42.40	256.99					23.28		41.54
FALLON DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	4,282.22	79.45	3.37		$1.02		$152.41	13.26		343.86
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
Total	4,282.22	79.45	3.37		1.02		152.41	13.26		343.86
FLANDREAU AGENCY.										
Support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, 1915.							765.24			
Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915.	60.00									
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Civilization of the Sioux										
Total	60.00						765.24			
FLANDREAU BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Flandreau, S. Dak., 1915	28,393.79		1,206.78	$416.45	122.86	$15.00	14,188.61	6,047.64	$4.50	4,894.59
Indian school, Flandreau, S. Dak., repairs and improvements, 1915.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			3,912.00							
Indian school, Flandreau, S. Dak., special repairs, 1915.										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	75.70	102.46	98.22	42.20	55.09		143.45	5.40		13.30
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Indian school, transportation, 1915	7.00	2,393.61			25.12					
Total	28,476.49	2,496.07	5,217.00	438.65	203.07	15.00	14,332.06	6,053.04	4.50	4,907.89
FLATHEAD AGENCY.										
Support of Indians of Flathead Agency, 1915	4,606.74	976.49	72.77		50.90	47.50	848.16		1,314.22	732.33
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,977.80							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,503.49						5.69	217.76		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	7,247.62	3.75					831.39			20.50
Indian schools, supports, 1915 (tuition)										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4		97.65							25.00	103.02
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						32.00				
Industry among Indians, 1915		47.85	1,305.00							
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	3,641.50									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	3,013.00									
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.								10.99		
Proceeds of Flathead patented lands, etc										
Proceeds of Flathead Reservation, Mont										
Sawmill, etc., Flathead Reservation, Mont. (reimbursable).	2,070.00									
Buildings, etc., Flathead Reservation, Mont. (reimbursable).										
Total	23,250.35	1,125.74	3,355.57		50.90	79.50	1,685.24	228.75	1,339.22	855.85
FLATHEAD DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	5,103.59						90.37			104.00
FOND DU LAC AGENCY.										
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915	2,262.25	104.41		12.25	52.74	19.05	544.43		315.43	90.67
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.		50.56	37.88							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	884.17						28.44	62.15		
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	398.33	18.14								
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915									35.00	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	900.00	14.35								
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	741.67	16.60								
Individual Indian money	2,202.73	1.58			5.70	3.50				
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, hospital						49.02				
Industry among Indians, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	8.00	16.05				1.00			48.81	
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						4.00				
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	45.00			33.51		10.25				
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.		6.92					73.06			
Total	7,442.15	228.61	37.88	45.76	58.44	86.82	645.93	62.15	399.27	90.67

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									FALLON AGENCY.
$35.15			$839.14					$1,110.23	Support of Indians in Nevada, 1915.
								5.50	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
								252.81	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								615.62	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								840.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			22.50				[1]488.22	514.90	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
35.15			861.64				488.22	3,339.06	Total.
									FALLON DAY SCHOOL.
	$45.48	$37.51	335.18				11.25	5,305.01	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				$3,245.86	$168.89			3,414.75	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
		6.50						6.50	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
	6.50							6.50	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
	51.98	44.01	335.18	3,245.86	168.89		11.25	8,732.76	Total.
									FLANDREAU AGENCY.
			1.32					766.56	Support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, 1915.
								60.00	Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915.
		8.15						8.15	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
							[2]1,409.47	1,409.47	Civilization of the Sioux.
		8.15	1.32				1,409.47	2,244.18	Total.
									FLANDREAU BOARDING SCHOOL.
1.56	377.57	321.05	4,240.73			$90.00	32.50	60,353.63	Indian school, Flandreau, S. Dak., 1915.
				1,818.65	4,274.54			6,093.19	Indian school, Flandreau, S. Dak., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								3,912.00	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
			178.20		8,214.36			8,392.56	Indian school, Flandreau, S. Dak., special repairs, 1915.
	173.50	18.75	868.32		3.75		115.65	1,715.79	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		18.25						18.25	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								2,425.73	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
1.56	551.07	358.05	5,287.25	1,818.65	12,492.65	90.00	148.15	82,911.15	Total.
									FLATHEAD AGENCY.
[3]90.45		192.10	1,847.77				[4]371.36	11,450.79	Support of Indians of Flathead Agency, 1915.
								1,977.80	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					106.12			106.12	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								2,726.94	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
			647.64	120.00	499.71			9,370.61	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
							620.48	620.48	Indian schools, support, 1915 (tuition).
			6.70					232.37	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
							4.50	36.50	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
			29,211.73				[5]2,541.99	33,106.37	Industry among Indians, 1915.
			357.00					3,998.50	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			2,602.77					5,615.77	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
		16.25	221.96					249.29	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
							[6]1,947.83	1,947.83	Proceeds of Flathead patented lands, etc.
							[6]5,138.77	5,138.77	Proceeds of Flathead Reservation, Mont.
								2,070.00	Sawmill, etc., Flathead Reservation, Mont. (reimbursable).
				16,600.29				16,600.29	Buildings, etc., Flathead Reservation, Mont. (reimbursable).
390.45		208.35	34,895.57	16,720.29	605.83		10,924.93	95,416.54	Total.
									FLATHEAD DAY SCHOOL.
	152.53		77.30					5,533.99	Indian schools, support, 1915.
									FOND DU LAC AGENCY.
10.93			122.38		58.42		48.50	3,641.46	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915.
								88.44	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					16.52	919.00		935.52	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			7.50					982.26	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								416.47	Determining heirs of deceased Indians (Indian), 1915.
								35.00	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
			459.95					1,374.30	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915.
								758.27	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915.
2.89			36.70					2,253.01	Individual Indian money.
				4,218.00				4,267.02	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, hospital.
			2,914.10					2,914.10	Industry among Indians, 1915.
2.80			47.84		28.18		10.90	163.61	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
							4.00	4.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
2.95							18.00	109.71	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								79.98	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
19.48			3,588.47	4,218.00	103.12	919.00	77.40	18,023.15	Total.

[1] Seed.
[2] Treaty benefit payments.
[3] Seed, trees, etc.
[4] Proceeds of sale of land.
[5] Opening Indian lands, General Land Office.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
FOND DU LAC DAY SCHOOLS.										
Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund	$4,595.25	$5.42					$86.73	$46.26	$135.02	$390.54
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915										.12
Indian schools, support, 1915										
Indian schools, transportation, 1915		150.00								
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	4,595.25	155.42					86.73	46.26	135.02	390.66
FORT APACHE AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915	9,054.73	368.44	$46.97				4,067.07	10.53	2,693.18	575.67
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	29,522.28	476.65	3,637.64		$21.30		1,196.26		3,474.71	196.00
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			3,938.81							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,465.00							291.85		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M							61.52	3.42		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,200.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	4,386.48	91.30							1,334.82	
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4		15.50	12.11			$11.25				
Total	46,796.49	951.89	7,635.53		21.30	11.25	5,324.85	305.80	7,502.71	771.67
FORT APACHE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	13,356.07		2,509.68		24.76		5,232.21	699.44	460.68	8.60
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	1,438.47						5,682.87	3,526.35	582.65	1,555.81
Total	14,794.54		2,509.68		24.76		10,915.08	4,225.79	1,043.33	1,564.41
FORT APACHE DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	2,186.00						465.60	592.32		350.25
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor							298.24	280.02		75.10
Total	2,186.00						763.84	872.34		425.35
FORT BELKNAP AGENCY.										
Support of Indians of Fort Belknap Agency, 1915	9,741.94	47.03	475.68		1.36		5,651.77	72.77	15.63	794.64
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			3,236.26							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,606.00							158.13		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	3,246.39	485.39	17.28		13.02				815.11	84.10
Miscellaneous receipts, class 2	142.22		9.30							
Miscellaneous receipts, class 3										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	757.24				2.44				109.56	13.75
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915										
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	3,614.45									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	708.00							7.84		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For		17.50								
Fort Belknap Reservation 4 per cent fund	5.00									
Industry among Indians, 1915										
Industry among Indians, 1915–16		24.80								
Total	19,989.24	574.72	3,738.52		16.82		5,651.77	238.74	940.30	892.49
FORT BELKNAP BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	7,449.37		493.39		.39		2,476.76	1,357.35	313.55	1,016.16
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		16.10								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4					.42					
Total	7,449.37	16.10	493.39		.81		2,476.76	1,357.35	313.55	1,016.16
FORT BELKNAP DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	1,045.00						192.61	1.59		102.46
FORT BERTHOLD AGENCY.										
Support of Indians of Fort Berthold Agency, 1915	8,057.67	96.09	196.96		.82		2,421.14	13.28	705.99	1,218.61
Fort Berthold Reservation 3 per cent fund	2,245.19	97.41	106.33							14.75
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			771.29							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,023.34							192.08		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	4,573.61	496.66	429.02				554.14		68.88	292.24
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	3,333.00						1.50			
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	660.00									
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915	702.78									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4		2.00							1.05	13.15
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						8.50				
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915										
Total	21,763.59	692.16	1,503.60		.82	8.50	2,976.78	205.36	775.92	1,738.75

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									FOND DU LAC DAY SCHOOLS.
$0.26	$141.10	$121.43	$101.91		$100.69			$5,724.61	Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund.
								.12	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915.
			99.00					99.00	Indian schools, support, 1915.
								150.00	Indian schools, transportation, 1915.
					92.21			92.21	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.26	141.10	121.43	200.91		192.90			6,065.94	Total.
									FORT APACHE AGENCY.
		292.77	198.40					19,090.76	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
235.75		91.30	11,431.41		1,287.52		$188.45	51,759.27	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								3,938.81	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					795.97			795.97	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								2,756.85	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
		3.57	30.62					98.53	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			400.00					1,600.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			171.49					5,984.09	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
130.00		8.50	255.85		39.84		2.50	475.55	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
365.75		396.14	14,270.17		2,123.33		190.95	86,667.83	Total.
									FORT APACHE BOARDING SCHOOL.
	266.27		1,767.39				37.50	24,362.60	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				$1,241.19	4,481.82			5,723.01	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			59.55		4.25			63.80	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
2.60	134.66	71.64	1,156.98	169.50	260.11		2.00	14,583.64	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
2.60	400.93	71.64	2,983.92	1,410.69	4,746.18		39.50	44,733.05	Total.
									FORT APACHE DAY SCHOOLS.
	48.87	19.20	616.46					4,278.70	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					77.09			77.09	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	62.88	11.23	24.09		18.35			770.91	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
	111.75	30.43	640.55		96.44			5,126.70	Total.
									FORT BELKNAP AGENCY.
26.01		481.76	952.54				[1]355.00	18,626.13	Support of Indians of Fort Belknap Agency, 1915.
								3,236.26	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					294.44			294.44	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								1,764.13	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
103.50		50.51	2,922.48				[2]2,370.25	10,108.03	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								151.52	Miscellaneous receipts, class 2.
			100.00					100.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 3.
10.00			217.94				[3]286.87	1,398.46	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		159.00					[4]50.00	209.00	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
			360.00					3,974.45	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			28.74					744.58	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
								17.50	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
								5.00	Fort Belknap Reservation 4 per cent fund.
			75,000.00					75,000.00	Industry among Indians, 1915.
			33,520.00					33,544.80	Industry among Indians, 1915-16.
140.11		601.27	113,101.70		294.44		3,072.12	149,342.24	Total.
									FORT BELKNAP BOARDING SCHOOL.
	44.07		606.99				2.00	13,760.03	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					1,104.20			1,104.20	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								16.10	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
							6.45	6.87	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
	44.07		606.99		1,104.20		8.45	14,887.20	Total.
									FORT BELKNAP DAY SCHOOLS.
	5.16		35.07					1,381.89	Indian schools, support, 1915.
									FORT BERTHOLD AGENCY.
146.45		326.99	1,518.13				1.18	14,703.31	Support of Indians of Fort Berthold Agency 1915.
			2,746.84		48.40		488.46	5,747.38	Fort Berthold Reservation 3 per cent fund.
								771.29	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					502.08			502.08	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			101.92					2,317.34	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
197.75			17,290.81				823.45	24,726.56	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
		2.90	6.15					3,343.55	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			1.70					661.70	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
								702.78	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
		3.40	187.71		4.83		21.60	233.74	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								8.50	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
		56.00						56.00	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
344.20		389.29	21,853.26		555.31		1,334.69	53,942.23	Total.

[1] Hospital expenses. [2] Seed, $2,319. [3] Seed.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
FORT BERTHOLD BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	$5,931.34		$227.69				$1,358.42	$1,504.27		$592.75
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Fulfilling treaties with Indians at Fort Berthold Agency.										
Total	5,931.34		227.69				1,358.42	1,504.27		592.75
FORT BERTHOLD DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	3,085.00						217.11	265.08		275.26
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915		$17.05								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
Total	3,085.00	17.05					217.11	265.08		275.26
FORT BIDWELL AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in California, 1915	1,290.00	30.05	18.22		$5.33		173.06			
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915		19.40								
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,737.62		.95					
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	392.66							55.31		
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)			53.12							
Industry among Indians, 1915			556.69							
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.		36.00								
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	780.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	654.00								$69.50	30.00
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	786.50	225.57			1.43					
Total	3,903.16	311.02	2,365.65		7.71		173.06	55.31	69.50	30.00
FORT BIDWELL BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Fort Bidwell, Cal., 1915	9,934.62	10.85	535.66		12.49		3,071.60	2,041.22	214.00	1,223.52
Indian school, Fort Bidwell, Cal., repairs and improvements, 1915.										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		145.65								
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							206.00			
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Total	9,934.62	156.50	535.66		12.49		3,277.60	2,041.22	214.00	1,223.52
FORT BIDWELL DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools support, 1915	2,965.00		22.69				109.16	77.73		199.33
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	2,965.00		22.69				109.16	77.73		199.33
FORT HALL AGENCY.										
Support Indians of Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho, 1915	12,993.79	101.15		$160.46	19.38		9,678.56	1.85	1,733.63	1,565.42
Support of Bannocks: Employees, Idaho, 1915	3,525.00									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	225.00		10.67						500.00	
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.		59.40	4,172.14							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Relieving distress and prevention of diseases among Indians, 1915.										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,727.33							212.47		
Pay for judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	2,270.00								62.50	
Fulfilling treaties with Fort Hall Indians										
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)			557.77							
Industry among Indians, 1915			1,200.48						1,032.52	
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	209.45	23.35			16.34	$11.00			69.81	12.83
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	720.00									
Interest on Shoshone and Bannock fund										
Total	21,838.57	183.90	6,031.06	160.46	35.72	11.00	9,678.56	214.32	3,418.46	1,578.25
FORT HALL BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	11,672.00	2.10		937.84	9.56		6,283.68	3,260.62	1.88	1,235.97
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915						4.90				
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	227.98				2.70	3.60	104.02			
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		7.55								
Support of Bannocks: Employees, Idaho, 1915	1,200.00									
Total	13,099.98	9.65		937.84	12.26	8.50	6,387.70	3,260.62	1.88	1,235.97
FORT LAPWAI AGENCY.										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			768.44							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,555.49							169.03	80.00	
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	912.66									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	992.50	240.95	.94		10.00	240.00			65.00	72.50

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									FORT BERTHOLD BOARDING SCHOOL.
.....	$139.22	$25.60	$221.46	.....	.....	.....	$14.64	$10,015.39	Indian schools, support, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	$333.91	$75.00	.....	408.91	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,510.00	.....	.....	2,510.00	Fulfilling treaties with Indians at Fort Berthold Agency.
.....	139.22	25.60	221.46	.....	2,843.91	75.00	14.64	12,934.30	Total.
									FORT BERTHOLD DAY SCHOOLS.
81.30	178.81	.....	37.24	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,059.80	Indian schools, support, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	96.12	.....	.....	113.17	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	9.25	.....	.....	.....	.....	9.25	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
1.39	178.81	.....	46.49	.....	96.12	.....	.....	4,182.22	Total.
									FORT BIDWELL AGENCY.
2.95	.....	24.64	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,544.25	Support of Indians in California, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	19.40	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,738.57	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	$350.00	.....	.....	.....	350.00	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	2.90	.....	.....	.....	.....	450.87	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	135.09	.....	.....	.....	.....	188.12	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
.....	.....	.....	2,834.75	.....	.....	.....	[1] 11.50	3,402.94	Industry among Indians, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	36.00	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	780.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	84.00	.....	837.50	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3.50	1,017.00	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
2.95	.....	24.64	2,972.65	350.00	.....	84.00	15.00	10,364.65	Total.
									FORT BIDWELL BOARDING SCHOOL.
217.45	225.63	205.19	2,103.54	.....	.....	.....	4.50	19,800.27	Indian school, Fort Bidwell, Cal., 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,660.68	.....	.....	3,500.68	Indian school, Fort Bidwell, Cal., repairs and improvements, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	145.65	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
.....	.....	2.28	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2.28	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	173.62	.....	.....	.....	.....	379.62	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100.00	.....	75.05	175.05	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
217.45	225.63	207.47	2,277.16	.....	3,760.68	.....	79.55	24,103.55	Total.
									FORT BIDWELL DAY SCHOOLS.
.....	153.81	.91	150.40	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,670.03	Indian schools, support, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	30.71	280.00	.....	310.71	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	153.81	.91	150.40	.....	30.71	280.00	.....	3,980.74	Total.
									FORT HALL AGENCY.
1.70	.....	149.49	3,241.55	.....	.....	.....	1,266.45	30,003.43	Support Indians of Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,525.00	Support of Bannocks: Employees, Idaho, 1915.
70.25	.....	.....	423.80	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,223.72	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,231.54	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	1,877.47	504.89	.....	.....	2,382.36	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	6.50	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	6.50	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,939.80	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	470.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,822.50	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
.....	.....	.....	[2] 20,100.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	20,100.00	Fulfilling treaties with Fort Hall Indians.
.....	.....	.....	1.33	.....	.....	.....	.....	559.10	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
.....	.....	.....	39,050.81	.....	.....	.....	[3] 6,824.11	48,197.92	Industry among Indians, 1915.
241.83	.....	4.41	362.65	.....	524.80	.....	69.82	1,516.23	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	720.00	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	[4] 5,200.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,200.00	Interest on Shoshone and Bannock fund.
313.78	.....	160.40	67,850.14	1,877.47	1,029.69	.....	8,160.38	122,602.16	Total.
									FORT HALL BOARDING SCHOOL.
13.72	183.53	5.38	2,998.72	.....	.....	.....	39.85	26,644.85	Indian schools, support, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	2,632.50	3,044.13	.....	.....	5,681.53	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	35.74	.....	164.34	.....	334.60	.....	157.60	1,030.58	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.....	.....	.....	72.00	.....	45.30	.....	.....	117.30	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7.55	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,200.00	Support of Bannocks: Employees, Idaho, 1915.
13.72	219.27	5.38	3,235.06	2,632.50	3,424.03	.....	197.45	34,681.81	Total.
									FORT LAPWAI AGENCY.
.....	.....	30.55	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	30.55	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	768.44	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	1,609.58	605.31	96.00	.....	2,310.89	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,804.52	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	912.66	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
87.50	.....	.....	357.03	.....	.....	.....	[5] 57.19	2,123.61	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.

[1] Seed. [2] Bulls and heifers.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
FORT LAPWAI AGENCY—continued.										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						$16.50				
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	$1,762.52	$27.05								
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	720.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Forestry.	3,462.00						$39.25			
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	289.42		$21.60			9.50				
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	5,400.00	315.70	22.75		$33.28		3.52	$5.22	$62.50	$685.32
Total	15,094.59	583.70	813.73		43.28	266.00	42.77	174.25	207.50	757.82
FORT LAPWAI DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools support, 1915	4,465.00	111.80	3.79		79.16		22.38	4.25	66.00	54.65
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	4,465.00	111.80	3.79		79.16		22.38	4.25	66.00	54.65
FORT LAPWAI SANATORIUM.										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.	16,514.18	1,356.91	446.61		103.58	48.50	5,905.47	2,419.26	289.83	2,129.70
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,789.05							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915						23.50				
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	232.01				2.34	22.24	50.31	6.70	48.15	11.30
Indian schools support, 1915	1,326.99									
Total	18,073.18	1,356.91	2,235.66		105.92	94.24	5,955.78	2,425.96	337.98	2,141.00
FORT M'DERMITT AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Nevada, 1915	50.00	17.90	91.02		34.39		235.92			55.51
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			239.80		4.25					
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor			132.10							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	588.50							23.17		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	91.00									
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										3.27
Total	729.50	17.90	462.92		38.64		235.92	23.17		58.78
FORT M'DERMITT DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools support, 1915	4,631.61	74.41	220.44		5.84		427.98	262.08		413.77
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
Total	4,631.61	74.41	220.44		5.84		427.98	262.08		413.77
FORT MOJAVE AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.	3,438.39	229.50	58.49		9.80		164.15		42.00	22.42
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,869.75							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	840.00							37.75		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	816.67								63.00	
Bridge across the Colorado River at Topock, Ariz., 1915.						37.10				
Dike, Fort Mojave Reservation, Ariz. (reimbursable), 1915.	25.00	95.43								
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Total	5,120.06	324.93	1,928.24		9.80	37.10	164.15	37.75	105.00	22.42
FORT MOJAVE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Fort Mojave, Ariz., 1915	13,712.36	304.68	1,494.91		34.80		5,263.31	3,182.76	1,169.90	5,729.97
Indian school, Fort Mojave, Ariz., repairs and improvements, 1915.										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		230.35								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4		14.90								23.00
Total	13,712.36	549.93	1,494.91		34.80		5,263.31	3,182.76	1,169.90	5,752.97
FORT PECK AGENCY.										
Support of Indians of Fort Peck Agency, Mont., 1915.	16,274.21	315.90	130.55		54.00		8,414.07	7.80	1,315.50	1,345.22
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			4,354.47							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,176.65							106.30	150.00	
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Industry among Indians, 1915			751.00							
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	1,147.00				18.00					482.47
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4						6.75				5.85
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	3,292.00									
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915		8.90								
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Proceeds of Fort Peck Reservation, Mont										
Total	23,057.86	324.80	5,236.02		72.00	6.75	8,414.07	114.10	1,465.50	1,833.54

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									FORT LAPWAI AGENCY—continued.
								$16.50	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
			$78.09					1,867.66	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
						$9.00		729.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			51.75					3,553.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Forestry.
$85.85			27.62				[1] $51.25	485.24	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
103.50		$374.59	303.45					7,309.83	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
276.85		405.14	817.94	$1,609.58	$605.31	105.00	108.44	21,911.90	Total.
									FORT LAPWAI DAY SCHOOL.
	$19.46	30.12	219.85				23.73	5,100.19	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					59.92			59.92	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	19.46	30.12	219.85		59.92		23.73	5,160.11	Total.
									FORT LAPWAI SANATORIUM.
1.50	125.65	818.48	3,292.29	7,108.55	5,552.92		[2] 3,798.05	49,911.48	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								1,789.05	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					1,571.03			1,594.53	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
6.32	9.00	1.50	294.35		104.73		67.05	856.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								1,326.99	Indian schools, support, 1915.
7.82	134.65	819.98	3,586.64	7,108.55	7,228.68		3,865.10	55,478.05	Total.
									FORT M'DERMITT AGENCY.
		77.43	20.03					582.20	Support of Indians in Nevada, 1915.
								244.05	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
							49.50	181.60	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								611.67	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								91.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
			50.28				[3] 210.00	260.28	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
		12.30	22.87				35.43	73.87	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		89.73	93.18				294.93	2,044.67	Total.
									FORT M'DERMITT DAY SCHOOL.
	14.82	1.63	276.65				[4] 34.92	6,364.15	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					770.42			770.42	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
							[5] 30.65	30.65	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
	14.82	1.63	276.65		770.42		65.57	7,165.22	Total.
									FORT MOJAVE AGENCY.
26.00		52.66	434.63				[6] 180.00	4,058.04	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
								1,869.75	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								877.75	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								879.67	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								37.10	Bridge across the Colorado River at Topock, Ariz., 1915.
								120.43	Dike, Fort Mojave Reservation, Ariz. (reimbursable), 1915.
140.00								140.00	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
166.00		52.66	434.63				180.00	8,582.74	Total.
									FORT MOJAVE BOARDING SCHOOL.
169.21	274.39	323.78	1,775.75				[1] 89.31	33,525.13	Indian school, Fort Mojave, Ariz., 1915.
					2,624.98			2,624.98	Indian school, Fort Mojave, Ariz., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								230.35	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
94.50			314.98		10.50			457.88	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
263.71	274.39	323.78	2,090.73		2,635.48		89.31	36,838.34	Total.
									FORT PECK AGENCY.
156.05		621.96	1,311.09				24.00	29,970.35	Support of Indians of Fort Peck Agency, Mont., 1915.
								4,354.47	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					298.94			298.94	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								2,432.95	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								108.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
			36,431.10				[1] 5,454.20	42,036.30	Industry among Indians, 1915.
			206.20				[7] 100.00	1,953.67	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
13.15		2.80	153.73		68.79		[1] 40.00	297.07	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								3,292.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								8.90	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
		10.10						10.10	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
							[8] 8,504.48	8,504.48	Proceeds of Fort Peck Reservation, Mont.
169.20		634.86	38,108.12		367.73		14,182.68	93,987.23	Total.

[1] Seed.
[2] Improvements on land.
[3] Seed and trees.
[4] Care of insane.
[5] Horse killed.
[6] Opening Indian land, $8,152.33; refund, H. E., $412.15.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
FORT PECK BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	$10,208.07		$83.69		$18.00		$4,368.20	$2,475.97	$653.18	$2,131.03
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							190.70	3.00	6.00	
Total	10,208.07		83.69		18.00		4,558.90	2,478.97	659.18	2,131.03
FORT PECK DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	4,074.00	$14.60	50.17				670.27	847.76	.75	299.76
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
Total	4,074.00	14.60	50.17				670.27	847.76	.75	299.76
FORT TOTTEN AGENCY.										
Support of Sioux of Devils Lake, N. Dak., 1915	3,550.00	95.95	188.59				128.17		423.63	355.35
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			3,580.77							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	718.00						51.55	73.89	332.14	
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915	258.00	22.70								
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,407.33	14.85								
Industrial work and care of timber 1915, M	905.00									
Industry among Indians, 1915–16										
Total	6,838.33	133.50	3,769.36				179.72	73.89	755.77	355.35
FORT TOTTEN BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Fort Totten, N. Dak., 1915	29,412.36	75.30	4,101.75		163.89		14,312.57	8,630.17	692.73	5,429.78
Indian school, Fort Totten, N. Dak., repairs and improvements, 1915										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		947.60								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4									560.00	
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor							296.47			
Indian school, Fort Totten, N. Dak., buildings.										
Total	29,412.36	1,022.90	4,101.75		163.89		14,609.04	8,630.17	1,252.73	5,429.78
FORT YUMA AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in California, 1915	1,000.00	88.45					741.76	53.51	168.00	
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			1,068.44							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,548.67						202.59	17.65		
Industry among Indians, 1915–16										
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)										
Industry among Indians, 1915			516.99				884.75		730.25	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,900.00								116.21	139.70
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	720.00									
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915		68.27								
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915	95.00									
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	855.00									
Total	6,118.67	156.72	1,585.34				1,829.10	71.16	1,014.46	139.70
FORT YUMA BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	13,810.11	25.00		$1,161.65	68.70		6,403.59	3,491.77	220.00	635.00
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		170.35								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4			2.08		.69		27.60		10.00	1.50
Total	13,810.11	195.35	2.08	1,161.65	69.39		6,431.19	3,491.77	230.00	636.50
GENOA BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Genoa, Nebr., 1915	27,842.76	5.82	870.11		38.60		13,254.48	7,116.62	356.10	4,046.80
Indian school, Genoa, Nebr., repairs and improvements, 1915					4.10					
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			7,203.92		5.42					
Indian school, transportation, 1915		2,768.35			30.36					
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	149.41	524.81	338.70		127.70	$12.00	646.19	64.35	88.10	
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor			55.30		8.55		139.45	267.50	72.57	
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915										
Indian school, Genoa, Nebr., industrial building.										
Indian school, Genoa, Nebr., laundry										
Total	27,992.17	3,298.98	8,468.03		214.73	12.00	14,040.12	7,448.47	516.77	4,046.80
GRAND PORTAGE AGENCY.										
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915	2,168.00	251.34			41.43	20.29	520.84	158.58	298.58	125.00
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			380.80							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	360.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Forestry	682.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Forestry	776.35									
Total	3,986.35	251.34	380.80		41.43	20.29	520.84	158.58	298.58	125.00

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									FORT PECK BOARDING SCHOOL.
50.05	$116.59	.....	$1,015.62	.....	.....	.....	.....	$21,070.40	Indian schools, support, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	$2,090.04	$1,136.18	.....	.....	3,235.82	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	$3.10	396.80	.....	39.31	.....	$190.06	828.97	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
50.05	116.59	3.10	1,412.42	2,090.04	1,175.49	.....	190.06	25,135.19	Total.
									FORT PECK DAY SCHOOLS.
2.08	90.38	.....	87.03	.....	.....	.....	.....	6,136.80	Indian schools, support, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	120.33	.....	.....	120.33	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	1.00	.....	.....	.....	17.15	18.15	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
2.08	90.38	.....	88.03	.....	120.33	.....	17.15	6,275.28	Total.
									FORT TOTTEN AGENCY.
.....	.....	58.57	258.53	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,058.79	Support of Sioux of Devils Lake, N. Dak., 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,580.77	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	673.89	$48.00	.....	721.89	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,175.58	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
72.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	352.70	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	358.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,780.18	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
.....	.....	.....	150.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,055.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7,680.56	7,680.56	Industry among Indians, 1915–16.
72.00	.....	58.57	766.53	.....	673.89	48.00	7,680.56	21,405.47	Total.
									FORT TOTTEN BOARDING SCHOOL.
11.38	947.40	117.80	4,266.32	.....	.....	.....	308.59	68,470.04	Indian school, Fort Totten, N. Dak., 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,764.39	.....	.....	5,764.39	Indian school, Fort Totten, N. Dak., repairs and improvements, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	947.60	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	86.85	.....	49.00	.....	45.00	740.85	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	78.90	.....	.....	375.37	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
.....	.....	.....	.....	496.88	.....	.....	.....	496.88	Indian school, Fort Totten, N. Dak., buildings.
11.38	947.40	117.80	4,353.17	496.88	5,892.29	.....	353.59	76,795.13	Total.
									FORT YUMA AGENCY.
50.25	.....	504.45	763.30	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,369.72	Support of Indians in California, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,068.44	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,768.91	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	1,671.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,671.00	Industry among Indians, 1915–16.
.....	.....	.....	775.75	.....	.....	.....	.....	775.75	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
.....	.....	.....	22,029.40	.....	.....	.....	[1] 499.72	24,661.02	Industry among Indians, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	20.54	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,176.45	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	720.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
.....	.....	.....	188.38	.....	.....	.....	.....	256.65	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	70.43	.....	.....	70.43	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	95.00	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	855.00	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
50.25	.....	504.45	25,448.37	.....	70.43	.....	499.72	37,488.37	Total.
									FORT YUMA BOARDING SCHOOL.
1.56	444.38	5.85	2,422.84	.....	.....	.....	307.16	28,997.61	Indian schools, support, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,347.93	.....	.....	1,347.93	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	170.35	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	207.93	.....	77.97	.....	.....	327.77	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
1.56	444.38	5.85	2,630.77	.....	1,425.90	.....	307.16	30,843.66	Total.
									GENOA BOARDING SCHOOL.
246.15	848.90	320.81	4,499.08	.....	.....	.....	311.50	59,757.79	Indian school, Genoa, Nebr., 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	5,535.13	4,930.31	.....	.....	10,469.54	Indian school, Genoa, Nebr., repairs and improvements, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7,209.34	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,798.71	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
5.00	237.03	3.65	1,467.64	.....	63.19	.....	891.76	4,619.53	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
31.65	.....	.....	113.73	.....	72.50	.....	243.87	1,008.12	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
.....	.....	2.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2.00	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease, among Indians, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	2,605.71	.....	.....	.....	2,605.71	Indian school, Genoa, Nebr., industrial building.
.....	.....	.....	.....	3,006.08	.....	.....	.....	3,006.08	Indian school, Genoa, Nebr., laundry.
285.80	1,085.93	326.46	6,080.45	11,146.92	5,066.00	.....	1,447.13	91,476.82	Total.
									GRAND PORTAGE AGENCY.
111.93	.....	155.10	1,195.07	.....	.....	.....	164.55	5,210.71	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	380.80	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	236.92	.....	.....	236.92	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	360.00	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	18.09	.....	.....	.....	.....	700.09	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Forestry.
.....	.....	.....	67.44	.....	.....	.....	.....	843.79	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Forestry.
111.93	.....	155.10	1,280.60	.....	236.92	.....	164.55	7,732.31	Total.

[1] Seed.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
GRAND PORTAGE DAY SCHOOL.										
Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915	$2,288.25						$63.70	$161.47	$339.38	$119.75
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915										125.87
Miscellaneous receipts, Class 4										18.75
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	2,288.25						63.70	161.47	339.38	264.37
GREENVILLE AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in California, 1915		$19.60					16.20			
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915		7.60					37.93			
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			$299.46							
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	425.00								150.00	
Total	425.00	27.20	299.46				54.13		150.00	
GREENVILLE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian School, Greenville, Cal., 1915	8,290.41	17.05	716.83	$239.47	$48.85		3,142.14	1,368.09	329.00	922.60
Indian School, Greenville, Cal., repairs and improvements, 1915										
Indian School, transportation, 1915		231.58								
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915	120.00									
Indian School, Greenville, Cal., buildings										
Total	8,410.41	248.63	716.83	239.47	48.85		3,142.14	1,368.09	329.00	922.60
HASKELL BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian School, Lawrence, Kans., 1915	50,599.56	81.17		2,520.00	218.52		27,439.40	13,349.03	3,282.28	10,744.77
Indian School, Lawrence, Kans., repairs and improvements, 1915										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915		7.01	2,636.06							
Miscellaneous receipts, Class 4	104.30	47.50	18.88		37.50		309.03	88.55		22.25
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915										
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915		25.43								
Indian School, transportation, 1915		5,452.47			10.58					
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	50.00									
Indian School, Lawrence, Kans., drainage										
Indian School, Lawrence, Kans., gymnasium										
Total	50,753.86	5,613.58	2,654.94	2,520.00	266.60		27,748.43	13,437.58	3,282.28	10,767.02
HAVASUPAI AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915	1,302.22						34.91	43.06	26.46	21.50
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			209.06							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	300.00							19.68	20.00	
Total	1,602.22		209.06				34.91	62.74	46.46	21.50
HAVASUPAI DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools support, 1915	2,176.67	47.05	210.91				96.47	438.13	498.74	91.62
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	2,176.67	47.05	210.91				96.47	438.13	498.74	91.62
HAYWARD AGENCY.										
Support of Chippewas of Lake Superior, Wis., 1915		75.00			25.00		297.95	22.41	143.03	26.15
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			1,285.13							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	480.00							41.08		
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						$1.50				
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915		106.25				73.65				
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Individual Indian money	506.00									
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915							225.48	2.15		4.00
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, forestry	1,301.00	95.22				41.86				
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, P	955.83	12.88							115.00	
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915	189.60									
Total	3,432.43	289.35	1,285.13		25.00	117.01	523.43	65.64	258.03	30.15
HAYWARD BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Hayward, Wis., 1915	15,425.20	6.98	292.50	500.00	72.00		6,795.73	5,063.91	639.38	2,969.21
Indian school, Hayward, Wis., repairs and improvements, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							10.00	27.00	26.00	70.80
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										99.54
Indian school, transportation, 1915		147.88								
Total	15,425.20	154.86	292.50	500.00	72.00		6,805.73	5,090.91	665.38	3,139.55

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									GRAND PORTAGE DAY SCHOOL.
$0.62	$71.51	$11.46	$331.26		$9.33		$26.50	$3,423.23	Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915.
	.75				24.82		10.00	161.44	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915.
								18.75	Miscellaneous receipts, Class 4.
					457.49			457.49	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.62	72.26	11.46	331.26		491.64		36.50	4,060.91	Total.
									GREENVILLE AGENCY.
							3.50	39.30	Support of Indians in California, 1915.
								45.53	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								299.46	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
						$181.00		756.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
						181.00	3.50	1,140.29	Total.
									GREENVILLE BOARDING SCHOOL.
103.50	186.44	129.98	1,003.00				28.50	16,525.86	Indian school, Greenville, Cal., 1915.
					3,691.98			3,691.98	Indian school, Greenville, Cal., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								231.58	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
		6.50						126.50	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
				$5,964.00				5,964.00	Indian school, Greenville, Cal., buildings.
103.50	186.44	136.48	1,003.00	5,964.00	3,691.98		28.50	26,539.92	Total.
									HASKELL BOARDING SCHOOL.
190.70	2,080.63	399.29	11,969.17				[1]162.35	123,036.87	Indian school, Lawrence, Kans., 1915.
				172.35	9,006.43			9,178.78	Indian school, Lawrence, Kans., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								2,643.07	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
216.68	222.85	63.40	1,295.74		340.12		192.02	2,964.82	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		2.00						2.00	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								25.43	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
								5,463.05	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
								50.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
							[2]35.25	35.25	Indian school, Lawrence, Kans., drainage.
				18,545.64				18,545.64	Indian school, Lawrence, Kans., gymnasium.
407.38	2,303.48	464.69	13,264.91	18,717.99	9,352.55		389.62	161,944.91	Total.
									HAVASUPAI AGENCY.
		69.65	138.57				[1]19.00	1,655.37	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
								209.06	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								339.68	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
		69.65	138.57				19.00	2,204.11	Total.
									HAVASUPAI DAY SCHOOL.
	12.33	30.50	72.42				3.00	3,677.84	Indian schools support, 1915.
					32.62			32.62	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	12.33	30.50	72.42		32.62		3.00	3,710.46	Total.
									HAYWARD AGENCY.
		209.15	9.34				[1]132.68	940.71	Support of Chippewas of Lake Superior, Wis., 1915.
								1,285.13	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								521.08	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								1.50	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
							[4]23.87	23.87	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								179.00	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
					100.00			100.00	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								506.00	Individual Indian money.
		1.35					[5]115.69	348.67	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
			300.00					1,738.08	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, forestry.
			20.00					1,103.71	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, P.
								189.60	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
		210.50	329.34		100.00		272.24	6,938.25	Total.
									HAYWARD BOARDING SCHOOL.
3.35	213.51	161.11	1,617.68				211.01	33,971.57	Indian school, Hayward, Wis., 1915.
					4,990.53			4,990.53	Indian school, Hayward, Wis., repairs and improvements, 1915.
			98.18		55.54		26.63	314.15	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		2.60						2.60	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								99.54	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								147.88	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
3.35	213.51	163.71	1,715.86		5,046.07		237.64	39,526.27	Total.

[1] Seed. [2] Drainage assessment. [3] Hospital and burial expenses. [4] Burial expenses. [5] Hospital expenses

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
HAYWARD DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	$1,050.00						$156.27	$269.00		$60.00
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	1,050.00						156.27	269.00		60.00
HOOPA VALLEY AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in California, 1915	4,110.53	$979.82	$512.60		$31.39		837.09	.21	$180.00	61.59
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			410.96							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,016.00						60.33	91.76	209.98	
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	161.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	875.00	26.15								
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, forestry.	2,112.28									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	600.00							3.37		
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										15.41
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor					3.00					
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915		25.50								
Industry among Indians, 1915			175.27						189.68	
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)			221.64							
Total	8,874.81	1,031.47	1,320.47		34.39		897.42	95.34	579.66	75.03
HOOPA VALLEY BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	13,467.31	154.30	1,577.27		40.46		5,963.01	2,791.00	1,979.48	829.87
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		163.25								
Total	13,467.31	317.55	1,577.27		40.46		5,963.01	2,791.00	1,979.48	829.87
JICARILLA AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.	12,926.17	57.14			3.92	$200.03	9,740.81	170.12	320.00	883.22
Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.			2,674.49							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,237.01							153.38		
Industry among Indians, 1915–16		3.80								
Industry among Indians, 1915		55.85					625.91		342.48	3.28
Miscellaneous receipts, class 2										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	2,619.61	142.32	362.32		4.95	7.00	347.33		12.00	194.15
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,561.67	9.20							268.80	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	641.67							5.15		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, forestry.	6,612.92	52.75								
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	168.61	63.47								
Proceeds of timber, Jicarilla Reservation, New Mexico.	231.24									
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Total	26,998.90	384.73	3,036.81		8.87	207.03	10,714.05	328.65	943.28	1,080.65
JACARILLA BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	8,378.17	28.03			5.21		3,574.49	1,390.32	492.99	2,500.53
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915					2.26					
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							16.55			
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	110.50									
Total	8,488.67	28.03			7.47		3,591.04	1,390.32	492.99	2,500.53
JICARILLA DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915							91.71	320.08		2.57
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total							91.71	320.08		2.57
JONES BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw	10,880.13	32.13			52.40	11.55	4,812.29	1,955.46	539.40	724.62
Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.			370.42							
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4			1.35				18.46			
Total	10,880.13	32.13	371.77		52.40	11.55	4,830.75	1,955.46	539.40	724.62
KAIBAB AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.	3,716.50	42.07	188.59				80.00		329.03	4.03
Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.			142.49							
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, forestry.										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	136.67							28.97		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	84.00									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4		9.00				5.00			87.50	4.50
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									HAYWARD DAY SCHOOL.
	$36.33	$0.81						$1,572.41	Indian schools, support, 1915.
						$100.00		100.00	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	36.33	.81				100.00		1,672.41	Total.
									HOOPA VALLEY AGENCY.
$3.85		421.45	$172.07					7,310.60	Support of Indians in California, 1915.
								410.96	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					$167.26			167.26	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			1.00					1,379.07	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								161.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
								901.15	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			14.63					2,126.91	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, forestry.
								603.37	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
		9.50	57.45		14.40		$1.00	95.79	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								3.00	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
		19.50						19.50	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								25.50	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
			2,581.50					2,946.45	Industry among Indians, 1915.
			1,101.50					1,323.14	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
3.85		450.45	3,928.15		181.66		1.00	17,473.70	Total.
									HOOPA VALLEY BOARDING SCHOOL.
45.00	254.20		1,905.35				108.94	29,116.19	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				$740.00	1,606.68			2,346.68	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
1.25	3.91		68.84		5.26		18.50	97.76	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								163.25	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
46.25	258.11		1,974.19	740.00	1,611.94		127.44	31,723.88	Total.
									JACARILLA AGENCY.
		149.80	2,676.79				[1] 198.00	27,326.00	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
								2,674.49	Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.
					151.27			151.27	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								2,390.39	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
			61,463.03					61,466.83	Industry among Indians, 1915-16.
			24,635.22				20.90	25,683.64	Industry among Indians, 1915.
							.40	.40	Miscellaneous receipts, class 2.
			2,437.75				840.00	6,967.63	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			438.75					2,278.42	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			214.64					861.46	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			177.89					6,843.56	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, forestry.
								232.08	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
								231.24	Proceeds of timber, Jicarilla Reservation, New Mexico.
					1,441.70			1,441.70	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
		149.80	92,044.07		1,592.97		1,059.30	138,549.11	Total.
									JICARILLA BOARDING SCHOOL.
67.50	120.66	38.90	1,730.87				173.84	18,510.51	Indian schools support, 1915.
					2,763.26			2,765.52	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
		3.25						3.25	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
							1.50	18.05	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
	10.10		263.56					384.16	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
67.50	130.76	42.15	1,994.43		2,763.26		175.34	21,681.49	Total.
									JICARILLA DAY SCHOOLS.
.13	40.97		26.93					482.39	Indian schools support, 1915.
					17.96			17.96	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.13	40.97		26.93		17.96			500.35	Total.
									JONES BOARDING SCHOOL.
	108.15	74.69	1,489.51	378.30	1,514.76		171.62	22,745.01	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw.
								370.42	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
	3.29		307.23		1.70			332.03	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
	111.44	74.69	1,796.74	378.30	1,516.46		171.62	23,447.46	Total.
									KAIBAB AGENCY.
		101.24	184.99				24.00	4,670.47	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
								142.49	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
							[2] 12.75	12.75	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, forestry.
								165.64	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								84.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
			4.95		3.60			114.55	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
				731.00	8.97			739.97	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.

[1] Seed.

[2] Trees.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
KAIBAB AGENCY—continued.										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.	$97.00									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	521.25	$18.60								
Industry among Indians, 1915–16										
Industry among Indians, 1915		28.50								
Total	4,555.42	98.17	$331.08			$5.00	$80.00	$28.97	$416.53	$8.55
KAIBAB DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	1,439.60	29.40	54.85		$24.00		75.82	196.34		55.93
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Total	1,439.60	29.40	54.85		24.00		75.82	196.34		55.93
KESHENA AGENCY.										
Interest on Menominee log fund	29,415.20					116.02	2,388.63	180.35	1,244.74	1,142.65
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			956.31							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915	325.00	17.12								
Fulfilling treaties with Menominees, logs										
Fulfilling treaties with Menominees, proceeds of lands.										
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	380.00								95.50	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For		55.86								
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,142.50						200.38	210.06		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	170.66									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	6.50						7.46			
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	600.25	8.89								
Interest on Menominee fund	676.50	45.26	372.70		83.25		685.69			
Industry among Indians, 1915–16										
Total	33,716.61	127.13	1,329.01		83.25	116.02	3,282.16	390.41	1,340.24	1,142.65
KESHENA BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Interest on Menominee log fund	14,772.41						2,825.07	4,552.08		4,027.33
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	224.49		2.16				62.64	7.79	68.57	42.52
Interest on Menominee fund	859.83	24.59	314.23				39.99	2.25	20.00	5.65
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										35.00
Indian schools, support, 1915										
Total	15,856.73	24.59	316.39				2,927.70	4,562.12	88.57	4,110.50
KESHENA DAY SCHOOL.										
Interest on Menominee log fund	1,321.50						13.37	35.07		
Interest on Menominee fund	47.00									
Total	1,368.50						13.37	35.07		
MENOMINEE SAW MILLS.										
Menominee log fund	223,784.61	329.87	134.17		311.03	474.50	25,190.34	1,456.29	16,744.14	7,083.45
KICKAPOO AGENCY.										
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	780.00	99.19								
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			585.11							
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,000.00									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						6.50				
Total	1,780.00	99.19	585.11			6.50				
KICKAPOO BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Kickapoo Reservation, Kans. 1915.	7,972.50		158.77		72.40		2,046.86	1,283.51	3.75	865.24
Indian school, Kickapoo Reservation, Kans., repairs and improvements, 1915.										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	43.07						168.51		360.17	50.81
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor		12.60					115.50			31.25
Total	8,015.57	12.60	158.77		72.40		2,330.87	1,283.51	363.92	947.30
KICKAPOO DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	586.00									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4					18.00		1.35			100.00
Total	586.00				18.00		1.35			100.00
KIOWA AGENCY.										
Support of Wichitas and affiliated bands, Oklahoma, 1915.	3,245.25	397.01	10.09		91.44	3.46			62.22	59.08
Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche 4 per cent fund, 1915.	14,641.01	800.52	30.78	$505.67	397.00	18.79	8.04		203.55	1,661.79
Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche 4 per cent fund										
Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche 4 per cent fund, hospital.										
Kiowa Agency Hospital 4 per cent fund	66.67						422.81	249.66		

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									KAIBAB AGENCY—continued.
		$6.50						$103.50	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
$47.19			$93.78					680.73	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			1,100.00					1,100.00	Industry among Indians, 1915-16.
								28.50	Industry among Indians, 1915.
47.19		107.74	1,383.72	$731.00	$12.57		$36.75	7,842.60	Total.
									KAIBAB DAY SCHOOL.
.30	$122.60	6.25	68.78				1.75	2,075.62	Indian schools support, 1915.
			12.15		373.33	$30.00		403.33	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			1.25					12.15	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								1.25	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
.30	122.60	6.25	82.18		373.33	30.00	1.75	2,492.35	Total.
									KESHENA AGENCY.
106.73		340.23	11,224.33	5,104.40	453.18		3,275.06	54,991.52	Interest on Menominee log fund.
								956.31	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					334.19			676.31	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
					44.25			44.25	Fulfilling treaties with Menominees, logs.
			10.25					10.25	Fulfilling treaties with Menominees, proceeds of lands.
			66.40					541.90	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								55.86	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
								2,552.94	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								170.66	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
1.60		1.00	5.02		8.65		10.95	81.18	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			1,355.46		61.65		9.29	2,035.54	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
3.60		103.13	1,282.37		5.50			3,258.00	Interest on Menominee fund.
							[1] 1,922.03	1,922.03	Industry among Indians, 1915-16.
111.93		444.36	13,983.83	5,104.40	907.42		5,217.33	67,296.75	Total.
									KESHENA BOARDING SCHOOL.
69.13	455.17		2,688.60		297.20			29,686.99	Interest on Menominee log fund.
					.85			.85	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
1.10			142.26		170.72		6.05	728.30	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		5.10	253.79		1,771.78		1.44	3,298.65	Interest on Menominee fund.
		5.63	106.92		146.55			294.10	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			1,236.92				[1] 116.57	1,353.49	Indian schools, support, 1915.
70.23	455.17	10.73	4,428.49		2,387.10		124.06	35,362.38	Total.
									KESHENA DAY SCHOOL.
.52	466.77		105.08		18.60			1,960.91	Intatest on Menominee log fund.
								47.00	Interest on Menominee fund.
.52	466.77		105.08		18.60			2,007.91	Total.
									MENOMINEE SAW MILLS.
402.54		736.36	27,452.43	2,097.39	3,407.80		[2] 17,600.05	327,204.97	Menominee log fund.
									KICKAPOO AGENCY.
								879.19	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
			212.00					212.00	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
								585.11	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
			193.05					1,193.05	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								6.50	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
			405.05					2,875.85	Total.
									KICKAPOO BOARDING SCHOOL.
165.80	96.05	69.96	1,206.50				4.40	13,945.74	Indian school, Kickapoo Reservation, Kans., 1915.
				1,916.80	655.88			2,572.68	Indian school, Kickapoo Reservation, Kans., repairs and improvements, 1915.
	3.60		1,639.85		21.65		[1] 119.65	2,407.31	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
	16.00		82.65	336.97	32.50			627.47	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
165.80	115.65	69.96	2,929.00	2,253.77	710.03		124.05	19,553.20	Total.
									KICKAPOO DAY SCHOOL.
	.75							586.75	Indian schools, support, 1915.
	4.05	5.60	99.30		16.80			245.10	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
	4.80	5.60	99.30		16.80			831.85	Total.
									KIOWA AGENCY.
41.06		446.05	192.11				38.15	4,585.92	Support of Wichitas and affiliated bands, Oklahoma, 1915.
269.09		202.61	1,378.59				37.00	19,554.44	Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche 4 per cent fund, 1915.
							[3] 110.94	110.94	Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche 4 per cent fund.
				[4] 1,050.00				1,050.00	Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche 4 per cent fund, hospital.
65.09		558.58	912.28		1,893.39		3,132.95	7,301.34	Kiowa Agency Hospital 4 per cent fund.

[1] Seed.
[2] Insurance, $16,311.06; refunds, $956.67; burial expenses, $98.20; seed, $190.64; miscellaneous, $43.68.
[3] Refund H. E.
[4] Superintendent of construction.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
KIOWA AGENCY—continued.										
Interest on Kiowa Agency Hospital 4 per cent fund.	$56.00									
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			$3,184.02							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	4,151.98									
Indian schools, support, 1915 (tuition) (should be charged to Ponca).										
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	2,723.41								$175.19	$73.75
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, P	2,378.83								157.43	
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	42.85				$1.10					
Proceeds of Wichita ceded lands										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	352.50	$171.94				$116.90				
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	3,090.50									
Release and settlement of Apache Indians held as prisoners of war at Fort Sill, Okla.	76.00								147.65	6.00
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Total	30,825.00	1,369.47	3,224.89	$305.67	480.54	139.15	$430.85	$249.66	746.04	1,200.62
ANADARKO BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	7,700.29	70.12	154.89	350.51	53.67		4,313.48	2,186.25	918.80	768.68
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	71.10		3.00							
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor							59.10			
Total	7,771.39	70.12	157.89	350.51	53.67		4,372.58	2,186.25	918.80	768.68
FORT SILL BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	11,636.56	184.54	176.29	714.30	81.35		5,103.60	3,069.56	13.00	1,537.09
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	269.98		2.14			1.50	21.00		216.50	.65
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	598.33					5.50	69.77			
Total	12,504.87	184.54	178.43	714.30	81.35	7.00	5,194.37	3,069.56	229.50	1,537.74
RAINY MOUNTAIN BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	10,988.39	178.80	728.28		36.91		6,058.26	2,987.44	351.25	1,486.45
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	327.26		27.85			12.65	33.00		5.00	12.90
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor						1.50	37.45	86.31		
Indian school, transportation, 1915		9.54								
Total	11,315.65	188.34	756.13		36.91	14.15	6,128.71	3,073.75	356.25	1,499.35
RIVERSIDE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	9,913.19	70.14	118.35	235.39	20.51		5,056.79	2,575.42	133.84	1,317.79
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	64.71					4.00	12.00	.60	20.00	
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.	117.85	17.74								
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	25.00						60.00			
Total	10,120.75	87.88	118.35	235.39	20.51	4.00	5,128.79	2,576.02	153.84	1,317.79
KLAMATH AGENCY.										
Support of Indians of Klamath Agency, 1915	5,099.00		99.31		4.87				120.00	813.50
Purchase and transportation, Indian supplies, 1915.			1,314.46		3.99					
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,214.90							158.81		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	31.50									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, P	2,997.50								120.00	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	1,414.00									30.00
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	4,195.48	64.45				15.00	228.91		263.62	
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	6,691.52	204.78	.52		13.46		337.58	.42	441.64	327.05
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	2.00		8.00							
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						19.30				
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allotees, 1915.	2,290.84	148.33								
Industry among Indians, 1915										
Payment to Indians of Klamath Agency, Oreg.										
Payment to Indians of Klamath Agency for lands, etc.	153.33		14.00						120.95	
Total	25,090.07	417.56	1,436.29		22.32	34.30	566.49	159.23	1,066.21	1,170.55
KLAMATH BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	10,553.59		431.89		1.30		2,796.57	1,357.15	60.00	915.05
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	9.25	53.63	1.30		8.46	37.70	212.70		12.00	16.87
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor		2.00					32.70	91.65		
Payment to Indians of Klamath Agency, Oreg., for lands.										
Total	10,562.84	55.63	433.19		9.76	37.70	3,041.97	1,448.80	72.00	931.92

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									KIOWA AGENCY—continued.
								$56.00	Interest on Kiowa Agency Hospital 4 per cent fund.
								3,184.02	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					$3,249.66	$266.25		3,515.91	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								4,151.98	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
							[1] $375.15	375.15	Indian schools, support, 1915 (tuition) (should be charged to Ponca).
			$161.96			349.50		3,483.81	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			1,927.21					4,463.47	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, P.
$5.00					135.59		1.00	185.54	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
							[2] 144.95	144.95	Proceeds of Wichita ceded lands.
			121.77				2.95	766.06	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
71.60							5.00	3,167.10	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
			1,736.81	$8,937.30			[3] 69,812.35	80,716.15	Release and settlement of Apache Indians held as prisoners of war at Fort Sill, Okla.
		$34.00						34.00	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
451.75		1,241.24	6,430.73	9,987.30	5,278.64	615.75	73,660.44	136,846.74	Total.
									ANADARKO BOARDING SCHOOL.
42.85	$311.77	11.25	832.04				139.66	17,854.26	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					151.71	400.00		551.71	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			78.04		126.51		14.50	293.15	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			39.00				28.79	126.89	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
42.85	311.77	11.25	949.08		278.22	400.00	182.95	18,826.01	Total.
									FORT SILL BOARDING SCHOOL.
12.50	307.46	148.06	4,655.41				38.95	27,678.67	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					1,226.58			1,226.58	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
		2.80	304.20		1,098.30		177.20	2,094.27	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
							28.79	702.39	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
12.50	307.46	150.86	4,959.61		2,324.88		244.94	31,701.91	Total.
									RAINY MOUNTAIN BOARDING SCHOOL.
12.50	205.60	158.10	1,318.92				86.37	24,597.27	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				3,339.20	3,632.42			6,371.62	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
		11.10	258.41		943.60		15.00	1,646.17	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			165.00				28.79	319.05	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								9.54	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
12.50	205.60	169.20	1,742.33	3,339.20	3,975.42		130.16	32,943.65	Total.
									RIVERSIDE BOARDING SCHOOL.
12.50	327.11	2.18	2,794.60				121.76	22,699.57	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					5,114.48			5,114.48	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	1.80	.35	284.50		183.41		75.72	647.09	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		21.00						156.59	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
							17.71	102.71	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
12.50	328.91	23.53	3,079.10		5,297.89		215.19	28,720.44	Total.
									KLAMATH AGENCY.
			143.95					6,280.63	Support of Indians of Klamath Agency, 1915.
								1,318.45	Purchase and transportation, Indian supplies, 1915.
				2,264.51	412.62			2,677.13	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			10.00					2,383.71	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								31.50	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
								3,117.50	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, P.
			60.00					1,504.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			656.50				42.50	5,466.46	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
51.66		246.49	2,470.06		150.60		66.46	11,002.24	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			16.65		3.75			30.40	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								19.30	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
171.89								2,611.06	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
			52.45					52.45	Industry among Indians, 1915.
			5.24					5.24	Payment to Indians of Klamath Agency, Oreg.
			3,457.45				[4] 291.85	4,037.58	Payment to Indians of Klamath Agency for lands, etc.
223.55		246.49	6,872.30	2,264.51	566.97		400.81	40,537.65	Total.
									KLAMATH BOARDING SCHOOL.
	204.43	25.67	804.39				158.85	17,308.89	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					1,540.52			1,540.52	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	1.16		968.86		183.97		18.75	1,524.65	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			331.00		484.09			941.44	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
					9.00			9.00	Payment to Indians of Klamath Agency, Oreg., for lands.
	205.59	25.67	2,104.25		2,217.58		177.60	21,324.50	Total.

[1] Tuition. [2] Refund H. E. [3] Land, $69,670; seed, time, etc., $142.25. [4] United States Geological Survey maintenance of gauging station.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
KLAMATH DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	$5,260.33		$4.00				$11.04	$28.96		$312.24
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915									$15.60	44.58
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Payment to Indians of Klamath Agency for lands, etc.										
Total	5,260.33		4.00				11.04	28.96	15.60	356.82
LAC DU FLAMBEAU AGENCY.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	240.00						711.35	81.00		
Purchase and transportation, Indian supplies, 1915			2,593.62							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	350.67							50.15	117.96	
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	84.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	780.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	550.00						50.00		117.97	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	1,477.68									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	50.00				$0.49					221.26
Support of Chippewas of Lake Superior, Wis., 1915							61.50			
Individual Indian money	136.67									
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	750.00									
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	4,419.02		2,593.62		.49		822.85	131.15	235.93	221.26
LAC DU FLAMBEAU BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	12,379.83	$28.01			2.29		3,857.24	1,656.13	1,383.56	1,939.32
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	19.82					$5.50	4.50		192.17	40.94
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		33.10								
Total	12,399.65	61.11			2.29	5.50	3,861.74	1,656.13	1,575.73	1,939.26
LA POINTE AGENCY.										
Support of Chippewas of Lake Superior, Wis., 1915	2,460.00	25.36	9.47		36.00		457.31		125.40	82.30
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			39.33							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Diking, etc., Bad River Reservation, Wis. (reimbursement), 1915	[1] 7,688.73									
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,560.00								34.65	
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915										
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,996.00								91.00	65.78
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	23.33	99.40								
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	1,929.33	556.10			29.24				6.40	2.05
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor									108.50	
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915		15.72								
Individual Indian money	4,166.67	96.14								
Proceeds of timber, cemetery site, etc., La Pointe Chippewas, Wis.	228.25									
Total	20,052.31	792.72	48.80		65.24		457.31		365.95	150.33
LA POINTE DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools support, 1915	3,855.00						45.91	7.57		
LEECH LAKE AGENCY.										
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915	13,057.80	809.35	39.79		23.56		706.72		1,261.17	1,142.16
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			710.76							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915	52.50	19.94								
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,820.67							245.97	175.00	
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	146.04									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	108.33	116.45								
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	1,228.50	66.67								
Industry among Indians, 1915										
Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund		95.91					96.60			44.25
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
Individual Indian money	4,919.00	415.90				6.00				
Chippewa in Minnesota fund	2,425.00	36.30								
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor					4.50					
Total	24,757.84	1,560.52	750.55		28.06	6.00	803.32	245.97	1,436.17	1,186.41
LEECH LAKE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund	8,679.30		389.87				1,975.85	1,707.92	962.18	1,661.29
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							1.92		105.00	13.10
Indian school, transportation, 1915		3.18								
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915			85.79				147.94	45.28	187.48	203.90
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	8,679.30	3.18	475.66				2,125.71	1,753.20	1,254.66	1,878.29

[1] Contract labor and material.

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									KLAMATH DAY SCHOOLS.
.....	$154.33	$1.50	$141.28	.....	.....	.....	.....	$5,913.68	Indian schools, support, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	$120.26	.....	.....	120.26	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	5.27	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	65.45	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	8.25	.....	.....	8.25	Payment to Indians of Klamath Agency for lands, etc.
.....	159.60	1.50	141.28	.....	128.51	.....	.....	6,107.64	Total.
									LAC DU FLAMBEAU AGENCY.
.....	.....	262.31	.75	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,295.41	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,593.62	Purchase and transportation, Indian supplies, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	518.78	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	84.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	393.97	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,173.97	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, P.
.....	.....	.....	44.40	.....	.....	.....	.....	762.37	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
.....	.....	.....	199.01	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,676.69	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
$20.69	.....	.....	355.15	.....	32.00	.....	.....	679.59	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.....	.....	122.93	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	184.43	Support of Chippewas of Lake Superior, Wis., 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	136.67	Individual Indian money.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	750.00	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	22.00	.....	.....	22.00	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
20.69	.....	385.24	993.28	.....	54.00	.....	.....	9,877.53	Total.
									LAC DU FLAMBEAU BOARDING SCHOOL.
.....	199.40	.79	1,954.09	.....	.....	.....	$162.55	23,563.21	Indian schools, support, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,619.81	.....	.....	1,619.81	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	525.24	.....	46.70	.....	3.00	837.87	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.....	.....	6.78	15.24	.....	12.00	.....	.....	34.02	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	33.10	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
.....	199.40	7.57	2,494.57	.....	1,678.51	.....	165.55	26,088.01	Total.
									LA POINTE AGENCY.
.....	.....	185.12	100.00	.....	.....	.....	4.00	3,485.16	Support of Chippewas of Lake Superior, Wis., 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	39.33	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	29.89	$1,050.15	.....	1,080.04	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7,688.73	Diking, etc., Bad River Reservation, Wis. (reimbursement), 1915.
.....	.....	.....	22.45	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,617.10	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	141.50	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,294.28	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
.....	.....	.....	2.97	.....	.....	.....	.....	125.70	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
.....	.....	.....	55.05	.....	.....	.....	12.90	2,591.07	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	52.63	.....	183.03	.....	.....	344.16	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	15.72	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,262.81	Individual Indian money.
.....	.....	.....	.....	$450.00	.....	.....	.....	678.25	Proceeds of timber, cemetery site, etc., La Pointe Chippewas, Wis.
.....	.....	185.12	374.60	450.00	212.92	1,050.15	16.90	24,222.35	Total.
									LA POINTE DAY SCHOOL.
.....	3.73	.....	3.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,915.21	Indian schools support, 1915.
									LEECH LAKE AGENCY.
217.50	.....	589.91	2,233.62	.....	.....	.....	626.52	20,708.10	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	710.76	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,300.84	.....	.....	1,300.84	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
61.25	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	133.69	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,241.64	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	146.04	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	224.78	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
.....	.....	.....	33.60	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,328.77	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
.....	.....	.....	3,313.67	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,313.67	Industry among Indians, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	236.76	Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund.
.....	.....	13.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	25.55	38.55	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	3.35	.....	.....	.....	.....	3.35	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.....	.....	.....	26.50	.....	.....	.....	26.24	5,393.64	Individual Indian money.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,461.30	Chippewa in Minnesota fund.
.....	.....	33.83	73.20	.....	.....	.....	12.85	124.38	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
278.75	.....	636.74	5,683.94	.....	1,300.84	.....	691.16	39,366.27	Total.
									LEECH LAKE BOARDING SCHOOL.
70.00	84.71	3.51	499.41	1,663.64	241.67	.....	22.50	18,061.85	Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund.
.....	.....	.75	66.15	.....	80.45	.....	106.00	373.37	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3.18	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	570.72	.....	47.31	.....	.....	1,288.42	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	1,924.75	2,736.07	.....	.....	4,660.82	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
70.00	84.71	4.26	1,136.28	3,588.39	3,205.50	.....	128.50	24,387.64	Total.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
LEECH LAKE DAY SCHOOLS.										
Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund	$1,950.00	$3.80					$0.38	$6.97		$240.96
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915										
Total	1,950.00	3.80					.38	6.97		240.96
LEUPP AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915	5,732.14	62.29	$314.09		$3.01	$1.75	128.18	55.40	$410.57	326.95
Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915			1,973.20		.82					
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,150.50						97.84	146.29	63.00	
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, P	1,550.83								29.97	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	85.83								14.30	
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4					.90		41.58			
Industry among Indians, 1915			232.58							
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915	34.00				.24		11.78			
Total	8,721.30	62.29	2,519.87		4.97	1.75	279.38	201.69	517.84	326.95
LEUPP BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools support, 1915	7,474.67	52.70	1,511.67		6.32	1.75	2,642.62	2,011.64	36.49	1,961.64
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian school transportation, 1915					.23					
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4					2.17		33.80	5.00		
Total	7,474.67	52.70	1,511.67		8.72	1.75	2,676.42	2,016.64	36.49	1,961.64
LOWER BRULE AGENCY.										
Support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, 1915	752.95	267.81	2,852.96		67.35	20.00	2,724.02		691.32	699.01
Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915			2,021.95							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,059.17							78.82		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	84.00									
Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915	7,840.68									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	1,536.71					176.75	70.45		260.48	11.48
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	797.50									
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915										
Proceeds of Lower Brule Reservation, S. Dak	348.75	82.80							5,251.77	
Civilization of the Sioux										
Total	12,419.76	350.61	4,874.91		67.35	196.75	2,794.47	78.82	6,203.57	710.49
LOWER BRULE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Education, Sioux Nation, S. Dak., 1915	8,233.42	2.00					1,179.39	1,646.88	320.51	1,001.09
Support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, 1915							591.42			
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	11.00		3.95				11.20			
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor									32.00	
Total	8,244.42	2.00	3.95				1,782.01	1,646.88	352.51	1,004.09
MACKINAC AGENCY.										
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915	495.00									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor			.50				4.98			2.15
Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915			4.69							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915							7.66			
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	736.00	57.47								
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	2,058.00	6.00	2.10	$42.00	20.00				400.00	79.40
Individual Indian money	99.00	39.02			2.04					
Total	3,388.00	102.49	7.29	42.00	22.04		12.64		400.00	81.55
MALKI AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in California, 1915	2,878.00	233.20			80.25		224.75	25.00	340.68	1,020.89
Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915			401.04							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)										
Industry among Indians, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,193.33						70.00			
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Por	453.49									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,842.23	185.40							690.00	112.00
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	600.00								102.00	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Exp	174.00									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915	17.00	16.30					150.00			
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	302.25									
Total	7,628.30	434.90	401.04		80.25		444.75	25.00	1,132.68	1,132.89

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									LEECH LAKE DAY SCHOOLS.
.....	$51.16	.....	$5.23	.....	$36.87	.....	.....	$2,295.37	Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund.
.....	.....	.....	503.39	.....	81.15	.....	$3.80	588.34	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915.
.....	51.16	.....	508.62	.....	118.02	.....	3.80	2,883.71	Total.
									LEUPP AGENCY.
$72.64	.....	$446.58	3,575.41	.....	.....	.....	71.50	11,200.51	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,974.02	Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	659.29	.....	.....	659.29	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	68.60	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,526.23	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	992.75	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,573.55	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, P.
.....	.....	.....	19.13	.....	.....	.....	.....	119.26	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.45	42.93	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	232.58	Industry among Indians, 1915.
.....	.....	66.03	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	112.05	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
72.64	.....	512.61	4,655.89	.....	659.29	.....	71.95	18,608.42	Total.
									LEUPP BOARDING SCHOOL.
81.82	233.13	112.02	790.98	.....	.....	.....	24.50	16,941.95	Indian schools support, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,049.77	.....	.....	1,049.77	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.23	Indian school transportation, 1915.
.....	.....	16.60	8.05	.....	.....	.....	.10	65.72	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
81.82	233.13	128.62	799.03	.....	1,049.77	.....	24.60	18,057.67	Total.
									LOWER BRULE AGENCY.
186.60	.....	325.43	1,742.35	.....	.....	.....	71.23	10,401.03	Support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,021.95	Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,056.68	.....	.....	1,056.68	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,137.99	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	84.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7,840.68	Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	2,078.12	.....	178.27	.....	586.75	4,899.01	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
.....	.....	.....	275.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,072.50	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
147.60	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	147.60	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	32,260.03	$5,437.92	.....	.....	554.11	43,935.38	Proceeds of Lower Brule Reservation, S. Dak.
.....	.....	.....	7,049.86	.....	.....	.....	[1] 3,440.21	10,490.07	Civilization of the Sioux.
334.20	.....	325.43	43,405.36	5,437.92	1,234.95	.....	4,652.30	83,086.89	Total.
									LOWER BRULE BOARDING SCHOOL.
40.56	296.51	5.00	2,139.96	5,312.58	1,105.02	.....	.....	21,285.92	Education, Sioux Nation, S. Dak., 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	591.42	Support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, 1915.
7.00	1.20	.....	362.61	.....	3.42	.....	19.53	419.91	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.....	.....	3.50	.....	.....	.....	.....	37.50	73.00	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
47.56	297.71	8.50	2,502.57	5,312.58	1,108.44	.....	57.03	22,370.25	Total.
									MACKINAC AGENCY.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	10.00	505.00	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7.63	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	4.69	Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	$372.00	14.50	386.50	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7.66	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	83.89	.....	.....	.....	.....	877.36	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
74.45	.....	1.75	16.39	.....	.....	.....	10.00	2,710.09	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	140.06	Individual Indian money.
74.45	.....	1.75	100.28	.....	.....	372.00	34.50	4,638.99	Total.
									MALKI AGENCY.
.....	.....	59.71	1,345.08	.....	.....	.....	364.50	6,572.06	Support of Indians in California, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	401.04	Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	275.36	.....	[2] 24.00	299.36	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	[3] 390.27	390.27	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	[4] 1,750.00	1,750.00	Industry among Indians, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	28.40	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,291.73	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	453.49	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
.....	.....	.....	716.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,545.63	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
.....	.....	.....	25.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	727.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	174.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Exp.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	[5] 90.00	90.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	[6] 125.00	308.30	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	285.43	.....	.....	.....	[7] 60.00	647.68	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
.....	.....	59.71	2,399.91	.....	275.36	.....	2,803.77	16,818.56	Total.

[1] Treaty benefit payments.
[2] Water.
[3] Fruit trees.
[4] Seed and fruit trees.
[5] Seed.
[6] Hospital expenses, etc.
[7] Burial expense.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
MALKI DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian school support, 1915	$1,250.00	$166.50			$118.65		$55.99	$192.99		$191.00
Indian school, transportation, 1915		893.34								
Total	1,250.00	1,059.84			118.65		55.99	192.99		191.00
MEKUSUKEY BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Interest on Seminole school fund	9,211.42	29.62			23.40		4,602.02	726.06	$758.25	1,046.18
Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915			$396.51							
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	13.50	5.00				$13.25	57.62		50.09	
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915	150.00									
Total	9,374.92	34.62	396.51		23.40	13.25	4,659.64	726.06	808.34	1,046.18
MESCALERO AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915	10,855.43	120.81	144.09		38.31	3.25	7,133.36	5.60	928.41	360.81
Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915			2,375.21							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915			14.36							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,995.00							166.58	35.40	
Industry among Indians, 1915		36.10	187.17				84.28		299.55	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,680.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	2,695.57									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	1,719.85	222.18	151.05				1,105.38	241.95	245.00	78.60
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915						44.57				
Miscellaneous receipts, class 2			21.20							
Release and settlement of Apache Indians held as prisoners of war at Fort Sill, Okla.	3,329.23	10.50	888.68				4,182.79			277.74
Total	23,275.08	389.59	3,781.76		38.31	47.82	12,505.81	414.13	1,508.36	717.15
MESCALERO BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school support, 1915	7,789.20		1,165.65		2.74		4,973.68	1,769.57	520.00	1,152.15
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	158.70						128.96			7.00
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor							11.25			
Total	7,947.90		1,165.65		2.74		5,113.89	1,769.57	521.00	1,159.15
MOAPA RIVER AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Nevada, 1915		24.95		$10.50			142.50	3.25		17.30
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915							46.72			
Purchase and transportation, Indian supplies, 1915			71.91							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Industry among Indians, 1915–1916										
Industry among Indians, 1915	286.12		295.45							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	468.67							21.94		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	59.00									
Total	813.79	24.95	367.36	10.50			189.22	25.19		17.30
MOAPA RIVER DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	3,150.83	65.90	3.10	26.05			151.17	9.81	21.54	188.07
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	3,150.83	65.90	3.10	26.05			151.17	9.81	21.54	188.07
MOQUI AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915	9,074.72	172.10	5,679.86			13.20	145.20	73.17	1,633.30	244.74
Purchase and transportation, Indian supplies, 1915		67.80	3,980.13		.66					
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,310.00						35.44	149.28		24.00
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	217.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	3,140.00						17.65	17.79		120.60
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	2,031.67								54.60	
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)			4.67							
Industry among Indians, 1915	25.00	121.60	1,226.51							
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
Payment to William Volz, Oklahoma		65.50								
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915										
Industry among Indians, 1915–1916	20.00									
Total	15,818.39	427.00	10,891.17		.66	13.20	198.29	240.24	1,687.90	389.34
MOQUI BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	15,339.91	146.35	6,236.20				4,122.53	1,928.84	992.60	389.25
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
Total	15,339.91	146.35	6,236.20				4,122.53	1,928.84	992.60	389.25
MOQUI DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	12,552.70						1,292.99	1,740.79	58.64	582.48
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	12,552.70						1,292.99	1,740.79	58.64	582.48

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									MALKI DAY SCHOOL.
		$32.95	$124.00					$2,132.08	Indian schools support, 1915.
								893.34	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
		32.95	124.00					3,025.42	Total.
									MEKUSUKEY BOARDING SCHOOL.
995.00	$52.41	72.72	1,642.62		$2,015.79		[1]$523.20	20,774.69	Interest on Seminole school fund.
								396.51	Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.
3.20	22.99		53.67		220.04		15.56	514.92	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								150.00	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
108.20	75.40	52.72	1,716.29		2,235.83		544.76	21,816.12	Total.
									MESCALERO AGENCY.
.50		162.01	1,097.51				12.97	20,870.06	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
								2,375.21	Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.
				$1,052.08	322.73			1,389.17	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								3,196.98	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
			68,727.02					69,334.12	Industry among Indians, 1915.
			380.80					2,060.80	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			491.86		12.40			3,199.83	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For
		1.80	598.31	229.53			853.40	5,447.05	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			135.00	5,786.66				5,966.23	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								21.20	Miscellaneous receipts, class 2.
			2,225.93	11,341.81			[2]360.00	22,616.68	Release and settlement of Apache Indians held as prisoners of war, at Fort Sill, Okla.
.50		163.81	73,656.43	18,410.08	335.13		1,226.37	136,477.33	Total.
									MESCALERO BOARDING SCHOOL.
	177.58	1.32	243.58				16.50	17,817.97	Indian schools support, 1915.
					1,316.90			1,316.90	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			152.23				64.94	551.89	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
					74.60			85.85	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
	177.58	1.32	441.87		1,391.50		81.44	19,772.61	Total.
									MOAPA RIVER AGENCY.
		.14	25.60				20.00	248.24	Support of Indians in Nevada, 1915.
							53.00	99.72	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								71.91	Purchase and transportation, Indian supplies, 1915.
					98.00	$420.00		518.00	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			310.00					310.00	Industry among Indians, 1915–1916.
			514.32					1,395.89	Industry among Indians, 1915.
			3.18					493.79	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								59.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
		4.14	1,153.10		98.00	420.00	73.00	3,196.55	Total.
									MOAPA RIVER DAY SCHOOL.
	16.66	37.23	274.24				21.37	2,965.37	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					234.10		[1]22.80	256.90	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	16.66	37.23	274.24		234.10		44.17	4,222.27	Total.
									MOQUI AGENCY.
		740.90	8,731.86				765.00	27,074.05	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
							139.00	4,187.59	Purchase and transportation, Indian supplies, 1915.
				2,985.15	1,759.36			4,744.51	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								1,518.72	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								217.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
			112.65					3,408.69	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			350.00					2,436.27	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								4.67	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
			4,332.27					5,905.38	Industry among Indians, 1915.
			10.03					10.03	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								65.50	Payment to William Volz, Oklahoma.
		21.00						21.00	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								20.00	Industry among Indians, 1915–1916.
		761.90	13,736.81	2,985.15	1,759.36		904.00	49,613.41	Total.
									MOQUI BOARDING SCHOOL.
28.50	140.75	41.74	968.16				30.31	30,365.14	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					3,703.03			3,703.03	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	4.93							4.93	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
28.50	145.68	41.74	968.16		3,703.03		30.31	34,073.10	Total.
									MOQUI DAY SCHOOL.
	160.42	114.06	417.08					16,919.16	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				2,542.00	18.64			2,560.64	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	160.42	114.06	417.08	2,542.00	18.64			19,479.80	Total.

[1] Insurance, $443.70.

[2] Water.

[3] Sheep dip.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
MOUNT PLEASANT BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Mount Pleasant, Mich., 1915	$22,677.15	$146.81	$832.33	$199.70	$72.03	$5.50	$13,969.89	$8,247.24	$301.50	$5,013.15
Indian school, Mount Pleasant, Mich., repairs and improvements, 1915										
Purchase and transportation, Indian supplies, 1915			3,613.27							
Indian school, transportation, 1915		1,258.37			12.34					
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4					24.00					
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915										
Total	22,677.15	1,405.18	4,445.60	199.70	108.37	5.50	13,969.89	8,247.24	301.50	5,013.15
NAVAJO AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915	15,792.48	523.22	4,541.28		114.31	18.50	1,214.29	270.25	2,810.09	189.13
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			6,044.04							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,484.67		50.00					18.00	341.00	120.00
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	156.33									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	4,785.00	19.45							100.00	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	863.17									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	1,190.54									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
General expenses, Indian service, 1915	1,550.00									
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915	250.00						600.00			
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)										
Total	27,072.19	542.67	10,635.32		114.31	18.50	1,814.29	288.25	3,251.09	309.13
NAVAJO BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	20,016.12	218.10	7,821.14		9.59	8.00	10,534.40	6,689.60	878.20	443.60
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	6.00		3.73							
Fulfilling treaties with Navajoes, schools, Arizona, 1915										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		30.25								
Total	20,022.12	248.35	7,824.87		9.59	8.00	10,534.40	6,689.60	878.20	443.60
CHIN LEE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools support, 1915	9,371.00	58.70	4,818.10				4,700.15	2,401.32	198.61	1,785.53
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Fulfilling treaties with Navajoes, schools, Arizona, 1915			261.92							
Total	9,371.00	58.70	5,080.02				4,700.15	2,401.32	198.61	1,785.53
TOHATCHI BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools support, 1915	9,931.01	55.15	3,417.74		.25		3,858.86	3,897.57	821.48	573.22
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							20.00	8.06		
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915										
Total	9,931.01	55.15	3,417.74		.25		3,878.86	3,905.63	821.48	573.22
NAVAJO DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools support, 1915	1,138.33	3.00	229.73				397.07	430.31		212.12
Fulfilling treaties with Navajoes, schools, Arizona, 1915			616.42				22.26	18.33		
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	1,138.33	3.00	846.15				419.33	448.64		212.12
NAVAJO SPRINGS AGENCY.										
Interest on Ute 5 per cent fund	3,008.08		107.19				1.52	27.55	562.50	44.10
Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, subsistence, Utah, 1915							4,160.99			
Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915			401.37							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Confederated Bands of Utes 4 per cent fund	395.25	136.88	302.23		21.07				2,136.00	
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,063.00							147.94		
Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, employees, Utah, 1915	2,315.50									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	576.67						3.50	4.42		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,256.00									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	385.25	219.21			45.44				2,250.00	131.43
Interest on Confederated Bands of Utes 4 per cent fund	11,888.11	936.61	103.24	72.00	14.74		233.70		55.74	
Payment to Confederated Bands of Utes (reimbursable)	372.25									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4									282.99	
Determining heirs of deceased, Indian allottees, 1915	606.00	61.75								
Total	22,866.11	1,354.45	914.03	72.00	81.25		4,399.71	179.91	5,287.23	175.53

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									MOUNT PLEASANT BOARDING SCHOOL.
$74.35	$858.14	$451.73	$3,356.32				$472.93	$56,678.77	Indian school, Mount Pleasant, Mich., 1915.
					$4,662.44			4,662.44	Indian school, Mount Pleasant, Mich., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								3,613.27	Purchase and transportation, Indian supplies, 1915.
							4.00	1,274.71	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
	5.25	5.00	69.48		5.00		174.00	282.73	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		13.00						13.00	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
74.35	863.39	469.73	3,425.80		4,667.44		650.93	66,524.92	Total.
									NAVAJO AGENCY.
396.40		891.18	7,380.61				[1] 423.00	34,573.74	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
								6,044.04	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					2,123.27			2,123.27	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								3,013.67	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								156.33	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
								4,904.45	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								863.17	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
								1,190.54	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
			350.45				[2] 249.97	600.42	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								1,550.00	General expenses, Indian service, 1915.
15.20		84.63	742.19	$10,392.54				12,084.56	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
			4,199.00					4,199.00	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
411.60		975.81	12,681.25	10,392.54	2,123.27		672.97	71,303.19	Total.
									NAVAJO BOARDING SCHOOL.
	337.51	31.75	2,295.12				[2] 149.10	49,432.23	Indian schools support, 1915.
				12,540.06	1,672.64			14,212.70	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
		112.50						112.50	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
	19.30		296.02					325.05	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
					2,023.33			2,023.33	Fulfilling treaties with Navajoes, schools, Arizona, 1915.
			109.00					109.00	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								30.25	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
	356.81	144.25	2,700.14	12,540.10	3,695.97		149.10	66,245.06	Total.
									CHIN LEE BOARDING SCHOOL.
18.25	185.55	354.04	421.58					24,312.83	Indian schools support, 1915.
					736.20			736.20	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
				16,006.54	2,227.96			18,496.42	Fulfilling treaties with Navajoes, schools, Arizona, 1915.
18.25	185.55	354.04	421.58	16,006.54	2,964.16			43,545.45	Total.
									TOHATCHI BOARDING SCHOOL.
22.93	242.76	244.99	673.30					23,739.26	Indian schools support, 1915.
					334.57			334.57	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			55.71		72.06			155.83	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		4.88						4.88	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
22.93	242.76	249.87	729.01		406.63			24,234.54	Total.
									NAVAJO DAY SCHOOLS.
	102.36	3.63	282.64					2,799.19	Indian schools support, 1915.
			49.07	185.64				891.72	Fulfilling treaties with Navajoes, schools, Arizona, 1915.
					30.54			30.54	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	102.36	3.63	331.71	185.64	30.54			3,721.45	Total.
									NAVAJO SPRINGS AGENCY.
4.60		116.93	683.23				103.70	4,659.40	Interest on Ute 5 per cent fund.
								4,160.99	Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, subsistence, Utah, 1915.
								401.37	Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.
					3.78			3.78	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			85,282.60	7,464.53	1,426.77		[2] 279.26	97,444.59	Confederated Bands of Utes 4 per cent fund.
								2,210.94	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								2,315.50	Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, employees, Utah, 1915.
			28.60					613.19	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			22.41					1,278.41	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			742.08					3,773.41	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
		4.20	4,623.58		500.13			18,432.05	Interest on Confederated Bands of Utes 4 per cent fund.
			880.00					1,252.25	Payment to Confederated Bands of Utes (reimbursable).
								282.99	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								667.75	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
4.60		121.13	92,262.50	7,464.53	1,930.68		382.96	137,496.62	Total.

[1] Sheep dip, $393.

[2] Seed.

[2] Seed and trees.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
NAVAJO SPRINGS DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools support, 1915	$2,685.54		$6.21				$16.07	$367.31		
Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, subsistence, Utah, 1915.							12.44			
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.										
Total	2,685.54		6.21				28.51	367.31		
NEAH BAY AGENCY.										
Support of Makahs, Washington, 1915	600.00	$51.60	129.82				149.41	1.20	$80.00	$8.52
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.										
Support of Quiraielts and Quillehutes, Washington, 1915.		17.80								
Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.			115.69							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	540.00							40.85		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	7.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	566.00								48.75	
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	320.00									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4			9.16							
Total	2,033.00	69.40	254.67				149.41	42.05	128.75	8.52
NEAH BAY DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools support, 1915	4,627.42	24.30	14.57				25.50	6.65		154.00
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor					$30.00					
Total	4,627.42	24.30	14.57		30.00		25.50	6.65		154.00
NETT LAKE AGENCY.										
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915	9,824.08	442.44	319.19				1,471.61	109.37	828.97	284.44
Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.			279.48							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.										
Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	480.00						118.25	28.72		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	718.52					$27.90				
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	716.00									
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915						125.78				
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	22.00	27.35								
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Total	11,760.60	469.79	598.67			153.68	1,589.86	138.09	828.97	284.44
NETT LAKE DAY SCHOOL.										
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915							297.88	473.78	295.28	127.11
Indian schools, support, 1915										
Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund	2,690.00						14.25	4.02		30.00
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							5.60	.30		
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.										
Total	2,690.00						317.73	478.10	295.28	157.11
NEVADA AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Nevada, 1915	1,360.00		4.80				736.99	.21	280.84	205.41
Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.			1,446.74							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,319.33							40.80		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	84.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,616.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	720.00									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	2,827.00	6.50								
Industry among Indians, 1915										
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)										
Total	7,926.33	6.50	1,451.54				736.99	41.01	280.84	205.41
NEVADA BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	6,271.67	11.25	247.19				2,811.42	1,465.59	766.54	1,118.24
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							32.78	5.31		15.50
Indian school, transportation, 1915		13.50								
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	6,271.67	24.75	247.19				2,844.20	1,470.90	766.54	1,133.74
NEVADA DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	300.00									
NEW YORK AGENCY.										
Fulfilling treaties with Six Nations of New York.								2,727.66		
Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.			70.43							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 3	250.00									
General expenses, Indian service, 1915	2,517.50	178.05	60.25		30.00	10.20				2.00
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.		3.40								
Total	2,767.50	181.45	130.68		30.00	10.20		2,727.66		2.00

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									NAVAJO SPRINGS DAY SCHOOL.
	$4.60		$5.92					$3,085.65	Indian schools support, 1915.
								12.44	Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, subsistence, Utah, 1915.
					$516.39			516.39	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915
	4.60		5.92		516.39			3,614.48	Total.
									NEAH BAY AGENCY.
$72.00		$101.04	393.28					1,586.87	Support of Makahs, Washington, 1915.
				$151.75	52.34			204.09	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			400.00					417.80	Support of Quinaielts and Quillehutes, Washington, 1915.
								115.69	Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.
								580.85	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								7.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
			100.00					714.75	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								320.00	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
			75.00					75.00	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			.70		7.50			17.36	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
72.00		101.04	968.98	151.75	59.84			4,039.41	Total.
									NEAH BAY DAY SCHOOLS.
13.80	146.31		267.12				$2.00	5,281.67	Indian schools support, 1915.
				415.58	67.66			483.24	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								30.00	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
13.80	146.31		267.12	415.58	67.66		2.00	5,794.91	Total.
									NETT LAKE AGENCY.
197.23		64.74	2,067.11		35.55		218.78	15,863.55	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915.
								279.48	Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.
					447.25			447.25	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			4.50					4.50	Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund.
								626.97	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
			58.50					804.92	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
			372.00					1,088.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								125.78	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
								49.35	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
		29.30						29.30	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
197.23		94.04	2,502.11		482.80		218.78	19,319.06	Total.
									NETT LAKE DAY SCHOOL.
	127.60	185.60	394.46					1,901.71	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915.
							[1] 119.00	119.00	Indian schools support, 1915.
	12.98		210.31		51.57			3,013.13	Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund.
			21.75				2.00	29.65	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
				3,430.07	412.74			3,842.81	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	140.58	185.60	626.52	3,430.07	464.31		121.00	8,906.30	Total.
									NEVADA AGENCY.
		172.19	300.97					3,061.41	Support of Indians in Nevada, 1915.
								1,446.74	Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.
					352.35			352.35	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								1,360.13	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								84.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
								1,616.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
							$72.00	792.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			534.31				258.00	3,625.81	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			1,065.00					1,065.00	Industry among Indians, 1915.
			200.00					200.00	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
		172.19	2,100.28		352.35	72.00	258.00	13,603.44	Total.
									NEVADA BOARDING SCHOOL.
	9.12	175.73	694.85					13,781.60	Indian schools support, 1915.
			214.16				8.25	276.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								13.50	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
				698.22	84.29			782.51	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	9.12	175.73	1,119.01	698.22	84.29		8.25	14,853.61	Total.
									NEVADA DAY SCHOOL.
			20.00					320.00	Indian schools support, 1915.
									NEW YORK AGENCY.
								2,727.66	Fulfilling treaties with Six Nations of New York.
								70.43	Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.
					33.80	120.00		153.80	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
							[2] 2,524.00	2,774.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 3.
5.25		87.73	64.83				9.44	2,165.25	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
								3.40	Relieving distress and prevention of disea among Indians, 1915.
5.25		87.73	64.83		33.80	120.00	2,533.44	8,694.54	Total.

[1] Seed.

[2] Rental due Seneca Tribe.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
NEW YORK WAREHOUSE.										
Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.	$7,279.97	$110.21	$453.84	$121.36	$64.17					
NUYAKA BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Interest on Creek general fund	8,864.86	49.62	512.27		10.00		$4,642.86	$299.58	$1,090.69	$563.42
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			568.23							
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	9.00		31.01		10.25		55.26	16.20	112.06	
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		13.30								
Total	8,873.86	62.92	1,111.51		20.25		4,698.12	315.78	1,202.75	563.42
OMAHA AGENCY.										
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	5,381.91	109.63			54.67		21.08		209.20	391.19
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	528.30		142.74							
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			157.13							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	945.00							89.05		
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	142.42				5.33		3.85			
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,011.64	94.53								
Proceeds of Omaha Reservation, Nebr., act of May 15, 1888.	449.86									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						$16.00				
Total	8,459.13	204.16	299.87		60.00	16.00	24.93	89.05	209.20	391.19
OMAHA WAREHOUSE.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.	5,226.66	196.11	134.06	4.74	123.68					70.75
ONEIDA AGENCY.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			276.11							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	240.00									
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.		243.62								
Total	240.00	243.62	276.11							
ONEIDA BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	14,164.21	23.60	43.81		18.00		3,505.73	2,261.09	249.70	1,904.15
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	21.00	9.00						36.70		
Total	14,185.21	32.60	43.81		18.00		3,505.73	2,297.79	249.70	1,904.15
OSAGE AGENCY.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, agency, 1915	27,505.63	5,246.70	5.12	123.16	389.02	164.00			1,206.10	340.15
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			558.40							
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4				3.30						
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						7.50				
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	27,505.63	5,246.70	563.52	126.46	389.02	171.50			1,206.10	340.15
OSAGE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, school, 1915	18,067.73	150.85	18.37		60.24		2,892.49	1,038.19	1,949.30	713.94
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	3.00		3.18	7.70		5.00	64.86			
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	18,070.73	150.85	21.55	7.70	60.24	5.00	2,957.35	1,038.19	1,949.30	713.94
OTOE AGENCY.										
Interest on Otoe and Missouria fund	2,989.67	178.69			77.86				35.00	1.20
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915						96.25				
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			204.02							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	442.50							19.63		
Miscellaneous receipts, class 3						55.00				
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	720.00								110.00	
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor		75.00								
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	285.00	7.04								
Total	4,437.17	260.73	204.02		77.86	151.25		19.63	145.00	1.20
OTOE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Interest on Otoe and Missouria fund	8,188.61		435.41				966.73	929.90	254.18	1,162.10
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	12.50						36.08	2.75		8.99
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor			83.50						128.50	144.10
Indian schools, support, 1915	90.00						21.39	82.71		73.73
Total	8,291.11		518.91				1,024.20	1,015.36	382.68	1,388.83

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									NEW YORK WAREHOUSE.
$84.93			$15.40			$3,208.33	$14.07	$11,352.28	Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.
									NUYAKA BOARDING SCHOOL.
	$100.45	$145.01	2,556.23	$3,863.91	$2,204.62	115.63	79.86	25,099.01	Interest on Creek general fund.
								568.23	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
			218.70		70.29		11.29	534.06	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		6.50						6.50	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								13.30	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
	100.45	151.51	2,774.93	3,863.91	2,274.91	115.63	91.15	26,221.10	Total.
									OMAHA AGENCY.
193.35			396.59					6,757.62	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
			939.05		96.00		89.40	1,796.39	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								157.13	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					1,448.31			1,448.31	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								1,034.05	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
235.02			55.01		11.00		12.30	464.93	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			321.00					1,427.17	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								449.86	Proceeds of Omaha Reservation, Nebr., act of May 15, 1888.
								16.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
428.37			1,712.55		1,555.31		101.70	13,551.46	Total.
									OMAHA WAREHOUSE.
46.84			2.65			1,466.63	39.90	7,432.02	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
									ONEIDA AGENCY.
								276.11	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								240.00	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								243.62	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
								759.73	Total.
									ONEIDA BOARDING SCHOOL.
224.26	173.80	36.38	276.29				806.30	23,247.32	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					1,277.74			1,277.74	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
2.03		29.61	33.92		.23		5.00	137.49	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
226.29	173.80	65.99	310.21		1,277.97		371.30	24,662.55	Total.
									OSAGE AGENCY.
825.99			2,427.52		995.26	30.00	533.05	39,781.70	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, agency, 1915.
								556.40	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
9.40			12.60				14.00	39.30	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								7.50	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
					309.51			309.51	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
835.39			2,440.12		1,304.77	30.00	537.05	40,696.41	Total.
									OSAGE BOARDING SCHOOL.
41.39	143.38	212.30	1,642.91	7,442.41	4,721.50		1,199.50	40,294.50	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, school, 1915.
		4.75	322.17		28.25			435.91	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
					619.04			619.04	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
41.39	143.38	217.05	1,965.08	7,442.41	5,368.79		1,199.50	41,352.45	Total.
									OTOE AGENCY.
1.50			52.30		35.38		20.00	3,391.69	Interest on Otoe and Missouria fund.
								96.25	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
								204.02	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								462.13	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								55.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
			385.00					1,215.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
140.00		87.87					18.06	320.98	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
64.50								356.54	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
206.00		87.87	437.30		35.38		38.06	6,101.56	Total.
									OTOE BOARDING SCHOOL.
	21.94	75.51	1,176.85		428.25		[1]301.54	13,941.02	Interest on Otoe and Missouria fund.
113.65			60.09					233.97	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
					737.94			737.94	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			223.76					579.86	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
54.75	7.47	25.61	76.92				23.50	456.08	Indian schools, support, 1915.
168.40	29.41	101.12	1,537.62		1,166.19		325.04	15,948.87	Total.

[1] Seed.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
PALA AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in California, 1915	$1,880.34	$148.71	$50.00		$40.30		$232.20		$593.75	$593.59
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			951.34							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915			119.11							
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,420.00							$76.39		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	3,045.84	49.25							117.77	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Exp										
Industry among Indians, 1915										
Total	6,514.18	197.96	1,120.45		40.30		232.20	76.39	711.52	593.59
PALA DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	6,144.33	290.62	100.00		35.33		77.99	36.33	261.24	518.70
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		489.84								
Total	6,144.33	780.46	100.00		35.33		77.99	36.33	261.24	518.70
PAWNEE AGENCY.										
Support of Pawnees: Employees, etc., Oklahoma, 1915	5,109.98									
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	61.00	186.27	45.81	$221.36	78.55				546.27	491.06
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			433.17							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915					.39					
Pay of Indian police, 1915	720.00							46.25		
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915	2,597.00	50.45			15.00					
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	2,232.00									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	78.00					$8.00				
Support of Pawnees: Iron, steel, etc., Oklahoma, 1915	325.73									
Total	11,123.71	236.72	478.98	221.36	93.94	8.00		46.25	546.27	491.06
PAWNEE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Support of Pawnees: Schools, Oklahoma, 1915	723.66		94.28	510.28	18.00		2,841.92	1,614.50	1,261.19	603.33
Support of Pawnees: Employees, etc., Oklahoma, 1915	1,345.00									
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian schools, support, 1915	8,766.66									145.55
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	95.50					1.50	102.55		68.70	19.56
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor		50.00					154.16			
Indian school, transportation, 1915					.54					
Total	10,930.82	50.00	94.28	510.28	18.54	1.50	3,098.63	1,614.50	1,329.89	768.44
PHOENIX BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Phoenix, Ariz., 1915	49,919.23	102.65	1,431.37	1,996.91	305.98		28,196.29	15,228.63	2,589.97	4,410.88
Indian school, Phoenix, Ariz., repairs and improvements, 1915										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			10,884.87		2.00					
Indian school, transportation, 1915		3,794.81			30.65					
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	126.60				60.20	64.09	98.13	83.18		29.05
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915	4,971.25	727.17		47.94	103.15		4,837.58	2,700.89	287.41	294.69
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor				1,477.44	31.75			156.75		261.91
Indian school, Phoenix, Ariz., sewer system, 1915		76.77				103.41				
Indian school, Phoenix, Ariz., buildings						11.70				
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	840.00									
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915										
Total	55,857.08	4,701.40	12,316.24	3,522.29	533.73	179.20	33,132.00	18,169.36	2,877.38	4,995.60
PIERRE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Pierre, S. Dak., 1915	16,161.33	33.66	396.85	914.70	45.74	140.50	9,475.48	5,041.03	792.25	1,488.87
Indian school, Pierre, S. Dak., repairs and improvements, 1915					2.55					
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			4,534.55							
Indian school, transportation, 1915		1,043.07			37.17					
Indian schools, support, 1915 (tuition)										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	117.94	15.00			16.70	26.50	17.40	42.08	51.95	61.26
Indian school, Pierre, S. Dak., irrigation system	785.65	228.77								26.20
Indian school, Pierre, S. Dak., buildings						39.29				
Indian school, Pierre, S. Dak., land, 1915										
Total	17,064.92	1,320.50	4,931.40	914.70	102.16	206.29	9,492.88	5,083.11	844.20	1,576.33
PIMA AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915	12,906.83	575.36	880.92		9.52	20.00	1,724.05	17.48	1,092.66	2,628.23
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			7,764.02							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,088.17					179.22	180.00			

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									PALA AGENCY.
		$159.04	$1,378.85				$17.00	$5,093.78	Support of Indians in California, 1915.
								951.34	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				$1,142.87	$2,259.61			3,521.59	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
		2.90					23.56	26.46	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								1,496.39	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
							6.55	3,219.41	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			1.00				[1] 85.06	86.06	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Exp.
							[1] 1,580.16	1,580.16	Industry among Indians, 1915.
		161.94	1,379.85	1,142.87	2,259.61		1,712.33	16,143.19	Total.
									PALA DAY SCHOOLS.
	$80.94	7.66	833.58				21.81	8,408.53	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					633.44			633.44	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								489.84	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
	80.94	7.66	833.58		633.44		21.81	9,531.81	Total.
									PAWNEE AGENCY.
		23.33						5,133.31	Support of Pawnees: Employees, etc., Oklahoma, 1915.
$16.45		111.87	277.43				[2] 116.39	2,152.46	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
								433.17	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					574.07	$150.00		724.07	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								.39	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								766.25	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
6.75								2,609.20	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
			275.00					2,507.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			76.93				207.80	370.73	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
79.85			96.16					501.74	Support of Pawnees: Iron, steel, etc., Oklahoma, 1915.
103.05		135.20	725.52		574.07	150.00	324.19	15,258.32	Total.
									PAWNEE BOARDING SCHOOL.
3.35	203.40	16.26	925.85		163.49		19.55	8,998.97	Support of Pawnees: Schools, Oklahoma 1915.
								1,345.00	Support of Pawnees: Employees, etc., Oklahoma, 1915.
					889.28			889.28	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			75.03				[2] 102.43	9,089.67	Indian schools, support, 1915.
5.00	2.80		328.34		523.24		23.75	1,170.94	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
					30.00		30.00	204.16	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								.54	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
8.35	206.20	16.26	1,329.22		1,606.01		175.73	21,758.58	Total.
									PHOENIX BOARDING SCHOOL.
207.40	643.20	1,054.24	7,958.24			240.00	839.05	115,124.04	Indian school, Phoenix, Ariz., 1915.
					6,912.43			6,912.43	Indian school, Phoenix, Ariz., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								10,886.87	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								3,825.46	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
54.90	357.64		2,620.60		70.08		147.67	3,712.14	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
99.25		1,011.32	4,135.68	2,876.97	7,259.91		110.50	29,463.59	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
							[2] 525.00	525.00	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915
2.50								1,929.45	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
				23,268.08			38.75	23,487.01	Indian school, Phoenix, Ariz., sewer system, 1915.
				14,900.00				14,911.70	Indian school, Phoenix, Ariz., buildings.
								840.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			63.78	435.93				499.71	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
364.05	1,000.84	2,065.56	14,778.30	41,480.98	14,242.42	240.00	1,660.97	212,117.40	Total.
									PIERRE BOARDING SCHOOL.
786.56	96.88	122.85	6,351.60				66.08	41,714.36	Indian school, Pierre, S. Dak., 1915.
				975.09	4,647.07			5,624.71	Indian school, Pierre, S. Dak., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								4,534.55	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								1,080.24	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
							[4] 26.00	26.00	Indian schools, support, 1915 (tuition).
		.65	419.05			35.00	67.60	871.13	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			807.66					1,848.28	Indian school, Pierre, S. Dak., irrigation system.
				9,972.32				10,011.61	Indian school, Pierre, S. Dak., buildings.
							[3] 3,500.00	3,500.00	Indian school, Pierre, S. Dak., land, 1915.
786.56	96.88	123.50	7,578.31	10,947.41	4,647.07	35.00	3,650.68	69,210.88	Total.
									PIMA AGENCY.
79.40		1,122.93	6,700.73				803.10	28,761.21	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
								7,764.02	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				463.98	537.97	200.00		1,141.95	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
				89.25				2,527.64	Pay of Indian police, 1915.

[1] Seed, trees, etc. [2] Hospital expenses. [3] Land. [4] Tuition.

Detailed statement of expenditures.

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
PIMA AGENCY—continued.										
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	$174.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	6,682.08	$118.90							$498.31	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	720.00						$79.65	$16.41	25.62	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Exp	4,260.36		$3.01						38.50	
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor		37.05	429.83		$0.31					
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	524.99	51.30			4.33	$4.61	12.00			$62.85
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915		104.40								
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915	1,029.46					46.81	28.02	479.14		100.00
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)			624.74							
Industry among Indians, 1915			252.88							
Industry among Indians, 1915–16			67.91							
Total	28,385.89	887.01	10,023.31		14.16	241.64	2,023.72	513.03	1,655.09	2,791.08
PIMA BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	18,998.71	100.40	433.38	$470.15			7,303.66	4,718.61	769.81	1,556.00
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	487.98	25.55	14.67		14.56		23.96		3.50	
Indian school, transportation, 1915		6.75								
Total	19,486.69	132.70	448.05	470.15	14.56		7,327.62	4,718.61	773.31	1,559.00
PIMA DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	5,885.50	58.65						27.76		14.00
Indian schools and agency buildings, 1915		21.55								
Indian school, transportation, 1915		432.00								
School facilities for Papago Indians, Arizona, 1915		186.18	352.85							
Total	5,885.50	698.38	352.85					27.76		14.00
PINE RIDGE AGENCY.										
Support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, 1915	10,317.45	659.32	13,833.44				80,661.97		3,445.16	3,200.64
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			7,261.67							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	7,580.00	59.90								
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	1,570.00									
Pay of Indian police, 1915	10,421.32							1,068.43		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	261.00									
Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915	26,830.84									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	66.66									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	194.10				1.00	20.00				2.00
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 3	50.00	23.85								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						39.80				
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915	2,261.00	49.82								
Pine Ridge Reservation 3 per cent fund										
Civilization of the Sioux										
Total	59,561.37	792.89	21,095.11		1.00	59.80	80,661.97	1,068.43	3,445.16	3,202.64
PINE RIDGE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Education, Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915	18,816.39						2,033.07	4,214.32	1.50	2,824.00
Support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, 1915							1,593.42			
Interest on Sioux fund, Pine Ridge, education							5.40	399.12		1,032.34
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	72.00	26.65	2.16		.26					
Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915	615.00									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor								37.00		104.85
Total	19,503.39	26.65	2.16		.26		3,631.89	4,650.44	1.50	3,961.19
PINE RIDGE DAY SCHOOLS.										
Education, Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915	32,877.67	107.00					139.71	5,918.84		3,310.60
Support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, 1915							1,172.08			
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Interest on Sioux fund, Pine Ridge, education							4.02	991.10		1,153.65
Total	32,877.67	107.00					1,315.81	6,909.94		4,464.25
PIPESTONE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Pipestone, Minn., 1915	16,916.00		119.61	545.44	53.07	5.00	7,807.47	5,075.83		2,525.84
Indian school, Pipestone, Minn., repairs and improvements, 1915										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			2,217.63							
Indian school, transportation, 1915		1,349.17			21.78					
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor									242.50	
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	43.83						23.28	116.49	65.76	
Indian school, Pipestone, Minn., special repairs, 1915										
Total	16,959.83	1,349.17	2,337.24	545.44	74.85	5.00	7,830.75	5,192.32	308.26	2,525.84

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									PIMA AGENCY—continued.
								$174.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
			$431.44					7,730.73	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			101.17					942.85	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			4,826.52	$1,647.20			[1] $43.49	10,819.08	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Exp.
			15.54		$428.48			911.21	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
$73.60			590.80		413.44		.52	1,738.44	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								104.40	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
		$23.50	3,002.13		2,991.54			7,700.60	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
			1,315.64					1,940.38	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
			4,427.36					4,680.24	Industry among Indians, 1915.
			615.50					683.41	Industry among Indians, 1915-16.
153.00		1,146.43	22,026.83	2,140.43	4,371.43	$200.00	847.11	77,420.16	Total.
									PIMA BOARDING SCHOOL.
151.33	$345.44	139.04	5,160.69				[1] 183.47	40,342.60	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				2,525.00	4,514.86	150.00		7,189.86	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	8.55	5.15	911.17		314.70		50.78	1,860.57	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								6.75	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
151.33	353.99	144.19	6,080.86	2,525.00	4,829.56	150.00	234.25	49,399.87	Total.
									PIMA DAY SCHOOL.
	105.56		172.17					6,263.64	Indian schools support, 1915.
					195.72			217.27	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								432.00	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
				16,901.57				17,440.60	School facilities for Papago Indians, Arizona, 1915.
	105.56		172.17	16,901.57	195.72			24,353.51	Total.
									PINE RIDGE AGENCY.
105.55		743.53	2,382.40				2,550.18	117,899.64	Support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, 1915.
								7,261.67	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					1,345.00			1,345.00	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			199.64					7,839.54	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								1,570.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
								11,489.75	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								261.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
								26,830.84	Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915.
			114.50	922.18			895.00	1,998.34	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
304.59			235.09		201.43		1.00	959.21	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		2.00						2.00	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915
								82.85	Miscellaneous receipts, class 3.
								39.80	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
170.25								2,481.07	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
							[2] 30.00	30.00	Pine Ridge Reservation 3 per cent fund.
			119,453.25				[3] 97,426.34	216,879.59	Civilization of the Sioux.
580.39		745.53	122,384.88	922.18	1,546.43		100,902.52	396,970.30	Total.
									PINE RIDGE BOARDING SCHOOL.
	336.91	170.20	698.47	2,179.65	1,105.72			32,380.23	Education, Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915.
								1,593.42	Support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, 1915.
	7.92	8.58	260.95	274.50	20.28		[1] 405.00	2,423.09	Interest on Sioux fund, Pine Ridge, education.
	82.21		1,162.47		301.46		142.48	1,789.69	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								615.00	Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915.
	5.75		73.80	256.17	29.66		253.75	760.98	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
	432.79	178.78	2,204.69	2,710.32	1,457.12		801.23	39,562.41	Total.
									PINE RIDGE DAY SCHOOLS.
	660.79	440.03	1,354.69		1,507.37			46,316.70	Education, Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915.
								1,172.08	Support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, 1915.
					298.00			298.00	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
	9.90	29.71	136.79		739.44			3,064.61	Interest on Sioux fund, Pine Ridge, education.
	670.69	469.74	1,491.48		2,544.81			50,851.39	Total.
									PIPESTONE BOARDING SCHOOL.
20.00	419.99	211.55	3,981.95				140.06	37,821.81	Indian school, Pipestone, Minn., 1915.
				3,763.75	3,343.09			7,106.84	Indian school, Pipestone, Minn., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								2,217.63	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								1,370.95	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
72.40			28.00				7.50	350.40	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
	12.28	9.10	386.42		166.35		46.88	870.39	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
					6,500.00			6,500.00	Indian school, Pipestone, Minn., special repairs, 1915.
92.40	432.27	220.65	4,396.37	3,763.75	10,009.44		194.44	56,238.02	Total.

[1] Seed. [2] Opening Indian lands. [3] Treaty benefit payments.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
PIPESTONE DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools support, 1915	$1,420.00		$4.00		$15.00		$101.37	$2.27		$74.12
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.							75.47	14.43		
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915					.87			.42		
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.		$53.36								
Total	1,420.00	53.36	4.00		15.87		176.84	17.12		74.12
PONCA AGENCY.										
Support of Poncas, Oklahoma, 1915	4,974.51	22.07			72.70	$24.70	1.01		$533.75	45.30
Support of Kansas Indians, Oklahoma, 1915	1,008.50	19.16			24.15	24.70			35.80	58.50
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			509.52							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	300.00							21.58		
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915		109.57			9.30				19.25	40.29
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	600.00							3.25	140.00	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	2,800.00								29.59	
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4, Kaw	21.00	10.56			6.00					
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						73.00				
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	34.50									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4		9.66								3.25
Expense account, mining operations						11.50				
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor					36.00					329.43
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Kaw										
Total	9,738.51	171.02	509.52		148.15	133.90	1.01	24.83	758.39	476.77
PONCA BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	9,088.10				48.00		2,998.44	1,403.66	352.75	1,662.59
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	248.09	4.85				12.50	14.36			
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor								40.72		
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Total	9,336.19	4.85			48.00	12.50	3,012.80	1,444.38	352.75	1,662.59
POTTAWATOMIE AGENCY.										
Interest on Pattawatomie general fund	1,289.72	68.54	26.50		16.80		24.04		197.25	405.82
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			187.10							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	394.16							22.97		
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.							23.00			
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	1,519.00	175.32			7.60	4.25				
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,080.00									
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	667.50	24.04								
Industry among Indians, 1915-16										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor		40.76				23.85				
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4						54.00				
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						5.60				
Total	4,950.38	308.66	213.60		24.40	87.70	47.04	22.97	197.25	405.82
POTTAWATOMIE DAY SCHOOL.										
Interest on Pottawatomie education fund	1,231.00									
Interest on Pottawatomie general fund										
Total	1,231.00									
PUEBLO AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.	6,588.80	414.60	67.83	$34.55	78.32	12.25	584.79		293.89	125.41
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			535.44							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,755.00									
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	175.50									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	3,401.49									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	2,313.83									83.00
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)			12.30							
Industry among Indians, 1915-16										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.							29.94			36.00
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	225.00									
Total	14,459.42	414.60	615.57	34.55	78.32	12.25	614.73		293.89	274.41
PUEBLO DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	18,171.11	279.40	57.58	11.45	37.21		346.90	80.51	477.75	293.30
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	18,171.11	279.40	57.58	11.45	37.21		346.90	80.51	477.75	293.30
PUEBLO ALBUQUERQUE AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.	2,577.57	248.80	115.44	35.45	63.25		254.33	515.45	1,530.31	98.50
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,364.98							

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									PIPESTONE DAY SCHOOL.
	$107.57	$32.95	$21.21					$1,778.49	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					$50.00			50.00	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								89.90	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
		68.56	.14					69.99	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
								53.36	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
	107.57	101.51	21.35		50.00			2,041.74	Total.
									PONCA AGENCY.
$6.20		24.47	509.48				$19.65	6,233.84	Support of Poncas, Oklahoma, 1915.
3.42			78.75				6.85	1,259.83	Support of Kansas Indians, Oklahoma, 1915.
								509.52	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				$4,000.00	754.28			4,754.28	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								321.58	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
			73.23				14.74	266.38	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
			43.40					786.65	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			213.40					3,042.99	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			3.40					40.96	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4, Kaw.
								73.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
								34.50	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
5.75								18.66	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
75.60								87.10	Expense account, mining operations.
33.40			64.15					462.98	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
10.30								10.30	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Kaw.
134.67		24.47	985.81	4,000.00	754.28		41.24	17,902.57	Total.
									PONCA BOARDING SCHOOL.
.52	257.89	164.68	744.89				52.32	16,803.84	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					1,536.48			1,536.48	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			223.81		106.66		77.00	687.27	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			287.25		278.61			606.58	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
		3.25						3.25	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
.52	257.89	167.93	1,255.95		1,921.75		129.32	19,637.42	Total.
									POTTAWATOMIE AGENCY.
17.75			207.44				[1] 10.80	2,264.66	Interest on Pottawatomie genera fund.
								187.10	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					386.17			386.17	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								417.13	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
		12.35				$12.65	88.50	136.50	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
3.15			30.75				9.00	1,749.07	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
			313.50					1,393.50	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
							10.70	702.24	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
			3,555.50					3,555.50	Industry among Indians, 1915–16.
			43.95					108.56	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			32.50					86.50	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								5.60	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
20.90		12.35	4,183.64		386.17	12.65	119.00	10,992.53	Total.
									POTTAWATOMIE DAY SCHOOL.
								1,231.00	Interest on Pottawatomie education fund.
	3.00							3.00	Interest on Pottawatomie general fund.
	3.00							1,234.00	Total.
									PUEBLO AGENCY.
1.20		43.09	920.14				[2] 493.38	9,658.25	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
								535.44	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								1,755.00	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								175.50	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
			82.77					3,484.06	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			2.53			244.66	[3] 11.50	2,655.52	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
				378.08	58.48	1,056.50	[3] 41.55	1,534.61	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			14.10					26.40	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
			552.00					552.00	Industry among Indians, 1915–16.
			1.80	1,772.96				1,840.70	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								225.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
1.20		43.09	1,573.34	2,151.04	58.48	1,301.16	546.43	22,442.48	Total.
									PUEBLO DAY SCHOOLS.
6.18	52.82		2,040.01				5.00	21,859.22	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				10,893.49	636.78	618.50	[3] 53.45	12,202.22	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
6.18	52.82		2,040.01	10,893.49	636.78	618.50	58.45	34,061.44	Total.
									PUEBLO ALBUQUERQUE AGENCY.
3.35		708.17	938.61				[4] 24.00	7,113.23	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
								1,364.98	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.

[1] Trees. [2] Seed. [3] Water. [4] Burial expenses.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
PUEBLO ALBUQUERQUE AGENCY—continued.										
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	$1,045.00							$46.45		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	40.50									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	1,072.50						$50.75	81.60		$42.41
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,307.76						.38		$146.16	15.27
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.			$60.00				435.61	69.40	278.50	.24
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)										
Total	6,043.33	$248.80	1,540.42	$35.45	$63.25		741.07	712.90	1,954.97	156.42
PUEBLO ALBUQUERQUE DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	5,731.34	19.75	357.54		26.18		287.69	2,873.26		818.77
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		.50								
Total	5,731.34	20.25	357.54		26.18		287.69	2,873.26		818.77
PUEBLO BONITO AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.	6,785.90	395.71	1,117.48				89.15	91.33	2,173.71	123.19
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			3,191.49							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,363.00						126.69	123.46	180.00	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	3,000.00								92.00	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M								6.97		
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.		19.70								
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915		6.65								
Total	12,148.90	422.06	4,308.97				215.84	221.76	2,445.71	123.19
PUEBLO BONITO BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	8,235.75		829.08				3,607.62	2,462.67	240.53	47.70
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		4.75								
Fulfilling treaties with Navajoes, schools, Arizona, 1915.						$48.86				
Total	8,235.75	4.75	829.08			48.86	3,607.62	2,462.67	240.53	47.70
RAPID CITY BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Rapid City, S. Dak., 1915	20,852.35		919.82	1,231.80	143.58	13.17	8,858.48	4,695.80	796.90	6,419.70
Indian school, Rapid City, S. Dak., repairs and improvements, 1915.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies 1915.			1,140.41							
Indian school, transportation, 1915		1,393.83								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	217.67		36.80		25.80	52.11	167.55	16.56	244.00	49.50
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Indian schools, support, 1915 (tuition)										
Total	21,070.02	1,393.83	2,097.03	1,271.80	169.38	65.28	9,026.03	4,712.36	1,040.90	6,469.20
RED CLIFF AGENCY.										
Support of Chippewas of Lake Superior, Wis., 1915.	1,320.00	16.50	6.45	20.34	56.68	1.65	190.40		198.10	167.89
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			63.25							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	330.00						30.00	29.95		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	658.00								32.60	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	922.98								8.51	50.00
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	1,800.00	38.65					3.50			
Individual Indian money						13.70				
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						41.50				
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.	30.85									
Total	5,061.83	55.15	69.70	20.34	56.68	56.85	223.90	29.95	238.61	217.89
RED CLIFF DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	2,491.00	10.80	12.46				80.85	9.10		104.00
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	2,491.00	10.80	12.46				80.85	9.10		104.00
RED LAKE AGENCY.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	11,609.39	180.40	19.95				915.55		1,646.76	702.42
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915	9,620.19	78.54	73.91		120.00	2.00			10.00	
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,278.79							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,922.67						523.80	276.57		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,620.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	1,333.26									
Proceeds of Red Lake Reservation, Minn										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 3	3,087.55		112.87			8.00				
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	5.00		24.60							

Indian Service, 1916—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									PUEBLO ALBUQUERQUE AGENCY—continued.
					$57.95	$462.00	[1] $144.20	$664.15	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								1,091.45	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								40.50	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
			$80.84			115.50		1,443.60	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			63.77					1,533.34	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
$3.35		$164.75	53.97		17.51			1,083.33	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
			209.48					209.48	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
6.70		872.92	1,346.67		75.46	577.50	168.20	14,544.06	Total.
									PUEBLO ALBUQUERQUE DAY SCHOOLS.
	$493.49	12.55	317.39					10,937.96	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					14.88	291.50		306.38	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								.50	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
	493.49	12.55	317.39		14.88	291.50		11,244.84	Total.
									PUEBLO BONITO AGENCY.
93.50		410.83	6,858.30				[2] 2,311.50	20,450.60	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
								3,191.49	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					208.04		[3] 90.60	298.64	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								2,793.15	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								3,092.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			55.85					62.82	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
		2.00	2,550.00					2,550.00	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
								21.70	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								6.65	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
93.50		412.83	9,464.15		208.04		2,402.10	32,467.05	Total.
									PUEBLO BONITO BOARDING SCHOOL.
40.00	127.14	35.48	2,908.72				110.11	18,644.80	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					1,200.71			1,200.71	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								4.75	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
			86.43	$10,300.00	1,073.50			11,508.79	Fulfilling treaties with Navajoes, schools Arizona, 1915.
40.00	127.14	35.48	2,995.15	10,300.00	2,274.21		110.11	31,359.05	Total.
									RAPID CITY BOARDING SCHOOL.
101.20	319.63	235.95	2,406.32				255.50	47,290.20	Indian school, Rapid City, S. Dak., 1915.
					4,912.34			4,912.34	Indian school, Rapid City, S. Dak., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								1,140.41	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								1,393.83	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
40.70	76.56	19.30	685.35		73.12		54.52	1,759.54	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		22.83					[4] 149.50	172.33	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
							175.00	175.00	Indian schools, support, 1915 (tuition).
141.90	396.19	278.08	3,091.67		4,985.46		634.52	56,843.65	Total.
									RED CLIFF AGENCY.
11.00		163.24	382.25				.80	2,535.30	Support of Chippewas of Lake Superior, Wis., 1915.
								63.25	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					59.12	510.00		569.12	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			4.50					394.45	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								690.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			37.34					1,018.83	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
35.65			103.75				2.00	1,983.55	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
								13.70	Individual Indian money.
								41.50	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
							[4] 35.00	65.85	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
35.65		163.24	527.84		59.12	510.00	37.80	7,375.55	Total.
									RED CLIFF DAY SCHOOL.
	98.50	4.36	117.44					2,928.51	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					61.94	100.00		161.94	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	98.50	4.36	117.44		61.94	100.00		3,090.45	Total.
									RED LAKE AGENCY.
18.00		267.48	11,143.18		328.35		354.50	27,185.98	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
7.75		29.69	383.75				720.70	11,046.53	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915.
								1,278.79	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				1,322.01	852.85	60.00		2,234.86	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								3,723.04	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
			69.89					1,689.89	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			371.13					1,704.39	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
							[5] 133.55	133.55	Proceeds of Red Lake Reservation, Minn.
			61.02					3,272.44	Miscellaneous receipts, class 3.
			7.68					35.28	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.

[1] Land, $99. [2] Sheep dip. [3] Use of perforator. [4] Hospital expenses. [5] Refund H. E.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
RED LAKE AGENCY—continued.										
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, hospital						$22.19				
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.	$49.50	$3.74								
Total	30,415.56	262.68	$1,510.12		$120.00	32.19	$1,439.35	$276.57	$1,656.76	$702.42
RED LAKE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	3.00		47.39				56.73			38.75
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	119.00						2,448.75	1,326.88	393.86	2,135.21
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915									100.07	
Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund	7,251.50	14.85	64.68				35.85		77.50	82.71
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Indian schools, support, 1915							49.45			
Total	7,373.50	14.85	112.07				2,590.78	1,326.88	571.43	2,256.67
CROSS LAKE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund	4,121.24	22.60					.57			10.56
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor							1,548.65	1,224.37	450.03	464.96
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915		12.95								5.60
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian schools, support, 1915		6.50								
Total	4,121.24	42.05					1,549.22	1,224.37	450.03	481.12
RED MOON AGENCY.										
Support of Cheyennes and Arapahoes, Oklahoma, 1915.	1,858.17	154.76			8.00		1.41		49.43	80.23
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			235.15							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	200.00							26.58		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	300.00							2.91		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	720.00								49.50	
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						7.00				
Total	3,078.17	154.76	235.15		8.00	7.00	1.41	29.49	98.93	80.23
RED MOON DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	2,831.65	2.60					74.04	54.95	115.31	81.46
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	824.42		3.13			4.00	202.94	22.78	365.64	22.28
Total	3,656.07	2.60	3.13			4.00	276.98	77.73	480.95	103.74
RICE STATION BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	15,349.50						7,144.89	2,538.69	965.00	4,102.45
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,559.98							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915			438.94							
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	200.25		5.83					25.19	61.90	
Total	15,549.75		2,004.75				7,144.89	2,563.88	1,026.90	4,102.45
ROSEBUD AGENCY.										
Proceeds of Rosebud Reservation, S. Dak., act of Mar. 2, 1907.	16,633.12	1,469.86	13,588.54		53.06	52.66	50,015.95	¥49.14	3,0d9.01	1,476.11
Proceeds of Rosebud Reservation, S. Dak., act of Apr. 23, 1904.										
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915		12.18								
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			9,848.87							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915		7.80								
Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915.	18,209.51									
Pay of Indian police, 1915	8,688.67						80.00	978.90		
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Reimbursed to Edward B. Kelly, late superintendent of Rosebud Agency, S. Dak., etc.										
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M								13.72		45.39
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	5,402.50								13.75	
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	61.01	14.70								
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	2,490.00	131.17				7.00				
Rosebud Reservation 3 per cent fund, act of May 30, 1910.										
Civilization of the Sioux										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4		36.70								4.30
Total	51,484.81	1,672.41	23,437.41		53.06	59.66	50,095.95	1,741.76	3,082.76	1,525.80
ROSEBUD BOARDING SCHOOS.										
Proceeds of Rosebud Reservation, S. Dak., act of Mar. 2, 1907.	25.00					21.00	2,881.09	1,817.00	1,524.54	1,035.42
Interest on Sioux fund, Rosebud education	10,577.22								400.00	114.00
Education, Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915	17.40	21.17					3,806.12		313.20	796.00
Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota., 1915.	1,179.17									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	37.50						66.75	5.20	147.54	
Total	11,836.29	21.17				21.00	6,753.96	1,822.20	2,385.28	1,945.42

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									RED LAKE AGENCY—continued.
				$8,328.28				$8,350.47	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, hospital.
		$26.00						79.24	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
$25.75		323.17	$12,037.65	9,650.29	$1,181.20	$60.00	$1,208.75	60,902.46	Total.
									RED LAKE, BOARDING SCHOOL.
			66.35		9.50			221.72	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.78	$171.31	3.90	556.85		120.04			7,276.58	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
25.10			28.90				88.98	243.05	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915.
	10.26	18.15	150.33		6.80		2.40	7,715.03	Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund.
					804.26			804.26	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
		43.50						43.50	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
			195.00					244.45	Indian schools, support, 1915.
35.88	181.57	65.55	997.43		940.60		91.38	16,548.59	Total.
									CROSS LAKE BOARDING SCHOOL.
			128.78					4,283.75	Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund.
	78.66		349.22	1,171.23	* 414.65			5,701.77	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			1.20				18.22	37.97	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915.
					482.73			482.73	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			213.75					220.25	Indian schools, support, 1915.
	78.66		692.95	1,171.23	897.38		18.22	10,726.47	Total.
									RED MOON AGENCY.
		12.83	204.61				11.08	2,389.52	Support of Cheyennes and Arapahoes, Oklahoma, 1915.
								235.15	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				272.40	66.69			339.09	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								226.58	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
			.80					303.71	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			15.00					784.50	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								7.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
		12.83	220.41	272.40	66.69		11.08	4,285.55	Total.
									RED MOON DAY SCHOOL.
2.30	6.12		166.44					3,334.87	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					66.60			66.60	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	52.94	8.40	711.02		129.13		79.36	2,426.04	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
2.30	59.06	8.40	877.46		195.73		79.36	5,827.51	Total.
									RICE STATION BOARDING SCHOOL.
	17.47	100.62	734.76				269.10	31,222.48	Indian schools, support, 1915.
								1,559.98	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				853.73	1,542.43			2,835.10	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
15.85		56.30	242.43		477.11		53.24	1,138.10	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
15.85	17.47	156.92	977.19	853.73	2,019.54		322.34	36,755.66	Total.
									ROSEBUD AGENCY.
336.67		1,395.94	36,604.43	34,682.24	2,329.39		4,403.67	166,859.79	Proceeds of Rosebud Reservation, S. Dak., act of Mar. 2, 1907.
							[1] 120.00	720.00	Proceeds of Rosebud Reservation, S. Dak., act of Apr. 23, 1904.
							7.80	19.98	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
								9,848.87	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				5,050.00	1,371.72	48.00		6,477.52	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								18,209.51	Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915.
			209.97					9,957.54	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
		30.00					[2] 148.00	178.00	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
							1,558.20	1,558.20	Reimbursed to Edward B. Kelly, late superintendent of Rosebud Agency, S. Dak., etc.
			130.63					189.74	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			755.25					6,171.50	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			190.00				223.00	488.71	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
61.25							74.00	2,763.42	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
							2,592.46	2,592.46	Rosebud Reservation 3 per cent fund, act of May 30, 1910.
			153,083.26				[3] 63,525.08	216,608.34	Civilization of the Sioux.
			19.95					60.95	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
397.92		1,425.94	190,993.49	39,732.24	3,701.11	48.00	73,252.21	442,704.53	Total.
									ROSEBUD BOARDING SCHOOL.
1.56	613.60	.79	1,205.04		1,596.71			10,721.75	Proceeds of Rosebud Reservation, S. Dak., act of Mar. 2, 1907.
			751.07		54.00			11,896.29	Interest on Sioux fund, Rosebud education.
	43.34		206.65		489.95		.80	5,694.63	Education, Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915.
								1,179.17	Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915.
	14.60		263.07				12.00	546.66	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
1.56	671.54	.79	2,425.83		2,140.66		12.80	30,038.50	Total.

[1] Refund hospital expenses.

[2] Hospital expenses, costs in suit.

[3] Treaty benefit payment.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
ROSEBUD DAY SCHOOL.										
Proceeds of Rosebud Reservation, S. Dak., act of Mar. 2, 1907.							$1,184.07	$3,878.45		$945.09
Education, Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915.	$29,820.25	$259.26					1,024.33	4.70		475.75
Total	29,820.25	259.26					2,208.40	3,883.15		1,420.84
ROSEBURG AGENCY.										
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	3,036.72	1,724.02		$12.00	$86.89					163.30
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.	67.50						165.35	49.85		14.00
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			$3.72							
Support of Indians in California, 1915							302.64			
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, for	431.33	302.71								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						$39.50				
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	60.00		1.25			3.50				
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	3,630.55	1,225.17								
Indian schools, support 1915										
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	7,226.10	3,251.90	4.97	12.00	86.89	43.00	467.99	49.85		177.30
ROUND VALLEY AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in California, 1915	2,068.13	54.36	29.04		5.74		292.14	108.16	$346.38	6.59
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			382.53							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	209.00									
Pay of Indian police, 1915	898.67							46.56		
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
Individual Indian money									192.20	
Miscellaneous receipts, class 3	3.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,470.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	1,050.00								125.25	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	878.96						18.35	9.31	59.00	12.00
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)	18.00		265.25							
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	889.01	104.45			.34					
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915		8.60								
Total	7,484.77	167.41	676.82		6.08		310.49	164.03	722.83	18.59
ROUND VALLEY DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	7,427.70	90.88	68.95		30.40		120.97	14.71	9.80	443.25
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915	[1] 8.50	15.50			.21					
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	307.91						1.70		90.00	2.10
Indian school, transportation, 1915		759.27			.73					
Total	7,744.11	865.65	68.95		31.34		122.67	14.71	99.80	445.35
SAC AND FOX AGENCY, IOWA.										
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	488.50				7.00				173.40	21.28
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	885.00							53.49		
Interest Sac and Fox of Mississippi fund, Iowa, acts of Mar. 3, 1909, and Apr. 4, 1910.	[2] 500.00									
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			744.19							
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	330.90		7.50			85.50				22.50
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,200.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M							50.00			
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	12.00									
Total	3,416.40		751.69		7.00	85.50	50.00	53.49	173.40	43.78
SAC AND FOX DAY SCHOOLS, IOWA.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	2,255.93		21.59		20.00		325.17	438.00		82.85
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Total	2,255.93		21.59		20.00		325.17	438.00		82.85
SAC AND FOX SANATORIUM, IOWA.										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.	11,576.19	1,257.04	238.89	334.49	61.82	2.20	4,386.80	1,990.25	342.50	670.39
Indian schools, support, 1915	165.00									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	33.75		36.01		12.00		9.23	3.64	87.40	
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	11,774.94	1,257.04	274.90	334.49	73.82	2.20	4,396.03	1,993.89	429.90	670.39
SAC AND FOX AGENCY, OKLA.										
Interest on Sac and Fox of the Mississippi fund, Oklahoma; acts of Mar. 3, 1909, and Apr. 4, 1910.	5,024.35	462.84	25.97		84.36				692.50	423.31
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			574.03							
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,620.00								39.00	
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	60.89									
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	517.50	45.58								

[1] Surveyor.

[2] Chief's salary.

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									ROSEBUD DAY SCHOOLS.
.....	$1,448.73	.....	$1,035.93	$525.00	$826.78	.....	.....	$9,844.05	Proceeds of Rosebud Reservation, S. Dak., act of Mar. 2, 1907.
.....	170.54	.....	140.59	.....	241.00	$00.00	.....	32,196.42	Education, Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915.
.....	1,619.27	.....	1,176.52	525.00	1,067.78	00.00	.....	42,040.47	Total.
									ROSEBURG AGENCY.
$4.00	.....	.....	363.65	.....	.....	690.00	.....	6,080.58	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	296.70	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3.72	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	302.64	Support of Indians in California, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	734.04	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	39.50	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
343.20	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	407.95	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
125.25	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,980.97	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
.....	.....	$0.75	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.75	Indian schools support, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	30.00	.....	30.00	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
472.45	.....	.75	363.65	.....	.....	720.00	.....	12,876.85	Total.
									ROUND VALLEY AGENCY.
.....	.....	287.65	169.96	.....	.....	.....	$31.00	3,399.15	Supportof Indians in California, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	382.53	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	20.93	.....	.....	20.93	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
94.58	.....	.....	558.70	.....	.....	.....	.....	862.28	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	945.23	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	3.50	.....	.....	.....	.....	3.50	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	[1] 1,230.07	1,422.27	Individual Indian money.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 3.
.....	.....	.....	125.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,595.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,175.25	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
.....	.....	.....	39.13	.....	.....	120.00	.....	1,136.75	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
.....	.....	.....	1,904.76	.....	.....	.....	[2] 1,458.25	3,646.26	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
186.23	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,180.03	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	8.60	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
280.81	.....	287.65	2,801.05	.....	20.93	120.00	2,719.32	15,780.78	Total.
									ROUND VALLEY DAY SCHOOLS.
11.63	183.18	9.36	575.88	.....	.....	.....	4.45	8,991.16	Indian schools, support, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	433.62	414.00	[3] 125.00	996.83	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	57.00	.....	.....	.....	152.81	611.52	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	760.00	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
11.63	183.18	9.36	632.88	.....	433.62	414.00	282.26	11,359.51	Total.
									SAC AND FOX AGENCY, IOWA.
.....	.....	200.03	45.58	.....	.....	.....	.....	935.79	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	200.00	.....	200.00	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	938.49	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	500.00	Interest Sac and Fox of Mississippi fund, Iowa, acts of Mar. 3, 1909, and Apr. 4, 1910.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	744.19	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	4.80	.....	.....	.....	[4] 1,008.86	1,460.06	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
.....	.....	.....	269.80	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,469.80	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	50.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	12.00	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
.....	.....	200.03	320.18	.....	.....	200.00	1,008.86	6,310.33	Total.
									SAC AND FOX DAY SCHOOLS, IOWA.
.....	268.81	.20	218.67	.....	.....	.....	3.00	3,634.22	Indian schools, support, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	206.34	.....	.....	206.34	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	9.60	.....	424.70	.....	.....	434.30	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
.....	268.81	.20	228.27	.....	631.04	.....	3.00	4,274.86	Total.
									SAC AND FOX SANATORIUM, IOWA.
25.00	57.95	362.05	1,460.41	5,721.14	1,829.31	.....	203.16	30,520.09	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
.....	20.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	185.00	Indian schools, support, 1915.
1.00	.....	10.05	262.50	.....	2.05	.....	8.55	466.18	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,124.29	.....	.....	1,124.29	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
26.00	77.95	372.10	1,722.91	5,721.14	2,956.15	.....	211.71	32,295.56	Total.
									SAC AND FOX AGENCY, OKLA.
27.10	.....	97.17	207.58	.....	.....	.....	21.96	7,067.14	Interest on Sac and Fox of the Mississippi fund, Oklahoma; acts of Mar. 3, 1909, and Apr. 4, 1910.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	440.19	420.00	.....	860.19	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	574.03	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,659.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
.....	.....	.....	5.61	.....	41.92	.....	5.40	113.82	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	10.00	.....	573.08	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees 1915.

[1] Vaquero fees. [2] Seed. [3] Abstract. [4] Taxes on Indian land, $935.13.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
SAC AND FOX AGENCY, OKLA.—continued.										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						$9.15				
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.		$5.81								
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	$2,038.22	112.10								
Special deposits, R. of W. inspection		21.00								
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor				$3.00						$31.75
Total	9,260.96	647.33	$600.00	3.00	$84.36	9.15			$731.50	455.06
SAC AND FOX BOARDING SCHOOL, OKLAHOMA.										
Indian schools support, 1915	3,370.83		183.39		1.85		$2,088.61	$1,195.47	415.78	709.48
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	343.37						7.55			
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	90.00									
Indian school, transportation, 1915		24.95								
Interest on Sac and Fox of the Mississippi fund, Oklahoma; acts of Mar. 3, 1909, and Apr. 4, 1910.	4,725.43									
Total	8,529.63	24.95	183.39		1.85		2,096.16	1,195.47	415.78	709.48
ST. LOUIS WAREHOUSE.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.	7,505.85	351.61	352.30	80.63	168.03	9.00				36.41
SALEM BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Salem, Oreg., 1915	38,482.91	74.10	50.60		187.42	24.40	22,399.96	18,159.19	160.05	10,846.68
Indian school, Salem, Oreg., repairs and improvements, 1915.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			9,024.72		29.57					
Indian school, transportation, 1915		8,291.64			71.61					
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	261.35	440.80	80.00		12.00					
Indian schools support, 1915 (tuition)										
Indian school, Salem, Oreg., assembly hall										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Total	38,744.26	8,806.54	9,155.32		300.60	24.40	22,399.96	18,159.19	160.05	10,846.68
SALT RIVER AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.	3,192.67	28.45	129.79		26.86		145.19		107.50	134.20
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			367.97							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	829.33							41.98		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	84.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,297.33									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)			117.00							
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Total	5,403.33	28.45	614.76		26.86		145.19	41.98	107.50	134.20
SALT RIVER DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools support, 1915	5,193.34	6.15	1.30		25.77	1.75	30.39	181.24	100.00	353.65
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
Total	5,193.34	6.15	1.30		25.77	1.75	30.39	181.24	100.00	353.65
SAN CARLOS AGENCY.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	46,593.76	193.95				28.52	12,428.81	352.60	4,695.00	4,317.95
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			4,500.94							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,935.84							237.42	280.65	
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	174.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	1,200.00							.29		.20
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	2,189.67									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4		111.27	2.00		15.59		95.15			5.45
Miscellaneous receipts, class 3	313.83									
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.	3.00	25.00			23.09					146.92
Total	53,410.10	330.22	4,502.94		38.68	28.52	12,523.96	590.31	4,975.65	4,470.52
SAN CARLOS DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	2,250.00		2.41				211.75			
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	4,464.83	.30					157.20	815.29		240.00
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	17.70						24.52	4.80		
Total	6,732.53	.30	2.41				393.47	820.09		240.00
SAN FRANCISCO WAREHOUSE.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.	6,873.68	38.20	375.54	14.40	145.82					

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									SAC AND FOX AGENCY, OKLA.—continued.
								$9.15	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
								5.81	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								2,150.32	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
								21.00	Special deposits, R. of W. inspection.
							$3.65	38.40	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
$27.10		$97.17	$213.19		$482.11	$430.00	31.01	13,071.94	Total.
									SAC AND FOX BOARDING SCHOOL, OKLAHOMA.
24.68	$134.57		548.65				91.44	8,764.75	Indian schools support, 1915.
					771.96			771.96	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			7.20		196.49		98.00	652.61	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		1.30						1.30	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
					12.50			102.50	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								24.95	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
					6.35			4,731.78	Interest on Sac and Fox of the Mississippi fund, Oklahoma; acts of Mar. 3, 1909, and Apr. 4, 1910.
24.68	134.57	1.30	555.85		987.30		189.44	15,049.85	Total.
									ST. LOUIS WAREHOUSE.
325.16			28.92			1,500.00	8.00	10,365.91	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
									SALEM BOARDING SCHOOL.
181.85	1,212.32	442.28	6,071.54				475.53	98,768.83	Indian school, Salem, Oreg., 1915.
					11,626.67			11,626.67	Indian school, Salem, Oreg., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								9,054.29	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								8,363.25	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
1.75			233.62		1,323.79		306.30	2,659.61	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
							[1] 293.35	293.35	Indian schools support, 1915 (tuition).
				$25.00				25.00	Indian school, Salem, Oreg., assembly hall.
		73.75						73.75	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
					135.00			135.00	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
183.60	1,212.32	516.03	6,305.16	25.00	13,085.46		1,075.18	130,999.75	Total.
									SALT RIVER AGENCY.
140.00		248.89	2,941.38				306.45	7,401.38	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
								367.97	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				1,499.88	28.14			1,528.02	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								871.31	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								84.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
								1,297.33	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F
			52.76					52.76	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			542.73				[2] 158.40	818.13	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
							[2] 15.00	15.00	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
140.00		248.89	3,536.87	1,499.88	28.14		479.85	12,435.90	Total.
									SALT RIVER DAY SCHOOLS.
.78	164.96	11.50	532.49				8.43	6,611.75	Indian schools support, 1915.
					93.17			93.17	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	1.20		41.23					42.43	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.78	166.16	11.50	573.72		93.17		8.43	6,747.35	Total.
									SAN CARLOS AGENCY.
		275.40	52,778.00	4,487.92	400.74		[3] 1,275.17	127,827.82	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								4,500.94	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				445.49	362.80			808.29	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								3,453.91	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								174.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
			92.95					1,293.44	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			26.00					2,215.67	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			757.99					757.99	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
		10.50	950.43		166.55		72.92	1,429.86	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
							21.78	335.61	Miscellaneous receipts, class 3.
		25.50						25.50	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
		129.60	17.10					344.71	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
		441.00	54,622.47	4,933.41	930.09		1,369.87	143,167.74	Total.
									SAN CARLOS DAY SCHOOLS.
	6.54							2,470.70	Indian schools, support, 1915.
.52	173.37	4.29	200.72	3,534.73	1,441.04			11,032.20	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			12.48		13.79		9.70	82.99	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.52	179.91	4.29	213.20	3,534.73	1,454.83		9.70	13,585.98	Total.
									SAN FRANCISCO WAREHOUSE.
60.30			44.60			2,400.00	139.05	10,091.59	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.

[1] Tuition. [2] Seed. [3] Ground water investigations, $1,000; hospital expenses, $275.17.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
SAN JUAN AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.	$16,930.20	$79.05	$609.73		$75.70		$153.78		$1,960.50	$402.26
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			3,767.63							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	6,295.99						214.52	$147.15	610.00	
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	145.13									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	4,365.83								500.00	
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	640.00	280.03								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	63.90				4.50					11.60
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)			288.58							
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	697.56									
Total	29,138.61	359.08	4,665.94		80.20		368.30	147.15	3,070.50	413.86
SAN JUAN BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	25,013.82	45.06	644.37		6.69		5,384.41	2,252.37	999.50	284.78
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	482.42		8.97		11.75		183.40	5.28		193.83
Fulfilling treaties with Navajoes, schools, Arizona, 1915.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Total	25,496.24	45.06	653.34		18.44		5,567.81	2,257.65	999.50	478.61
SAN JUAN DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	1,063.33	25.10	77.91				481.55	440.61		228.02
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Fulfilling treaties with Navajoes, schools, Arizona, 1915.										
Total	1,063.33	25.10	77.91				481.55	440.61		228.02
SANTA FE AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.	2,560.66	264.10	142.02		39.54		1.27	.76	1,416.53	211.08
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			4,486.35							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	440.00							78.57		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	99.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,567.50									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	375.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	935.00						13.80	15.58		62.49
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)			482.75							
Total	5,977.16	264.10	5,111.12		39.54		15.07	94.91	1,416.53	273.57
SANTA FE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Santa Fe, N. Mex., 1915	25,121.74	7.25		$1,109.62	113.05	$2.50	11,682.77	6,547.52	1,913.28	5,763.59
Indian school, Santa Fe, N. Mex., repairs and improvements, 1915.										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		1,402.74								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4					14.10			18.50		
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor					14.10					
Indian school, Santa Fe, N. Mex., buildings		6.95								
Indian school, Santa Fe, N. Mex., dairy barn										
Total	25,121.74	1,416.94		1,109.62	141.25	2.50	11,682.77	6,566.02	1,913.28	5,763.59
SANTA FE DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools support, 1915	4,463.88	55.15	36.60		37.82		73.42	1,711.48		626.43
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	4,463.88	55.15	36.60		37.82		73.42	1,711.48		626.43
SANTEE AGENCY.										
Subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, 1915.	982.50	37.15	241.38		47.65	27.00	2,073.62		307.13	598.49
Interest on Sioux fund, Santee, education	1,700.00									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	36.00									
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			343.84							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4		8.70								21.48
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	85.00							20.47		
Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915.	4,595.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	2,100.00								102.88	
Determining heirs of deceased, Indian allottees, 1915.	735.00	48.27								
Support of Poncas, Oklahoma, 1915	180.00	15.55	15.01		7.50				138.88	105.07
Industry among Indians, 1915										
Civilization of the Sioux										
Total	10,413.50	109.67	600.23		55.15	27.00	2,073.62	20.47	548.89	725.04
SAN XAVIER AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.	3,919.63	184.26					237.16		191.73	467.68
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			2,717.17							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									SAN JUAN AGENCY.
		$500.97	$4,871.40				[1] $1,909.75	$27,493.34	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
								3,767.63	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				$6,037.86	$1,270.39		1.50	7,309.75	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								7,267.66	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								145.13	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
								4,865.83	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								920.03	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
		5.95	51.85		4.00			141.80	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			1,872.75				[2] 999.97	3,161.30	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
			275.15					972.71	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
		506.92	7,071.15	6,037.86	1,274.39		2,911.22	56,045.18	Total.
									SAN JUAN BOARDING SCHOOL.
$1.56	$299.83	38.63	2,920.44				3.25	37,894.71	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					1,235.17			1,235.17	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
13.20		48.55	474.01		151.01		89.74	1,662.16	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
					528.00			528.00	Fulfilling treaties with Navajoes, schools, Arizona, 1915.
			118.70					118.70	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
14.76	299.83	87.18	3,513.15		1,914.18		92.99	41,438.74	Total.
									SAN JUAN DAY SCHOOLS.
	24.15	518.64	386.03					3,245.34	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					20.90			20.90	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
				12,702.33				12,702.33	Fulfilling treaties with Navajoes, schools, Arizona, 1915.
	24.15	518.64	386.03	12,702.33	20.90			15,968.57	Total.
									SANTA FE AGENCY.
3.50		647.29	930.85				1.00	6,218.60	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
								4,486.35	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					97.35	$429.00		526.35	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								518.57	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								99.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
								1,567.50	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								375.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
			52.90			111.82		1,191.59	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			793.78					1,276.53	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
3.50		647.29	1,777.53		97.35	540.82	1.00	16,259.49	Total.
									SANTA FE BOARDING SCHOOL.
32.00	235.42	292.67	6,231.79				[3] 1,756.11	60,809.31	Indian school, Santa Fe, N. Mex., 1915.
					5,513.54			5,513.54	Indian school, Santa Fe, N. Mex., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								1,402.74	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
2.25	41.74		214.65		52.75		30.35	374.34	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		5.00						19.10	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								6.95	Indian school, Santa Fe, N. Mex., buildings.
				3,959.75				3,959.75	Indian school, Santa Fe, N. Mex., dairy barn.
34.25	277.16	297.67	6,446.44	3,959.75	5,566.29		1,786.46	72,085.73	Total.
									SANTA FE DAY SCHOOLS.
	475.31		363.74					7,843.83	Indian schools support, 1915.
					134.15	70.00	[4] 59.50	263.65	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	475.31		363.74		134.15	70.00	59.50	8,107.48	Total.
									SANTEE AGENCY.
236.00		142.62	1,392.42				12.65	6,098.61	Subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, 1915.
								1,700.00	Interest on Sioux fund, Santee, education.
			190.40					226.40	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								343.84	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					1,902.04			1,902.04	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			40.25		2.50		49.00	121.93	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		2.00						2.00	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								105.47	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								4,595.00	Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915.
			715.75					2,918.63	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
							3.30	786.57	Determining heirs of deceased, Indian allottees 1915.
			534.96					996.97	Support of Poncas, Oklahoma, 1915.
							[2] 656.45	656.45	Industry among Indians, 1915.
							[5] 5,353.82	5,353.82	Civilization of the Sioux.
236.00		144.62	2,873.78		1,904.54		6,075.22	25,807.73	Total.
									SAN XAVIER AGENCY.
42.43		291.34	3,670.07				90.00	9,094.30	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
								2,717.17	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				262.50	159.13			421.63	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.

[1] Sheep dip, all but 25 cents. [2] Seed. [3] Irrigation water, $1,600. [4] School site (land), $55; water, $4.50. [5] Treaty Ban. payment.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
SAN XAVIER AGENCY—continued.										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	$1,830.00							$171.23		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	932.50	$16.45		$61.23			$5.52		$3.93	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	2,400.00	13.10								$78.00
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4			$10.82				14.40			
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	2,342.44	297.12								
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)			2.32							
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.						$49.05				
Total	11,592.57	510.93	2,730.31	61.23		49.05	257.08	171.23	195.66	545.68
SAN XAVIER DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools support, 1915	4,450.00						447.14	156.91		166.70
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
School facilities for Papago Indians in Arizona, 1915.		292.33				112.77				
Total	4,450.00	292.33				112.77	447.14	156.91		166.70
SEGER AGENCY.										
Support of Cheyennes and Arapahoes, Oklahoma, 1915.	4,895.75	247.08	150.40		$49.20	12.00			123.78	326.72
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			441.08							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	480.00							35.92		
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						26.50				
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4						16.75				
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,398.50	97.73							40.00	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	600.00									
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	865.00	14.20								
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	239.75	25.00								
Total	8,479.00	384.01	591.48		49.20	55.25		35.92	163.78	326.72
SEGER BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools support, 1915	9,352.55	13.48	1,293.72		8.92		2,703.36	1,520.87	86.00	2,283.32
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	107.25	66.87			2.70	20.75	150.36	6.80		109.81
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor								102.36	90.00	
Indian school, transportation, 1915		17.74								
Total	9,459.80	98.09	1,293.72		11.62	20.75	2,853.72	1,630.03	176.00	2,393.13
SENECA AGENCY.										
Support of Quapaws, employees, etc., Oklahoma, 1915.	480.00									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						45.00				
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			483.99							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	240.00							20.19		
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	2,340.00	177.41			64.13					8.00
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	654.50									
Total	3,714.50	177.41	483.99		64.13	45.00		20.19		8.00
SENECA BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools support, 1915	10,570.03		8.05				3,972.27	2,367.80	856.84	1,172.57
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	55.62				12.00	2.50	42.11		43.45	7.87
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.	150.00									
Total	10,775.65		8.05		12.00	2.50	4,014.38	2,367.80	900.29	1,180.44
SHAWNEE AGENCY.										
Support of Kickapoos, Oklahoma, 1915	900.00	30.00		89.69	71.55				52.25	304.90
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			349.42							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	7.70	4.94								
Pay of Indian police, 1915	770.67						55.72		69.19	
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						7.25				
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,740.00	245.02							328.32	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	588.33							3.97	43.22	24.00
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	898.75	475.44		17.14	73.20	3.50			162.66	
Payment drainage assessment on allotted lands in Pottawatomie County, Okla. (reimbursable), 1915.										
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Industry among Indians, 1915–16										
Industry among Indians, 1915										
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	800.00									
Total	5,705.45	755.40	349.42	106.83	144.75	10.75	55.72	3.97	655.64	328.90

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									SAN XAVIER AGENCY—continued.
								$2,001.23	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
			$35.43			$441.00		1,496.06	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
								2,491.10	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
		$4.10	632.34		$36.75		$108.50	806.91	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			10.58					10.58	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								2,639.56	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
								2.32	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
		19.50					152.74	221.29	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
$42.43		314.94	4,348.42	$262.50	195.88	441.00	351.24	22,070.15	Total.
									SAN XAVIER DAY SCHOOL.
.26	$97.16	159.48	275.64				5.65	5,758.94	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				863.00	188.87	323.33		1,375.20	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
				6,923.40				7,328.50	School facilities for Papago Indians in Arizona, 1915.
.26	97.16	159.48	275.64	7,786.40	188.87	323.33	5.65	14,462.64	Total.
									SEGER AGENCY.
129.11		271.70	356.12				17.40	6,579.26	Support of Cheyennes and Arapahoes, Oklahoma, 1915.
								441.08	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					137.97			137.97	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								515.92	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								26.50	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
								16.75	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			260.00					1,796.23	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			315.00			45.00		960.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
								879.20	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
65.00			25.00					354.75	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
194.11		271.70	956.12		137.97	45.00	17.40	11,707.66	Total.
									SEGER BOARDING SCHOOL.
9.02	214.13	1.77	1,113.71				16.95	18,617.80	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					740.63			740.63	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
1.11	20.12	14.87	1,234.06		213.91		273.35	2,221.96	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			55.72		1,160.45			1,408.53	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								17.74	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
10.13	234.25	16.64	2,403.49		2,114.99		290.30	23,006.66	Total.
									SENECA AGENCY.
			18.14					498.14	Support of Quapaws, employees, etc., Oklahoma, 1915.
							4.50	49.50	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
								483.99	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								260.19	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
140.00							97.50	237.50	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
2.95								2,502.49	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
							[1] 184.25	838.75	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
142.95			18.14				286.25	4,960.56	Total.
									SENECA BOARDING SCHOOL.
1.30	243.32	224.45	2,979.77					22,396.40	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					1,516.92			1,516.92	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			144.06				52.82	360.43	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			16.25					16.25	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
		1.89						151.89	Relieving distress and prevention o disease among Indians, 1915.
1.30	243.32	226.34	3,140.08		1,516.92		52.82	24,441.89	Total.
									SHAWNEE AGENCY.
5.60			444.70				28.84	1,927.53	Support of Kickapoos, Oklahoma, 1915.
								349.42	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					62.15	347.98		416.13	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								12.64	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								895.58	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								7.25	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
			62.00					2,375.34	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			15.00					674.52	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
11.05			97.80				4.50	1,744.04	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
							[2] 18,256.66	18,256.66	Payment drainage assessment on allotted lands in Pottawatomie County, Okla. (reimbursable), 1915.
			1,271.90					1,271.90	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
		2.35	5.20			10.00		17.55	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
			250.00					250.00	Industry among Indians, 1915-16.
			2,241.50					2,241.50	Industry among Indians, 1915.
							16.10	816.10	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
16.65		2.35	4,388.10		62.15	357.98	18,306.10	31,250.16	Total.

[1] Witness fees.

[2] Assessment on drainage district.

Detailed statement of expenditures.

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
SHAWNEE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	$10,849.68		$70.05	$706.41	$39.23	$64.00	$4,183.45	$1,617.85	$575.47	$2,007.98
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	49.52									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	525.33					10.25	53.65	15.65	189.35	15.60
Total	11,424.53		70.05	706.41	39.23	74.25	4,237.10	1,633.50	764.82	2,023.58
SHERMAN BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Riverside, Cal., 1915	39,582.70			3,007.97	251.55	36.50	22,849.33	13,550.61	1,137.36	5,406.37
Indian school, Riverside, Cal. (repairs and improvements), 1915.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			7,015.73							
Indian school, transportation, 1915		$5,996.10			47.11					
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	13.50		2.42				10.00		75.25	
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	63.00				66.00					
Special deposits, athletic association										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Total	39,659.20	6,996.10	7,018.15	3,007.97	364.66	36.50	22,859.33	13,550.61	1,212.61	5,406.37
SHIVWITS AGENCY.										
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	500.00						54.50	10.90		
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			98.41							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	104.00									
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	84.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	475.00							20.23		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Exp	75.00									
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.							220.00			
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor							143.19			
Total	1,238.00		98.41				417.69	31.13		
SHIVWITS DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	2,042.00		51.99		36.00		78.27	174.24	236.10	161.29
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915			4.21							
Total	2,042.00		56.20		36.00		78.27	174.24	236.10	164.29
SHOSHONE AGENCY.										
Support of Northern Cheyennes and Arapahoes, Montana, 1915.	9,593.19	198.51	320.00		57.82	15.00	4,000.50		965.15	724.53
Support of Shoshones in Wyoming, 1915	2,261.80	547.82	318.99		57.82	29.63	4,303.60		151.50	713.97
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			4,246.39							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Support of Shoshones: Employees, etc., Wyoming, 1915.	5,561.67									
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,820.00							236.99		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	5,050.50								150.00	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	1,939.03	15.00					40.55		1.50	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Exp										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	9,450.92	936.84	1,987.49			193.93	291.73		3,224.00	3.22
Miscellaneous receipts, class 3										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							2.83			
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	2,912.50	95.46								
Industry among Indians, 1915			1,863.72							
Repairs, Fort Washakie, Wind River Reservation, Wyo., 1915.	1,081.25									
Roads and bridges, Shoshone Reservation, Wyo. (reimbursed), 1915.	18,966.70		1,400.92						3.00	
Reimbursement to Bishop N. S. Thomas, Wyoming										
Pro. of Wind River Reservation, Wyo	37.38									
Total	59,674.94	1,793.63	10,137.51		115.64	238.56	8,639.21	236.99	4,495.15	1,441.72
SHOSHONE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Shoshone Reservation, Wyo., 1915.	13,617.91		3,548.66		69.26		5,307.42	2,437.31		3,549.47
Indian school, Shoshone Reservation, Wyo., repairs and improvements, 1915.										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	891.50		38.02				389.05			9.40
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		29.25								
Total	14,509.41	29.25	3,586.68		69.26		5,696.47	2,437.31		3,558.87
SHOSHONE DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	1,758.00		60.00				169.16	42.81		214.96
SILETZ AGENCY.										
Support of Indians of Grande Ronde and Siletz Agencies, Oreg., 1915.	2,088.00	194.40	28.75		24.00		701.27			220.67
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			116.50							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									SHAWNEE BOARDING SCHOOL.
	$202.85	$145.73	$1,183.65				$186.86	$21,833.21	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					$2,936.14			2,936.14	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			68.00		195.43			312.95	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
$10.54	67.05	13.97	712.46		235.80		89.69	1,939.34	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
10.54	269.90	159.70	1,964.11		3,367.37		276.55	27,021.64	Total.
									SHERMAN BOARDING SCHOOL.
272.80	657.17	709.96	17,451.89			$75.00	[1] 1,719.77	106,708.98	Indian school, Riverside, Cal., 1915.
					9,944.80			9,944.80	Indian school, Riverside, Cal. (repairs and improvements), 1915.
								7,015.73	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								7,043.21	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
48.60			170.55		26.90			347.22	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								129.00	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
							[2] 331.61	331.61	Special deposits, athletic association.
		41.40					[3] 26.75	68.15	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
321.40	657.17	751.36	17,622.44		9,971.70	75.00	2,078.13	131,588.70	Total.
									SHIVWITS AGENCY.
		3.60	143.05					712.05	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
								98.41	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								104.00	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								84.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
			9.00					504.23	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			65.00				[4] 25.00	165.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Exp.
							[4] 16.75	16.75	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
		13.29	27.90					261.19	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
		13.15	20.25					177.19	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
		30.64	265.20				41.75	2,122.82	Total.
									SHIVWITS DAY SCHOOL.
3.35	50.57	52.68	132.33					3,021.82	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					420.57			424.78	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
3.35	50.57	52.68	132.33		420.57			3,446.60	Total.
									SHOSHONE AGENCY.
45.95		193.23	2,709.49				[5] 130.00	18,953.37	Support of Northern Cheyennes and Arapahoes, Montana, 1915.
135.35		34.79	3,012.68					11,567.95	Support of Shoshones in Wyoming, 1915.
								4,246.39	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					952.68			952.68	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								5,561.67	Support of Shoshones: Employees, etc., Wyoming, 1915.
								3,056.99	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								5,200.50	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								1,996.08	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
							[4] 454.50	454.50	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Exp.
		55.46	2,898.57		6,462.99		3,734.45	29,239.66	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
							9.80	9.80	Miscellaneous receipts, class 3.
.98			1.20		7.76			12.77	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								3,007.96	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
			24,117.55					25,981.27	Industry among Indians, 1915.
					499.97			1,581.22	Repairs, Fort Washakie, Wind River Reservation, Wyo., 1915.
			3,497.90	$976.50				24,845.02	Roads and bridges, Shoshone Reservation, Wyo. (reimbursable), 1915.
					391.84			391.84	Reimbursement to Bishop N. S. Thomes, Wyoming.
								37.38	Pro. of Wind River Reservation, Wyo.
182.28		283.48	36,237.39	976.50	8,315.24		4,328.75	137,096.99	Total.
									SHOSHONE BOARDING SCHOOL.
	236.64	125.56	1,306.80					30,199.03	Indian school, Shoshone Reservation, Wyo., 1915.
				1,980.48	950.04			2,930.52	Indian school, Shoshone Reservation, Wyo., repairs and improvements, 1915.
	56.71		342.29		10.42		[4] 139.16	1,876.55	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			176.04					176.04	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
		13.00						13.00	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								29.25	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
	293.35	138.56	1,825.13	1,980.48	960.46		139.16	35,224.39	Total.
									SHOSHONE DAY SCHOOL.
	30.80		83.49					2,359.22	Indian schools, support, 1915.
									SILETZ AGENCY.
		238.59	275.20				[6] 124.00	3,894.88	Support of Indians of Grande Ronde and Siletz Agencies, Oreg., 1915.
								116.50	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					57.64			57.64	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.

[1] Irrigation water, $914.07; seed, etc., $667.70. [2] Athletic purposes. [3] Medical examination. [4] Seed. [5] Horses killed. [6] Hospital expenses, etc.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
SILETZ AGENCY—continued.										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	$1,320.00							$129.59		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	780.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	450.00									
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Total	4,638.00	$194.40	$145.25		$21.00		$701.27	129.59		$221.67
SILETZ DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	2,996.67		2.46				2.01	5.53		235.33
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							15.00			
Total	2,996.67		2.46				17.01	5.53		235.33
SISSETON AGENCY.										
Interest on Sisseton and Wahpeton fund	4,624.08	648.10			199.91				$229.10	
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,107.62							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	480.00									
Industry among Indians, 1915–16		44.00								
Industry among Indians, 1915										
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	720.00	47.09							40.00	
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	2,807.75	32.52			.99					
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Total	8,631.83	771.71	1,107.62		200.90				269.10	
SISSETON BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Interest on Sisseton and Wahpeton fund	11,998.73	12.70	813.97			$18.00	5,776.36	2,779.48	128.53	1,949.46
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	39.57								158.30	
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	12,038.30	12.70	813.97			18.00	5,776.36	2,779.48	286.83	1,949.46
SOBOBA AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in California, 1915	4,396.00	858.89	173.34	$283.54	136.80		163.10	.48	631.88	550.48
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			462.26							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	2,820.00							70.59		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	420.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F									160.00	
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4		23.50								10.00
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.							348.25			
Purchase of lands for landless Indians in California.		12.95								
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)	4.00		116.32							
Industry among Indians, 1915										
Total	7,640.00	895.34	751.92	283.54	136.80		511.35	71.07	791.88	560.48
SOBOBA DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools support, 1915	7,297.65	214.12	54.99	200.35	81.10		370.26	61.72	40.00	508.95
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		907.34								
Total	7,297.65	1,121.46	54.99	200.35	81.10		370.26	61.72	40.00	508.95
SOUTHERN UTE AGENCY.										
Interest on Ute 5 per cent fund	1,193.33	240.81			24.92		358.55	6.53	498.28	461.34
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,493.32							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,235.00							76.68		
Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, subsistence, Utah, 1915.							4,948.14			
Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, seeds and implements, Utah, 1915.										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										8.10
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	600.00							23.14	4.00	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,740.00									
Proceeds of Southern Ute Reservation										
Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, employees, Utah, 1915.	4,939.96									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor		102.90								
Payment to Confederated Bands of Utes (reimbursable).	87.17	28.07								48.90
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.		1.41			1.80					
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Confederated Bands of Utes 4 per cent fund										
Interest on Confederated Bands of Utes 4 per cent fund.	811.70	829.55	1,154.90							
Total	10,607.16	1,202.74	2,648.22		26.72		5,306.69	106.35	502.28	518.34

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									SILETZ AGENCY—continued.
								$1,449.59	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
			$32.00					812.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								450.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
		$21.85						21.85	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
			25.70					25.70	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
		260.44	332.90		$57.64		$124.00	6,828.16	Total.
									SILETZ DAY SCHOOL.
$0.13	$120.72	$1.32	$117.13					3,481.30	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					201.67			201.67	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								15.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
.13	120.72	1.32	117.13		201.67			3,697.97	Total.
									SISSETON AGENCY.
			1,506.47		449.05		[1] 3,939.70	11,596.41	Interest on Sisseton and Wahpeton fund.
								1,107.62	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				$736.05	1,464.32	$240.00		2,440.37	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								480.00	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
							[2] 3,989.08	4,033.08	Industry among Indians, 1915–16.
			[3] 19,206.00					19,206.00	Industry among Indians, 1915.
			330.75					1,137.84	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
18.25								2,859.51	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
			800.00	1,400.00				2,200.00	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
18.25			21,843.22	2,136.05	1,913.37	240.00	7,928.78	45,060.83	Total.
									SISSETON BOARDING SCHOOL.
1.30	180.78	215.58	1,691.88	284.50	553.57			26,404.84	Interest on Sisseton and Wahpeton fund.
			278.80				25.46	502.13	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
					94.28			94.28	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
1.30	180.78	215.58	1,970.68	284.50	647.85		25.46	27,001.25	Total.
									SOBOBA AGENCY.
		482.13	561.82			18.75	344.25	8,601.46	Support of Indians in California, 1915.
								462.26	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
			1.00	399.65	61.56	150.00		611.21	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								2,891.59	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								420.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
			250.00					410.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
		2.50	14.50				1.13	51.63	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		36.65						384.90	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
							[4] 30.00	42.95	Purchase of lands for landless Indians in California.
			2,805.42				[5] 821.12	3,746.86	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
			1,660.00				[2] 11.91	1,671.91	Industry among Indians, 1915.
		521.28	5,292.74	399.65	61.56	168.75	1,208.41	19,294.77	Total.
									SOBOBA DAY SCHOOL.
64.56	257.47	8.39	1,477.15				51.59	10,688.30	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				883.50	429.28			1,312.78	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								907.34	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
64.56	257.47	8.39	1,477.15	883.50	429.28		51.59	12,908.42	Total.
									SOUTHERN UTE AGENCY.
2.25		236.32	970.42					3,992.75	Interest on Ute 5 per cent fund.
								1,493.32	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				2,000.00	343.06	135.41		2,478.47	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								1,311.68	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								4,948.14	Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, subsistence, Utah, 1915.
			1,553.40					1,553.40	Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, seed and implements, Utah, 1915.
			1.00					9.10	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			325.96					953.10	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
								1,740.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
							[6] 120.00	120.09	Proceeds of Southern Ute Reservation.
								4,939.96	Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, employees, Utah, 1915.
			82.20					185.10	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			1,814.11				[7] 177.75	2,156.00	Payment to Confederated Bands of Utes (reimbursable).
								3.21	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
		2.10						2.10	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
							[8] 1,358.71	1,358.71	Confederated Bands of Utes 4 per cent fund.
			6,301.50				489.75	9,587.40	Interest on Confederated Bands of Utes 4 per cent fund.
2.25		238.42	11,048.59	2,000.00	343.06	135.41	2,146.21	36,832.44	Total.

[1] Seed, $3,747.95. [2] Seed. [3] Cows. [4] Abstract of title. [5] Seed and trees. [6] Refunds. [7] Fair premiums.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
SOUTHERN UTE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	$7,644.26	$25.80					$292.82	$880.52	$177.87	$1,353.36
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	40.75						20.00		88.05	
Interest on Confederated Bands of Utes 4 per cent fund.										
Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, subsistence, Utah, 1915.							2,499.92			
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.		26.10								
Total	7,685.01	51.90					2,812.74	880.52	265.92	1,353.36
SOUTHERN UTE DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	1,075.00						3.48	150.95		23.68
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, subsistence, Utah, 1915.							84.08			
Total	1,075.00						87.56	150.95		23.68
SPOKANE AGENCY.										
Fulfilling treaties with Spokanes	3,746.50	25.80	$631.88				305.71		236.20	193.96
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			157.99							
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	12.00	240.58			$42.92		18.80		195.92	44.54
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Support of Spokanes, Washington, 1915	590.50									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor			24.00							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,027.67						239.66	84.90	35.80	
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)										
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	900.00	2.50								
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	3,042.88									
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Total	9,487.55	268.88	813.87		42.92		561.17	84.90	467.92	238.50
SPOKANE DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	4,640.00	1.00	62.35				236.23	61.96		266.60
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							22.00			
Total	4,640.00	1.00	62.35				258.23	61.96		266.60
SPRINGFIELD BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	5,148.46		56.01	$10.40	43.30	$1.75	2,005.70	1,101.42	431.65	786.27
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			674.06							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4					3.00		7.60			
Indian school, transportation, 1915		42.38								
Total	5,148.46	42.38	730.07	10.40	46.30	1.75	2,013.30	1,101.42	431.65	786.27
STANDING ROCK AGENCY.										
Standing Rock Reservation 3 per cent fund	8,080.40	712.63	6,139.15		12.69		18,729.74	18.23	2,821.50	2,755.30
Standing Rock Reservation 3 per cent fund, act of Feb. 14, 1913.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			6,999.92		1.68					
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	7,433.33							761.31		
Pay of judges Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915.	15,132.61									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	8,777.11	13.23					196.45			540.11
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	4,440.00									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4			1.75			29.50	4.80			4.15
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	1,948.00	34.89								
Interest on Standing Rock Reservation 3 per cent fund.	11,254.09									402.00
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Civilization of the Sioux						185.28				
Total	57,233.54	760.75	13,140.82		14.37	214.78	18,930.99	779.54	2,821.50	3,701.56
STANDING ROCK BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Education Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915							3,522.98	1,078.11	387.15	3,505.83
Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915.	1,200.00									
Interest on Sioux fund, Standing Rock, education.	10,771.07									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							44.00	8.10		9.53
Interest on Standing Rock Reservation 3 per cent fund.			105.00				5,355.71	3,070.44	1.88	517.74
Standing Rock Reservation 3 per cent fund		17.90					191.00		264.00	165.65
Indian school, transportation, 1915					.50					
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Total	11,971.07	17.90	105.00		.50		9,113.69	4,156.65	653.03	4,198.75

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									SOUTHERN UTE BOARDING SCHOOL.
	$84.13		$869.63		$1,260.80		$19.50	$11,347.89	Indian schools, support, 1915.
								1,260.80	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			162.82				10.50	322.12	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			37.20					37.20	Interest on Confederated Bands of Utes 4 per cent fund.
								2,499.92	Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, subsistence, Utah, 1915.
			29.60					29.60	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								26.10	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
	84.13		1,099.25		1,260.80		30.00	15,523.63	Total.
									SOUTHERN UTE DAY SCHOOLS.
	15.84		19.43					1,288.38	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					44.98			44.98	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								84.08	Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, subsistence, Utah, 1915.
	15.84		19.43		44.98			1,417.44	Total.
									SPOKANE AGENCY.
		$171.86	477.15					5,789.06	Fulfilling treaties with Spokanes.
								157.99	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
		27.80	725.82				1.25	1,309.63	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
				$10,996.34	3.10			10,939.44	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			271.85					862.35	Support of Spokanes, Washington, 1915.
								24.00	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			31.25					1,419.28	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
							[1] 591.13	591.13	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
			320.00					1,222.50	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			374.96					3,417.84	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
		2.70						2.70	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
		202.36	2,201.03	10,996.34	3.10		592.38	25,963.92	Total.
									SPOKANE DAY SCHOOLS.
	153.86		449.28				73.21	5,944.49	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					209.07			209.07	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								22.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
	153.86		449.28		209.07		73.21	6,175.56	Total.
									SPRINGFIELD BOARDING SCHOOL.
	114.51	47.00	615.69				30.03	10,392.19	Indian schools, support, 1915.
								674.06	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				509.95	749.32	$240.00	[2] 13.50	1,512.77	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
$1.50			34.60		34.05			80.75	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								42.38	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
1.50	114.51	47.00	650.29	509.95	783.37	240.00	43.53	12,702.15	Total.
									STANDING ROCK AGENCY.
372.35		1,339.34	5,289.74	24,287.04	388.68		8,224.76	79,171.55	Standing Rock Reservation 3 per cent fund.
			99,783.23					99,783.23	Standing Rock Reservation 3 per cent fund, act of Feb. 14, 1913.
								7,001.60	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					930.81	10.00		940.81	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								8,194.64	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								168.00	Pay of judges Indian courts, 1915.
								15,132.61	Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915.
22.18			193.96				1,028.35	10,771.39	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								4,440.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
.25			144.30				2.10	186.85	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
61.25								2,944.14	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
			33.80					11,689.89	Interest on Standing Rock Reservation 3 per cent fund.
		13.00						13.00	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
			57,220.99				[3] 7,521.86	64,928.13	Civilization of the Sioux.
456.03		1,352.34	162,666.02	24,287.04	1,319.49	10.00	16,777.07	304,465.84	Total.
									STANDING ROCK BOARDING SCHOOL.
.78	193.20	133.20	299.52		787.69			9,908.46	Education Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915.
								1,200.00	Support of Sioux of different tribes, employees, etc., South Dakota, 1915.
								10,771.07	Interest on Sioux fund, Standing Rock, education.
	5.15		52.25		58.80			177.83	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
	.54	87.07	485.67		87.88			9,711.93	Interest on Standing Rock Reservation 3 per cent fund.
		18.66	485.58	378.00	319.28			1,840.07	Standing Rock Reservation 3 per cent fund.
								.50	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
							40.48	40.48	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
.78	198.89	238.93	1,323.02	378.00	1,253.65		40.48	33,650.34	Total.

[1] Seed. [2] Water. [3] Treaty benefit payment.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
STANDING ROCK AGRICULTURAL SCHOOL.										
Education Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915		$10.95					$2,639.48	$429.67	$448.82	$1,891.31
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							25.00			
Interest on Standing Rock Reservation 3 per cent fund							342.93	1,839.59		13.75
Standing Rock Reservation 3 per cent fund	$7,056.50	33.45					32.50	.25	417.00	16.35
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Total	7,056.50	44.40					3,039.91	2,269.51	865.82	1,921.41
STANDING ROCK DAY SCHOOL.										
Education Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915							718.24	314.94	35.00	714.36
Interest on Standing Rock Reservation 3 per cent fund			$7.20				206.67	1,288.04		87.66
Standing Rock Reservation 3 per cent fund	8,364.30						39.00	93.45		
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Total	8,364.30		7.20				963.91	1,696.43	35.00	802.02
TAHOLAR AGENCY.										
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	1,316.09		150.00		$1.80					
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			128.86							
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor		22.45					25.00			
Pay of Indian police, 1915	584.01									
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	68.13									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	4,539.96	38.92	14.25				587.45			80.00
Support of Quinaielts and Quillehutes, Washington, 1915		100.00					300.00			
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	6,508.19	161.37	293.11		1.80		912.45			80.00
TAHOLAH DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	2,660.44									182.15
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor									222.20	
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	2,660.44								222.20	182.15
TOMAH AGENCY.										
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	1,962.78	499.03		$6.45	.40	$1.50				25.10
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			3,133.36		4.55					
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	240.00							5.29		
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915	2,957.50	228.45				1.10				
Indian schools, support, 1915										
Total	5,160.28	727.48	3,133.36	6.45	4.95	2.60		5.29		25.10
TOMAH BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Tomah, Wis., 1915	18,487.06	31.71	691.80	744.30	15.05		7,341.72	5,937.83	1,145.99	4,761.61
Indian school, Tomah, Wis., repairs and improvements, 1915										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		1,348.16			15.15					
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	86.35	268.22	9.58			9.27	6.24	38.02	221.57	
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915										
Indian school, Tomah, Wis., special repairs, 1915		20.88				1.25				
Indian school, Tomah, Wis., employees' building						62.41				
Total	18,573.41	1,668.97	701.38	744.30	30.20	72.93	7,347.96	5,975.85	1,367.56	4,761.61
TONGUE RIVER AGENCY.										
Support of Northern Cheyennes and Arapahoes, Montana, 1915	12,886.02	628.48	3,563.30		48.52		24,595.25	10.94	32.50	783.25
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915			3,354.77		.70					
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	3,053.83							200.31		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	161.00									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	36.00									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	13,563.25	24.65	389.63						2,672.32	108.49
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915	996.50	30.55						1.00		
Line riders, Northern Cheyenne Reservation, Mont., 1915	1,236.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	653.33									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	1,174.50							2.92		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	2,802.22	145.31								
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Exp.										.75
Industry among Indians, 1915–16		42.00	1,346.61						4,075.43	
Industry among Indians, 1915		114.68	707.43							
Purchase of stock for Northern Cheyenne Indians, Montana (reimbursable)										
Indian schools, support, 1915 (tuition)							421.46		1,490.00	1.09
Individual Indian money	2,269.07	68.25								
Purchase of implements for Indians of Tongue River Reservation, Mont. (reimbursable)			265.29							
Total	38,831.72	1,053.92	9,627.03		49.22		25,016.71	215.17	8,270.25	893.49

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									STANDING ROCK AGRICULTURAL SCHOOL.
$75.60	$57.15		$303.46		$106.38			$5,962.82	Education Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915.
	1.76		179.81		27.50			232.31	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			577.68		24.01			2,799.72	Interest on Standing Rock Reservation 3 per cent fund.
			1,668.28		651.43			9,875.76	Standing Rock Reservation 3 per cent fund.
			400.00				$60.33	460.33	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
75.60	58.91		3,129.23		809.32		60.33	19,330.94	Total.
									STANDING ROCK DAY SCHOOL.
3.12	444.70		544.06		187.63			2,962.05	Education Sioux Nation, South Dakota, 1915.
	17.34	$2.80	183.76		59.79			1,853.26	Interest on Standing Rock Reservation 3 per cent fund.
			35.14		2.50			8,534.39	Standing Rock Reservation 3 per cent fund.
							18.41	18.41	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
3.12	462.04	2.80	762.96		249.92		18.41	13,368.11	Total.
									TAHOLAH AGENCY.
156.45			93.45					1,717.79	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
								128.86	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
		950.70	6.10					1,004.25	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								584.01	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								68.13	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
			505.44				4.93	5,770.95	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
								400.00	Support of Quinaielts and Quillehutes, Washington, 1915.
					68.09			68.09	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
156.45		950.70	604.99		68.09		4.93	9,742.08	Total.
									TAHOLAH DAY SCHOOL.
	74.73		48.80				5.00	2,971.12	Indian schools, support, 1915.
								222.20	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
					.85		[1] 460.50	461.35	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	74.73		48.80		.85		465.50	3,654.67	Total.
									TOMAH AGENCY.
2.95			211.29					2,709.50	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
								3,137.91	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					56.00			56.00	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								215.23	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
							4.25	3,191.30	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
							[2] 100.00	100.00	Indian schools, support, 1915.
2.95			211.29		56.00		104.25	9,440.00	Total.
									TOMAH BOARDING SCHOOL.
27.60	291.90	125.79	2,583.89				266.86	42,453.11	Indian school, Tomah, Wis., 1915.
					5,807.07			5,807.07	Indian school, Tomah, Wis., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								1,363.31	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
	31.74		319.32		43.83		158.24	1,192.38	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		32.66						32.66	Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
					2,280.44			2,302.57	Indian school, Tomah, Wis., special repairs, 1915.
				$3,980.70				4,043.11	Indian school, Tomah, Wis., employees' building.
27.60	323.64	158.45	2,903.21	3,980.70	8,131.34		425.10	57,194.21	Total.
									TONGUE RIVER AGENCY.
213.27		425.80	3,910.04				1,116.06	48,213.43	Support of Northern Cheyennes and Arapahoes, Montana, 1915.
								3,355.47	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					3,969.47			3,969.47	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								3,254.14	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								161.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
1.85	9.90		103.75		4.76		4.70	160.96	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		16.51	675.55	117.15			578.19	18,145.74	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
		133.50	35.50		921.09		[3] 51.10	2,169.24	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								1,236.00	Line riders, Northern Cheyenne Reservation, Mont., 1915.
			159.96					813.29	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
			.17					1,177.59	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			636.00					3,583.53	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
							[4] 130.00	130.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Exp.
			6,762.08		6.20		[4] 2,587.15	10,744.79	Industry among Indians, 1915-16.
			668.40		7,131.23			12,697.17	Industry among Indians, 1916.
			[5] 22,525.00					22,525.00	Purchase of stock for Northern Cheyenne Indians, Montana (reimbursable).
							[2] 230.55	230.55	Indian schools, support, 1915 (tuition).
			6.75					4,256.53	Individual Indian money.
			3,509.00				[4] 857.79	4,632.08	Purchase of implements for Indians of Tongue River Reservation, Mont. (reimbursable).
215.12	9.90	575.81	38,992.20	117.15	12,032.75		5,555.54	141,455.98	Total.

[1] Land, $459. [2] Tuition. [3] Hospital expenses. [4] Seed.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
TONGUE RIVER BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	$10,400.04	$60.85	$781.14				$1,713.64	$1,358.22	$410.75	$412.18
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	44.00						2.40			
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										9.63
Total	10,444.04	60.85	781.14				1,716.04	1,358.22	410.75	421.81
TONGUE RIVER DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	2,704.03	9.95	44.28				566.15	504.56		56.15
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	27.00									
Miscellaneous recepts, class 4										
Total	2,731.03	9.95	44.28				566.15	504.56		56.15
TRUXTON CANYON AGENCY.										
Indian moneys, p oceeds of labor	4,906.20	288.60	3.50		$3.69	$7.13	486.14	.21	395.45	26.00
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,414.13		.23					
Pay of Indian police, 1915	210.00							15.27		
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	5,116.20	288.60	1,417.63		3.92	7.13	486.14	15.48	395.45	26.00
TRUXTON CANYON BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Truxton Canyon, Ariz., 1915	8,946.43	61.15	3.52		5.02		2,461.12	1,580.35	678.35	988.33
Indian school, Truxton Canyon, Ariz., repairs and improvements, 1915.										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		113.85			.44					
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							6.35	11.50		4.40
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Total	8,946.43	175.00	3.52		5.46		2,467.47	1,591.85	678.35	992.73
TULALIP AGENCY.										
Support of D. Wamish and other allied tribes in Washington, 1915.	5,252.00	108.50			51.50				315.43	478.67
Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.			1,154.69							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,490.00							155.56		
Inddustrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.	1,000.00	56.20				168.47				
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	3,076.00									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915						61.84				
Individual Indian money	189.83									
Total	11,007.83	164.70	1,154.69		51.50	230.31		155.56	315.43	478.67
TULALIP BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	16,197.49	11.70					6,859.00	2,043.46	1,588.93	4,074.29
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	158.10	10.00								
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		32.60								
Total	16,355.59	54.30					6,859.00	2,043.46	1,588.93	4,074.29
TULALIP DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	1,336.00						69.28	209.47		240.00
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	1,336.00						69.28	209.47		240.00
TULE RIVER AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in California, 1915	25.00	8.20	6.30							13.20
Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.			112.97							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	227.33							9.66		
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.	10.00						496.00			
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	600.00	36.00							180.00	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.	1,824.74						5.75		121.50	14.00
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	529.50	50.30	3.03						15.00	14.00
Total	3,216.57	94.50	122.30				501.75	9.66	316.50	41.20
TULE RIVER DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	2,767.00	36.50	17.10				88.96	25.01	173.00	136.37
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	2,767.00	36.50	17.10				88.96	25.01	173.00	136.37
TULLAHASSEE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Interest on Creek general fund, 1915	866.33		4.50				31.52			
Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.			1.04							
Total	866.33		5.54				31.52			

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									TONGUE RIVER BOARDING SCHOOL.
	$76.04	$12.66	$1,182.34				[1] $125.91	$16,533.77	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				$334.70	$1,324.01			1,658.71	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			178.54		26.97		62.89	314.80	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			12.80					22.43	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
	76.04	12.66	1,373.68	334.70	1,350.98		188.80	18,529.71	Total.
									TONGUE RIVER DAY SCHOOLS.
$3.75	27.18		109.82				25.21	4,051.08	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					22.90			22.90	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			6.00					33.00	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			7.93		.70			8.63	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
3.75	27.18		123.75		23.60		25.21	4,115.61	Total.
									TRUXTON CANYON AGENCY.
4.85		268.20	14,381.30		46.77	$20.00	126.54	20,964.58	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								1,414.36	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								225.27	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
				977.92				977.92	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
4.85		268.20	14,381.30	977.92	46.77	20.00	126.54	23,582.13	Total.
									TRUXTON CANYON BOARDING SCHOOL.
29.25	102.51	111.21	803.46				64.95	15,835.65	Indian school, Truxton Canyon, Ariz., 1915.
					2,569.17			2,569.17	Indian school, Truxton Canyon, Ariz., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								114.29	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
			41.03		52.92		5.00	121.20	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
	31.05							31.05	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
29.25	133.56	111.21	844.49		2,622.09		69.95	18,671.36	Total.
									TULALIP AGENCY.
7.30		411.31	142.02				9.10	6,770.83	Support of D. Wamish and other allied tribes in Washington, 1915.
								1,154.69	Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.
					18.10			18.10	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
2.95			72.85					75.80	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								1,645.56	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
			41.26					1,265.93	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
			722.00					3,798.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
7.00		10.05	95.10					112.15	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								61.84	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
								189.83	Individual Indian money.
12.25		421.36	1,073.23		18.10		9.10	15,092.73	Total.
									TULALIP BOARDING SCHOOL.
262.75	539.53	182.72	2,910.66				[1] 157.10	34,827.63	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					4,114.61			4,114.61	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
		136.58	288.21		30.25		[2] 49.61	652.75	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
					18.85		[2] 214.39	233.24	Indian moneys proceeds of labor.
								32.60	Indian school transportation, 1915.
262.75	539.53	319.30	3,178.87		4,163.71		421.10	39,860.83	Total.
									TULALIP DAY SCHOOLS.
1.30	304.51		188.60					2,349.16	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					189.28			189.28	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
1.30	304.51		188.60		189.28			2,538.44	Total.
									TULE RIVER AGENCY.
			154.35					207.95	Support of Indians in California, 1915.
								112.97	Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.
								236.99	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
		9.41						515.41	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
			3.00			119.99		938.99	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M
			68.78					2,034.77	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
23.25		35.81	201.55		261.25		177.68	1,311.37	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
23.25		45.22	427.68		261.25	119.99	177.68	5,357.55	Total.
									TULE RIVER DAY SCHOOL.
	37.16	8.56	369.44					3,659.10	Indian schools support, 1915.
					151.78			151.78	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	37.16	8.56	369.44		151.78			3,810.88	Total.
									TULLAHASSEE BOARDING SCHOOL.
			17.75				[3] 76.25	996.35	Interest on Creek general fund, 1915.
								1.04	Purchase and transportation Indian supplies, 1915.
			17.75				76.25	997.39	Total.

[1] Seed. [2] Trees. [3] Insurance.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
TURTLE MOUNTAIN AGENCY.										
Support of Chippewas, Turtle Mountain Band, North Dakota, 1915.	$4,839.17	$672.35	$258.04		$88.49		$2,052.59	$4.65	$214.32	$885.83
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,046.70							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.										
Pay of Indian police, 1915.	1,664.66							159.92		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.	168.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.	1,920.00								106.00	
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.							102.75			
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.	28.00					$45.57	37.98			
Court costs, etc., in suits involving lands allotted to Indians, 1915.	28.00	104.05								
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	447.50									
Total.	9,095.33	776.40	1,304.74		88.49	45.57	2,193.32	164.57	320.32	885.83
TURTLE MOUNTAIN DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915.	6,743.75		242.66		5.10		683.57	119.99		873.38
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.										
Total.	6,743.75		242.66		5.10		683.57	119.99		873.38
TUSKAHOMA BOARDING SCHOOLS.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.	[1] 9,785.81	47.93	835.23		26.08	31.05	5,528.73	808.74	1,030.30	1,742.41
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			519.01							
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.	16.00						6.23			
Total.	9,801.81	47.93	1,354.24		26.08	31.05	5,534.96	808.74	1,030.30	1,742.41
UINTAH AGENCY.										
Interest on Ute 5 per cent fund.	373.33	379.15	1,837.33		55.47		1.58	17.15	3,294.81	1,604.48
Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, subsistence, Utah, 1915.	[2] 836.66						7,418.80			
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,734.49							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.		16.25								
Pay of Indian police, 1915.	2,308.00							158.94	107.66	
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.	41.67	75.35				65.00				
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.	5,104.22	256.20				38.50				
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.	3,613.89	25.00								
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.	994.00									
Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, employees, Utah, 1915.	13,658.21									
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.						52.50				
Miscellaneous receipts, class 3.	1,381.21	5.50								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.										
Interest on Confederated Bands of Utes 4 per cent fund.	4,808.02		1,870.96				74.61	18.27	292.63	
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.		4.90								
Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, seeds and improvement, Utah, 1915.									82.52	
Total.	33,119.21	762.35	5,442.78		55.47	156.00	7,494.99	194.36	3,777.62	1,604.48
UINTAH BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915.	6,367.90	74.60	420.83				302.99	1,451.23	404.49	1,039.58
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.	4.75	57.75					20.00			
Relief of Benj. A. Sanders, for injuries.								11.50		
Interest on Confederated Bands of Utes 4 per cent fund.										
Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, employees, Utah, 1915.	2,060.00									
Indian school, transportation, 1915.		6.75								
Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, subsistence, Utah, 1915.							1,527.83			
Total.	8,432.65	139.10	420.83				1,850.82	1,462.73	404.49	1,039.58
UMATILLA AGENCY.										
Interest on Umatilla general fund.										
Support of Indians of Umatilla Agency, Oreg., 1915.	2,940.00									
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			986.68							
Pay of Indian police, 1915.	698.67							60.93		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.	84.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.	900.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.	375.00									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.	1,164.17	38.02								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.		42.35			2.20					
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.						31.00				
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	215.00	41.18								
Court costs, etc., suits involving lands allotted to Indians, 1915.	3.70									
Umatilla general fund.										
Total.	6,380.54	121.55	986.68		2.20	31.00		60.93		

[1] Choctaw.

[2] Lieu of rations.

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									TURTLE MOUNTAIN AGENCY.
$356.08		$256.85	$716.96				$348.13	$10,693.46	Support of Chippewas, Turtle Mountain Band, North Dakota, 1915.
								1,046.70	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					$732.39			732.39	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			1.00					1,825.58	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
								2,026.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								102.75	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
		36.55	212.45	$9,779.20			22.00	10,161.75	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
							[1] 79.32	211.37	Court costs, etc., in suits involving lands allotted to Indians, 1915.
								447.50	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
356.08		293.40	970.41	9,779.20	732.39		449.45	27,415.50	Total.
									TURTLE MOUNTAIN DAY SCHOOLS.
83.55	$380.14	1.86	371.56				[2] 49.02	9,554.58	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				344.50	1,195.89			1,540.39	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
83.55	380.14	1.86	371.56	344.50	1,195.89		49.02	11,094.97	Total.
									TUSKAHOMA BOARDING SCHOOLS.
	207.85	115.36	1,088.99	374.50	2,649.08		144.67	24,516.73	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								519.01	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
			21.50		3.86			47.59	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
	307.85	115.36	1,110.49	374.50	2,652.94		144.67	25,083.33	Total.
									UINTAH AGENCY.
94.25		532.75	2,277.15				9.30	10,476.75	Interest on Ute 5 per cent fund.
								8,255.46	Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, subsistence, Utah, 1915.
								1,734.49	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				4,777.97	631.42	$120.00		5,545.64	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								2,574.60	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								182.02	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
			93.50				6.30	5,498.92	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			446.50					4,085.39	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								994.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
								13,658.21	Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, employees, Utah, 1915.
								52.50	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
								1,386.71	Miscellaneous receipts, class 3.
			27.70		2.70			30.40	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
21.00		142.81	42,224.00				[3] 3,673.76	53,126.06	Interest on Confederated Bands of Utes 4 per cent fund.
								4.90	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
			1,567.40				[3] 1,576.63	3,226.55	Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, seeds and improvement, Utah, 1915.
115.25		675.56	46,636.25	4,777.97	634.12	120.00	5,266.19	110,832.60	Total.
									UINTAH BOARDING SCHOOL.
	17.79		266.53				[1] 69.00	10,414.94	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					531.23			531.23	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			192.39				16.00	290.89	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
							[4] 1,000.00	1,000.00	Relief of Benj. A. Sanders, for injuries.
			90.00					101.50	Interest on Confederated Band of Utes 4 per cent fund.
								2,000.00	Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, employees, Utah, 1915.
								6.75	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
								1,527.83	Support of Confederated Bands of Utes, subsistence, Utah, 1915.
	17.79		548.92		531.23		1,085.00	15,933.14	Total.
									UMATILLA AGENCY.
		183.21						183.21	Interest on Umatilla general fund.
								2,940.00	Support of Indians of Umatilla Agency, Oreg., 1915.
								986.68	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								759.60	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								84.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
								900.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								375.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
7.65		7.70	64.30					1,202.19	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								124.20	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								31.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
								256.18	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
								3.70	Court costs, etc., suits involving lands allotted to Indians, 1915.
							[5] 3,906.39	3,906.39	Umatilla general fund.
7.65		190.91	64.30				3,906.39	11,752.15	Total.

[1] Court costs, etc. [2] Seed. [3] Seed, etc. [4] Injuries. [5] Refunds homestead entries.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
UMATILLA BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	$1,650.00						$2,342.65	$2,355.18	$499.80	$1,727.31
Interest on Umatilla general fund	6,125.08				$48.03			24.80		9.06
Interest on Umatilla school fund	291.66									
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	320.56	$152.00	$82.75		15.32	$2.00	268.00	73.55	917.89	26.19
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	600.00	10.05				10.50	.90	76.48	.90	75.00
Total	8,987.30	162.05	82.75		63.35	12.50	2,611.55	2,510.01	1,418.59	1,837.56
UNION AGENCY.										
Administration of the affairs of Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, 1915.	154,189.76	14,907.05	134.38	$51.17	1.82	15.50				
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			263.08							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	9,083.00							294.44		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	13,588.88	4,743.62								
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	144.00									
Probate attorneys, Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, 1915.	59,276.12	8,116.33	11.60	9.00	804.03	129.18				15.00
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw Roy.	7,000.00									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw Un. Land.	20,162.39	2,588.06			44.89	6,692.37				
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw Roy.	7,633.32	749.90								
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw Un. Land.	6,720.79	862.69			14.96	1,453.85				
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Union Agency.	5,667.08	4,248.43		42.65	474.39	621.28			258.98	38.75
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Creek Un. Land.	391.67	123.60								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	31,698.27	10,077.93	43.80	394.28	1,354.36	1,118.93			488.80	26.00
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						375.70				
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Five Civilized Tribes.					.20	684.95				
Interest on Cherokee moneys on deposit in banks.	8,334.92					264.13				
Interest on Chickasaw moneys on deposit in banks.	3,216.67					45.02				
Interest on Choctaw moneys on deposit in banks.										
Interest on Seminole moneys on deposit in banks.	2,739.00	255.47				12.90				4.03
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw Roy. Hospital.		57.54				92.24				
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw Roy. Hospital.		19.19				30.78				
Oil and gas inspectors, Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, 1915.	7,836.41	2,563.31			42.89	210.11				
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.							5.60	4.80		
Court costs, etc., in suits of Indian allottees, Five Civilized Tribes.										
Interest on Cherokee school fund	350.00									
Interest on Seminole general fund	2,201.00					10.00				
Interest on Creek general fund	9,714.44	756.80								
Creek general fund	3,060.00				5.39	72.38				
Cherokee national fund	250.00									
Choctaw 3 per cent fund										
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)										
Total	353,257.72	50,069.92	452.86	497.10	2,742.90	11,829.32	5.60	299.24	747.78	83.78
VERMILLION LAKE BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund	8,770.08			350.00	50.00		105.65	67.61	41.40	122.00
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			752.04							
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							5.60	16.34	9.20	
Indian school, transportation, 1915		180.88								
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915		11.39								
Indian schools, support, 1915										
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915	605.00				21.00		3,245.00	1,721.79	431.10	2,636.60
Total	9,375.08	192.27	752.04	350.00	71.00		3,356.25	1,805.74	481.70	2,758.60
WAHPETON BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian school, Wahpeton, N. Dak., 1915	14,269.01	110.92		602.34	47.57	6.40	6,998.61	4,504.89	837.20	3,640.94
Indian school, Wahpeton, N. Dak., repairs and improvements, 1915.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,383.20		.18					
Indian school, transportation, 1915		1,259.36			55.90					
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4		14.01			23.36		15.55	68.10		
Indian school, Wahpeton, N. Dak., buildings.										
Indian school, Wahpeton, N. Dak., power plant and water system.										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Total	14,269.01	1,384.29	1,383.20	602.34	127.01	6.40	7,014.16	4,572.99	837.20	3,640.94
WALKER RIVER AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Nevada, 1915	1,671.98	61.25			11.50		630.08	8.50	27.20	233.52
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			667.33							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									UMATILLA BOARDING SCHOOL.
$0.26	$186.47	$0.50	$1,060.25					$9,822.42	Indian schools, support, 1915.
	6.54		137.90		$205.07			6,576.18	Interest on Umatilla general fund.
					140.06			431.66	Interest on Umatilla school fund.
				$2,832.75	4.50			2,837.25	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
137.00	20.63	30.10	1,562.56		1,300.72		$28.60	4,937.87	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			413.43		1,010.96			2,178.22	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
137.26	213.64	30.60	3,194.14	2,832.75	2,661.25		28.60	26,783.90	Total.
									UNION AGENCY.
1,058.36		2.28	9.18			$2,038.50		173,308.00	Administration of the affairs of Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, 1915.
								283.08	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
						12,232.00		12,232.00	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								9,377.44	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
			325.00					18,657.50	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								144.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
1,012.84			59.75			3,403.00	495.75	73,332.57	Probate attorneys, Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, 1915.
							2,330.31	9,330.31	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw Roy.
						105.00	734.53	30,327.24	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw Un. Land.
							2,247.96	10,631.18	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw Roy.
						35.00	244.84	9,332.13	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw Un. Land.
28.79			365.96			38.67	348.39	12,428.37	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Union Agency.
								515.27	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Creek Un. Land.
1,988.83			168.40			788.25	1,526.78	49,674.63	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								375.70	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
								685.15	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Five Civilized Tribes.
						3.00	327.56	8,929.61	Interest on Cherokee moneys on deposit in banks.
							183.61	3,715.30	Interest on Chickasaw moneys on deposit in banks.
							.80	.80	Interest on Choctaw moneys on deposit in banks.
12.55							.40	3,024.35	Interest on Seminole moneys on deposit in banks.
								149.78	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw Roy. Hospital.
								49.97	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw Roy. Hospital.
503.62			407.19			172.50		11,826.03	Oil and gas inspectors, Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, 1915.
		212.92	7.00			18.67		248.99	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
							2,905.68	2,905.68	Court costs, etc., in suits of Indian allottees, Five Civilized Tribes.
							13.12	363.12	Interest on Cherokee school fund.
							386.71	2,597.71	Interest on Seminole general fund.
						300.00	2,316.60	13,087.84	Interest on Creek general fund.
21.50							289.40	3,448.67	Creek general fund.
						7.50		257.50	Cherokee national fund.
							.80	.80	Choctaw 3 per cent fund.
							[1] 94.07	94.07	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
5,016.49		215.20	1,342.48			20,042.09	14,742.31	461,344.79	Total.
									VERMILLION LAKE BOARDING SCHOOL.
15.00	5.04		82.68	110.11	53.35		[2] 41.96	9,814.88	Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund.
								752.04	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
.75			24.52		112.02			168.43	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								180.88	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
								11.39	General expenses, Indian service, 1915.
			221.57					221.57	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				980.57	1,094.90			2,075.47	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	94.66	67.92	988.74	240.00	598.45			10,650.26	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915.
15.75	99.70	67.92	1,317.51	1,330.68	1,858.72		41.96	23,874.92	Total.
									WAHPETON BOARDING SCHOOL.
	492.37	283.81	2,353.68			300.00	395.43	34,843.17	Indian school, Wahpeton, N. Dak., 1915.
				463.40	2,300.06			2,763.46	Indian school, Wahpeton, N. Dak., repairs and improvements, 1915.
								1,383.38	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								1,315.26	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
	6.00	9.95	87.95		7.50			232.42	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			147.75	218.95				366.70	Indian school, Wahpeton, N. Dak., buildings.
					3,329.12			3,329.12	Indian school, Wahpeton, N. Dak., power plant and water system.
		6.50					[2] 101.99	108.49	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
	498.37	300.26	2,589.38	682.35	5,636.68	300.00	497.42	44,342.00	Total.
									WALKER RIVER AGENCY.
1.09		385.28	318.02				10.50	3,328.92	Support of Indians in Nevada, 1915.
								667.33	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					38.04			38.04	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.

[1] Seed.

[2] Hospital expenses.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
WALKER RIVER AGENCY—continued.										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	$886.67						$80.62	$67.41		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	84.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,606.00									$90.00
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	892.99	$5.50							$28.80	20.00
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.							8.77			
Industry among Indians, 1915										
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)		66.55								
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor		71.10					80.50			
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915		66.55								
Total	5,141.64	270.95	$667.33		$11.50		799.97	75.91	56.00	313.52
WALKER RIVER DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	3,273.18	19.00	12.00		7.66		169.62	462.58	20.00	204.17
Ind an school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	3,273.18	19.00	12.00		7.66		169.62	462.58	20.00	204.17
WARM SPRINGS AGENCY.										
Support of Indians of Warm Springs Agency, Oreg., 1915.	2,119.30	149.75			23.57		396.68		562.69	151.70
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,184.02							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,560.00						182.07	45.51	42.53	
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	720.00							4.37	104.60	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	4,016.17								193.37	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, P	2,626.00								113.41	
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	1,296.00									
Industry among Indians, 1915–16										
Industry among Indians, 1915	1,516.00		1,965.80						247.75	
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	1,800.00	37.55								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							4.60			
Relieving distress, and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.							4.30			
General expenses, Indian service, 1915	184.00	106.40			3.49				97.61	
Total	16,005.17	293.70	3,149.82		27.06		588.25	49.88	1,361.96	151.70
WARM SPRINGS BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools support, 1915	10,406.78	53.30					3,643.56	1,172.53	1,986.28	1,593.06
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	5.03						20.40		96.02	
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.	90.00	14.45								
Indian school, transportation, 1915		43.65								
Total	10,501.78	111.40					3,663.96	1,172.53	2,082.30	1,593.06
WARM SPRINGS DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools support, 1915	1,020.00						59.94	84.07		52.37
WESTERN NAVAJO AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.	7,220.35	139.19	985.25				80.52	.21	420.25	126.43
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,996.05							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,972.00						123.50	236.63		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	2,688.75								234.50	
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	25.00								27.30	
Bridge, Western Navajo Reservation, Ariz. (reimbursable).	180.00	37.23				$32.70				
Total	12,264.10	176.42	2,981.30			32.70	204.02	236.84	682.05	126.43
WESTERN NAVAJO BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	11,366.73	76.55	3,909.08				3,155.90	2,058.13	246.62	1,365.98
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915			23.73							
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							16.38	5.75		
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		56.58								
Fulfilling treaties with Navajoes, schools, Arizona, 1915.			227.92			96.47				
Total	11,366.73	133.13	4,160.73			96.47	3,172.28	2,063.88	246.62	1,365.98
MARSH PASS BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	2,739.02	29.45	708.31				647.25	33.76	371.23	375.00
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							35.51			
Fulfilling treaties with Navajoes, schools, Arizona, 1915.		33.65	37.75							
Total	2,739.02	63.10	746.06				682.76	33.76	371.23	375.00
WESTERN NAVAJO DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	1,128.00						138.32	321.78		3.77
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	1,128.00						138.32	321.78		3.77

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									WALKER RIVER AGENCY—continued.
			$50.40					$1,085.10	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								84.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
								1,666.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			78.04				$107.07	1,132.40	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
		$2.30						11.07	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
			2,085.00					2,085.00	Industry among Indians, 1915.
			3,161.74				[1] $892.08	4,120.37	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
			776.75	$203.75				1,132.10	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								66.55	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
$1.09		387.58	6,469.95	203.75	$38.04	107.07	902.58	15,446.88	Total.
									WALKER RIVER DAY SCHOOL.
$3.83	$130.60	6.78	479.01				16.70	4,885.13	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				2,258.42	930.83			3,189.25	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
$3.83	130.60	6.78	479.01	2,258.42	930.83		16.70	8,074.38	Total.
									WARM SPRINGS AGENCY.
		193.16	402.81					3,999.36	Support of Indians of Warm Springs Agency, Oreg., 1915.
								1,184.02	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					71.63			71.63	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								1,830.11	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
		16.56	4.40					849.93	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			177.24					4,386.78	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
			12.53					2,751.94	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, P.
			17.35				170.39	1,483.74	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			1,177.80					1,177.80	Industry among Indians, 1915-16.
			44,584.38				[1] 1,725.50	50,039.43	Industry among Indians, 1915.
115.00							26.60	1,979.15	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
			71.75					76.35	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		29.16						34.06	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
			65.57					457.07	General expenses, Indian service, 1915.
115.00		238.88	46,513.83		71.63		1,922.49	70,489.37	Total.
									WARM SPRINGS BOARDING SCHOOL.
	120.35	29.65	778.51				190.73	19,974.75	Indian schools support, 1915.
					2,246.49			2,246.49	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
		3.11	278.27		46.65		2.35	451.80	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		116.13						220.58	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								43.65	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
	120.35	148.89	1,056.78		2,293.14		193.08	22,937.27	Total.
									WARM SPRINGS DAY SCHOOL.
	.11	.50	15.87					1,232.86	Indian school support, 1915.
									WESTERN NAVAJO AGENCY.
		218.13	5,223.28				[1] 352.30	14,765.91	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
								1,996.05	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					225.77			225.77	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			6.11					2,338.24	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
								2,933.25	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
							4.76	57.06	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
				5,741.00				5,990.93	Bridge, Western Navajo Reservation, Ariz. (reimbursable).
		218.13	5,229.39	5,741.00	225.77		357.06	28,475.21	Total.
									WESTERN NAVAJO BOARDING SCHOOL.
	124.75	1.50	1,613.62				[2] 289.56	24,208.42	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					968.28			992.01	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
7.00	4.69		439.68		1.14		31.60	506.24	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
			159.26		.94			160.20	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								56.58	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
				6,090.00	733.06			7,147.45	Fulfilling treaties with Navajoes, schools, Arizona, 1915.
7.00	129.44	1.50	2,212.56	6,090.00	1,703.42		321.16	33,070.90	Total.
									MARSH PASS BOARDING SCHOOL.
	5.15		12.30					4,921.47	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					13.63			13.63	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								35.51	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
				325.74	5.46			402.60	Fulfilling treaties with Navajoes schools, Arizona, 1915.
	5.15		12.30	325.74	19.09			5,373.21	Total.
									WESTERN NAVAJO DAY SCHOOL.
	72.02	.50	303.81					1,968.20	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					49.94			49.94	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	72.02	.50	303.81		49.94			2,018.14	Total.

[1] Seed.

[2] Sheep dip, $225; seed, $127.30.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
WESTERN SHOSHONE AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Nevada, 1915	$2,981.06	$69.61	$1,204.58		$57.38		$1,446.01	$4.00	$344.99	$88.48
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			964.10							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.	24.00									
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)			390.30							
Pay of Indian police, 1915	960.00							104.28		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	84.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	900.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	464.00									
Industry among Indians, 1915–16										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	1,244.55	16.35	1,440.03						23.53	
Total	6,657.61	85.96	3,999.01		57.38		1,446.01	108.28	368.52	88.48
WESTERN SHOSHONE DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	3,599.16	44.65	504.62		54.40		912.49	1,241.31	289.15	1,291.25
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							16.35	3.00	5.12	
Total	3,599.16	44.65	504.62		54.40		928.84	1,244.31	294.27	1,291.25
WHEELOCK BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw	10,202.22	32.39		$315.30	31.83	$30.80	4,134.47	1,226.54	579.85	486.92
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			327.87							
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	254.74					14.25	157.55	19.68		
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Total	10,456.96	32.39	327.87	315.30	31.83	45.05	4,292.02	1,246.22	579.85	486.92
WHITE EARTH AGENCY.										
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915	25,424.84	1,255.54	3,032.65		222.06		6,221.25	280.20	2,488.54	1,674.69
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			3,607.86							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	3,780.00							303.66		
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.		20.42								
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	526.83	8.80							599.25	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	3,066.50	478.91								
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Exp.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor							248.00			
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915						9.80				
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, annual celebration.										
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, extension of water system.										
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, purchase of lands for Mille Lac Indians.										
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, removal of dead bodies.		33.48								
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, expenses, delegates, Washington and Cass Lake.	58.00	1,074.70								
Industry among Indians, 1915–16										
Industry among Indians, 1915										
Education, Chippewas of Minnesota (reimbursable), 1915.										
Total	32,806.17	2,871.85	6,640.51		222.06	9.80	6,469.25	583.86	3,087.79	1,674.69
WHITE EARTH BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915	75.00	1.55					9,411.67	5,134.97	1,207.05	5,056.61
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Support of Chippewas of the Mississippi, Minnesota, 1915.	3,958.33									
Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund	8,627.20	204.34					59.91	60.06		240.49
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	7.00							16.65		7.00
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Indian school, transportation, 1915		26.28								
Total	12,667.53	232.17					9,471.58	5,220.68	1,207.05	5,304.10
WHITE EARTH DAY SCHOOL.										
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915	25.00	18.60					524.75	1,480.50	373.25	1,076.31
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund	10,461.67	231.30					12.00			
Total	10,486.67	249.90					536.75	1,480.50	373.25	1,076.31
WINNEBAGO AGENCY.										
Interest on Winnebago fund, Nebraska	16.00	12.12	56.21				.38		442.38	533.79
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			414.60							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,005.30							59.41		
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	8,146.83	73.48			38.47					170.25
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	780.00							16.17	58.00	
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915 F	1,200.00	119.96								17.25
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									WESTERN SHOSHONE AGENCY.
$131.87		[2]237.08	$1,167.96				$1.00	$7,734.02	Support of Indians in Nevada, 1915.
								964.10	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					$254.38			254.38	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
		254.05						278.05	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
			1,166.60					1,556.90	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
			11.80					1,076.08	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								84.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
								900.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			271.00					735.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			5,302.80					5,302.80	Industry among Indians, 1915–16.
			5,094.14		60.59		[1]732.00	8,611.19	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
131.87		491.13	13,014.30		314.97		733.00	27,496.52	Total.
									WESTERN SHOSHONE DAY SCHOOLS.
	$89.50	43.95	469.39				.50	8,540.37	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				$1,198.20	319.79			1,517.99	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			237.93		41.49			279.42	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
	2.01		57.70				1.00	85.18	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
	91.51	43.95	765.02	1,198.20	361.28		1.50	10,422.96	Total.
									WHEELOCK BOARDING SCHOOL.
31.09	272.80	106.30	1,208.96		2,250.32		25.49	20,935.28	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw.
								327.87	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
	4.26	10.10	70.63		508.09		29.18	1,068.48	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		3.90						3.90	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
31.09	277.06	120.30	1,279.59		2,758.41		54.67	23,335.53	Total.
									WHITE EARTH AGENCY.
74.95		1,423.18	955.74		44.48		475.62	43,573.74	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915.
								3,607.86	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				1,558.00	1,772.48			3,330.48	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								4,033.66	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								20.42	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
			350.00					1,484.88	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								3,545.41	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
							[2]5.20	5.20	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, Exp.
103.77		501.27	800.00				22.00	1,675.04	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
		68.78					[3]59.25	128.03	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								9.80	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
							1,000.00	1,000.00	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, annual celebration.
					526.39			526.39	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, extension of water system.
							[4]16,691.70	16,691.70	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, purchase of lands for Mille Lac Indians.
								33.48	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, removal of dead bodies.
								1,132.70	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, expenses, delegates, Washington and Cass Lake.
			186.30					186.30	Industry among Indians, 1915–16.
			318.69				[2]248.35	567.04	Industry among Indians, 1915.
							[5]1,000.00	1,000.00	Education, Chippewas of Minnesota (reimbursable), 1915.
178.72		1,993.23	2,610.73	1,558.00	2,343.35		19,502.12	82,552.13	Total.
									WHITE EARTH BOARDING SCHOOL.
	128.04	25.14	3,581.97		405.98			25,027.98	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915.
				716.39	1,025.21			1,741.60	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								3,958.33	Support of Chippewas of the Mississippi, Minnesota, 1915.
	20.33		987.72		77.06		49.85	10,335.96	Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund.
			398.90		4.98		4.77	349.30	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		1.80						1.80	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								26.28	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
	148.37	26.94	4,878.59	716.39	1,513.23		54.62	41,441.25	Total.
									WHITE EARTH DAY SCHOOL.
.52	286.37	270.23	416.16		152.11			4,623.80	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915.
					61.86			61.86	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			19.34				27.85	10,732.16	Interest on Chippewa in Minnesota fund.
.52	286.37	270.23	435.50		213.97		27.85	15,437.82	Total.
									WINNEBAGO AGENCY.
		226.09	213.15		.78			1,509.90	Interest on Winnebago fund, Nebraska.
								414.69	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
				7,783.56	506.34			8,289.90	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								1,064.71	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
35.09		112.12	72.84				307.70	8,956.69	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
			.15					854.32	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			161.00					1,498.21	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
		9.36						9.36	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.

[1] Seed, $604. [2] Seed. [3] Hospital expenses. [4] Land, $16,685.45. [5] Tuition, etc.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
WINNEBAGO AGENCY—continued.										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						$26.45				
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	$115.00		$32.36		$13.89				$38.00	
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor		$310.19					$20.50			
Total	11,263.13	515.75	503.17		52.36	26.45	20.88	$75.58	538.38	$721.29
WINNEBAGO DAY SCHOOLS.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	3,594.00	459.10	2.26				168.11			
Interest on Winnebago fund, Nebraska										51.00
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4							17.55			
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Total	3,594.00	459.10	2.26				185.66			51.00
WITTENBERG AGENCY.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			773.53							
WITTENBERG BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	10,739.87		1.69	$805.46	30.00		3,533.09	1,861.59	856.63	661.29
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	165.33		.55		10.79		18.79		6.20	
Indian school, transportation, 1915		160.00								
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor							17.76			
Total	10,905.20	160.00	2.24	805.46	40.79		3,569.64	1,861.59	862.83	661.29
YAKIMA AGENCY.										
Support of Indians of Yakima Agency, Wash., 1915.	455.75				121.54		186.65	.52	742.42	222.89
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			864.70							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	1,370.00						300.00	113.56		
Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915	168.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	686.00				13.50			3.06		22.74
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	1,900.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For	7,187.33	121.22					187.64		78.72	
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	40.00					8.40				
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	13,402.58	701.80	354.44		6.05		329.03		482.51	1,028.75
Determining heirs of deceased, Indian allottees, 1915.	1,852.50	112.60								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						4.75				
Indian schools, support, 1915 (tuition)										
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915										
Total	27,062.16	935.62	1,219.14		141.09	13.15	1,003.32	117.14	1,303.65	1,274.38
YAKIMA BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	12,059.44		612.54				5,236.11	2,119.27	269.23	2,003.84
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4	22.82					15.50		2.50		
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	60.00	3.35								
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Total	12,142.26	3.35	612.54			15.50	5,236.11	2,121.77	269.23	2,003.84
YANKTON AGENCY.										
Support of Sioux, Yankton Tribe, South Dakota, 1915.	7,701.77	129.80	412.82		135.72		635.82	13.75	755.09	630.31
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,898.79							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	718.00							84.40		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, P	1,800.00	88.87								49.98
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	328.33									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	286.00	59.13								34.75
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.	1,466.00	58.26								
Miscellaneous receipts, class 5						45.00				
Total	12,280.10	336.06	2,311.61		135.72	45.00	635.82	98.15	755.09	715.04
YANKTON BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	9,769.23	44.15	1,399.39		4.25		2,868.75	2,281.51	694.75	1,743.94
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4			8.38				35.40		85.40	98.50
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.										
Total	9,769.23	44.15	1,407.77		4.25		2,904.15	2,281.51	780.15	1,842.44
ZUNI AGENCY.										
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.	3,905.32	130.67	769.94				23.80	1.37	1,059.73	75.19
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			1,544.66							
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Pay of Indian police, 1915	480.00							24.30		
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M	560.00						16.56	3.29		

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									WINNEBAGO AGENCY—continued.
								$26.45	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
$7.02		$21.21	$186.55		$112.95		$59.61	586.59	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		12.96	371.15		40.84			755.64	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
42.02		381.74	1,004.84	$7,783.56	660.91		367.31	23,957.37	Total.
									WINNEBAGO DAY SCHOOLS.
50.85	$14.63		36.71					4,325.66	Indian schools, support, 1915.
								51.00	Interest on Winnebago fund, Nebraska.
					1,164.86	$54.00		1,218.86	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			12.50					12.50	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								17.55	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		53.85						53.85	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
50.85	14.63	53.85	49.21		1,164.86	54.00		5,679.42	Total.
									WITTENBERG AGENCY.
								773.53	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
									WITTENBERG BOARDING SCHOOL.
	174.64	55.05	1,124.29				178.47	20,022.07	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					625.66	120.00		745.66	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
10.70	11.89		230.77		44.99		21.29	521.21	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								160.00	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
					135.13			152.89	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
10.70	186.53	55.05	1,355.06		805.69	120.00	199.76	21,601.83	Total.
									YAKIMA AGENCY.
190.00		428.38	599.23					2,947.38	Support of Indians or Yakima Agency, Wash. 1915.
								864.70	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					508.47	822.00		1,330.47	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								1,783.56	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
								168.00	Pay of judges, Indian courts, 1915.
						507.50		1,232.80	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			275.00					2,175.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
4.00			1,266.97				1.00	8,846.88	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, For.
17.00			129.76		85.27		9.00	289.43	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
150.00		27.51	2,974.37				[1]30.00	19,487.04	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
7.00							1.59	1,973.60	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
								4.75	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
							[2]3,499.36	3,499.36	Indian schools, support, 1915 (tuition).
							2.70	2.70	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
368.00		455.89	5,245.33		593.74	1,329.50	3,543.56	44,605.67	Total.
									YAKIMA BOARDING SCHOOL.
	388.20	1.50	1,499.01					24,189.14	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					983.24			983.24	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			141.31		2.94		58.56	243.63	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
								63.35	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
		56.25						56.25	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
	388.20	57.75	1,640.32		986.18		58.56	25,535.61	Total.
									YANKTON AGENCY.
141.70		542.44	1,834.48				283.00	13,216.70	Support of Sioux, Yankton Tribe, South Dakota, 1915.
								1,898.79	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					545.42			545.42	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								802.40	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
			283.00					2,221.85	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, P.
			325.00					653.33	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.
			17.45					377.33	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
67.50			6.75					1,598.51	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
								45.00	Miscellaneous receipts, class 5.
209.20		542.44	2,466.68		545.42		283.00	21,359.33	Total.
									YANKTON BOARDING SCHOOL.
	156.08	10.53	1,699.60				[1]145.00	20,817.18	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					3,907.77			3,907.77	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
		26.77	242.96		84.38		10.00	591.79	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
		31.50						31.50	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
	156.08	68.80	1,942.56		3,992.15		155.00	25,348.24	Total.
									ZUNI AGENCY.
140.54		153.91	610.41				[1]270.00	7,140.88	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
								1,544.66	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
					410.37	240.00		650.37	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								504.30	Pay of Indian police, 1915.
			13.11			66.67		659.63	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, M.

[1] Seed. [2] Tuition. [3] Sheep dip.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
ZUNI AGENCY—continued.										
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	$1,585.00									
Industry among Indians (reimbursable)		$7.80	$1,075.76							
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor		8.38								
Total	6,530.32	146.85	3,390.36				$40.36	$28.96	$1,059.73	$75.19
ZUNI BOARDING SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	10,741.92	117.75	3,336.33		$100.00		3,432.68	1,641.59	434.76	587.35
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Miscellaneous receipts, class 4										
Total	10,741.92	117.75	3,336.33		100.00		3,432.68	1,641.59	434.76	587.35
ZUNI DAY SCHOOL.										
Indian schools, support, 1915	2,421.50						31.85	1,180.54		20.30
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Total	2,421.50						31.85	1,180.54		20.30
ALLOTMENT AND SURVEY WORK.[1]										
CHEYENNE RIVER.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.	1,645.00		13.50						271.70	
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.						$19.90				
Appropriations, classification, and allotments, (reimbursable), A.	2,959.00									
Total	4,604.00		13.50			19.90			271.70	
COLORADO RIVER.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.	791.25	87.85	4.27						22.22	
COLVILLE.										
Surveying and allotting Colville Reservation, Wash. (reimbursable), S.	292.11					16.20				
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.						17.10				
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations, (reimbursable), A.	31,296.47	1,101.77	29.70		84.03	134.76			1,710.29	100.23
Total	34,588.58	1,101.77	29.70		84.03	168.06			1,710.29	100.23
CROW CREEK.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.	656.00									
DUCK VALLEY (WESTERN SHOSHONE).										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.						154.30				
FLATHEAD.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.						209.85				
FORT BELKNAP.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	3,130.96	73.77	9.22				712.95		249.85	
FORT BERTHOLD.										
Surveying, etc., Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak. (reimbursable), S.	34.66	9.40	4.09			151.30	20.20			
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.		26.70								
Surveying, etc., Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak. (reimbursable), A.	10.00									
Appropriation, classification, etc., of reserved lands, Fort Berthold Reservation (reimbursable), 1915, A.	1,949.33	86.19								3.05
Total	1,993.99	122.29	4.09			151.30	20.20			3.05
FORT HALL.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.						5.25				
Total						5.25				
FORT YUMA.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.										
GRAND PORTAGE.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.										

[1] "A" refers to allotment work; "S" refers to survey work.

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									ZUNI AGENCY—continued.
								$1,585.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			$5,225.89					6,209.45	Industry among Indians (reimbursable).
								8.38	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
$140.54		$153.91	5,849.41		$410.37	$306.67	$270.00	18,402.67	Total.
									ZUNI BOARDING SCHOOL.
41.72	$188.20	307.00	1,453.28					22,382.58	Indian schools, support, 1915.
				$2,153.82	551.99			2,705.81	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
			11.72				11.15	22.87	Miscellaneous receipts, class 4.
41.72	188.20	307.00	1,465.00	2,153.82	551.99		11.15	25,111.26	Total.
									ZUNI DAY SCHOOL.
	70.86	6.09	157.75					3,888.89	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					1,940.09			1,940.09	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
	70.86	6.09	157.75		1,940.09			5,828.98	Total.
									ALLOTMENT AND SURVEY WORK.[1]
									CHEYENNE RIVER.
			86.07					2,016.27	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.
								19.90	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
			250.00					3,209.00	Appropriation, classification, and allotments, C. R. & S. R. Res. (reimbursable), A.
			336.07					5,245.17	Total.
									COLORADO RIVER.
			62.00				[1]35.00	1,002.59	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.
									COLVILLE.
							1.00	309.31	Surveying and allotting Colville Reservation, Wash. (reimbursable), S.
								17.10	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
330.01			2,069.82		2.50	48.00	164.48	40,072.06	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.
330.01			2,069.82		2.50	48.00	165.48	40,398.47	Total.
									CROW CREEK.
								656.00	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.
									DUCK VALLEY (WESTERN SHOSHONE).
								154.30	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
									FLATHEAD.
								209.85	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
									FORT BELKNAP.
			35.38				3.98	4,216.11	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
									FORT BERTHOLD.
								219.65	Surveying, etc., Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak. (reimbursable), S.
								26.70	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
								10.00	Surveying, etc., Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak. (reimbursable), A.
			647.20					2,685.77	Appropriation, classification, etc., of reserved lands, Fort Berthold Reservation (reimbursable), 1915, A.
			647.20					2,942.12	Total.
									FORT HALL.
							[2]847.93	847.93	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.
								5.25	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
							847.93	853.18	Total.
									FORT YUMA.
							[2]394.45	394.45	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.
									GRAND PORTAGE.
			67.34					67.34	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.

[1] Rent of equipment.

[2] Examination and designation of land.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
ALLOTMENT AND SURVEY WORK—Continued.										
JICARILLA.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	$2,383.10	$144.03	$30.92				$413.20			
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.	105.00									
Total	2,488.10	144.03	30.92				413.20			
LA POINTE.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	1,597.34	181.61	20.90		$1.53		113.80			
LEUPP.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	4.33	12.50	2.00				3.45			
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.	4.33	12.50	2.00							
Total							3.45			
MOAPA RIVER.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	40.00	31.05					4.65			
NAVAJO.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.										
NEAH BAY.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	2,193.23	154.64	10.57				642.97			
PIMA.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	669.49									
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.	3,210.00	59.80							$79.69	$40.00
Total	3,879.49	59.80							79.69	40.00
PINE RIDGE.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.						$27.05				
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.	3,582.00	47.30				33.90				
Appropriation, classification, measurements, Pine Ridge Reservation, S. Dak. (reimbursable), A.	1,569.67									
Total	5,151.67	47.30				60.95				
PUEBLOS.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	16,089.20	352.22	493.50				6,414.53		2,173.44	
ROSEBUD.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.	3,855.50								124.70	19.72
ROUND VALLEY.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	505.01	712.83	2.04			2.90				
SAN CARLOS.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.										
SAN XAVIER.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	3,020.45	124.05	357.79				1,313.96		244.53	
SHOSHONE.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	4,998.33	106.16	74.80			28.65	1,282.54		454.47	
SOBOBA.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	2,271.18	91.65					1,369.34		33.90	
SILETZ.										
Survey, sale, etc., of Siletz Reservation, Oreg. (reimbursable), S.	40.00	10.25			.48					
SOUTHERN UTE.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	3,343.12	85.10	17.47				1,472.08		466.78	

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									ALLOTMENT AND SURVEY WORK—Contd.
									JICARILLA.
			$10.69				$497.25	$3,479.19	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
								105.00	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.
			10.69				497.25	3,581.19	Total.
									LA POINTE.
			15.84				12.75	1,943.77	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
									LEUPP.
								22.28	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
$61.25								61.25	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.
61.25								83.53	
									MOAPA RIVER.
							1.25	76.95	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
									NAVAJO.
			827.50				.50	828.00	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
									NEAH BAY.
			20.26				150.35	3,172.02	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
									PIMA.
								669.49	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
1.04			204.28					3,594.81	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.
1.04			204.28					4,264.30	Total.
									PINE RIDGE.
								27.05	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
17.50							[1]616.00	4,296.70	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.
								1,569.67	Appropriation, classification measurements, Pine Ridge Reservation, S. Dak. (reimbursable), A.
17.50							616.00	5,893.42	Total.
									PUEBLOS.
			5,880.65				317.63	31,721.17	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
									ROSEBUD.
								3,999.92	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.
									ROUND VALLEY.
								1,222.78	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
			176.50					176.50	SAN CARLOS. Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
									SAN XAVIER.
			1,136.36				60.52	6,257.66	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
									SHOSHONI.
			245.00				11.00	7,200.95	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
									SOBOBA.
			855.32				645.42	5,266.81	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
									SILETZ.
								20.73	Survey, sale, etc. of Siletz Reservation, Oreg. (reimbursable), S.
									SOUTHERN UTE.
			142.38				37.05	5,563.98	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.

[1] Hire of teams.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
ALLOTMENT AND SURVEY WORK—Continued.										
SPOKANE.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.						$29.95				
STANDING ROCK.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.						5.20				
Surveying and allotting Standing Rock Reservation, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (reimbursable), S.	$1,491.17	$40.45					$543.86		$152.34	
Total	1,491.17	40.45				5.20	543.86		152.34	
TAHOLAH.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	315.49	20.05				12.35	74.37		1.70	
TURTLE MOUNTAIN.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.	1,015.00	286.76								
UINTAH.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.						60.70				
WARM SPRINGS										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.	4,219.80	66.45							590.72	
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	214.33	20.85					70.37			
Total	4,434.13	87.30					70.37		590.72	
YAKIMA.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.	1,038.00	171.50								
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	180.79					4.45	41.34			
Total	1,218.79	171.50				4.45	41.34			
ZUNI.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	468.00	18.80					165.88		2.00	
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.						33.65				
Total	468.00	18.80				33.65	165.88		2.00	
GOSHUTE.										
Surveying and allotting indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	1,414.31	161.35	$73.08				294.09			
MISCELLANEOUS.										
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.	1,390.94	659.04	2.96			187.20				
Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.	40.00	166.00	146.33		$51.61	67.50	18.30			
Total	1,430.94	825.04	149.29		51.61	254.70	18.30			
IRRIGATION WORK.										
BISHOP.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	4,415.89	391.42	417.44							$119.82
BLACKFEET.										
Irrigation system, Blackfeet Reservation, Mont. (reimbursable).	33,232.50	84.95								
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).		4.35								
Total	33,232.50	89.30								
CAMPO.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	631.75	34.50	184.80							2.90
COLORADO RIVER.										
Irrigation, Colorado River Reservation, Ariz. (reimbursable).	11,646.21	201.71	695.85						293.88	491.02
COLVILLE.										
Proceeds of Colville Reservation, Wash.	3,427.03	461.47	31.89		3.12				57.00	

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									ALLOTMENT AND SURVEY WORK—Continued.
									SPOKANE.
								$29.95	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
									STANDING ROCK.
								5.20	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
			$233.72				$56.00	2,517.54	Surveying and allotting Standing Rock Reservation, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (reimbursable), S.
			233.72				56.00	2,522.74	Total.
									TAHOLAH.
			1.40				[1] 35.50	540.86	Surveying and allotting Indian reservation, (reimbursable), S.
									TURTLE MOUNTAIN
								1,301.76	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.
									UINTAH.
								60.70	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
									WARM SPRINGS.
			145.42				4.00	5,026.39	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.
			3.68				29.37	338.60	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
			149.10				33.37	5,364.99	Total.
									YAKIMA.
$8.37								1,217.87	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.
							[1] 72.00	298.58	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
8.37							72.00	1,516.45	Total.
									ZUNI.
			641.20				20.20	1,316.08	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
								33.65	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.
			641.20				20.20	1,349.73	Total.
									GOSHUTE.
			12.70				291.28	2,246.81	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
									MISCELLANEOUS.
								2,240.14	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), A.
30.66			1,763.77				11.50	2,295.67	Surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable), S.
30.66			1,763.77				11.50	4,535.81	Total.
									IRRIGATION WORK.
									BISHOP.
			883.98				[1] 21.75	6,230.30	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									BLACKFEET.
			24,710.79				[1] 65.95	58,094.19	Irrigation system, Blackfeet Reservation, Mont. (reimbursable).
								4.35	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable.)
			24,710.79				65.95	58,098.54	Total.
									CAMPO.
			450.04				[1] 70.00	1,373.99	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable.)
									COLORADO RIVER.
			1,165.61				[1] 58.50	14,552.78	Irrigation, Colorado River Reservation, Ariz. (reimbursable).
									COLVILLE.
14.43			24.65				150.20	4,169.79	Proceeds of Colville Reservation, Wash.

[1] Team hire. [2] Court fees. [3] United States Geological Survey, measuring flow of streams. [4] Hire of transit.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
IRRIGATION WORK—Continued.										
CROW.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	$21,479.51	$32.90	$415.87	.....	.....	$4.50	.....	.....	$1,114.40	$340.12
Proceeds of Crow ceded lands (miscellaneous)	11,989.42	23.25	1.07	.....	.....	6.50	.....	.....	72.48	165.48
Total	33,468.93	56.15	416.94	.....	.....	11.00	.....	.....	1,186.97	505.60
DIGGER.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable)	849.09	148.30	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
FALLON.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
FLATHEAD.										
Irrigation system, Flathead Reservation, Mont. (reimbursable)	46,111.77	50.17	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable)	.....	4.35	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	46,111.17	54.52	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
FORT APACHE.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable)	3,557.11	26.85	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	31.00	10.90
FORT BELKNAP.										
Maintenance and operation, Milk River irrigation system, Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont. (reimbursable), 1915.	14,751.06	283.28	415.26	.....	85.72	.....	.....	.....	105.36	314.53
FORT HALL.										
Maintenance and operation, Fort Hall irrigation system, Idaho (reimbursable), 1915.	17,613.67	355.62	11.40	$93.27	23.67	59.60	.....	.....	828.34	487.22
Irrigation maintenance fund, Fort Hall project	7,971.96	2.65	.....	.....	.....	2.25	.....	.....	283.32	188.78
Irrigation and water system, Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho (reimbursable)	2,046.23	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	27,631.86	358.27	11.40	93.27	23.67	61.85	.....	.....	1,111.66	676.00
FORT M'DERMITT.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable)	767.95	.....	63.00	.....	2.42	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
FORT PECK.										
Irrigation system, Fort Peck Reservation, Mont. (reimbursable)	49,984.94	185.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable)	.....	19.85	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	49,984.94	204.85	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
FORT YUMA.										
Irrigating allotments, Yuma Reservation, Cal. (reimbursable), 1915.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
KLAMATH.										
Irrigation system, Klamath Reservation, Oreg. (reimbursable)	22,118.02	282.47	754.98	.....	12.40	6.00	.....	.....	8.00	87.84
Payment to Indians of Klamath Reservation for lands, etc.	2,091.48	26.60	.....	.....	4.15	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	2,277.52	8.05	243.80	.....	2.06	.....	.....	.....	.....	21.75
Maintenance and operation Modoc Point irrigation system, Klamath Reservation, 1915 (reimbursable)	2,047.91	70.55	123.65	.....	3.26	.....	.....	.....	65.36	52.00
Total	28,534.93	387.67	1,122.43	.....	21.87	6.00	.....	.....	73.36	161.59
MALKI.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable)	20,858.68	697.88	154.01	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	265.65
MOAPA RIVER.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable)	413.50	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
NAVAJO.										
Canado irrigation project, Navajo Reservation, Ariz.	13,366.15	57.15	.07	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Water supply, Navajo Indians, Arizona (reimbursable)	18,258.60	122.80	781.52	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	114.45
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable)	1,288.16	252.11	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	32,912.91	432.06	1,110.59	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	114.45
NEVADA.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable)	1,239.50	20.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
PALA.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable)	9,432.02	276.98	1,161.59	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	48.63

[1] Three assessments and interest on "Two Leggins Ditch."
[2] Three assessments and interest on "Two Leggins Ditch" and for water.
[3] Seventh and eighth annual installments, building and operation and maintenance charges.
[4] Earnings on Wilson Bros. and Nelson Rish contracts.

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs, material.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									IRRIGATION WORK—Continued.
									CROW.
$17.41			$3,690.29		$39.04		[1] $3,229.41	$30,363.54	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
18.46		$1.40	2,902.88				[2] 53,443.05	68,623.99	Proceeds of Crow ceded lands (miscellaneous).
35.87		1.40	6,593.17		39.04		56,672.46	98,987.53	Total.
									DIGGER.
			325.23					1,322.62	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									FALLON.
							[3] 14,736.65	14,736.65	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									FLATHEAD.
			63,717.23				[4] 20,852.81	130,731.98	Irrigation system, Flathead Reservation, Mont. (reimbursable).
								4.35	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
			63,717.23				20,852.81	130,736.33	Total.
									FORT APACHE.
			112.65					3,738.51	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									FORT BELKNAP.
11.71			3,422.49		438.27		72.33	19,820.01	Maintenance and operation Milk River irrigation system, Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont. (reimbursable), 1915.
									FORT HALL.
447.10			2,874.62		424.67		21.70	23,240.88	Maintenance and operation Fort Hall irrigation system, Idaho (reimbursable), 1915.
.30		1.50	1,231.23		156.28		33.75	9,872.02	Irrigation maintenance fund, Fort Hall project.
			52.16					2,098.39	Irrigation and water system, Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho (reimbursable).
							[5] 1,573.00	1,573.00	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
447.40		1.50	4,158.01		580.95		1,628.45	36,784.29	Total.
									FORT M'DERMITT.
			3.00				[6] 28.00	864.37	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									FORT PECK.
			20,936.79				[6] 222.57	71,329.30	Irrigation system, Fort Peck Reservation, Mont. (reimbursable).
								19.85	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
			20,936.79				222.57	71,349.15	Total.
									FORT YUMA.
							[7] 33,396.00	33,396.00	Irrigating allotments, Yuma Reservation, Cal. (reimbursable), 1915.
									KLAMATH.
14.67			3,830.88				1,605.82	28,721.08	Irrigation system, Klamath Reservation, Oreg. (reimbursable).
1.00			81.41				[8] 46.49	2,251.13	Payment to Indians of Klamath Reservation for lands, etc.
			407.20				[8] 39.50	2,999.88	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
			163.51				109.99	2,636.23	Maintenance and operation Modoc Point irrigation system, Klamath Reservation, 1915 (reimbursable).
15.67			4,483.00				1,801.80	36,608.32	Total.
									MALKI.
			4,495.28				261.73	26,733.23	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									MOAPA RIVER.
			105.00					518.50	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									NAVAJO.
			853.92					14,606.29	Ganado irrigation project, Navajo Reservation, Ariz.
			4,621.44			$24.00		23,922.81	Water supply, Navajo Indians, Arizona (reimbursable).
			53.65					1,593.92	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
			5,529.01			24.00		40,123.02	Total.
									NEVADA.
								1,259.50	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									PALA.
			7,215.38				418.85	18,553.45	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).

[5] United States Geological Survey, maintenance gauging stations.
[6] United States Geological Survey, measuring streams, etc.
[7] Fourth annual installment building charges.
[8] Hire of stock.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
IRRIGATION WORK—Continued.										
PIMA.										
Maintenance of irrigation system, Pima Indian lands, Arizona (reimbursable), 1915.	$6,859.40	$16.80	$47.03	$273.02					$169.68	$3.60
Irrigation, Pima Indian lands, Arizona (reimbursable), 1915.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	23,320.92	413.10	681.58			$23.80			446.34	65.92
Irrigation, Indian reservations (Gila River survey) (reimbursable).	1,922.99	68.19	36.65							
Total	32,103.31	498.09	765.26	273.02		23.80			556.02	69.52
PINE RIDGE.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	280.37									
PUEBLOS.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	12,889.75	300.49								138.20
ROUND VALLEY.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	3,082.24	62.46								
SALT RIVER.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	1,882.78	15.95								
SAN CARLOS.										
Irrigation, San Carlos Reservation, Ariz.					$0.21					
Investigation, San Carlos irrigation project, Arizona, 1915.	12,342.13	1,813.32	14.32			234.42			28.30	334.67
P. & R. investigation, irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	903.50	14.90								
Investigation, irrigation possibilities, irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	1,568.83	28.85								
Total	14,814.46	1,857.07	14.32		.21	264.42			28.30	334.67
SAN JUAN.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	16,822.96	44.18			30.00					
SAN XAVIER.										
Papago Reservation, irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	4,950.71	457.63	227.80						5.00	42.32
Ah-chin village, irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	7,621.79	634.93	9.82						147.71	157.43
Nomadic Papago, irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	8,158.08	557.82				32.00				254.43
Flood protection, irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	6,362.27	72.02							774.30	4.32
Water supply, nomadic Papago Indians, Arizona, 1915.	2,997.92	175.40								
Water supply, Papago Indian villages, Arizona, 1915.	5,705.11	219.41								82.21
Total	35,795.88	2,117.21	237.62			32.00			927.01	540.71
SHIVWITS.										
Irrigations, Indian reservation (reimbursable).	75.00									
SHOSHONE.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	17,759.91								390.50	12.52
Irrigation system, W. River Dam, reservation, Wyo. (reimbursable).	42,552.96	101.84	1,814.95		110.48				1,553.77	733.80
Total	60,312.87	101.84	1,814.95		110.48				1,944.27	746.38
SOBOBA.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	10,488.58	353.70	206.59							22.20
SOUTHERN UTE.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	24,924.71	110.42				3.50				10.10
TONGUE RIVER.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	1,379.75		9.96							
TULE RIVER.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	320.38	76.93								
UINTAH.										
Irrigation system, Uintah Reservation, Utah (reimbursable).	30,594.41	758.45	194.59	20.73	18.27	3.35			2,192.07	79.90
WALKER RIVER.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).	6,408.01	143.75			14.38	2.25			60.00	136.55
WARM SPRINGS.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).										

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs, material.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									IRRIGATION WORK—Continued.
									PIMA.
			$831.89				[1] $36.34	$8,177.76	Maintenance of irrigation system, Pima Indian lands, Arizona (reimbursable), 1915.
							.62	.62	Irrigation Pima Indian lands, Arizona (reimbursable), 1915.
			2,781.12				[1] 450.51	28,183.29	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
			85.70				[1] 105.50	2,219.03	Irrigation, Indian reservations (Gila River survey) (reimbursable).
			3,698.71				592.97	38,580.70	Total.
									PINE RIDGE.
			112.30				[2] 238.94	631.61	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									PUEBLOS.
			2,425.84			$16.00		15,770.28	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									ROUND VALLEY.
			161.13					3,305.83	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable)
									SALT RIVER.
			149.95				[3] 1,014.65	3,063.33	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									SAN CARLOS.
			12.00					12.21	Irrigation, San Carlos Reservation, Ariz.
$26.70			1,117.41			10.00	4,552.14	20,503.41	Investigation, San Carlos irrigation project, Arizona, 1915.
			117.85					1,036.25	P. & R. investigation, irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
			8.39					1,606.07	Investigation, irrigation possibilities, irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
26.70			1,255.65			10.00	4,552.14	23,157.94	Total.
									SAN JUAN.
			581.54					17,478.68	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									SAN XAVIER.
			4,395.07				[1] 82.48	10,161.01	Papago Reservation, irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
			13,946.04			[1] 78.60	206.74	22,803.06	Ah-chin village, irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
			963.73				12.87	9,978.93	Nomadic Papago, irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
			125.50				[1] 956.58	8,294.99	Flood protection, irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
			1,599.60					4,772.92	Water supply, nomadic Papago Indians, Arizona, 1915.
			12,389.85				[1] 69.50	18,416.68	Water supply, Papago Indian villages, Arizona, 1915.
			33,369.79			78.60	1,328.17	74,426.99	Total.
									SHIVWITS.
								75.00	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									SHOSHONE.
3.98			946.71					19,113.62	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
54.75			5,721.25		$426.93	20.00	3.00	53,093.79	Irrigation system, W. River Dam Reservation, Wyo. (reimbursable).
58.73			6,667.96		426.93	20.00	3.00	72,207.41	Total.
									SOBOBA.
			3,097.88				[1] 243.75	14,412.70	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									SOUTHERN UTE.
10.00			1,787.84			36.00		26,882.87	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									TONGUE RIVER.
			321.90					1,711.61	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									TULE RIVER.
			36.11					433.42	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									UINTAH.
10.65		$16.63	2,292.86		254.02	15.00	7.08	36,458.01	Irrigation system, Uintah Reservation, Utah (reimbursable).
									WALKER RIVER.
113.94			1,561.04				3.60	8,443.52	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									WARM SPRINGS.
							[2] 424.22	424.22	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).

[1] Hire of equipment.
[2] United States Geological Survey maintenance-gauging stations.
[3] Irrigation assessments.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
IRRIGATION WORK—Continued.										
WESTERN NAVAJO.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable)	$4,245.59	$89.01								
WESTERN SHOSHONE.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable)	2,620.97	82.03	$232.70		$38.41	$2.25			$279.92	$82.50
YAKIMA.										
Maintenance and operation, irrigation system, Yakima Reservation, Wash. (reimbursable), 1915	11,910.20	104.00	192.60	$6.00	47.02				271.78	25.40
Irrigation system, Yakima Reservation, Wash. (reimbursable)	742.50	11.45	9.50							
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable)	7,393.91	84.15	20.98						147.03	179.90
Payment for water, Yakima Reservation, Wash., 1915										
Irrigation fund, maintenance	30,311.08	86.05		19.70	121.41	1.10			166.91	216.62
Total	50,357.69	285.65	223.08	25.70	168.43	1.10			585.72	421.92
ZUNI.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable)	13,390.16				36.00					31.63
MISCELLANEOUS.										
Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable)	36,614.34	9,317.21	177.56		303.23	668.76				43.07
ATTORNEYS.										
Counsel for Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, 1915	[1] 1,500.00	12.10								
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw Roy	[2] 5,000.00									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw Roy	[3] 5,000.00									
Interest on Creek general fund	[4] 5,000.00									
Total	16,500.00	12.10								
BUREAU OF CATHOLIC INDIAN MISSIONS.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Osage school, 1915 (Osage pupils)										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw Roy. (Choctaw pupils)										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw Roy. (Chickasaw pupils)										
Support of northern Cheyennes and Arapahoes, Montana, 1915										
Support of Quapaws, education, Oklahoma, 1915 (Quapaw pupils)										
Interest on Menominee log fund (Menominee pupils)										
Education, Sioux Nation, South Dakota (Crow Creek pupils)										
Interest on Sioux fund, Lower Brule, education (Lower Brule pupils)										
Interest on Sioux fund, Pine Ridge, education (Pine Ridge pupils)										
Proceeds of Rosebud Reservation, S. Dak., act of Mar. 2, 1907 (Rosebud pupils)										
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915 (Red Lake Chippewa pupils)										
Total										
COMMISSIONER TO THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES.										
Administration of the affairs of Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, 1915	1,815.00	230.00	.95	18.51	47.97	23.09				
Miscellaneous receipts, class 1	1,320.00					4.50				
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw Roy	93.75	189.98			.56					
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw Roy	31.25	63.33			.19					
Choctaw 3 per cent fund	75.00									
Chickasaw national fund	25.00									
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw un. land	4,930.61	243.85				367.05				
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw un. land	1,643.55	81.28				122.35				
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Creek general fund	4,236.32	233.94			9.87	195.15				
Total	14,170.48	1,042.38	.95	18.51	58.59	712.14				
FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES SCHOOLS—CONTRACT.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw Roy										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw Roy										
Total										

[1] Francis C. Wilson, $438.86; Jacob H. Crist, $1,162.50, for Pueblos of New Mexico.
[2] P. J. Hurley for Choctaws.
[3] Reford Bond for Chickasaws.
[4] R. C. Allen for Creeks.
[5] Northern Cheyenne pupils, Tongue River Reservation, Mont., $2,296.05. Arapahoe pupils, Shoshone Reservation, Wyo., $7,833.36.

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs, material.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									IRRIGATION WORK—Continued.
									WESTERN NAVAJO.
			$41.20					$4,375.80	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									WESTERN SHOSHONE.
$158.13			561.58				$9.65	4,068.14	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									YAKIMA.
42.55			2,260.85		$14.85	$135.00	97.50	15,107.75	Maintenance and operation, irrigation system, Yakima Reservation, Wash. (reimbursable), 1915.
			63.36					826.81	Irrigation system, Yakima Reservation, Wash. (reimbursable).
96.06			367.91			140.00	[1] 1,701.24	10,131.18	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
							[2] 100,000.00	100,000.00	Payment for water, Yakima Reservation, Wash., 1915.
365.26			2,549.92			265.00	77.58	34,180.63	Irrigation fund, maintenance.
503.87			5,242.04		14.85	540.00	101,876.32	160,246.37	Total.
									ZUNI.
			42.28					13,500.07	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									MISCELLANEOUS.
480.84			3,420.66			157.50	[3] 860.61	52,052.78	Irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable).
									ATTORNEYS.
							[4] 89.26	1,601.36	Counsel for Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, 1915.
							[4] 2,864.64	7,864.64	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw Roy.
							[4] 2,722.50	7,722.50	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw Roy.
						745.00	6,510.22	12,255.22	Interest on Creek general fund.
						745.00	12,186.62	29,443.72	Total.
									BUREAU OF CATHOLIC INDIAN MISSIONS.
							[5] 4,202.88	4,202.88	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Osage school, 1915 (Osage pupils).
							[5] 14,657.01	14,657.01	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw Roy. (Choctaw pupils).
							[5] 10,301.19	10,301.19	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw Roy. (Chickasaw pupils).
							[5] 10,126.41	10,126.41	Support of Northern Cheyennes and Arapahoes, Montana, 1915.[5]
							[5] 972.00	972.00	Support of Quapaws, education, Oklahoma, 1915 (Quapaw pupils).
							[5] 16,200.00	16,200.00	Interest on Menominee log fund (Menominee pupils).
							[5] 3,672.00	3,672.00	Education, Sioux Nation, South Dakota, (Crow Creek pupils).
							[5] 480.60	480.60	Interest on Sioux fund, Lower Brule, education (Lower Brule pupils).
							[5] 23,086.73	23,086.73	Interest on Sioux fund, Pine Ridge, education (Pine Ridge pupils).
							[5] 29,160.00	29,160.00	Proceeds of Rosebud Reservation, S. Dak., act of Mar. 2, 1907 (Rosebud pupils).
							[5] 3,741.12	3,741.12	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, 1915 (Red Lake Chippewa pupils).
							116,599.94	116,599.94	Total.
									COMMISSIONER TO THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES.
33.66			15.00				8.20	2,192.38	Administration of the affairs of Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, 1915.
								1,324.50	Miscellaneous receipts, class 1.
						52.50	420.75	757.54	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw Roy.
						17.50	140.25	252.52	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw Roy.
								75.00	Choctaw 3 per cent fund.
								25.00	Chickasaw national fund.
							[6] 241.74	5,783.25	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw un. land.
							[6] 80.59	1,927.77	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw un. land.
						30.00		30.00	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
.74							499.45	5,175.47	Creek general fund.
34.40			15.00			100.00	1,390.98	17,543.43	Total.
									FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES SCHOOLS—CONTRACT.
							[5] 15,089.35	15,089.35	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw Roy.
							[5] 7,303.82	7,303.82	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw Roy.
							22,393.17	22,393.17	Total.

[1] United States Geological Survey, maintenance gauging stations.
[2] Transferred to United States Reclamation Service to pay for water.
[3] United States Geological Survey, maintenance gauging stations, $671.23.
[4] Including expenses.
[5] Care and maintenance of pupils.
[6] Refund.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
IRRIGATION WORK—Continued.										
FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES SCHOOLS—GENERAL EXPENSES.										
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw Roy.	$1,420.00	$577.44								
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw Roy.	600.00									
Interest on Creek general fund	37.50									
Interest on Cherokee orphan fund	233.33									
Interest on Cherokee school fund	816.67	95.72								
Interest on Seminole school fund	450.00									
Interest on Seminole general fund										
Indian schools, Five civilized tribes, 1915	7,128.50	415.13			$140.23	$73.00				
Indian schools, Five Civilized Tribes, surplus court fees.	3,618.00	415.01				3.51				
Total	14,304.00	1,503.30			140.23	76.51				
INSPECTION SERVICE (SPECIAL AGENTS, ETC.)										
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	30,006.00	20,690.12	$25.00	$15.00	95.86					$14.70
Inspectors, Indian Service, 1915	1,633.99	1,032.83								
Total	31,639.99	21,722.95	25.00	15.00	95.86					14.70
SUPERVISION (SCHOOL SUPERVISORS).										
Indian schools, support, 1915	19,569.77	5,754.58			.96					
CONSTRUCTION (SUPERVISORS OF CONSTRUCTION AND ENGINEERING, ETC.)										
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915	9,386.66	3,767.17			.20					
INDUSTRIES (SUPERVISOR OF EMPLOYMENT AND GENERAL AND SUPERVISORY EMPLOYEES OF FARMING AND STOCK RAISING).										
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	3,450.00	392.75								
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	2,300.00	964.48			112.41					
Indian schools, support, 1915	300.00	581.91								
Indian school, transportation, 1915		2,445.32								
Total	6,050.00	4,384.46			112.41					
HEALTH (GENERAL AND SUPERVISORY HEALTH EMPLOYEES).										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.	26,682.76	9,696.43			.66					
Indian schools, support, 1915	2,000.00	557.33								
Total	28,682.76	10,253.76			.66					
LETTING CONTRACTS AND ADVERTISING OF SUPPLIES.										
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.	10.00	430.55	6.54		.41	761.67				
SUPPRESSING LIQUOR TRAFFIC.										
Suppressing liquor traffic among Indians, 1915	51,247.82	46,851.50	3.02		800.52	27.45				
TIMBER (GENERAL AND SUPERVISORY TIMBER EMPLOYEES).										
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, for	10,955.56	2,317.68								
WILLIAM O'NEIL, SUPERINTENDENT OF LOGGING.										
Chippewa in Minnesota fund	17,174.66	5,550.85	2.19		22.82					
LORENZO D. CREEL (SPECIAL AGENT FOR SCATTERED BANDS OF INDIANS IN UTAH).										
Support of Indians in Utah, 1915	3,447.00	1,326.01	784.05				89.31	$74.20	$98.33	
Indian schools, support, 1915	1,875.00		13.01				10.00	103.51	216.67	7.46
Indian school and agency buildings, 1915										
Court costs, etc., suits involving lands allotted to Indians in 1915.	96.00									
Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F	910.00									
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.			283.09							
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	218.00									
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915					4.49					
Total	6,546.00	1,326.01	1,080.15		4.49		99.31	177.71	315.00	7.46
LUCIEN A. SPENCER, SPECIAL COMMISSIONER TO SEMINOLES IN FLORIDA.										
Support of Indians in Florida, 1914–15	2,000.00	977.04			.27					

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									IRRIGATION WORK—Continued.
									FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES SCHOOLS—GENERAL EXPENSES.
					$537.00			$2,534.44	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Choctaw Roy.
							[1]$270.00	870.00	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Chickasaw Roy.
								37.50	Interest on Creek general fund.
								233.33	Interest on Cherokee orphan fund.
								912.39	Interest on Cherokee school fund.
					182.00			632.00	Interest on Seminole school fund.
					58.00			58.00	Interest on Seminole general fund.
$28.02							[2]262,476.57	270,261.45	Indian schools, Five Civilized Tribes, 1915.
73.15	$0.75		$6.00				3.00	4,119.42	Indian schools, Five Civilized Tribes, surplus court fees.
101.17	.75		6.00		777.00		262,749.57	279,658.53	Total.
									INSPECTION SERVICE (SPECIAL AGENTS, ETC.).
114.09			202.05			$546.00	62.50	51,771.32	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
								2,666.82	Inspectors, Indian Service, 1915.
114.09			202.05			546.00	62.50	54,438.14	Total.
									SUPERVISION (SCHOOL SUPERVISORS).
88.60								25,413.31	Indian schools, support, 1915.
									CONSTRUCTION (SUPERVISORS OF CONSTRUCTION AND ENGINEERING, ETC.).
45.00			59.57					13,258.60	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
									INDUSTRIES (SUPERVISOR OF EMPLOYMENT AND GENERAL AND SUPERVISORY EMPLOYEES OF FARMING AND STOCK RAISING).
								3,842.75	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
			2.05			82.50		3,461.44	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
			22.65					904.56	Indian schools, support, 1915.
								2,445.32	Indian school, transportation, 1915.
			24.70			82.50		10,654.07	Total.
									HEALTH (GENERAL AND SUPERVISORY HEALTH EMPLOYEES).
45.00		717.21	418.77				189.88	37,750.71	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								2,557.33	Indian schools, support, 1915.
45.00		717.21	418.77				189.88	40,308.04	Total.
									LETTING CONTRACTS AND ADVERTISING OF SUPPLIES.
								1,209.17	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
									SUPPRESSING LIQUOR TRAFFIC.
473.85			99.78			480.00	144.80	100,128.74	Suppressing liquor traffic among Indians, 1915.
									TIMBER (GENERAL AND SUPERVISORY TIMBER EMPLOYEES).
			771.28					14,044.52	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, for.
									WILLIAM O'NEIL, SUPERINTENDENT OF LOGGING.
123.27						600.00		23,473.79	Chippewa in Minnesota fund.
									LORENZO D. CREEL (SPECIAL AGENT FOR SCATTERED BANDS OF INDIANS IN UTAH).
45.90		37.99	1,064.85				99.91	7,067.55	Support of Indians in Utah, 1915.
	243.20		774.95				[3]53.36	3,297.16	Indian schools, support, 1915.
					25.13			25.13	Indian school and agency buildings, 1915.
								96.00	Court costs, etc., suits involving funds allotted to Indians in 1915.
								910.00	Industrial work and care of timber, 1915, F.
								283.09	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
			169.62					387.62	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.
								4.49	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
45.90	243.20	37.99	2,009.42		25.13		153.27	12,071.04	Total.
									LUCIEN A. SPENCER, SPECIAL COMMISSIONER TO SEMINOLES IN FLORIDA.
							[4]42.00	3,019.31	Support of Indians in Florida, 1914-15.

[1] Tuition.

[2] Aid of common schools, $262,473.19.

[3] Seed.

[4] Hospital expenses.

Detailed statement of expenditures,

	Salaries, wages, etc.	Traveling expenses.	Transportation of supplies.	Heat, light, and power (service).	Communication service.	Printing, binding, advertising, etc.	Subsistence supplies.	Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.	Forage.	Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.
IRRIGATION WORK—Continued.										
C. H. ASBURY, SPECIAL AGENT.										
Support of Indians in Nevada, 1915	$124.50	$39.02	$4.05				$568.95			
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915	297.93	68.65								
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915							92.07			
Indian schools, support, 1915 (tuition)										
Support of Indians in California, 1915							76.11			
Total	422.43	107.67	4.05				737.13			
BOARD OF INDIAN COMMISSIONERS.										
Expenses, Indian commissioners, 1915	4,924.74	2,911.54			$86.39	$1,125.20				
MISCELLANEOUS.										
General expenses, Indian Service, 1915	72.00	2,046.86	7.62		.84	1.44				
Indian schools, support, 1915	1,085.27	1,375.44			.29					
Telegraphing and telephoning, Indian Service, 1915					9,528.34					
Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915		24.86	1,120.64		6.30					
Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915	[1]20,126.47									
Relief of May Stanley, widow of Will H. Stanley, etc.	393.75	43.95								
Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915	7,998.42	73.00	347.51							[2]$101.20
Chippewa in Minnesota fund	1,478.00	75.14								
Judgment, Indian depredation claims										
Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915		60.45					3.78			
Chippewa in Minnesota fund, expenses general council at Bermidji		1,288.08								
Total	31,153.91	4,987.78	1,475.77		9,535.77	1.44	3.78			101.20
Grand total										

[1] Indian Office employees, $19,982.57.

[2] H. F. Robinson, developing water supply.

It is interesting to know the number of Indians under Federal supervision to-day and the number under the Federal supervision in years past. In 1890 there were 230,437 Indians under Federal supervision. To-day, according to the commissioner's report for 1915, there are 309,911. Of the Indians under Federal supervision in 1911—that is, the first time that these statistics were compiled—there were 88,182 holding trust or restricted fee patents. In 1915 there were 68,000. Those holding fee patents for part allotments in 1911 were 1,926. In 1915 there were 2,600. Those holding patents for their entire allotments, fee patents, in 1911 were 76,000. In 1915 there were 110,686.

It is a well-recognized fact that as the number of Indians own and holding full title to their lands increases it is an indication of their higher civilization, and I trust that this Congress will always favor legislation that will soon bring about the granting of patents in fee simple to all Indians who are competent and self-supporting.

This is a statement which shows more fully the Indians under supervision of the United States since 1890 and the manner in which their lands are held by them.

Indians under Federal supervision—Unallotted and holding trust and fee patents, June 30, 1915.

	Total Indians under Federal supervision.	Allotted.				Unallotted.
		Total allotted.	Holding trust or restricted fee patents.	Holding fee patents for—		
				Part of allotment.	Entire allotment.	
Total, 1915	309,911	182,289	68,980	2,623	110,686	126,379
1914	307,891	180,605	69,944	1,643	109,018	124,797
1913	307,433	183,742	72,411	1,420	109,911	121,233
1912	300,930	177,626	103,417	1,926	70,904	120,876
1911	296,320	164,215	88,182		76,033	120,780
1901	247,522	64,853				
1890	230,437	15,166				

It is gratifying to those interested in Indian problems of our Government to find that the number of Indians holding full title to their own lands is slowly but surely and constantly increasing. The statement was made before the Committee on Indian Affairs a few days ago by one of the members of the Chippewa Tribe, a very highly educated and most able young attorney, that he believed over 90 per cent of the 8,000 Chippewa Indians in northern Minnesota were competent and self-supporting. All these Indians to-day are under the supervision of the Government. The Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs said that, in his opinion, 60 per cent of those Indians were competent and in every way self-supporting. Now, I present these facts to you, gentlemen of the House, for the reason that I believe the 60 per cent, or the 90 per cent, as the case may be, of these Indians who are competent and self-supporting, who have been in that condition for a number of years, should be released from the supervision of the Indian Service, and that the work of the Indian Bureau, instead of increasing, should at some time soon begin to decrease. In my opinion it will be a golden day in the history of the American Indian when he can do away with the services of the Indian Bureau.

It would surprise some gentlemen of the House, I believe, to know where the Indians of the United States are variously located, where they are civilized, where semicivilized, where most full bloods are to be found, and where the most mixed bloods reside. If I should go anywhere here in the East and tell the people that I was from North Dakota, they would at once think of Indians in North Dakota. Why, gentlemen, to-day there are nearly, within just a few hundreds, as many Indians in New York State as in the State of North Dakota. In New York State there are more full-blood Indians to-day than in North Dakota, and North Dakota, as you know, is considerably larger in area than New York and of comparatively recent settlement and development by white men.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the subject which the gentleman is discussing is a most interesting one, and I suggest that we ought to have a quorum present to listen to it. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Indian Service, 1915—Continued.

Stationery and office supplies.	Educational supplies.	Medical supplies.	Equipment, material, etc.	Construction.	Repairs.	Rent.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	
									IRRIGATION WORK—Continued.
									C. H. ASBURY, SPECIAL AGENT.
		$26.20	$27.10			$60.00	$108.42	$958.24	Support of Indians in Nevada, 1915.
								366.58	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
$53.50								53.50	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
								92.07	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
							[1]910.65	910.65	Indian schools, support, 1915 (tuition).
								76.11	Support of Indians in California, 1915.
53.50		26.20	27.10			60.00	1,019.07	2,457.15	Total.
									BOARD OF INDIAN COMMISSIONERS.
135.76							21.16	9,294.79	Expenses, Indian commissioners, 1915.
									MISCELLANEOUS.
			123.43				254.20	2,506.39	General expenses, Indian Service, 1915.
17,000.00							113.30	19,574.30	Indian schools, support, 1915.
								9,528.34	Telegraphing and telephoning, Indian Service, 1915.
509.64			57.85				25.30	1,735.59	Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915.
								20,126.47	Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1915.
							3,062.30	3,500.00	Relief of May Stanley, widow of Will F. Stanley, etc.
			4,068.24			55.70		[2]12,644.07	Support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 1915.
							[3]1,376.00	2,920.14	Chippewa in Minnesota fund.
							[4]42,565.00	42,565.00	Judgment, Indian depredation claims.
82.50	$60.00							206.73	Relieving distress and prevention of disease among Indians, 1915.
								1,288.08	Chippewa in Minnesota fund, expenses general council at Bermidji.
17,583.14	60.00		4,249.52			55.70	47,396.10	116,604.11	Total.
								13,644,389.01	Grand total.

[1] Tuition.
[2] Moqui and Navajo Reservations, $4,568.24; Pueblo Reservation, $8,075.83.
[3] Refund hospital expenses.
[4] Judgment, depredation claims.

Pending the count.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think a quorum has now come in, and I withdraw the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.

Mr. NORTON. Another indication of the increasing civilization and development of the Indians is shown in the statistics that present the records of marriages among them, the number of missionaries who work with them, the number of churches that have been established and are doing work among them, and the number of Indians who have acquired citizenship. In 1890 there were 118,196 Indians wearing citizens' clothing. In 1915 there were 182,496.

In 1915 there were 24,134 Indians who were voters and there were 74,092 who were citizens of the United States. The memorandum which I have gives these facts more fully so that comparisons can be made. I shall place the memorandum in the RECORD.

Marriages, missionaries, churches, English language, dress, citizenship, crimes, misdemeanors, etc., June 30, 1915.

	Marriages.				Plural marriages existing June 30, 1915.	Crimes.		Misdemeanors.		Arrests for drunkenness.		Missionaries working among Indians		Churches among Indians.	Professing Indians.		Indians who—				
	Between Indians and whites.	Between Indians.	By tribal custom.	By legal procedure.		By Indians.	By whites.	By Indians.	By whites.	Indians.	Whites.	Protestant.	Catholic.		Protestant.	Catholic.	Speak English language.	Read and write English language.	Wear citizens' clothing.	Are citizens of the United States.	Are voters.
Total, 1915	111	1,633	474	1,210	219	312	120	942	165	1,489	135	432	291	625	37,430	51,638	113,928	74,973	[1]182,496	74,092	24,134
1914	168	1,892	496	1,516	154	305	229	881	512	1,815	261	431	282	583	36,377	48,925	104,594	66,203	[1]172,160	80,241	22,118
1913	200	1,800	516	1,484	201	292	244	822	348	1,960	153	425	277	554	34,136	45,251	100,208	62,865	[1]161,585	74,295	.....
1912	172	2,151	779	1,544	588	266	207	1,264	327	2,057	165	386	258	513	29,897	39,632	90,431	54,843	[1]149,521	78,543	.....
1911	.....	.....	606	1,177	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	283	189	458	.....	.....	.....	.....	[1]135,410	.....	.....
1900	.....	.....	459	891	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	177	118	348	.....	.....	.....	.....	[1]131,714	.....	.....
1890	.....	.....	397	770	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	144	130	203	.....	.....	.....	.....	[1]118,196	.....	.....

[1] Exclusive of Five Civilized Tribes.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. EMERSON. What does the gentleman mean by "citizens"? I do not understand. Are they not all citizens?

Mr. NORTON. Those to whom have been given the full rights of citizenship in the States in which they reside.

Mr. EMERSON. Under what conditions?

Mr. NORTON. On condition that the Indian has severed his tribal relations, and, in some instances, on the further condition that all restrictions as to his property has been released by the Federal Government.

Mr. EMERSON. Is that all that is necessary in order to give them the status of citizenship—to be released from their tribal relations?

Mr. NORTON. That depends upon the laws of the different States. In most of the Western States that is all that is necessary—that the Government recognize the fact that they have no tribal relations and that they are self-supporting.

Mr. EMERSON. The point is, does that take the decree of any court, or how is that brought about?

Mr. NORTON. No; that does not take a decree of court. Full citizenship is granted to the Indian, as a matter of fact, when he complies with certain conditions provided by the law. They may exercise all the rights of citizenship, and, of course, some do exercise the rights of full citizenship who, if the question were tested, are not under the laws entitled to enjoy the full rights of citizenship.

A very interesting and important problem in the administration of Indian affairs is the use of the agricultural land belonging to the Indians. There has been a great deal of criticism of that, and I believe it is well that the Members of the House should know how the amount of agricultural land held by the Indians is, in increasing proportion, being placed under actual farming conditions.

The report of the Indian Commissioner for 1890 shows that in that year there were engaged in farming 5,554 Indians. In 1915 that number had increased to 31,956, a most encouraging increase.

The area of allotted lands of the Indians in 1915 was 6,623,170 acres. The area of unallotted lands was 969,441 acres. The income from leases for the allotted and unallotted lands in 1915 was $2,122,431. I might say, in commenting upon this, that the amount of land owned by the Indians and under cultivation is rapidly growing larger each year. This is the most significant and most promising indication of the larger development and higher civilization that is being attained by our red brethren. The statement which I have here presents the conditions pertaining to the lands cultivated by Indians since 1911 and for other years.

Use of agricultural lands belonging to Indians, fiscal year ended June 30, 1915.

	Area of lands.		Cultivated by Indians.		Able-bodied male adults.	Number of Indians farming.	Leased.							
							Allotted.				Unallotted.			Total income.
	Allotted.	Unallotted.	Allotted.	Unallotted.			Number of leases.	Number of allotments.	Area.	Income.	Number of leases.	Area.	Income.	
	Acres.	*Acres.*	*Acres.*	*Acres.*					*Acres.*			*Acres.*		
Total, 1915	6,623,170	969,441	532,095	132,444	42,239	31,956	16,500	15,207	2,415,794	$2,117,166	51	2,370	$5,265	$2,122,431
1914	5,820,701	2,221,135	468,722	125,546	42,353	29,811	(1)	16,757	1,570,267	(2)	68	4,151	(2)	2,164,319
1913	6,775,542	2,873,108	478,052	117,279	39,951	29,216	(1)	[3] 28,847	[3] 3,109,209	(2)	578	[3] 70,201	(2)	[3] 3,520,251
1912	6,661,032	2,042,963	431,500	127,003	39,901	28,051	(1)	[3] 27,605	[3] 2,792,799	(2)	46	4,951	(2)	[3] 3,073,898
1911	6,311,561	2,533,328	265,080	117,945	28,544	24,483	(1)	[3] 19,753	[3] 2,528,495	(2)	1,706	[3] 183,528	(2)	[3] 2,075,271
1900						10,835	(1)	2,592		(2)	52	8,421	(2)	7,033
1890						5,554	(1)							

[1] Not reported. [2] Included in "Total income." [3] Includes grazing leases also.

Use of grazing lands belonging to Indians, fiscal year ended June 30, 1915.

	Area of lands.		Grazed by Indian stock.		Indians engaged in stock raising.	Leased.							
						Allotted.				Unallotted.			Total income.
	Allotted.	Unallotted.	Allotted.	Unallotted.		Number of leases.	Number of allotments.	Area.	Income.	Number of leases.	Area.	Income.	
	Acres.	*Acres.*	*Acres.*	*Acres.*				*Acres.*			*Acres.*		
Total, 1915	13,088,784	30,935,867	8,702,245	21,894,898	44,704	9,387	10,426	1,868,779	$925,554	329	8,122,918	$420,895	$1,346,449
1914	13,499,098	29,991,010	8,176,753	21,350,359	53,503	(1)	[2] 18,356	2,384,446	(3)	1,759	10,162,842	(3)	1,771,421
1913	12,500,000	30,500,000	8,544,127	20,611,984	54,220	(1)	[2] 28,847	[2] 3,109,209	(3)	3,911	10,568,948	(3)	[2] 4,100,078
1912	9,506,449	31,029,096	8,735,552	21,314,688	51,380	(1)	[2] 27,605	[2] 2,792,799	(3)	3,225	8,369,351	(3)	[2] 3,535,948
1911	6,295,485	25,169,192	4,696,446	18,729,124	44,985	(1)	[2] 19,753	[2] 2,528,495	(3)	3,584	5,859,325	(3)	[2] 2,161,125
1900	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	2,592	(1)	(3)	101	2,373,815	(3)	94,243

[1] Not reported. [2] Includes farming leases also. [3] Included in "Total income."

This statement shows how the grazing lands of the Indians are being used. Among other things, it shows that while a large amount of both the unallotted and allotted lands of the Indians is leased there are this year some 44,704 Indians engaged in stock raising. From the leasing of their grazing lands the Indians receive a total income of $1,346,449.

The policy of the Indian Bureau is to encourage in every way the use by the Indians themselves of more and more of their lands each year for both agriculture and grazing. In the past not so much emphasis was placed upon this by those having the Indians under supervision and control. It is now held by those who have made closest study of the Indian question that if the leasing of the lands of the Indians for agricultural and grazing purposes proves profitable to white citizens the use of this same land by the Indians themselves will return to them a greater and more permanent income than that received from leases to white citizens.

I shall insert in the RECORD summarized statements showing the industrial pursuits, employment, and income of the Indians of the United States during the past fiscal year and for other years.

Comparative statement of industrial pursuits by Indians for last five years, 1911 to 1915.

It should be borne in mind that the system of gathering industrial statistics began in 1911. The figures of 1911 are largely estimates, and in some cases have been subjected to office changes to harmonize with later and better data.]

	Population.	Use of agricultural lands.												Indians engaged in stock raising.	
		Area, 1915.	Number of Indians farming.					Acreage farmed.					Value of crops raised.		
			1915	1914	1913	1912	1911	1915	1914	1913	1912	1911	1915	1911	1915	1911
Total [1]	196,306	7,489,118	30,277	28,702	28,962	27,311	24,065	643,843	616,348	607,576	557,344	490,951	$4,776,481	$2,638,179	44,473	49,860

[1] Does not include Florida, Pipestone, Salt Lake, and Carter.

Employment of Indians during fiscal year ended June 30, 1915.

	Total employed.		Indians employed by United States Indian Service.				Employed by private parties.			
			Regular employees.		Irregular employees.		Adults.		Minors or outing pupils.	
	Number.	Earnings.	Number.	Earnings.	Number.	Earnings.	Number.	Earnings.	Number.	Earnings.
Total 1915	25,681	$2,304,339	2,533	$940,013	13,968	$414,422	6,899	$828,218	2,281	$121,686
1914	23,440	2,127,403	2,319	810,950	13,218	505,492	5,553	689,517	2,350	121,444
1913	22,793	2,065,124	2,271	762,264	12,290	414,706	5,585	778,117	2,647	110,037
1912	22,424	1,940,414	2,516	732,526	12,420	432,470	5,113	673,289	2,375	102,129
1911	11,781	1,861,630	1,995	687,039	6,582	582,919	3,204	591,672	(1)	(1)
1910	2,901	953,573	2,094	749,148	(2)	(2)	(2)	177,169	807	27,256

[1] Included with adults by private parties.

[2] No data available.

Incomes of Indians, by reservations, fiscal year ended June 30, 1915.

	Population.	Total.	Crops raised by Indians.	Stock sold.	Weaving, basketry, etc.	Value of timber cut.	Wages earned.	Rations and miscellaneous issues.	From leases.	Proceeds sales of land.	Interest on trust fund.	Treaty and agreement obligations.	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor and miscellaneous.
Total 1915	309,911	$23,193,046	$4,790,968	$2,114,623	[1] $1,177,600	$1,446,021	$2,304,339	$499,585	[2] $2,975,526	$3,571,855	$2,125,787	$630,560	$1,556,182
1914	307,447	24,709,074	4,007,335	1,599,633	1,194,185	1,925,056	2,127,403	576,202	3,486,634	4,312,812	1,777,543	630,560	3,071,711
1913	303,240	26,283,494	4,021,392	1,783,950	1,316,298	1,605,011	2,065,124	437,458	4,386,151	6,116,369	1,830,584	780,560	1,940,597
1912	300,980	22,484,093	3,250,288	1,571,795	1,211,433	2,000,337	1,940,414	462,128	3,542,971	4,475,489	1,740,296	594,560	1,694,082
1911	296,320	21,092,923	1,951,782	900,000	847,556	1,398,166	1,861,630	590,655	2,382,027	6,010,642	1,911,609	1,177,561	2,051,015
1900	247,522	9,091,986	1,408,865	(3)	177,169	324,225	953,573	1,231,000	109,946	(3)	1,387,349	2,702,649	797,210
1890	230,437	3,307,235	1,507,072	(3)	131,374	193,460	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	1,475,329	(3)	(3)

[1] Includes 27,927 Indians engaged in various industries as follows:

Basket making by 4,062 Indians	$52,063
Beadwork by 3,429 Indians	39,664
Blanket weaving by 3,653 Indians	501,070
Fishing by 3,498 Indians	168,289
Lace making by 253 Indians	5,033

[2] Does not include $463,354, which is duplicated in farming and grazing tables.

[3] Unknown.

The number of self-supporting Indians is gradually increasing and the ration Indians are each year becoming fewer. On a number of reservations now where but a few years ago most of the Indians were ration Indians—that is, Indians living for the most part from rations received from the Government—it has become among the Indians themselves quite unpopular, in fact it has become discreditable for any able-bodied Indian to accept rations from the Government. This shows a splendid spirit of self-respect and a genuine progress to the very highest civilization. The statement which I shall place in the RECORD will show some of the changes that are taking place along these lines among the Indians of the country.

States and reservations.	Able-bodied adult Indians entirely self-supporting.	Indians receiving rations.							Indians receiving miscellaneous supplies.						
		Total.		In return for labor.		Without labor equivalent.			Total.		In return for labor.		Without labor equivalent.		
		Receiving rations.	Value of rations.	Number.	Value of rations.	Able-bodied.	Disabled.	Value of rations.	Receiving supplies.	Value of supplies.	Number.	Value of supplies.	Able-bodied.	Disabled.	Value of supplies.
Total, 1915	51,761	18,231	$297,668	1,325	$30,196	6,650	10,256	$267,472	8,512	$201,917	4,625	$64,024	2,677	1,219	$137,893
1914	52,110	14,987	471,394	805	9,475	4,371	9,811	461,919	9,045	104,808	5,331	72,190	1,634	2,080	32,618
1913	51,516	17,166	344,024	1,138	13,172	5,338	10,690	330,852	7,963	93,434	4,468	61,048	2,045	1,450	32,386
1912		16,679	400,732	1,415	37,262	5,175	10,089	363,470	5,475	61,695	3,501	45,743	635	1,339	15,951
1911		15,987	395,165						5,759	195,488					
1900		57,570	1,231,000												
1840			11,800												
1830			11,528												

The true policy of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as I understand it to-day, is to encourage the Indian to make his own livelihood. The bureau believes from past experience that it is better to spend a dollar in inducing the Indian to earn a dollar than to give him the dollar outright. They are meeting with success in this, as shown by the report which I shall place in the RECORD, giving the value of the products raised by the Indians on their farms and in their workshops during the past year. There are at the present time 84,929 Indian children of school age, according to the last report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Those eligible for attendance in school number 78,333. There are in Government schools of this number 27,960 and in public schools 26,438, or, altogether, in Government schools in mission, private, and public schools, 59,447. There are 15,359 Indian children of school age who are not in school, according to this report. Of that number there are many who are attending the public schools of which no report has been made to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. This is the report made by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of school population, schools, school attendance, and so forth, for the last fiscal year:

School population, number eligible for school attendance, number in schools, etc., and capacity of schools provided for Indian children during fiscal year ended June 30, 1915.

	Number of school age.	Ineligible for attendance.	Eligible for attendance.	In school.							Eligible children not in school.	Capacity of schools.					Total capacity, all schools.
				Government.				Mission and private.		Public.	Total in school.		Government.		Mission and private.		Public.	
				Non-reservation boarding.	Reservation boarding.	Day.	Total.	Boarding.	Day.				Reservation boarding.	Day.	Boarding.	Day.		
Grand total	84,929	6,596	78,333	10,791	9,899	7,270	27,960	4,557	492	26,438	59,447	[1] 15,359	18,596	8,239	5,572	615	26,438	59,460

[1] Includes those in public schools but not reported.

From this it would seem fair to estimate that there are upward of 10,000 Indian children of school age who should be in school and for whom no adequate school facilities are provided. It is, I believe, the aim of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and I know that it is the earnest desire of the members of the Committee on Indian Affairs, that at any early date ample school accommodations be provided, so that every Indian child of school age may be placed in school. Through the environment of the school more than through any other influence lies the hope that the red man will fit and adapt himself to successfully compete for existence in our modern life and modern civilization.

The appropriations made for school facilities for the Indians is one that shows a generous and steady increase. In 1877 the amount appropriated for this purpose was $20,000; in 1878, $30,000; in 1915 the amount appropriated was $4,238,627. It would be interesting to me, and I venture to say it would also be interesting to gentlemen of the House, to have the figures showing how much was expended by the United States for the period of 10 or 15 years succeeding 1877 on our Army for the protection of white settlers against the Indians. To-day instead of spending money for the Army to protect the whites from the attacks of the Indians we are spending that money for the education of the Indians and getting much better and much more desirable results.

The problem of irrigating the lands of the Indians is a large one and a most perplexing one. I shall place in the RECORD, with your consent, a table showing the area of Indian lands susceptible of irrigation, the extent of the irrigation projects that have already been appropriated for by the Government, the cost of that, the number of acres under irrigation, and the number of acres that are actually farmed. To-day I believe there are a number of projects that have been started for Indians on reservations that have not proved successful and will not in the future prove successful—projects where a great waste of money has been made. But it is no different than in some cases where projects have been begun for white settlers and have failed. I know of more than one project begun for white settlers where more than a million dollars has been spent and the land under cultivation is so small that the profits from the products would not pay for the operating expenses of the project.

The tables which I here present give in summary statement the expenditures made for irrigation projects, the acreage under projects, and so forth:

Area susceptible of irrigation, acreage under projects, and expenditures for irrigation, fiscal year ended June 30, 1915.

	Area susceptible of irrigation (acres).				Acreage now under project.			Acreage not under project.	Expenditures—				
									During fiscal year 1915.		To June 30, 1915.		
	Total.	Allotted.	Unallotted.	School and agency.	Allotted.	Unallotted.	School and agency.		Construction.	Maintenance.	Construction.	Maintenance.	Total.
Grand total	1,627,253	1,015,772	596,711	14,770	605,515	263,011	6,613	752,114	$896,843.79	$294,461.60	$11,275,458.91	$1,122,850.87	$12,398,309.78

Miles of ditches and use of irrigated areas on Indian reservations, fiscal year ended June 30, 1915.

	Ditches on reservation.		Allotments under ditch June 30, 1915.	Indians benefited by irrigation.	Irrigated allotted lands leased.	Acreage of irrigated lands cultivated.						Within service of ditches June 30, 1915.	Remainder to be put under ditch.
	Main.	Lateral.				Allotted.	Unallotted.	School and agency.	Total.	Indians engaged.	Value of crops.		
	Miles.	*Miles.*	*Acres.*	*Acres.*	*Acres.*							*Acres.*	*Acres.*
Grand total	1,304	2,422	13,366	37,940	63,312	92,434	53,761	129	146,324	12,649	$3,448,122	518,786	1,018,821

In the consideration of the appropriations for irrigation projects in this bill your Committee on Indian Affairs has made an honest effort to first determine, before recommending any appropriation, that the money asked to be appropriated would, if appropriated, be wisely expended, and that it would be expended upon a project where the land when placed under irrigation would be used and farmed by the Indians. Care has been taken that appropriations be not made chiefly for the benefit of others than the Indians, and that the funds of the Indians be not exploited in the construction of irrigation projects for the development of any section of the country for white citizens.

The Indians of the country own property totaling in value nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars. With your permission, I shall place in the RECORD this statement, giving the value of the individual and tribal property of the Indians during the past five years.

Value of Indians' individual and tribal property, June 30, 1915.

	Total individual and tribal property.	Individual.							Tribal.			
		Total.	Lands, exclusive of timber.	Timber.	Funds in banks and in hands of superintendents. [1]	Homes, furniture, barns, etc.	Wagons, implements, etc.	Stock, poultry, and other property.	Total.	Lands, exclusive of timber.	Timber and stock.	Balance of funds in Treasury.
Total 1915	$658,262,436	$438,116,841	$368,030,944	$11,369,277	$12,224,196	$10,827,552	$4,244,646	$31,420,226	$220,145,595	$101,390,579	[2] $76,558,336	$42,196,680
1914	667,454,639	434,872,202	372,776,671	11,373,084	12,251,557	9,924,495	3,769,903	[3] 24,776,492	232,582,437	111,396,816	74,093,412	47,092,209
1913	666,931,263	426,436,766	368,890,835	11,766,623	11,200,525	8,537,204	2,815,071	[3] 23,226,508	240,494,497	120,701,799	73,123,997	46,668,701
1912	648,689,092	404,265,024	348,504,293	11,745,511	10,098,276	8,276,073	2,641,906	[3] 22,998,965	244,424,068	127,838,467	72,011,067	44,519,534
1911	623,134,254	380,934,110	331,429,404	9,106,470	10,735,723	7,796,805	2,232,379	[3] 19,633,329	242,200,144	124,942,110	75,413,904	41,843,853

[1] Data incomplete. [2] Includes $1,694,721 tribal stock. [3] Includes tribal stock.

A very grave responsibility rests upon the Government and upon the Congress in the proper administration of the affairs of those Indians who are still wards of the Nation. Might I hope that every Member of the House will give just a little more time and study to the serious and difficult problems which confront the Nation in its efforts to best provide for the welfare and civilization of our red brethren, so that each may be better able and better prepared to bear his share of the responsibility for this work. If this would be done, I am confident that the golden era would soon be reached in the care and conduct of Indian affairs by our Government.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague Mr. McLEMORE be given leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DOUGHTON). The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that his colleague Mr. McLEMORE be allowed to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, on day before yesterday, Saturday last, the House presented a very unusual and a very pleasing sight. As the Members gathered for the session nearly everyone wore in his lapel a pink carnation. Visitors in the gallery and the uninitiated, on inquiry, were informed, almost reverentially, that this was in honor of the memory of the character and public services of a great American, William McKinley. [Applause.] Those of us who knew him well remember him best for his modesty, for his kindly, knightly chivalry, and courteous consideration of the views of all men.

But he will be remembered best and longest as the advance agent, as the prophet of prosperity [applause on the Republican side], a prosperity as wide as the boundaries of the Republic, a prosperity felt and appreciated throughout the length and breadth of the land, a prosperity affecting every section, every industry, a prosperity that reached every hamlet and every home under the flag. And as we think of this prohpet of a real prosperity we are reminded of the voices that are now coming to us from divers places claiming that at last, after a long period of depression, prosperity has again returned to the land.

Prosperity is howled at us from the stock exchange by frenzied speculators in the stocks of munition corporations and other blood merchandisers.

Prosperity is shrieked at us from the riotous debauchery of money-mad munition speculators, their dupes and painted consorts in and around the lobster and champagne palaces of New York's great white way.

Prosperity is yelled at us from out the feverish activity and wild debauchery; of raw, crude, and comfortless mushroom war-munition settlements.

Prosperity is bawled at us by those whose profits increase with the increase of want, suffering, misery, anguish, and death along the battle lines and in the wake of the ruthless and devastating armies of Europe.

Prosperity is persistently thrust upon us by smug and unctious professional official prosperity barkers of Government bureaus.

Prosperity is deluged upon us daily by great newspapers, whose proprietor's profits lie that way, in fervid editorials on the alleged revival, spread, and expansion of prosperity over the land.

In the midst of these edifying evidences and palpitating pronouncements that prosperity, though belated, has arrived, it is perhaps unkind and inconsiderate for one to calmly ponder and plainly relate a few features of the country's actual situation.

For the first time since the Civil War not an industry or an enterprise, unless it may be that of building automobiles, is expanding, enlarging, or prospering except as the direct or indirect result of the war in Europe and the conditions which flow from it.

The cost of living to the American people, both actually and by comparison with incomes and wages, is higher to-day than at any time in our history, and is steadily advancing.

The past year has witnessed the first check in the continuous and steady decline of freight and passenger rates on American railroads, and has brought an advance in rates, under which our people are paying millions in increased charges.

Notwithstanding this increased burden of transportation charges, more miles of railways have been in the hands of receivers in the past year than at any other period of our history and fewer miles of new railway were constructed than in any year since the Civil War.

Not since the days of forty-nine has there been a year of peace in American history which brought so little increase in new mileage, new territory developed, and new facilities afforded by railway construction as did the year 1915.

The year 1915 found and left our people paying tax burdens, direct and obnoxious, never before levied in time of peace. It gave us our largest deficit in public revenues and our smallest cash balance in the Public Treasury.

Of one thing at least we are all in agreement, the times are and have been most extraordinary and the question of whether or not you consider them prosperous depends on your point of view.

If the making of millionaires be a badge and sign of prosperity, then we have certainly been prosperous, for the making of powder, shot, and shell and the speculation in the stocks of this murder merchandising has, it is estimated, made more millionaires in a year than we have heretofore acquired in a decade.

If wild speculation be a criterion of prosperity, then we have been prosperous, for never in our history has the fever of speculation reached the temperature or counted the victims that war-stock speculation has brought.

If the amassing of great riches in a few hands and temporary and mushroom expansion of industries, a large part of which must be abandoned or radically adjusted with the dawn of peace, is prosperity, then we have been prosperous.

If, however, we expect prosperity to be evidenced by a steady and secure development of resources and the safe, substantial, and permanent growth and expansion of industries, we shall scan the horizon of 1915 or that of the present time in vain for substantial evidence of such growth, development, or expansion.

If we view prosperity as a condition under which the burdens of the people under government are lightened, as a condition under which the cost of living, as compared with the average income, is moderate or declining, then we shall search all horizons in vain for sign or semblence or immediate prospect of prosperity.

It is a most unusual condition and situation however you view it, either from the standpoint of those who winning large profits out of the woe and welter of the world-wide war proclaim all things prosperous, or from the standpoint of those who noting the lack of orderly and permanent development, and witnessing the continued increase of living costs, can not sense, realize, or admit the existence of the prosperity so clamorously proclaimed.

Out of such conditions so varying viewed from different standpoints it is indisputable that certain facts stand out as the characteristic signs and tokens of the times. We are not lacking in such signs and tokens. This period will be remembered as the one which, on the one hand, created the munition millionaires, and which, on the other hand, first witnessed the offering of horse meat as a staple article of American diet. I leave it to you to judge whether these things spell prosperity. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. NORTON. If the gentleman from Texas will permit, we will use some more time on this side. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, the conditions apparent this afternoon bear out what I have often thought, that there is too much talk in the House of Representatives and too little action. It is my opinion that we ought more to get down to business and not waste so much time in making speeches for home consumption. I have taken up very little of the time of this House expressing my views, and I shall take but a very few minutes now. There is one question, it seems to me, of paramount importance in this country at this time, about which the people are talking and about which they desire us to take action, and that is on the question of preparedness, not preparedness for war but preparedness for peace.

I have given to this question considerable consideration myself; and, in order to know what the people back home want, I have sent out a large number of letters to the people in my district, to all classes and to the members of all political parties, asking them what they desired their Representative to do and what they desired the Congress to do upon the question of preparedness, and how far they expected me as their Representative to go upon that question; and, if they were in favor of the propaganda for preparedness, to what extent they favored increased appropriations by Congress in order that the country might be prepared for national defense, and be able to defend ourselves against possible aggression, and how they

desired the revenues necessary to pay the expenses of preparedness to be raised. I also asked them in that letter to state their opinion on the question of an embargo on munitions of war to the belligerent nations of Europe. In answer to these letters that I have sent out I have received a great many hundreds of answers from all classes and from members of all parties, showing that the people are interested and that they are studying these questions and have views of their own as to what this Congress should do. I am here to say to-day that the people of my district—the great majority of them—are in favor of the Government making adequate preparation so that we may be prepared—not for war, which they do not want, but to maintain the peace of this country of ours [applause] and be able to defend our homes, our institutions, and our rights on land or sea; and the almost unanimous response has been that no matter what the expense may be they are willing to bear their share; and they want us, not to talk about this question all summer, not to be here month after month considering what we will do, but to make preparation now [applause], to see that this country is prepared against any possible invasion. One gentleman gave to me in the shortest possible form this argument. He said: "I do not expect my house to be burned, but as a matter of precaution, as a prudent man, I have it insured." And so, Mr. Chairman, that is what we should do. We should have an adequate measure of insurance against whatever might occur, whatever danger may threaten our peace or our rights and interests as a great Nation growing out of the exceptional conditions which now exist throughout the world. Some men think we are in no danger; that this war is so great, so devastating, so expensive that the nations engaged therein are becoming exhausted, that their resources will soon be wholly exhausted, and that when they get through there will be no more war. But we see to-day conditions that never have existed before, and we must take account of the fact that wars, like fires, will spread.

If a great conflagration is impending, if building after building is being destroyed, will you say that you will not insure your building because that fire can not extend any farther, because that fire will burn out? Oh, no; we do not know how far it will extend, and only the Almighty can know or predict when or how this great war will end. We ought, we must, as prudent men, as Representatives of the people intrusted with responsibility, to make reasonable preparation for whatever may come. This is a great treasure land, and is worth defending at whatever cost. It is the most prosperous Nation on the face of the earth. Other countries will be jealous of us when the war is over, and our very prosperity will be one of our greatest dangers. They will not be unprepared for war. We want no war, but we do want and must have reasonable preparation for peace. That is what I am in favor of, and that is what I understand the great majority of the people of my district and of this country favor.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. FULLER. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. Inasmuch as it is up to the members of the Committee on Military Affairs to devise some plan to carry out the idea of preparedness, and inasmuch as we are seeking all the light we can along that line, I would be very much obliged to the gentleman if he would state whether any of his constituents have submitted to him any plan or given any idea as to what they believe would be adequate preparedness?

Mr. FULLER. I will. There is a great diversity of opinion, however, upon the question. My constituents do not believe, as a general proposition, that we are in any great danger, but they do believe we ought to make adequate preparation. What would be adequate preparation is a matter of detail, about which laymen are not usually well advised. So far as I can judge, from the letters I have received—more than a thousand of them, from all classes of people; from Republicans, Democrats, Progressives, Prohibitionists, and Socialists; from manufacturers, business men, professional men, farmers, and laborers—which I would be glad to submit to the gentlemen here, most of them say they believe that the first measure of defense is the Navy; that we ought to have a Navy equal to any in the world, that will protect us from any invasion from foreign shores, and maintain our right to the freedom of the seas, on equal terms with any other nation. They also believe we ought to have adequate coast defenses, and, as a general proposition, averaging the various opinions my constituents have expressed in their letters to me, I think they believe we ought to have a standing army of not less than 250,000 men [applause], trained and ready for duty at a moment's notice. That is the general proposition. As I say, there is a great diversity of opinion. Some believe that we are in less danger to-day than at any other time in our history. I think they are mistaken. Some of them believe we ought to make no provision for the protection of American coasts, American industries, and all of our institutions, but trust alone, with child-like confidence, to our peaceful desires as a sufficient protection. I do not agree with them. I am in favor, and I think I voice the sentiment of the great majority of the people of my district and of the district of the gentleman [Mr. McKENZIE] and of all the great districts in the interior of this country, that we ought to have adequate protection so that our institutions shall not be in danger from any possible invasion. [Applause.]

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. I do.

Mr. EMERSON. Speaking of our institutions, does not the gentleman think along this line of preparedness a little protective tariff would help us to be prepared after the war is over?

Mr. FULLER. I will talk just a moment on that. I asked in these letters what measure they would propose for raising the revenues necessary to pay the cost of preparedness. I come from a great Republican district, and nine-tenths of the letters I received say that the revenues ought principally to be raised by a protective tariff. [Applause on the Republican side.] However, most of them, if other revenues are needed, favor an increased tax on large incomes and on inheritances—and a heavy tax on munitions of war.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. I will yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FULLER. Can I have 10 minutes' more?

Mr. NORTON. I yield 10 minutes' additional to the gentleman.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. I concur in what my colleague says. I have been in communication with the gentleman's constituents, and of my other colleagues from Illinois, and I find a very large per cent of those with whom I have corresponded; in fact, I would say 9 out of 10 are in favor of materially increasing our Navy, our coast defenses, and developing our aviation.

I find that sentiment true as to the Navy. I do not find it so true, though, as to the Army. There is this difference of opinion, as to whether we should increase our standing Army or have some kind of Infantry service that would compel all to drill and prepare for war. What can the gentleman say he finds the sentiment to be on that question in his district?

Mr. FULLER. I find it to be exactly as my colleague states. There is a great diversity of opinion as to the question of increasing the standing Army, and I will say in the communications that I have received, which number more than a thousand, I find not one who expresses himself in favor of the so-called "continental army." [Applause.] They are all in favor of increasing the Navy and the coast defenses. Most of them also declare in favor of some military training or education of the youth, from 18 to 21, in our public schools and in our universities, requiring compulsory military education of the youth of the land, so that we will have a reserve all the time of those who are fit to organize companies and regiments and be officers in case we need them.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. I will ask my colleague how this proposition would strike him—that we largely increase our National Guard or State militia, set apart, say, 30 days each year for drill, and that during that period they should become compensated reasonably by the Federal Government?

Mr. FULLER. As I understand the matter, the Federal Government has nothing to do with the State militia except in time of actual war. I wish it were possible that we could have a National Guard, in fact as well as in name, something different from the present State militia, that would be under the control of the War Department of the Government all the time. I understand that the War Department has now no control whatever over our State militia except in case of war. And I would like to see a National Guard that was a National Guard in reality, that was under the control of the War Department of the Government; that could be educated and trained and drilled by men sent out by the War Department; and that the State militia as it now exists might be relieved from strike duty or anything of that kind, and that there might be in the States a State constabulary that would have charge of riots and such matters. One thing now against our State militia is that the men who belong to the unions will not join it because it is used too often for strike purposes or in labor troubles. We ought to have a National Guard under the control of the General Government, and, what would be feasible and very proper, they should be exempted entirely from the strike duty that the members of the State militia in the States are now required to perform.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FULLER. I will.

Mr. PLATT. I agree very largely with what the gentleman has now said; but does not the gentleman believe that the continental army scheme gives the chance to do just that?

Mr. FULLER. I am not fully posted on the scheme for a proposed continental army. I am in favor, in some way, of having the National Guard under the control of the Federal authorities.

Mr. PLATT. Has the gentleman had letters from any National Guard officers in his district?

Mr. FULLER. I have.

Mr. PLATT. Against the continental army system?

Mr. FULLER. Not against it. I have not had any expression from any National Guard officers on that subject. None of them has said anything about it in their communication to me.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. May I say to the gentleman that I have been connected with the National Guard for 25 years, and that there is not a National Guardsman in the State of Illinois that favors a continental army.

Mr. FULLER. I have had no expression in favor of a continental army or anything of that kind.

Mr. SWEET. I do not wish to anticipate the gentleman, but I wish to ask him in regard to the answers he received in regard to an embargo.

Mr. FULLER. I am going to speak on that question. I find the people are not at all unanimous on the question of placing or not placing an embargo on the shipment of munitions of war to Europe. I do not know that what I say will be in accord with the views of a majority of my constituents. As a personal matter, I would not sell munitions of war to any country to be used for the purpose of war, or the taking of human life. I would not own any stock in any corporation that did that business. I may be perhaps overconscientious upon that question. Many of the answers I have received have said that it was legal, that it was not unneutral, and that therefore we should sell munitions of war to any country that wanted them and would come and get them and take them away at their own risk. I do not take that view. I would not sell or permit the sale of munitions to any of the warring nations. I would not do anything myself toward the taking of human life in this war, nor would I be in any way responsible for making one woman a widow or one child an orphan. I think it is a cruel, a brutal, a murderous business, and if I had my way I would prohibit the shipment of munitions of war to any of the belligerent nations of Europe. That is my personal view from a humanitarian standpoint.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. And if the sale could not be prohibited, if that could not be, I would, at least, do this: I would levy a tax on the manufacture of such munitions that would pay the extra expense that this Government is bound to be put to for the maintenance of peace. These manufacturers are making huge profits on war orders. The Government should at least take the profit out of the business, and that of itself would do much to stop the infernal traffic.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FULLER. I will.

Mr. FESS. I think that your position would be the position of all of my people at home, in this far, that they would not ship munitions of war, but the question whether we as Congressmen should prevent an American citizen shipping munitions of war is an entirely different proposition with me, in view of the fact that we as a Nation urged that right in The Hague conference, which was adopted, and that is what troubles me in not being able to vote for an embargo, the Government forbidding an American citizen shipping munitions of war. I would do it if I were free to do it.

Mr. FULLER. Conceding that right, conceding that it is legal to manufacture and ship munitions of war, I do not think it is right. It is not necessary that a thing must be done because it is legal to do it.

Mr. PLATT. Does the gentleman know that the United States Government in every single one of its wars has bought a large portion of its arms and ammunition from abroad—in the Spanish-American War, in the Civil War, in the Mexican War, in the War of 1812, and in the Revolutionary War? We were absolutely dependent on what we could import from abroad.

Mr. FULLER. I do not dispute that proposition, but I dispute the proposition that it is right in this day and age and under existing conditions.

Mr. PLATT. If the gentleman sees two men about to fight and he can not stop the fight and he knows one has got a gun and the other has not and wants one, would he not be prompted to furnish a gun to the one who did not have one?

Mr. FULLER. If two men are trying to fight and one of them wants my gun with which to kill his opponent, he is not going to get it. [Laughter.]

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. Has the gentleman not overlooked one feature of this matter? In what shape would the Democratic Party be to-day if they were not able to refer to the sporadic prosperity that exists from the manufacture of munitions of war? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. FULLER. Oh, I do not place my remarks upon a partisan basis. I am speaking not as a Republican or as a Democrat. This is a question that concerns the welfare of this Nation, and every Republican and every Democrat ought to put partisanship aside and all, as patriotic Americans, work together as one to insure the peace of the Nation and, if that might be, to at least not do anything or sanction anything that would prolong the awful war that is now madly raging——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I will give the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER] is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. FULLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Has the gentleman considered in his remarks—I just came into the Chamber—the question of the right of American citizens to prosecute a business that everybody concedes to be entirely legal and the power of this Government to put them out of business?

Mr. FULLER. Oh, I think this Government is for the people, and for all the people, and we ought to have higher ambitions than to encourage an industry that takes human life.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further there?

Mr. FULLER. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. To what extent and in what manner, if any, has this Government encouraged the people to manufacture arms and ammunition?

Mr. FULLER. To this extent it has not discouraged the business: Most of the letters I get show that those who sympathize with one side are in favor of shipping all the munitions of war they want and those in favor of the other side are against it. Now, I am neutral. I am not for one side or the other; and I want to say right here and now that I have no ambition for this country to dominate the world or to rule the sea like the British Empire, "whose morning drumbeat, following the sun in its course and keeping pace with the hours, encircles the globe with one continuous strain of the martial airs of England." I have no such ambition for America, but I do want to see the flag of this Union honored and respected around the world. I want it to be justly entitled to the respect of all people and of all nations, and I want to see behind it the power to compel the respect alike of a measly Mexican or an arrogant Briton. [Applause.]

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. FULLER. The gentleman from Texas desires to say something. I will yield first to him.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. I am interested in the gentleman's speech, and I was especially interested in the sentence the gentleman from Illinois uttered when he said he thought this ought to be a nonpartisan question—one in which all Americans should feel a common interest. I feel that way about it. But he had just stated, in a paragraph in front of that, that he was in favor of levying a protective tariff for covering the expenses of preparedness; and I stand unquestionably for an income tax, and an increase of the surtax on incomes, and a tax on inheritances, and a tax——

Mr. FULLER. All right. Make your speech a little later in your own time. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. And the difference between the Democrats and the Republicans is made absolutely manifest in the way in which they would impose the taxation.

Mr. FULLER. Oh, that is not the question.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to his colleague?

Mr. FULLER. Yes; I will yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. McKENZIE. I simply wish to call my colleague's attention to one statement that he has made, in which he has made the declaration that he does not believe that the selling of munitions to the belligerents is right. Now, if I understand my colleague he means that it is not right from the moral standpoint, and he is not discussing the legal phases of the question at all?

Mr. FULLER. Oh, that is true. It is against my principles. I would not do it. I concede that it is legal, and that if it must be indulged in I would like to see those fellows pay the tax that is necessary in order to prepare this country for what they are bringing about.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Of course, it goes without saying that the Government is not selling munitions.

Mr. FULLER. I understand that.

Mr. FESS. But individuals are selling to the people who can deliver. They are not denying the sale to Germany.

Mr. FULLER. Oh, no; but it is understood that one side can get the munitions and the other side can not; and in this country we are made up of all classes of people from all nations, and I would like to see this country absolutely neutral. That is the way I feel. I would not favor one side or the other.

Mr. FESS. Now, since it is a right under The Hague conference for a belligerent to buy of a neutral, if you and I vote to prevent that belligerent from exercising that right, would that be a neutral act on our part?

Mr. FULLER. I do not think it would be an unneutral act at all for this country to say that we will stand aloof, and that we will favor neither side. To my mind, to be strictly neutral is to favor neither side either by action or by nonaction.

Mr. FESS. What does the gentleman think would be the position of the United States in case we set that example, forbidding the sale of munitions to a belligerent, if we should get into trouble? Would not that necessitate our building up great munition plants here in America to supply all our needs?

Mr. FULLER. I am in favor of the building up of munition plants here. I am in favor of the United States Government preparing to manufacture in its own plants everything that is necessary for defense, and I will vote to take private profit out of the manufacture of war munitions and for everything of that kind. [Applause.]

By permitting the unlimited sale and shipment of munitions of war to Great Britain, we are aiding that nation as much as though we had actually joined the allies in the prosecution of the war. And yet that nation assumes control of the seas, as its own private property. It assumes the right to interfere with our commerce on the sea and even claims the right to rifle and censor our mails. We should stand for the freedom of the seas, for ourselves and for all other nations, and I hope to see this Government take that stand and I want a Navy sufficient to enforce the right. These munitions of war we are sending to them to aid them in controlling the seas may yet be used against us. Is it not time we adopt a purely American policy, and as its corner stone declare that the seas shall be open to the commerce of the world, and that no country shall assume to control the mastery of the seas, however great its navy may be. Our interest, and the interest of all other nations, except Great Britain, is for the freedom of the seas. Our every act should guard that interest.

I want to say just this much further on the question of preparedness and the provisions to be made to pay the cost thereof, and in this I know I voice the sentiment of the people of my district. The poorer people, those in the ordinary walks of life, the farmer, the small business man, the worker—these are all taxed now about all they can stand and all they should be required to pay. For the extraordinary expense now contemplated, and now necessary, those who have most at stake and those best able to bear the extra expense should be required to pay the greater part of the cost. For the ordinary expenses of the Government, the tariff and the internal-revenue tax on liquors and tobacco should afford ample revenue without any direct tax. The tariff on luxuries, imported goods, used only by the rich, and the like, should be materially increased. For the extraordinary expense now made necessary, the surtax on large incomes should be materially increased, and a graduated inheritance tax should be imposed, bearing very largely on great inheritances, so that no person should ever be permitted to inherit from one person more than a million dollars. Great fortunes have been accumulated under the protection and the benign laws of this country, and these should properly bear the expense of national defense. Odious stamp taxes hamper business and bear most heavily on those least able to pay, and should be repealed. Tax munitions of war to the limit. Let those best able bear the burdens of taxation, which will be no burden to them, and the great benefits of national preparedness is, to them, all important. In a word, I advocate a high protective tariff on all articles not in general use by the people of moderate means, a large surtax on great incomes, a large tax on great inheritances, and a tax on all munitions of war manufactured by private corporations, and a repeal of all direct Federal taxes affecting the great mass of people of limited means. We are here to legislate for the people and for the country. The path of duty and the way to perform it is clear. Let us do it, and do it now, and all the people will say, Amen!

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, how does the time stand?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has used 46 minutes and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] has used 1 hour and 45 minutes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of the bill, which is merely the general Indian appropriation bill, I have observed that it is fashionable not to discuss the bill itself. The first gentleman this morning made a speech on rural credits, a subject that we all profess to favor, which a few of us understand, and all differ upon. [Laughter.] The second gentleman discussed the subject of "Why it is right to have prohibition of liquor for an Indian but not for a white man." Another gentleman, Mr. FULLER, the one who has just left the floor, discussed the question of preparedness, and my good friend from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] discussed, as well as I could understand it, the subject of "Bullet-mold prosperity."

So I may be pardoned for not discussing the bill itself. I shall attempt, however, to discuss what, in my opinion, ought to be in the bill, and I may say, as far as it was practicable, the committee put into the bill what ought to be there and where it did not, it was due to the fact that the things that were left out would be subject to points of order.

Ever since I have been in Congress the statement has been made in our committee and upon the floor of the House that pretty soon the Indian Bureau will be through with its work; but I say to you that under the present policy of the Government the Indian Bureau will never be through with its work, but if that policy continues it will grow larger. Why? Because you will observe in the history of the civilization of the Indian that he has progressed more often by the neglect of the Government than by the protection of the Government. I say that in all kindness to the conscientious gentlemen who fill positions in the Indian Bureau. The Indian is not suffering so much from graft—and God knows that it is great enough—as he is from ignorance of how to deal with him. I call your attention to the fact that the Five Civilized Tribes were civilized by the neglect of the Government. Up until the time that they moved west they had never had a Government public school. After they went west there never was a school in the Five Civilized Tribes, established, controlled, or even superintended by the United States Government until after the Atoka agreement in 1897. Those Indians became civilized because they were relieved from departmental red tape.

It is a regretable thing to know that the Government really has no policy. It started within our early history the policy of stirring up an insurrection among the Indians and then shooting them down, and that continued until Sam Houston came to the United States Senate. Then began the system of education. The first suggestion of the education of an Indian came from an Indian himself, by A-push-ma-to-ha, in the treaty of October 18, 1820. The first practical result came from the efforts of Sam Houston. Now, to determine what is best for the Indian requires a study of the past history of the Indian and of human nature itself, because human nature is the same, whether of an Indian or a white man. Mr. J. B. Thoburn, a historian who is now connected with the Oklahoma University in research work, has, in my opinion, solved certain Indian

questions not heretofore understood. In my opinion there is no doubt that the Indians who were on this continent when it was discovered came from Mexico, where they had a dense population and a great civilization. Pressure of that population caused migration, just as pressure of population has caused the movement of humanity in all ages of the world, and just as to-day it has caused the war in Europe. The Indians began to drift along the shore of the Gulf and up the Mississippi River.

As there were from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 Indians on this continent when it was discovered, with the multitude of game and fish, there was no necessity for the Indian further to cultivate the fields, as the mound builders certainly did. The ambition of a "gentleman" of an Indian tribe became that of the huntsman, and that faculty, when well developed, enabled him to live without work, and so a knowledge of hunting was regarded as the accomplishment of a "gentleman." So after generations he ceased to work. You might put 5,000,000 white men on a continent like this, and in five generations they, too, would not work.

But we have reached a period when we must untrain the Indian and give him an ideal, which is apart from and the reverse of his former ideal—that is, in our congested civilization and under the pressure of population no race can progress until it learns industry. Industry is the first step in the progress of any race. The first step in that direction is the wage earner. Then when he learns how to manage a farm or an industry for himself he can take the next step. So, in my opinion, it follows if the Government desires to civilize the Indian it must teach him the work and not dole out a small amount now and then to feed him. [Applause.] He must be taught to work. The Government can not protect the full-blood Indian who is of age unless it has complete control of his property. Yet the Government maintains the same policy toward the mixed-blood Indian that it does toward the full blood and the minor children, when the three are distinct. There is one place where the Government can protect the Indian, and but one. That is in the matter of the minor children—to see that their lands are not sold wantonly and to see that they have an opportunity to become educated. But when they are of age the Government should give them their money and say to them: "Now, you have all coming to you, and you must go to work or starve." And then, if necessary, the Government ought to be paternalistic enought to supply the work, if work can not be found, until they have developed the faculty of industrial citizens, because it is only through an industrial course that the Indian will ever be enabled to be a full-fledged American citizen. I can call to mind now more men than I can count on the fingers of my hand who when I went to the old Indian country more than 20 years ago were self-sustaining and even wealthy. They lived around their capital, Tishomingo, where I now live, many of them having from 300 to 1,000 head of cattle. Those Indians to-day are paupers, and in a far worse condition than they were 20 years ago when they ran and operated a government of their own.

As I said a moment ago, I do not say this in criticism of the conscientious gentlemen in the Indian Bureau. The trouble has been that what has been done was without a definite policy.

Then, again, it seems that some gentlemen who have most to do with the question imagine that the right way to educate an Indian is to segregate him. When you segregate him into a school where no one except an Indian is allowed to attend you continue to make an Indian of him, and he will always be an Indian, misunderstanding the white man, not comprehending his ways, nor how to compete with him, and the white man will likewise misunderstand him. We have examples of that in my State.

The first institution established by the first Oklahoma Legislature was an agricultural and mechanical college in my home town, which bears my name. That school has been free to all the white and Indian pupils of the State. Two full-blood Indian boys living about 15 miles away, twins by the name of Greenwood, were the children of full bloods. I knew them when they were but Indian cubbies. Surrounded by full bloods, they knew no impulses except those of the full-blood Indian. They had gone to the Indian schools; but later, because the Government permitted the payment of their board out of certain Choctaw and Chickasaw funds, they went to this State institution. In the athletic sports it was found that these two boys were the best high jumpers and the best runners in the school. So when a contest came at the State agricultural and mechanical college, at Stillwater, where six district agricultural schools and 22 city high schools were represented, it was but natural that the pupils of the Murray State School of Agriculture, both white and Indian, contributed their mites and solicited funds from the citizens in order to send these two boys, the best of their class, to that contest. There they defeated all other contestants in the State. They returned and were graduated in course of time, and last year when I called upon a friend of mine for the name of the superintendent of Sunday schools of his church, to my astonishment I found that in a community where these two Indians were reared, and where there are not to exceed a dozen Indians of any blood in the community, one of these Greenwood boys was the superintendent of the white Sunday school in that neighborhood. He had learned by his college association the ways of the white man, understood his method of competition, understood his hope and his ambition, and in after life was enabled to use an education that became beneficial to him. If you segregate the Indians by continuing bureaucratic educational institutions, of that class in particular, who have become civilized, or nearly so, you continue to keep him an Indian.

I would not be understood to mean that there are not any Indians that deserve the protection of the Government as though they were children, but I am making the point that the Government fails to understand that they must be divided into different classes, the minors into one, the full bloods and helpless into another, and those self-sustaining into another. Then those that understand our civilization should have all the fetters taken off them, pay them their money, and give them an opportunity to compete with the white man. That will enable him to become an American citizen. I know also that in dealing with the minor Indians the Government should go the limit. It can see that the minor's property is not squandered; it can give him an opportunity to be educated where it is wisest to educate him. And when he is of age he will not look back and observe that his associates in childhood have a large farm while his is gone. He will not look back and say to himself "I once had a patrimony equal to my associates, but my great Government, my State, my guardian was permitted to sell and squander it, and now I am homeless and landless." That is enough to make an anarchist of him. With that class the Government ought to go the limit till they are of age, and when of age give them an opportunity to sink or swim, live or die, by their own efforts, and then they will prosper along with their white neighbors.

I grant you that there are certain classes of full bloods in the West that ought to have some paternal care, that there are tribes that ought not to be allotted, and there are other tribes that ought to be allotted and their property held in trust for them; but wherever there is an individual or the case of an individual being civilized, give him his property and give him an opportunity to use it. To remove his restrictions in part and keep a supervision over him in part, leaving him with the balance, is but to hamper the Government on the one hand and the Indian in his initiative on the other. He can never learn to manage his own affairs, a very important lesson in the life of any individual, white or Indian. Give him an opportunity, if you take them off, as a complete full-fledged citizen.

As far as the Indian Committee was enabled to follow that policy they have done so in this bill. They could go no further because it would be subject to a point of order, but wherever a treaty has stipulated and the conditions justified it we have put into this bill conditions for the payment of funds to the Indians from their funds properly belonging to them.

Before I conclude—and I observe that my time is flying—I do not think that it lies in the mouth of the Government in dealing with these Indians to say that their treaties in the past are but "scraps of paper." The promise of this Government to these Indians ought to be just as sacred—yes; more sacred—than a treaty with the British Government. Where the individual is but the ward of the Government there is something more than a treaty-making power involved. Where a treaty is between our Government and Great Britain, where they are equal, there are times when the treaty might be changed, and that is when it ceases to be profitable to both of them; but no so with the helpless wards of the Government.

In the beginning of the Government we started out, as I said a while ago, to exterminate the Indians. For that reason we created our military posts, not with a view of the best military preparedness, but scattered 50 or more posts over the West to fight the Indians; and we retain them there yet, although we found that it was not wise to continue that old policy.

We remember that in the Seminole insurrection we enlisted, as the war records show, a portion of the Regular Army and 43,000 volunteers to try to whip the Seminoles and make them move West; but that war ended without moving a single Indian. So the Government, after 20 years' warfare, discovered that it was wise to change; and I say to you that it is wiser to change still.

I was struck with the remark made by a learned gentleman from Boston, a great scholar, like the most of them are, who

had been on a tour with the Rodman Wanamaker expedition through Arizona and New Mexico, and in his discussing the Pueblo and Navajo Indians he made this startling statement, but I must confess that he had much record to prove it. He said this Government enlisted nearly 3,000,000 men and lost the lives of more than one-half a million soldiers, wounded many more, paid out in pensions $4,000,000,000, to try to develop the negro, and had made one Booker T. Washington. That the Government, on the other hand, had from time to time enlisted over half a million soldiers and spent more than $3,000,000,000 trying to crush the Indian, but the Indian had survived in spite of that loss of treasure and the opposition of the Government.

The Indian may survive in spite of the red tape and wrongful policy of the Government; but I do not see how he can, because a white man could not survive under such conditions. Here is a multitudinous race, dwindled away to 275,000 members, as reported by the Indian Department, because of a governmental policy founded upon a misapprehension of what ought to be done, holding him down and prohibiting his taking the initiative; and an Indian, a white man, and the child of either, must first learn to walk and to run, and sooner or later the mother's apron string must be taken loose and the child enabled to march or run by its own efforts. The apron string of the Federal Government must be taken off every Indian of age who has an education and who has developed to that period or 20 years from now he will be poorer and more dependent than he has been in the past. I could enumerate instances to prove to you what I said in the beginning—that more Indians have developed at the neglect of the Government than have developed with the red tape of the Government. The conscience of the American people has at last been pricked about its Indian policy in the past, and we have many thousands of patriotic citizens all over the eastern part of the Republic who are willing to give their funds, to sacrifice their personal comforts, to redeem the past crimes; but the only question with these people is that, with their discussion with the department self-sufficiency, connected with their own lack of information on the matter, they do not understand the practical thing to do. I find them willing and anxious to do the right thing. All that they need is to understand; but how are we to wind up the Indian Bureau by multiplying the necessity for clerks handling individual property when we handle the tribal property in bulk? To-day there are more Indian officers in Oklahoma than there were, and they will continue to grow as the Indian gets poorer and more dependent; and there will never be any end, because another generation will usher in a generation not taught to work, but taught to believe the Government will feed them; and they will lack individual initiative, they will lack knowledge of industry, and have but a theoretical education; and so the department will grow, and there are those who desire a continuation of this. But it is unwise from the standpoint of the Government and from the standpoint of the best policy for the civilization and development of the Indian himself. [Applause.]

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER].

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, as this seems to be a general field day and the House having just listened to a number of luminous observations upon the theme of war and preparedness, I desire to call the attention of the membership to the fact that the opening gun of the guerilla warfare to be waged against appropriations for rivers and harbors at this session of Congress has been fired by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] in the shape of a 43-page contribution to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it might be well for those who believe that the improvements of our rivers and harbors are beneficial to the people and of importance to the Nation to also join this great propaganda for preparedness. The conglomeration of reckless assertion, distorted facts, and misrepresentation of motives which have actuated former Congressmen and the Congresses, to which I have just referred, can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 13. As a compilation of irresponsible newspaper criticisms, hackneyed phrases, doggerel, and scurrility, I venture the assertion that it has not an equal in the annals of river and harbor discussion.

Toward the close of the gentleman's animadversions in which he had severely arraigned the Army engineers, composing the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, because of the action of the Secretary of War in his allotments under the authority given him by the last two river and harbor acts, and which were made, no doubt, upon the recommendation of these engineers, I interrupted the gentleman with the query of whether he believed these engineers should refuse to make allotments for projects merely because a handful of Congressmen had criticized such projects upon the floor of the House, and whether he believed they should disregard their honest judgment and just merely because of this criticism refuse to make any recommendation whatever, although their judgment in making such recommendations had been indorsed by the majority membership of both Houses of Congress. Instead of answering my question the gentleman seemed to become very much perturbed, and at once launched into a vociferous denunciation of the Ohio River project. He said, among other things, that it was the most wasteful one of them all, that it did not have a continuous—I suppose he meant annual—river traffic of 2,000,000 tons, and that the best and most profitable investment the Government could make would be to do away with the Ohio River project entirely, for he said it was on a river which already had $57,000,000 of a possible $100,000,000 investment.

These assertions were in full accord with similar remarks of the gentleman appearing in another portion of his speech, where he discusses the Ohio River project, and in which he further says that the Ohio canalization project fastens upon this country an annual interest burden of $3,000,000 and a further annual burden for maintenance and deterioration of at least $4,000,000 to maintain the 64 locks. A little later on he said, "Does this reduce the price of a ton of coal to a single consumer?" His wanton attack upon this project is such that it calls for some response from those who are interested to show why Congress has been making appropriations for the improvement of this river for the past 50 or 60 years. I desire to correct one error I think that the gentleman has fallen into, namely, that there are 53 locks and dams to be constructed on the Ohio River and not 64. This, of course, is not a serious matter, but for the sake of accuracy I will say that the reports of the engineers originally provided only for the construction of 54 and 1 of these has been subsequently eliminated.

The gentleman states that $57,000,000 has been appropriated for the Ohio River up to this time. While this is true there has only been about $40,000,000 appropriated for the present project. To arrive at $57,000,000 he starts with the first appropriation for the river in 1827 and includes everything appropriated up to the present hour. He would charge to the cost of construction of the present project all the appropriations heretofore expended for the maintenance of open-channel navigation, the building of ice piers, dredging and snagging, the expenditure for the acquisition and improvement of the Portland & Louisville Canal, all of which amounts to somewhere near $15,000,000 to $17,000,000; and he also includes as a part of the cost of the present slack-water construction $1,630,738, the total cost of the operation of the locks and dams which have already been completed. So it is evident to any fair-minded person that about $17,000,000 of his $57,000,000 should not be included in the cost of construction of the present slack-water scheme, but that it is a proper charge or offset against the open-channel traffic of the river for the past 45 years, an expenditure by the Government for the protection of river crafts, and those engaged in river traffic, and the passengers upon this stream during those long years, aggregating many millions of persons, and the cargoes transported aggregating hundreds of millions of tons of the value of billions of dollars.

The report of the Army Engineers show that it is proposed to provide slack-water navigation for the Ohio River from Pittsburgh to Cairo, a distance of 968 miles, to the depth of 9 feet, at a cost of $63,731,488, in addition to the appropriations made for slack-water navigation previous to 1907, which amounts to $16,555,225.48, making the entire cost something over $80,000,000. To this should be added, likely, six or seven millions for permanent open-channel improvement, making the total cost somewhere from eighty-five to ninety million dollars. He wants the people to understand that when this project is completed they will be for all time to come burdened with the annual payment of $3,000,000 of interest. Of course the gentleman knows better. He knows that no bonds have been issued, or will be issued, to construct this project and that its construction is being paid for out of the current revenues of the Government, and when completed it will be a fully paid-up proposition. The Government, through Congress, believing the canalization of the Ohio River to be important not only to the people of the Ohio Valley but to the Nation has concluded to donate sufficient money to construct this great improvement. It is remarkable what some people can lead themselves to believe. The new philosophy advanced by the gentleman teaches that when the Department of Agriculture disburses $25,000,000, which has been previously raised by some form of taxation, that the people thereafter will be continually burdened with a $750,000 annual interest charge, and so we could go through all the various appropriation bills passed annually by Congress, aggregating in the past billions

and billions of dollars, and by the gentleman's process of reasoning we could pyramid interest burden upon interest burden until the annual interest charge on the billions and billions of dollars being borrowed by the combined belligerent powers of Europe to carry on the present war would pale into insignificance. So much for this chimercial interest octopus the gentleman professes to see sapping the vitals of the Nation's future prosperity. As the Government will pay no interest and the people no interest on the cost of the improvement, his annual three million scare goes up in smoke. He states that the maintenance and deterioration charge will amount to $4,000,000 annually, but the Army Engineers in their reports place the cost of maintenance of the system at $1,000,000 a year. So we find upon an investigation of the actual facts that the gentleman's $7,000,000 annual burden drops to practically $1,000,000. The gentleman states in effect that there is a diminishing annual tonnage traffic on the river. I contend that the Government statistics and investigations of the Army Engineers show it to be holding its own or to be slightly increasing.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SWITZER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. For just a minute. I am interested in these river and harbor improvements, as I represent the State of Texas at large, which, as the gentleman knows, contains a number of rivers, and I believe in it. Now, it is my theory, and I want to know if the gentleman agrees with me, if the rivers were not there that the whole country and all its vast industries would be at the mercy of the inordinate greed of the railway traffic, and hence their very presence is worth millions of dollars to the industries of this country?

Mr. SWITZER. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Yes, sir. Thank you.

Mr. SWITZER. I am rather of the opinion, while I have not the report at hand, that there was a lower tonnage traffic than usual for 1915 on the river. Like the traffic upon harbors and lakes, it fluctuates from year to year; various things have an effect upon them, like strikes; and especially upon the Ohio River, like great droughts, or in winter when there is a great amount of ice. All of those things cause the traffic to fluctuate more or less, but I desire to say that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, having this, among other matters, under special investigation in 1906 and 1907, state that the statistical tonnage for the year 1905 of 13,955,918 tons contained many duplications; and after a thorough investigation by the engineers, Brig. Gen. Mackensie, Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, states in his report, to be found in House Document 492, Sixtieth Congress, first session, that the annual traffic on the river for this period was approximately 9,000,000 tons.

In 1912 a new method was adopted for taking and compiling tonnage statistics, which eliminates nearly all the duplications contained in the old method; and under this new system the annual tonnage for the streams for the years 1912, 1913, and 1914 approximates nine and one-half million tons. Just how the gentleman arrived at a diminishing commerce from the official reports I am at a loss to understand. Of course he usually deducts from the river tonnage as furnished by the engineers all ferriage tonnage, the coal, sand, gravel, lumber and timber, and other low-grade tonnage, and if anything remains he then divides this by some covenient factor, which will result in bringing about the figures he had in mind before he commenced his circuitous calculation. Now, if the gentleman wants to be fair in comparing the river tonnage of recent years with that of years long past, and he subjects the present official tonnage to the foregoing deductions and divisions, he should give the past tonnage the same treatment in making his comparisons, for there were ferries across the rivers then, and coal and sand and low-grade tonnage then existed and was counted the same as at present.

To his query as to whether the construction of locks and dams and canalization of the river reduces the price of a ton of coal to a single consumer, I will reply that the Jones & Laughlin Steel Co., by reason of the construction of the locks and dams in the Monongahela River and upper Ohio have been and are transporting an immense tonnage of coal by river at the cost of 4 cents per ton, whereas the rail rate from the same mines was 44 cents per ton.

The near completion of a dam across the Ohio River near Steubenville, making navigation dependable from that point to and up the Monongahela, I am informed, has caused a large corporation to procure a site on the West Virginia side below the Steubenville Dam upon which they propose to erect an immense coking plant which will consume 500,000 tons of coal yearly. This coal will be transported to this point from the Monongahela River at a cost from 30 to 35 cents per ton; the rate by rail for the same haul is 70 cents per ton. The saving of $175,000 a year on a freightage of 500,000 tons is certainly worthy of consideration. The Island Creek Coal Co., of West Virginia, has a river terminal at Huntington on the Ohio River and mine and railway facilities thereto to enable it to load 2,000 tons of coal a day into barges. The completion of the proposed locks and dams from this point to Cairo would be of immense benefit to this company, which is hindered and prevented from utilizing the expensive terminals by it constructed for long periods of the year on account of low water and uncertain water conditions. Of course, hundreds of instances of benefits derived directly from the partial improvement of the river could be given. The Ohio River in the past has been a great factor in reducing and keeping down freight rates on the railways paralleling the river from Pittsburgh to Cincinnati and Louisville and on down the Mississippi to the Gulf. The saving in this respect during the last 50 years has undoubtedly been enormous, and of itself would justify the expenditure of every dollar that has been spent upon the river up to this hour.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SWITZER. If the gentleman will wait until I read this, then I will yield. In this connection I desire to read a few excerpts from the report to which I have just referred as to whether the canalization of the river will have any effect to reduce present freight rates on the river as well as railway freight rates. This is from a statement in the report of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce.

> In the letter written by Capt. William L. Sibert, heretofore quoted, it is estimated that the cost of carrying 3,500,000 tons of coal from Pittsburgh to Louisville, in the present state of the Ohio, is 45.8 cents per ton, and that if the river were permanently deepened to 9 feet the cost would only be 24.1 cents per ton.
>
> He further estimated that with the improved river the rate per ton from Louisville to New Orleans would be only 53.38 cents, as against 89.2 cents at present. The saving would thus be 21.7 cents per ton from Pittsburgh to Louisville, and 35.82 cents more from Louisville to New Orleans.

Now I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman speaks as if he were familiar with the traffic on the Mississippi River below St. Louis. The gentleman, I take it, knows that the river from St. Louis to New Orleans passes through some of the most fertile and productive territory in this country, where there are great products of the farms and of the mines. Does the gentleman know that about 30 or 40 years ago there were hundreds—yes, thousands—of freight boats on the river between St. Louis and New Orleans, while to-day there are comparatively few? Is not the river open for traffic to-day as it was 30 or 40 years ago?

Mr. SWITZER. The Mississippi is in better condition than it was 40 or 50 years ago so far as navigation is concerned between those points, but I know nothing of traffic on the Mississippi further than what I glean from official statistics.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman explain why on a river like that, that is open for navigation, where the conditions are ideal, the watercourse is not used for transportation, but to-day, instead, the traffic is carried by the railroads that parallel this stream?

Mr. SWITZER. I have not the time to go into any lengthy discussion concerning the traffic upon the Mississippi River. The fact is, it has diminished from St. Louis to the mouth of the Ohio, and from there on down to New Orleans, but not to the extent that it has above.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield further? It occurs to ordinary laymen like myself, and one not as thoroughly acquainted with river traffic as the gentleman from Ohio appears to be, that it is a poor business proposition to expect that by the construction of a water route in some section of the country it is going to encourage traffic when the fact exists that where the waterway is already constructed and is suitable for traffic, where traffic lies along its banks, the traffic is not borne upon the watercourse.

Mr. SWITZER. I will say to the gentleman that my discussion is from the viewpoint of one who is on the Ohio River. I do not like to make any prediction, but I will say that I believe if the Ohio River is canalized you will see within a few years millions and millions more tons of freight going down the Mississippi annually from the mouth of the Ohio to the Gulf of Mexico than you see to-day.

Mr. NORTON. What experience or what condition in the past leads the gentleman to that conclusion?

Mr. SWITZER. Well, there are a great many things. For instance, in 1895 there were gathered in the harbor at Pittsburgh 2,500 barges on which had been loaded 1,200,000 tons of coal, and on account of the drought—no water in the Ohio River—it laid there from June until the last of November, entailing a cost—that is, when you count the interest charge on the money invested in the river craft, and the cost of holding those barges

here—something like $450,000 to those people. I have no doubt on account of a coal shortage at Cincinnati and Louisville and other places in the South, especially at that time, the people paid anywhere from half a million to one million dollars more for the coal that they used. These inconveniences necessarily diminish the river traffic which will revive when they are eliminated by having a dependable channel.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SWITZER. I would like to have about 10 minutes more, anyway.

Mr. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, if I should ask the gentleman from Wisconsin whether the improvement of the Great Lakes and their connecting links had reduced the price of a ton of coal to a single consumer at Hancock, Houghton, and Calumet, in northern Michigan, and at Superior and Duluth, especially after a perusal of the Army Engineers' reports as to the commerce of the Great Lakes, he would undoubtedly think I was mentally defective. If it should suddenly appear that a large majority of the present membership of Congress was seriously considering a proposition to abandon further improvements upon the Great Lakes and their connecting links, and to contribute no further to their upkeep, and tear out the lake connections, the people of his State, especially at Superior, would go crazy, for when they would lose the through-water rate over the Great Lakes from the East to the West, they would realize that they would be absolutely at the mercy of the railways.

Now, we want the gentleman to understand that the people of the great Pittsburgh and Wheeling iron district, the East Liverpool pottery district, and of the great developed and developing coal industry of Tennessee, Kentucky, and West Virginia, Pennsylvania and Ohio, and the hundreds of manufacturing plants of varied character of the entire Ohio Valley are mightily interested in a through water rate from Pittsburgh down the Ohio River, the Mississippi, the Gulf of Mexico, through the Panama Canal, along the Pacific to points on our western coast. Can the gentleman comprehend what that would mean to the people of the States bordering on the Ohio River and to the people of the Pacific coast as well as to the people of those States bordering on the lower Mississippi and the Gulf of Mexico? It is claimed that coal can be transported by the barge system on the Ohio River at 0.5 mill per ton-mile, and it is said that a tow consisting of 15,000 or 16,000 tons of coal has been towed from Pittsburgh to points on the lower Mississippi, a distance of nearly 2,000 miles, at a cost of 35 cents per ton. With a dependable water route, as I have suggested, can not the gentleman see that the transcontinental railway systems of our country will set up and take notice? With this great waterway facility between the Pacific coast and the city of Pittsburgh not only additional transportation facilities will have been provided, but millions of dollars will be saved to shippers in transcontinental railway freightage. The Ohio canalization project is not only a matter of national importance but a matter of the utmost importance to the people on our western coast and along the Gulf of Mexico and along the Mississippi River. It is a well-known fact to everyone who has made any investigation whatever that any two points of considerable distance apart, having a waterway connection as well as railway connection, that the freightage charges between these places is not only lower by water but much lower by rail than to places situated the same distance apart enjoying only a railway connection.

In a recent hearing before the Rivers and Harbors Committee we were informed that cotton shipped from Dallas to Galveston, Tex., by rail, there being no dependable waterway connection between these points, was burdened with a freightage charge of $2.62 per bale, while cotton shipped from points on the Mississippi River about the same distance to the Gulf cost only 75 cents per bale, and numerous instances of this kind can be cited in the States of Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas. The gentleman should also recollect that only about one-half of the work of constructing the present Ohio slack-water project has been done in dollars and cents, and that while some of the completed work has helped increase the river tonnage locally, the work now going on in other parts of the stream tends in many instances to hinder and obstruct navigation, and thereby diminish river traffic on those parts of the stream. He suggests that the Ohio River project should be abandoned, with more than $20,000,000 expended on 19 or 20 uncompleted dams scattered along the Ohio River from Wheeling to Cairo. He would refuse to make further appropriations for the completion of these dams and the project, and leave the river with these numerous and dangerous obstructions to navigation therein, and necessarily paralyze the eight or ten million tons of annual traffic, or he would make future appropriations to the amount of $15,000,000 at least for the removal of these deadly obstructions to navigation. There can be no accurate test made of the dependableness of this canalization and its helpfulness in developing an increased river traffic until the entire proposed improvement is completed. No one can predict just what the future annual commerce of this stream will be after the project is finished.

The scheme purposes taking care of an enormous commerce, and it is estimated that 20,000 tons can be locked from one pool to another in one and a half hours, or at the rate of about 100,000,000 tons in one direction per annum if the dams are not lowered. The utility of the locks and dams has been thoroughly tested out by the operation of those completed. It is also, I think, been fairly tried out on the Monongahela River, one of the streams forming the source of the Ohio, where there has been developed an annual river tonnage, on a 125-mile improved stream of more than 10,000,000 tons, being about treble its tonnage prior to its canalization and resulting in an enormous saving of freight rates along this stream. The Monongahela has certainly been a paying proposition. It is and will continue to be one of the great feeders of the Ohio River, and in the future it will contribute an enormous increased annual tonnage to the Ohio. It also must not be overlooked that, slack water once secured in the river, commerce will be moved up the stream at a cost but little exceeding that required to move it downstream. Nearly the whole of the present tonnage is a downstream one. Lumber is already being transported up the Mississippi River in large quantities to points on the lower part of the Ohio at a great saving in cost of freightage. Pittsburgh and the upper Ohio will need immense quantities of lumber in the future which will have to be transported long distances.

The canalized Ohio will enable the southern lumber producer and producers of numerous other products to avail themselves of the cheap water transportation up the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, and we believe that the completed Panama Canal, opening up the Pacific to our coal, iron, and innumerable manufactured products of the Ohio Valley, will enormously increase our river traffic. Its future possibilities as a great water highway are so believed in by the 4,000,000 people who inhabit the counties contiguous to the stream, the 5,000,000 people of Ohio, the 7,000,000 of Pennsylvania, and the 1,300,000 of West Virginia that the legislatures of these three great industrial States have authorized the counties of northeastern Ohio, southwestern Pennsylvania, and northwestern West Virginia to issue bonds to the extent of $60,000,000 for the purpose of constructing a canal 103 miles long, commencing at the confluence of the Beaver and Ohio Rivers, about 25 miles below Pittsburgh, up the Beaver River to its confluence with the Mahoning, thence up the Mahoning and across the portage to Lake Erie. When this canal is constructed it is claimed that coal can be transported thereover from the Ohio River to Lake Erie at a cost of 5 cents per ton; the cost of transportation a few years ago was about 90 cents to $1 per ton; and that iron ore can be brought from the lake to the Ohio for 25 cents per ton, if the canal is free, whereas the charge a few years ago was from $1 to $1.25 per ton. If this canal is constructed, it can not help but enormously increase the tonnage of the Ohio River. I take it the gentleman from Wisconsin will make no objection to the development of this waterway, which would probably result in a saving of 25 to 50 cents per ton to the consumers of coal in the northern part of his State, northern Minnesota, and Michigan, and which would probably save $1 per ton freightage on the iron ore from these States to the great Pittsburgh and Wheeling iron-manufacturing district, one of their largest consumers.

Mr. FESS. Would the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SWITZER. Yes; just for a question.

Mr. FESS. Do you refer to the Beaver River that enters into the Ohio there at Beaver Falls?

Mr. SWITZER. Yes.

Mr. FESS. What is the prospect for that canal?

Mr. SWITZER. It has been lying in a dormant state for three or four years, but the adjacent counties in that region have authority to issue bonds, and I have been given to understand that there is a revival of sentiment to build the canal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. I wanted to ask the Member from Ohio whether there is any length of distance where it is possible to construct a water route, where the possibilities of such great commerce can be carried as on the routes you speak of, connecting the region of Cleveland and the Lakes with Pittsburgh and the inland water section?

Mr. SWITZER. I will say to my colleague that I can not now recall any other that has such great possibilities.

I have never heard the gentleman, Mr. FREAR, complain of the expenditure of a hundred million dollars in the past upon the harbors and rivers of the Great Lakes, which has enabled them to get a 30-cent per ton coal rate for a distance of 800 miles and which made it possible for them years ago to find a great market for their immense iron-ore deposits by reason of their having the advantage of this great low water freight rate.

The Government, when poor, you might say, as compared with the present, was exceedingly liberal to the Great Lakes region; and by making dependable for commerce its wonderful waterways it has contributed to the development of that region undoubtedly more than any other one factor. The gentleman continually complains that the statistics of river commerce contain duplications. If coal and sand, lumber and timber tonnage of the river should not be taken into consideration in estimating river traffic, then why should the coal, sand, lumber, and timber tonnage and other low-grade freights of the railway be taken into consideration in estimating the tonnage of railway traffic? I have no doubt but that the chief tonnage of railways is coal, stone, sand, railway ties, lumber, and timber. The gentleman in discussing duplications said nothing about duplications in the aggregate tonnage of the Great Lakes and their connecting links as shown by the statistics. He must recollect that every ton of the 75,000,000 annually passing through the Soo Canal originated in some harbor or on some river of the lake and was there counted as a part of the tonnage of that river or harbor, and again counted as it passed through this great canal, and again counted at the port of its final destination upon the Great Lakes; and while the Soo Canal at an expenditurue of $15,000,000 accommodates an immense annual commerce, this commerce would not now exist in such large volume if it were not for the $100,000,000 of Governmental expenditure on the Great Lakes that I have referred to. The gentleman can, of course, point to some wastage of public money which has heretofore been expended upon the Ohio River and other rivers of the country, but I have no doubt that it could be pointed out that millions of dollars have been wasted upon the Great Lakes.

Why, I was in Chicago last summer, and I found where a great wall had been erected there years ago, out in the lake, for the protection of vessels and for the protection of the harbor; and that the people had filled in practically all of the area between the city and that wall, and that now as a protection to the harbor it was an obsolete proposition. And so we could enumerate.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one minute remaining.

Mr. SWITZER. I would ask, Mr. Chairman, leave to extend my remarks.

Mr. NORTON. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SWITZER. I was practically through. I wanted leave to extend my remarks in order to put in some observations concerning the Mississippi River.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Under leave granted to extend his remarks Mr. SWITZER inserted the following:

I have not time to call attention to all of the inaccurate statements made by the gentleman from Wisconsin, nor to reply to his unfounded charges and his attempts to cast suspicion and some ulterior motive on every movement of Congress to improve our rivers and harbors. So far as Congress being unduly influenced by lobbyists and dredging contractors, a matter to which the gentleman has paid much attention in his remarks, I wish to say that unfortunately we can not make the improvements on our rivers and harbors that we desire without giving employment to contractors and to thousands and thousands of laborers. I have no doubt that many contractors are looking forward in the hope of securing future work, as well as many thousands of laboring men; but I know of no waterway improvement ever having been undertaken by Congress merely to give some one employment, and if the gentleman knows of such an instance I would be pleased to have him bring it to my attention. It would seem to me that the great activity on the part of associations and communities in various parts of the country pleading and urging for Congress to make larger appropriations for waterway improvement, as shown by the gentleman's speech, is a conclusive argument of their inestimable value to the people. At any rate these great civic bodies have a right to petition Congress and to be heard. In the State of Ohio, which I have in part the honor to represent, the State and counties are spending millions of dollars for the improvement of our public roads, which necessarily gives employment to hundreds and thousands of contractors and laborers, many of whom I have no doubt are anxious to secure future work and likely, in many instances, urge increased appropriations for road building, but because of this activity on their part I know of no one who would suggest the discontinuance of future appropriations for highway improvement.

Many pages of the gentleman's speech, as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, are devoted to an argument designed to raise the old sectional feeling which once existed between the North and South. He cites statistics to show that the North pays 95 per cent of all taxes and Government revenues compared with the Southern States, and I suppose he therefore reasons that 95 per cent of all appropriations passed by Congress should be spent in the North. The South has a much larger navigable river mileage than the North, and many of the southern improvements are very expensive, especially that of the lower Mississippi. If any headway is to be made toward the completion of the lower Mississippi project, there must be an annual appropriation therefor for a number of years to come of $6,000,000 or $7,000,000. Unfortunately we can not move these rivers up North, and if we make any future appropriations for their improvement it will be necessary to spend the money in the South. But the argument of the gentleman is an old chestnut, which is being worked overtime at this session of Congress. For instance, the opponents of the good-roads bill advanced the same arguments in their opposition to that measure, and used practically the same tabulations and data as used by the gentleman from Wisconsin, and especially urged that the proposed $25,000,000 appropriation for good roads should not be distributed to the States in the proportion that the population of each bore to the population of all the States, and in proportion that the rural mail-route mileage in each State bore to the rural mail-route mileage of all the States, after arbitrarily giving each State $65,000, for the reason that the North paid 95 per cent of the taxes and therefore the Southern States and some few of the Western States were reaping an enormous advantage in the distribution. But the argument would not down. The attempt to revive the old, bitter sectional feeling met with dismal failure, and the good-roads bill passed the House by a vote of 282 for and 81 against. It seems to me that the gentleman is making a hopeless appeal.

The questions propounded by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] would indicate that he was unfavorable to making future appropriations for the lower Mississippi River because of some decrease in the commerce on this stream during the past few years. So far as the navigability of the lower Mississippi is concerned, it might be maintained for several years without an appropriation; but in order to bring about the present navigable condition of the river Congress, a number of years ago, began improving the stream by constructing levees on either side and revetment work along many of its wasting banks. The matter of flood control is a burning question in the Ohio and lower Mississippi Valleys, and I have no doubt that it is at this time at Los Angeles and San Diego. There is a great movement throughout the country to develop all possible flood control. The lower Mississippi receives the water from, I believe, 27 States of the Union. The devastation wrought by past floods has aroused the Nation to such an extent that all political parties have declared in their national platforms for legislation to control the flood waters of the Mississippi. Recollect that the levees now being constructed along the east and west sides of the Mississippi are something like 2 miles apart and about a thousand miles long. Here we have a great basin of 2,000 square miles, located where nature intended it, receiving the floods from the north and discharging them at the south.

When the Mississippi River Commission assumed charge of the river a flood having a discharge of 1,100,000 second-feet created disaster throughout the entire delta, but there has been constructed a levee line which can now successfully restrain a flood of 1,750,000 second-feet at the head of the levee system and one of over 1,400,000 second-feet at New Orleans. The maximum discharge of the floods of 1912 and 1913 was about 2,000,000 second-feet. A simple direct solution of the problem is to increase the size of the levees until they can safely pass 250,000 second-feet more than they do at present.

I quote the above from Col. Townsend's statement before the River and Harbor Committee, so we are making great progress toward controlling the Mississippi floods. Unless these floods are controlled it will be impossible to maintain the integrity of the channel of the river, for if the appropriations are discontinued and the floods allowed to run at random through these levees immense sandbars will soon appear in the channel.

The completion of these levees is of vital importance to the people of the Mississippi Delta. Of 20,000,000 acres of land in the Delta only three and a half million are under cultivation. When life and property are rendered absolutely secure by reason of the protection afforded by the levees 12,000,000 acres of what is now waste land in the Delta will be available for cultivation. Much of this land after it is reclaimed will produce two and three crops a year, and it is exceedingly fertile. This land, when made tillable, will be worth from $150 to $200 per acre, so this vast area of reclaimed land alone would add $2,000,000,000 to the developed wealth of the Nation. It seems to me that if this can be accomplished with the expenditure on the part of the Government of one hundred to one hundred and fifty million dollars that it would be a good investment, besides the protection it would afford for other forms of property and safety to human life in this district. It would develop a great agricultural region in the very heart of the country, readily accessible to many of our great cities and densely populated districts by water and rail, and while originally this feature was looked upon as one of the incidental benefits to be derived from the leveeing of the river, it is now looming up as not only of prime but of national importance.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] wished to be yielded five minutes; and if the gentleman in charge of the bill has no objection, I will yield five minutes to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the present Indian Committee is just rounding out twenty years of public service in the Congress of the United States. From the time of my earliest memory the then Territory of Oklahoma, having almost two-fifths of all the Indians in the United States within its borders, was in one form or another appealing to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] to be their helper and their friend in the Congress.

How dependent the Territory was. They had no titles to their lands that they could convey. The towns were on unpatented lands. The cemeteries were on unpatented lands. The school sites, what few there were, were likewise on unpatented lands. Everything had to come to Congress and be acted on here.

Always honest, always sympathetic, always just, always willing to help was the present chairman, the distinguished and beloved JOHN H. STEPHENS, of Vernon, Tex.

If the sparsely settled community needed even a cemetery lot in which to bury the dead they could not buy it or acquire it without the aid of Congress. Their first thought was their appeal to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS], who always held to them an attentive ear and always made a response to their appeal. This has been true every day during all these long and useful 20 years he has served in public life. During the time when our Statehood troubles came on it was then a question as to whether the big cattlemen in the State, who had pretty complete control of the State, should prevail or whether the settler, anxious to build for himself a home, should prevail. I am happy to-day to make grateful acknowledgment to the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, who always took his side and his stand with the home builder and with the settler and helped develop our bright, new State; and I use this moment in passing to tell him, and to make public acknowledgment to him, that the result of his untiring labors has brought to us a new State with 1,650,000 people, has brought to us prosperous cities and towns, has brought to us paved streets and high schools and colleges, has brought to us all the blessings that any of the sister States have, and it has been done by means of the good work and good deeds of the gentleman from Texas.

It is not, my friends, so usual to find one's entire public life spent in such an arduous and unselfish task. There is scarcely an Indian, I think I may say there is not one, in his entire district; there are few, if any, Indians in his entire State. If he did little or much for the Indian or his problems it would make little difference to the people of his State. But here we find him to-day, as he has been throughout the entire 20 years of his activity here, serving faithfully the dependent people of the Republic, the Indians, and helping to solve the problems in our new State, along with other problems in other States, whenever they arise. Only a couple of Congresses ago, Mr. Chairman, a little incident occurred which is worthy of mention in this House. Some 60 years ago one of the Indian tribes of Oklahoma stole a little white girl and carried her away from the State of Texas and from the district now represented by the chairman of this committee. She was carried among the Comanche tribe of Indians in Oklahoma, then a wild, unsubdued band of Indians. As she reached young womanhood an Indian child was born, half Indian, half white. That child was Quanah Parker. That child became the chief of his tribe, half Indian and half white. About two Congresses ago he went away to another tribe of Indians and contracted pneumonia and died. The chairman of this committee got the Congress of the United States to appropriate a thousand dollars to remove the remains of his mother from Texas to the residence of the Comanche tribe up into Comanche County, my home county, in my district, and there caused a thousand-dollar monument to be erected to the old chief and to his mother, who had formerly been a resident of that State.

Mr. Chairman, if I asked the youngest Indian child in that tribe whom he loved most, he would name without a moment's hesitation the chairman of the Indian Committee. If I should ask the oldest Indian down there whom he cared for most in public life, he would name the chairman of this committee. [Applause.] And, Mr. Chairman, it is not too much as a Representative in Congress from that State, where we have to trouble and annoy Congress so much, to make, first, grateful acknowledgment to him, and then grateful acknowledgment to this Congress for the great help and assistance they have rendered our Indian people in our new State in its upbuilding. I yield back the remainder of my time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request.

There was no objection.

[Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DILL].

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, the Indian question is almost as old as the establishment of white civilization on this continent. During the early years of our history the problem was largely how to protect the white man's life from the Indian. During the latter years of our history the problem has been largely how to protect the Indian's property from the white man. At the risk of being misunderstood, I dare to say that, in my opinion, the most important phase of the Indian problem to-day is how to prevent the Indians of the present, and especially the Indians of the future, from becoming permanent wards and dependents of the Federal Government. [Applause.] When I say the most important part of the Indian problem is to prevent his becoming permanently dependent on the Government, I make the statement advisedly. I have in mind the testimony of those who reside in practically all sections where the system of tutelage and guardianship is in full working effect. I have in mind the fact that where the Indians are kept confined to reservations they are more and more becoming dependent subjects of this Government instead of developing into independent citizens under this Government.

Nor do I think it particularly to the discredit of the Indians that this is so. I have sometimes thought that if a few hundred white men with their families were placed and kept on a wild undeveloped area of land, such as the Indian reservations are, without previous experience in making a livelihood from the soil, and their money, their property, almost their very activities were continually under the guardianship of Federal officers, I say I have sometimes thought that those white men, and certainly their descendants, would become even more dependent and helpless than the Indians are. No; the trouble is not with the Indian but with the system that keeps him in tutelage. Either that system must be changed or else the burden on the Government will grow greater year by year and the Indian problem become bigger and bigger as the Indian's condition grows more and more dependent.

As to the pending bill, let me say that I worked over it with the committee and joined in the favorable report made upon it. I think the appropriations are as low as is advisable to make them under the present system of administering Indian affairs, but I believe the system of financing the department should be changed. I desire therefore to discuss briefly what I believe to be at least one of the objections to the present system of financing the Indian Department.

In 1911 Congress provided, in section 27 of the act approved March 3 of that year, that the Secretary of the Interior should make reports to Congress of the fiscal affairs of all the Indian tribes on the first Monday of each December, showing the receipts and disbursements of all moneys for the preceding year. Five such annual reports have been made. From them I have

made certain tables. These tables show some most striking facts. I desire to insert one of them here without reading the figures.

Total of money disbursed by Indian Department, 1912 to 1915, inclusive.

	1911	1912	1913	1914	1915	Total.
Receipts	10,384,131	7,998,315	9,917,602	8,494,217	7,057,014	43,851,279
Per capita payments	3,127,308	5,485,015	6,470,839	6,268,074	6,515,209	27,866,445
Credit of tribes	50,710,789	44,519,533	46,668,701	47,092,214	42,196,680	.....
Spent from tribal funds	.....	8,704,556	1,297,595	1,802,630	5,437,339	17,242,120
Salaries of employees	1,799,022	4,469,093	4,317,602	4,678,118	4,454,789	19,718,624
Support and civilization	3,402,660	4,442,154	5,227,202	6,951,347	7,234,303	27,257,666
Government funds spent	.....	206,691	8,247,209	9,826,835	6,251,753	24,532,488

What does this table show? In the first place it shows that vast amounts of actual money belonging to the Indians are being continually handled and much of it continually held by the Indian Bureau. In referring to amounts of money shown by this table I shall mention only the approximate sums.

During the last five years, 1911 to 1915, inclusive, the receipts of all the Indian tribes amounted to $44,000,000. The per capita payments to Indians during the same period was $27,000,000, but the amount to the credit of the Indians fell from $50,000,000 to $42,000,000. Thus, during the four years, 1912 to 1915, inclusive—and I am unable to go back of 1912, because the figures previous to 1911 were not accessible to me—the department spent more than $17,000,000 of Indian funds. This, of course, does not include the reimbursable amounts appropriated from the Treasury to be expended for the Indians. That amounts to several million dollars additional.

Now, just how does the Indian Department get the authority to spend this Indian money? Under the present laws this is what happens. The Indian Department submits certain estimates of necessary expenditures for the ensuing year, some of which is to be appropriated from the Federal Treasury and some from the Indian funds. The Committee on Indian Affairs then goes over the estimates carefully and generally cuts them down. We have cut more than a half million out of the $10,000,000 asked for in this bill. Then the House goes over the bill section by section and makes such changes as it deems wise. Then it goes to the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs and the estimates are revised again, and then the Senate passes the bill. Then the conference committee agrees on the differences in the bill and the President signs it and the appropriations for the Indian Department are made for the fiscal year.

After all this work by Congress, cutting down and raising estimates for reservation or other purposes, one would naturally think the appropriations were somewhere near the proper sums the department should spend. What is the real practice? The Indian Department proceeds to spend not only the money appropriated by this bill, but such amounts from various tribal funds as, in the discretion of the Indian officials, seems proper for the benefit of the Indian. For instance, Congress appropriates, say, $100,000 for the expenditures of a certain tribe of Indians and that tribe has tribal funds also which are available for use by the Indian Bureau. What happens? The department uses the $100,000 and then appropriates and spends such amount from the tribal fund as the officials in their discretion think should be used, as they say, for the benefit of the Indians. Oh, I know the law which grants the authority used the language "in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior," but in practice the discretion which really controls is the discretion of some Indian agent, department inspector, or other subordinate official.

This authority was not given by a sweeping grant of power to the Secretary of the Interior by Congress over all these tribal funds at one time. I doubt if Congress could ever be induced to do that. So far as I know the officials of the Indian Department have never tried to secure such a grant. How was authority secured, then?

The answer is interesting. A few years ago a short provision was inserted in one of the Indian appropriation bills for that year granting this authority over certain of the tribal funds of one tribe, practically the same provision was inserted in another Indian bill another year as to another tribe, and the same provision in still another bill as to some other tribe, and so on year after year until now I think it is safe to say that this authority applies to certain tribal funds of most of the Indian tribes of the country. In the bill this year as submitted to the committee there was at least one such provision inserted, and I think two or three, and if I remember correctly the committee struck them all out. I know all that I noticed were struck out.

But the point I desire to make is this: This kind of piecemeal legislation extending over a period of years has resulted in a condition of the statutes which enables the Indian officials to appropriate and spend literally millions of dollars of money which belongs to the Indians. Of course they spend this money, as they say, for the benefit of the Indian, but the trouble is that they, the officials, are the judges of when, where, and how the Indians shall be benefited and of how much of his money shall be spent. The practical result has been that the expenditures for salaries and employees in the department have increased by leaps and bounds, and it seems they increased fastest on those Indian reservations where the Indians have tribal funds which can be so used. The general increase in expenditures for salaries and employees in the Indian Department in the last five years, 1911–1915, inclusive, has been 150 per cent, while on some of the reservations the increase has been 250 per cent to 300 per cent. New agencies, new hospitals, unauthorized by Congress and not desired by the Indians, but desired by department officials, as they say, for the benefit of the Indians, have been built by use of these tribal funds, and in the future Congress will be called upon to provide money for their support. In fact, Congress is already being called upon to do that very thing in the pending bill.

We can not go back or undo the past. I do not charge corruption, but I do say that in my judgment there has been abuse of discretion. I have no desire to try to remedy that now. What I desire now is to prevent the continuation of these practices. I believe the law should provide that the Indian Department shall do as all other departments of this Government are compelled to do, namely, to estimate all of its expenditures for the ensuing year and then be limited in making those expenditures to the actual amount Congress appropriates for that purpose.

Under present conditions the officials of the department appropriate and spend large sums of money each year. This is a violation of one of the basic principles of this Government. It combines the power to legislate and the power to administer in one body. It is to abolish this practice that I desire section 25 of this bill enacted into law. I introduced it in the committee meeting and it was adopted unanimously there. I most earnestly hope it will be adopted unanimously here. It reads as follows:

SEC. 26. That annually, on the first Monday in December, the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives estimates of the amounts of receipts to, and expenditures which the said Secretary recommends to be made for the benefit of the Indians from, all tribal funds of Indians for the ensuing fiscal year; and such statement shall show, first, the total amounts estimated to be received from any and all sources whatsoever, which will be placed to the credit of each tribe of Indians, in trust or otherwise, at the close of the ensuing fiscal year; second, an analysis showing the amounts which the Federal Government is directed and required by treaty stipulations and agreements to expend from each of said funds or from the Federal Treasury, giving references to the existing treaty or agreement or statute; third, the amounts which the Secretary recommends to be spent from each of the tribal funds held in trust or otherwise, and the purpose for which said amounts are to be expended, and said statement shall show the amounts which he recommends to be disbursed (a) for per capita payments in money to the Indians, (b) for salaries or compensation of officers and employees, (c) for compensation of counsel and attorney fees, and (d) for support and civilization: *Provided*, That from and after July 1, 1917, the Secretary of the Interior shall not expend any of the moneys which may be to the credit of any Indian tribe, whether received or held as a tribal fund or otherwise, except such amounts as are specifically authorized by Congress, and that all acts and parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

I believe the adoption of this section will aid in systematizing the expenditures of the Indian Department, save millions of dollars to the American people and to the Indians in the years to come, and also be of real benefit to the Indians by causing Congress to cut down appropriations and free them from tutelage and guardianship much more rapidly than is the case under the present system.

Thus far I have spoken of the dangers and abuses of discretion under the present law in connection with all the Indian tribes as a whole, but I desire now to speak of some specific cases of the results of the misuse of this discretion in handling the affairs of the Indian tribes within the district of which I am the Representative in this House, the Colvilles and the Spokanes.

For many years the affairs of these tribes were administered from one agency, located near the Columbia River, which runs between the Colville and Spokane Reservations. The north half of the Colville Indian Reservation was opened to settlement a few years ago. I should say, rather, that the part of it which was not made into a national forest was opened to settlement. In 1906 Congress passed an act to open the south half of the Colville Indian Reservation. That act provided that each Indian should be given an allotment and the unallotted surplus lands opened to settlement and sold. Now, mark you, that was in 1906.

In 1914, eight years later, the old agency located on the Spokane Reservation side of the Columbia River was abandoned.

A new agency had been built near the town site of Nespelem, on the Colville Reservation, at an expense of more than $50,000. Was the location and building of this new agency authorized by Congress? Not at all. Congress had directed that this big reservation of more than a million acres should be opened to settlement, and in that way the Indians would be brought into contact with white settlers and their children developed into useful, responsible citizens as a result of their association with the whites. But the Indian Department seemed to take an entirely different view, for it caused to be built a most magnificent Indian agency plant 40 miles from a railroad and in the very part of the reservation where white settlers would be most likely to take up homesteads. If Congress did not authorize the building of this magnificent new agency, where did the Indian Department secure the money? From the tribal funds of the Colvilles, of course. They had authority to spend certain funds in their "discretion" for the benefit of the Indians.

Think of it, gentlemen. Congress in 1906 had directed that this great reservation should be opened. Allotment work was going on all the time at the expense of the Indians. Plans for the opening were being discussed, and yet the Indian Department erected this new agency 40 miles from a railroad, out on a dry, treeless area on one of those benches that rises along the west side of the mighty Columbia. Out there on the open range the Indian Department erected fine new dwellings for its employees, built a large administration building, and constructed a magnificent water system, finer than is possessed by many towns with hundreds of people—a water system which keeps the beautiful lawns green through the longest drought, keeps down the dust on the tennis courts on the driest evening, and makes a very oasis of civilization, all paid for by Indian money "for the benefit of the Indians."

Mr. Chairman, the establishment and creation of that new agency several years after Congress had directed the opening of that reservation can be explained only by one of two theories. Either the Indian Department intended to delay the opening until enough Indian children were born to take up all the valuable lands in the form of allotments and have the remainder set aside as a permanent tribal reserve, or else it intended to carry on a most elaborate system of tutelage and guardianship of the Indians who will live among white men after the reservation has been homesteaded by white men. In either case the Indian would be kept dependent, half captive and half protégé, under this Government. All of this was done under authority which section 25 of the pending bill will abolish.

It would seem that this abuse of discretion in the use of Indian funds was enough for a department to be guilty of in one congressional district, but let me tell you of what in my opinion was an even worse handling and spending of Indian moneys.

The Spokane Indians are few in number, 611 in all. They were always peaceful. They have always been poor. In 1911 they had $25,000 in tribal funds which were subject to expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior. They also received a few hundred dollars from pasturage and miscellaneous sources each year. Under a treaty agreement the Government appropriated $1,000 annually to their support. This with the small sums coming in made it possible for these Indians to be cared for with but slight burden on their available funds. Yet what has happened? Why, when the department built the new agency on the Colville Reservation at Nespelem, it also decided to build a new agency on the Spokane Reservation at a place called Wellpinit, although the old agency of both the Colvilles and Spokanes was located on the Spokane Reservation. At Nespelem they went out upon the dry, treeless land and created an oasis. At Wellpinit they went into the forest, hewed down the trees, pulled the stumps and made a clearing like the pioneers of old, and then paid for it out of Indian money. What is the result? The result is that the tribal fund of $25,000 together with the miscellaneous annual receipts are all gone, and for the first time the Indian Department has asked for an increase in the appropriation to care for the Spokane Indians. In expending the money of the Colville Indians to build the new agency at Nespelem although deserving of the severest criticism, the Colvilles were not seriously hurt because they have a large tribal fund and will yet receive large amounts for their lands. In the case of the Spokanes, however, it was using their money in a way which helps them not and makes them poor indeed.

I realize I have spent more time in explaining these mistakes of the department than would ordinarily be justified, but they are concrete examples of the use of the authority to which I object of which I know.

In the first part of this address I referred to increases in expenditures for salaries and employees during the past five years. In examining those same fiscal reports in regard to these Colville and Spokane Indians I find some interesting statistics. I desire to insert here a table made from the reports.

Money disbursed by Indian Department on Colville and Spokane Indian Reservations, 1911 to 1915, inclusive, State of Washington.

	1911	1912	1913	1914	1915	Total
Receipts of tribes	$330,746	$322,423	$15,849	{ $9,983 [1] 2,736	$12,461 [1] 1,310	$691,462 4,046
Per capita payments	None.	165,000	12,000	233,000	77,500	487,500
Tribal funds	772,541	822,386	852,363	{ 485,814 [1] 28,219	428,249 [1] 24,891	.....
Spent out of tribal funds	.....	107,578	[2] 26,028	117,929	[2] 2,836	196,643
Salaries and employees	20,439	87,461	81,761	{ 94,137 [1] 13,264	98,283 [1] 14,127	382,051 [1] 27,391
Support and civilization	35,916	33,622	61,871	{ 77,826 [1] 7,916	50,659 [1] 18,041	259,894 [1] 25,957
Government funds spent	.....	13,525	149,650	75,114	183,896	271,957

[1] Spokane. [2] To tribe.

In 1914 the two agencies were separated, the Colville Agency being removed to Nespelem and the Spokane to Wellpinit. The report for 1914 and 1915 on the Spokane Agency are here given:

	1914	1915	Total.
Receipts	$2,736	$1,310	$4,046
Per capita payment	None.	None.	.....
Tribe's fund	28,219	24,891	.....
Spent out of tribal fund	.....	4,628	.....
Salaries and employees	13,264	14,127	27,391
Support and civilization	7,916	18,041	25,957
Government funds	.....	27,540	.....

The $24,000 to the credit of the Spokane Indians is for money received for lands but can not be used by the department.

I desire to call attention to the fact that the rise of expenditures for salaries and employees is somewhat proportional to the increase in receipts of the Colvilles. The place where the proportion breaks down is where the receipts fall off, because the salaries continue. In 1911 the expenditures for salaries and employees were only $20,000, but the receipts of the tribe were $330,000, and in 1912 what happened? Why, the expenditures for employees and salaries rose from $20,000 to $87,000, although the amount spent for support and civilization fell from $35,000 to $32,000. In 1913, when the receipts fell from $322,000 in 1912 to $15,000, the expenditures for employees and salaries only fell from $87,000 to $81,000. In 1914, although the receipts were only $12,000, the amount for salaries and employees rose from $81,000 to $107,000 and in 1915 to $112,000. In short, the annual expenditures for employees and salaries increased in the five years—1911 to 1915, inclusive—from $20,000 to $112,000, or 450 per cent, while the amount spent for civilization and support increased during the same period from $35,000 to $68,000, or only 95 per cent. I realize that some of these expenditures were the result of the allotting and appraising work on the reservation, but the fact remains that the increase in expenditures for employees is out of all proportion to other expenditures there. Part of these increased expenditures are the result also of the new agency at Wellpinit.

But this tremendous increase in expenditures for employees and salaries is not peculiar to the reservations in my district. It is true of Indian reservations in many other districts. The tables above, taken from the fiscal report, show that in 1911 the expenditures for employees and salaries were $1,800,000 and that in 1915 they were $4,450,000, while the expenditures for support and civilization increased from $3,400,000 to $7,200,000. In these totals are included the figures of the Five Civilized Tribes, whose expenditures for employees and salaries are comparatively small and support and civilization unusually large.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DILL. Certainly.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. As a matter of fact, the bill being considered in committee contained several items to the effect that the department desired to sell certain property belonging to the Indians and then use that for the benefit of the Indians without reporting to Congress the amount of money the property was sold for or the purpose for which it was used, and did not the committee in every instance strike out these items?

Mr. DILL. That is exactly my remembrance and what I referred to in the parts of the bill of which I have spoken. It is by that method that they have built up a number of statutes

which give them power to spend money from certain of the tribal funds of every Indian tribe in this country. The department not only spends the amounts appropriated, but reaches into the tribal funds and takes out what they see fit to spend for what they say is the benefit of the Indians.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to be understood as claiming that all of the troubles with expenditures by the Indian Department are due to the fact that the officials can appropriate and spend some of the tribal funds. I think the system is wrong. I believe it should be changed, and because I so believe I have introduced a bill authorizing the appointment of a commission to investigate, study, and report on the whole question, and, if possible, recommend some other system which will be more efficient, more economical, and more beneficial to the Indian than the one which we are now using.

How long shall we continue the reservation system? We began herding Indians on reservations about 100 years ago, and are keeping them there still. Shall it never end? Those who know the Indian best condemn it. The Indians themselves—that is, those who have once gotten away from it—object to it and urge its abolition and the others are wards and have no opportunity to know of any other system than the reservation system. I am informed that during the last 35 years we have appropriated $265,000,000 to carry on the present system. Are the Indians the better for it? No. Only those who have been able to get free from it have really profited by it.

Why do we not get rid of it? I'll tell you why. There are now in the Federal Treasury between $40,000,000 and $50,000,000 of Indian trust funds. The Indian lands are worth more than a billion. As long as these funds and this property remain to be administered by Government officials, who make a living by the administering and Congress obeys the recommendations of these officials, we shall not get rid of it.

The system will end only when Congress acts in the true interests of the Indian regardless of the official recommendations which the Indian Department may make. [Applause.]

Let me add that I believe that the commission to which I have already referred should investigate conditions both in the Indian Office and on the reservations. It should gather information from whatever sources information can be secured. After a year of such work I believe such a commission will be able to recommend some plan by which this Indian problem can be solved. I want the Indian of the future to develop individual responsibility. If he is kept as a ward and dependent, this is impossible. The present system not only keeps him so, but the tendency is to make him even more dependent and more burdensome on the Government than in the past. [Applause.]

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Oklahoma begins, I desire to yield the remainder of my time to a gentleman upon this side, if the gentleman from Oklahoma will yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. Certainly.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak on the subject of Indians, and perhaps owe an apology to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] for taking his time just now. This morning the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] made a very interesting speech on rural credits, in the course of which he spoke of the Nebraska system of guaranteeing bank deposits, and in a very taking way set forth the advantages of that system. It seems to me that some things he said perhaps should be answered, not that I desire to go into the whole question of the guaranty of bank deposits at this time, for that is too large a question, but simply to call attention to a few striking things with regard to banking and bank deposits which have to do with that question of guaranteeing bank deposits. In the first place, we have sent to our offices every month this circulation statement, which tells how much money there is in the country. The same thing is to be found in the report of the Comptroller of the Currency as of the 30th of June, 1915. According to these reports, there is a little less than $4,000,000,000 of all kinds of money in the country. That includes gold, silver, greenbacks, Federal reserve notes, national-bank notes, and gold certificates—everything that we call currency or money.

Well, now, if you will turn to page 120 of the report of the Comptroller of the Currency, you will find on deposit in the banks of the country which make reports—not all of them do—about $20,000,000,000. In other words, there is five times as much money on deposit in the banks as there is money in the country, and that is something that people who believe in the guaranteeing of bank deposits ought to put in their pipes and smoke, and let it settle down in their minds in some way. There is five times as much money on deposit in the banks as there is in the country. Every cent of money—and you can prove a lot of interesting things from the report of the Comptroller of the Currency with reference to banking—all the money there is in the United States is on deposit in the mutual savings banks. Those banks have on deposit $3,950,000,000, which is about the same as the total amount of currency in the country. Now, the money that is put in the savings banks is put in by small depositors, the average deposit in the mutual savings banks being only $475. These small depositors in savings banks deposit cash in nearly every case. Now, if all the money in the United States is on deposit in mutual savings banks, without counting the stock savings banks, which also receive mostly cash deposits, what about the money on deposit in national banks and State banks, banks of discount deposit? Where do they get it from? What is it?

I have shown from the comptroller's report that all the real money, the currency of the country, is in the national savings banks. This proves conclusively, does it not, that people who make deposits in national banks and State banks, banks of discount deposit, must put in wind and not money? As a matter of fact, that is just about what they do. The deposits in the banks of discount deposit are not made up of cash, excepting a very small amount. Their deposits are created by borrowing. They are deposits of credit. If I go to a bank and borrow $10,000 and have it placed to my credit, I create a deposit of $10,000, but I have not put a cent of money in the bank. If you will look at the New York Clearing House bank statements published every Saturday in the New York evening papers or in the Sunday morning papers you will find that the deposits and loans go up and down together almost always. When the loans go up, deposits go up. Money that is borrowed goes on deposit. When loans are paid in large volume deposits come down.

But you may perhaps say that no man in his senses ever borrows $10,000 and puts it to his credit and leaves it simply for the purpose of increasing deposits. He wants it to use. So he does, but he does not take it out of the bank. He draws checks on it, and the checks go to somebody else, and the persons who receive the checks deposit them. They are credit just the same, and they are not money. The great mass of the deposits of the banks of the country are not created by putting money in the banks. They are created by credit, by borrowing money; and why in the name of common sense anybody wants the Government to guarantee the payment of deposits that are four-fifths wind or credit I can not see for the life of me. If you are going to guarantee all the bank deposits, you have to guarantee all these billions of dollars which were never put in the banks in the form of cash, but which are really credit. You have got to guarantee the loans on which they are based. And that is the great fallacy of the whole idea.

As I have said, I have no intention of discussing this subject fully at this time, but it seemed timely to suggest these few interesting facts with regard to banking as food for thought for those who think the United States Government, or some great association of banks under Government compulsion, ought to try to guarantee bank deposits. [Applause.]

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the rest of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself to the paragraph in the bill providing for a per capita payment to the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians in Oklahoma.

The question to which I invite your attention is not a difficult one, nor will it be necessary to consume much time in its discussion. It is proposed by this amendment to direct the Secretary of the Interior to pay to the enrolled members of the Choctaw Tribe, entitled under existing law, $300 per capita out of their own money and the Chickasaws $200 per capita out of their funds. There should be no objection to it, and it should receive the unanimous vote of this House.

The statement of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, found on pages 336 and 337 of the hearings before the committee in justification of the item under consideration, shows that there is to the credit of the Choctaws tribal funds aggregating $7,432,353.24 and that there is to the credit of the Chickasaws tribal funds amounting to $1,922,110.48, or a total of $9,354,463.72 in both funds. The justification further invites attention to the additional property owned by the Chickasaw and Choctaw people including unsold lands and other property. It is estimated that the entire value of their property approximates $31,503,954.95.

There are 20,799 enrolled members of the Choctaw Tribe entitled to share in this distribution and 6,304 Chickasaws. A per capita payment of $100 was made to the members of the Chickasaw Tribe a little more than a year ago, which is the reason for the payment to the Choctaws now of $100 more than to the Chickasaws.

The members of the two tribes have an undivided equal interest in and to the lands and funds of both tribes, being separated only for political purposes. A per capita payment of $300 to the Choctaws would aggregate $6,239,700 and $200 to the Chickasaws would amount to $1,260,800, and to both Choctaws and Chickasaws $7,500,500. Hence it will clearly be seen that $300 could be paid to the Choctaws and $200 to the Chickasaws, leaving a balance of $1,853,963.72 in the Treasury, in addition to more than $22,000,000 worth of property not converted into cash.

When the Dawes Commission was created by the act of March 3, 1893, the Choctaw people had their own government with about as much sovereignty as a State of the Union. They had their own constitution and laws, their own governor, their own courts, and their own legislature. They made, executed, and enforced their own laws, appropriated their own money, and conducted their own schools. Railroads were built through the Indian Territory, towns sprang up, and white people from almost every State in the Union came among them. Finally the Choctaws yielded to the pressure of the Government and signed a treaty at Atoka on April 23, 1897 (30 Stat., 495), providing in detail for the allotment of their lands among the enrolled members of the tribe, the making of the rolls, the disposition of town sites, and, in fact, an adjustment of all their relations with the Government of the United States. This agreement looked to the members of the Choctaw Nation becoming citizens of the United States and the creation of a State out of the lands held by the Five Civilized Tribes.

The act of March 3, 1893 (27 Stat., 612, sec. 16), creating the Dawes Commission stated that it was—

To enable the ultimate creation of a State or States of the Union which shall embrace the lands within said Indian Territory.

The members of the Choctaw Tribe accepted these promises and their lands were allotted. Almost 19 years have elapsed since this treaty was ratified. A very large percentage of the Choctaws have died, but with the exception of a small per capita payment of $50 none of their moneys have been disbursed. The members of the Choctaw Tribe were allotted large areas of land. They had to build houses upon their allotments, clear up their fields, place fences along section lines, and otherwise improve their farms. They are greatly in need of a distribution of their own money in order to accomplish these purposes. The Government can not justify itself in longer withholding a partial distribution.

The supplemental agreement ratified by the act of July 1, 1902, section 14, promises a distribution of the moneys per capita among the members of the tribe, when their allotments should be made and their property disposed of. They now have $9,354,463.72 to their credit, and certainly this amount should be distributed among their own members. There is really no argument whatever against the distribution of this money, but every argument in its favor. One-third of the entire membership of the tribe is now dead and never received any part of their money. In my judgment, it is a legislative crime against them to longer withhold it.

CITIZENSHIP QUESTION.

The only argument urged against the distribution of this money is that certain Mississippi Choctaw claimants to citizenship should be provided for, that the money hereinabove referred to as being Choctaw tribal funds is a trust fund, and that the claimants to citizenship have some legal right thereto. It is to this question that I desire to address myself.

Many Members of Congress and good lawyers throughout the United States do not understand the citizenship question among the Five Civilized Tribes. They think it is a question of inheritance. This is a mistake. It requires three things to constitute citizenship in any of the Five Civilized Tribes:

First. You must be an Indian of the tribe by blood.

Second. You must be a recognized enrolled member of the tribe.

Third. You must be a resident of the tribe.

A great many people think that it is only a question of blood. However, many people of Choctaw and Cherokee blood reside in numerous States throughout the Union, but they are not members of the tribe. They are not residents of the tribe, and even if they are of the full quantum of Indian blood they are not entitled to enrollment. This question has been decided by every court to which it has been presented.

THE PATENT.

The promise of a patent by article 2, treaty of 1830 (7 Stat. L., 335) to the Choctaws, provided that the lands granted the Choctaws should be theirs "as long as they exist as a nation and live on it":

ART. 2. The United States, under a grant specially to be made by the President of the United States, shall cause to be conveyed to the Choctaw Nation a tract of country west of the Mississippi River, in fee simple to them and their descendants, to inure to them while *they shall exist as a nation and live on it.* [Italics ours.]

And article 3 of said treaty is as follows:

In consideration of the provisions contained in the several articles of this treaty the Choctaw Nation of Indians consent and hereby cede to the United States the entire country they own and possess east of the Mississippi River; *and they agree to remove beyond* the Mississippi River as early as practicable, and will so arrange *their removal* that as many as possible of their people, not exceeding one-half of the whole number, shall depart during the falls of 1831 and 1832, the *residue to* follow during the succeeding fall of 1833; a better opportunity in this manner will be afforded the Government to extend to them the facilities and comforts which it is desirable should be extended in conveying them to their new homes. [Italics ours.]

The patent executed by President Tyler in 1842 contained a similar provision and is as follows:

That the United States of America, in consideration of the premises and in execution of the agreement and stipulation in the aforesaid treaty, have given and granted and by these presents do give and grant unto the said Choctaw Nation the aforesaid "tract of country west of the Mississippi" to have and to hold the same, with all the rights, privileges, immunities, and appurtenances of whatsoever nature thereunto belonging as intended "to be conveyed" by the aforesaid article, "in fee simple to them and their descendants, to inure to them, *while they shall exist as a nation and live on it,*" liable to no transfer or alienations, except to the United States or with their consent. [Italics ours.]

Article 14 of the Choctaw treaty of 1830 (7 Stat. L., 335) gave the adult Choctaws who remained in Mississippi 640 acres of land, children over 10 years of age 320 acres, and children under 10 years of age 160 acres. They were made citizens of the United States and of the State of Mississippi. All could have accepted land and some did. They were recognized as citizens of the State under the laws of Mississippi. About 15,000 moved west under the treaty of 1830 and 4,180 remained. They could easily be identified up to 1842. Between 1838 and 1855, 3,400 moved to the Choctaw Nation and became members of the tribe.

Congress later provided for a payment to those Mississippi Choctaws who remained behind, and 3,585 received scrip entitling them to locate upon public lands in the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi. This scrip was transferable, and in lieu of the second half of the scrip Congress appropriated and paid these Mississippi Choctaws $872,000, conditioned upon their first removing to the Choctaw Nation in the Indian Territory. When they removed they could have remained there and have been identified as citizens of the Choctaw Nation; but with their removal from the Choctaw Nation they abandoned their citizenship, disconnected themselves from the tribe, and were no longer members of the tribe, and have no legal claim whatever to being enrolled as members of the tribe.

The Choctaw Nation has dealt generously with these people, and up to the time when the lands were finally allotted they voluntarily admitted all Indians of Choctaw blood as members of the tribe; but Congress insisted upon a termination of their tribal government and the allotment of their lands and a final settlement of their affairs. This could not be done without first settling the question as to who should be enrolled as members of the tribe.

CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATION.

The act of June 28, 1898 (30 Stat., 495), section 21, empowered the Secretary of the Interior to make a final roll of the citizens of the Five Civilized Tribes; and another provision of this same section specifically authorized the commission to make a roll of those Mississippi Choctaws entitled to citizenship under the fourteenth article of the treaty of 1830.

A provision in the Indian appropriation bill approved May 31, 1900 (31 Stat., 221), provided for the enrollment of the Mississippi Choctaws if they made bona fide settlement in the Choctaw Nation prior to the final approval of the rolls.

Section 41 of the supplemental agreement with the Choctaws and Chickasaws approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat., 641), provided for the enrollment of the Mississippi Choctaws at any time within six months after their identification as Mississippi Choctaws by making bona fide settlement within one year in the Choctaw Nation.

ROLLS FINAL AND CLOSED.

Section 21 of the act of June 28, 1898 (30 Stat., 495), contained a provision making the rolls final when approved by the Secretary of the Interior, as follows:

The rolls so made, when approved by the Secretary of the Interior, shall be final, and the persons whose names are found thereon, with

their descendants thereafter born to them, with such persons as may intermarry according to tribal laws, shall alone constitute the several tribes which they represent.

The Indian appropriation bill approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat., 1077), contained a provision making the rolls of the Dawes Commission of the Five Civilized Tribes final, when approved by the Secretary of the Interior, as follows:

The rolls made by the commission to the Five Civilized Tribes, when approved by the Secretary of the Interior, shall be final, and the persons whose names are found thereon shall alone constitute the several tribes which they represent.

Section 2 of the act of April 26, 1906 (34 Stat., 138), provided that the rolls of the tribe affected by this act shall be fully completed on or before the 4th day of March, 1907, and the Secretary of the Interior shall have no jurisdiction to approve the enrollment of any person after said date, as follows:

Provided, That the rolls of the tribes affected by this act shall be fully completed on or before the 4th day of March, 1907, and the Secretary of the Interior shall have no jurisdiction to approve the enrollment of any person after said date.

It will be seen that the first Choctaw agreement was made in 1897 and ratified by an act of Congress approved June 28, 1898, and that the enrollment proceeded from that time in 1898 until March 4, 1907, or a period of about nine years, and that provision was made for the identification and enrollment of such Mississippi Choctaws who chose to remove and permanently locate and become citizens of the Choctaw Nation, later to be admitted as a part of the State of Oklahoma. Such Indians as availed themselves of these provisions were enrolled to the number of 1,634. Those remaining in Mississippi were not enrolled.

MISSISSIPPI CHOCTAWS NOT ENTITLED TO ENROLLMENT.

Now, those opposing this item providing for a partial distribution of this money are attempting to assert that the Mississippi Choctaws and their descendants in the State of Mississippi are entitled to enrollment as members of the Choctaw Tribe and to participate in the distribution of the money. Their contention is not tenable. Every court, commission, Secretary, or committee investigating this question has decided against them.

1. The Supreme Court, in the Eastern Cherokee case (117 U. S., 288), held that the North Carolina Cherokees could not live apart from their tribe and share in the benefits of the funds and common property of the tribe. The court, after reviewing the treaties relating to the same, concluded by saying:

If Indians in that State [North Carolina] or in any other State east of the Mississippi wish to enjoy the benefits of the common property of the Cherokee Nation, in whatever form it may exist, they must, as held by the Court of Claims, comply with the constitution and laws of the Cherokee Nation and be readmitted to citizenship, as there provided. They can not live out of its territory, evade the obligations and burdens of citizenship, and at the same time enjoy the benefits of the funds and common property of the nation. Those funds and that property were dedicated by the constitution of the Cherokees and were intended by the treaties with the United States for the benefit of the united nation and not in any respect for those who had separated from it and become aliens to their nation. We can see no just ground on which the claim of the petitions can rest in either of the funds held by the United States in trust for the Cherokee Nation.

2. The Dawes Commission in the Jack Amos case held that the Choctaws residing in Mississippi were not entitled to enrollment without removal to the Choctaw Nation, as follows:

This historical review of the acquisition of this territory by the Choctaw Nation and its subsequent legal relations to it makes it clear in the opinion of this commission that the Mississippi Choctaws are not under their treaties entitled to all rights of Choctaw citizenship except an interest in the Choctaw annuities, and still continue their residence and citizenship in Mississippi. (H. Doc. 274, 55th Cong., 2d sess.)

3. The Federal court, through Judge Clayton, affirmed the decision of the Dawes Commission in the Jack Amos case and held that the Mississippi Choctaws residing out of the tribe were not entitled to be enrolled:

In the third article of the treaty the Choctaws agreed to move all of their people within three years, and the United States intended that they should go. But by the fourteenth article of the treaty provisions were made whereby those who should decide to remain and become citizens of the State of Mississippi, in the event that, because of the intolerance and persecutions of the whites, which they themselves had so bitterly experienced, or for any other cause, they might become dissatisfied with their altered conditions and their new citizenship and desire to follow them to their new homes, and thereafter exercise with them in their own country the privileges of citizenship, they could do so, except that they were not to participate with them in their annuities, the lands which they were to receive in Mississippi being deemed a compensation for that.

When the fourteenth article of the treaty was framed the negotiating parties understood that the policy of the United States was that the Choctaws were to be removed. The Choctaws, in article 3, had just agreed that they should all go. The ink was not yet dry in article 2 whereby the condition was placed in this grant to the lands that they were to live upon or they should be forfeited, and that no privilege of citizenship could be conferred or enjoyed outside of the territorial jurisdiction of their newly located nation. Understanding these conditions, the latter clause of article 14 was penned:

"Persons who claim under this article shall not lose the privilege of a Choctaw citizen, but if they ever removed—that is, if they ever placed themselves on the land and within the jurisdiction of the nation whereby those privileges may become operative—are not to be entitled to any portion of the Choctaw annuity."

In other words, if they ever remove, they are to enjoy all of the privileges of a Choctaw citizen except that of participating in their annuities. If this be not the meaning to be attached to the word "remove" as used in the clause of the treaty under consideration, it must be meaningless. But in the interpretation of statutes it is the duty of the court to so interpret them as to give to every word a meaning, and in doing so it must take into consideration the whole statute, its objects and purposes, the rights which are intended to be enforced, and the evils intended to be remedied; it may go to the history of the transaction about which the legislation is had and call to its aid all legitimate facts proven or of which the courts will take judicial notice in order to find the true meaning of the word as used in the statute. Of course, the same rule of interpretation applies to treaties. Adopting these rules in the interpretation of article 14 of the treaty of 1830, I arrive at the conclusion that the "privilege of a Choctaw citizen" therein reserved to those Choctaws who shall remain, thereby separating themselves, it may be forever, from their brethren and their nation, becoming citizens of another sovereignty and aliens of their own, situated so that it would be impossible, while in Mississippi, to receive or enjoy any of the rights of Choctaw citizenship, was the right to renounce his allegiance to the Commonwealth of Mississippi, move upon the lands conveyed to him and his people, and there, the only spot on earth where he could do so, renew his relations with his people and enjoy all of the privileges of a Choctaw citizen except to participate in the annuities.

As an evidence that the Choctaw people themselves took this view of the question, attention is called to the fact that their council has passed many acts and resolutions inviting these absent Choctaws to move into their country, and on one occasion appropriated a considerable sum of money to assist them on their journey, and until the past two or three years have always promptly placed those who did return on the rolls of citizenship, but never enrolled an absent Choctaw as a citizen.

4. An appeal was perfected to the Supreme Court of the United States and dismissed by the appellants. (190 U. S., 873.)

5. Congress by section 2 of the act of April 26, 1906 (34 Stat., 137), with all the information before it, ordered the rolls closed.

6. Secretary Ballinger on February 12, 1910, opposed the reopening of the rolls. Writing the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, he said:

In conclusion, I am constrained to believe, and therefore recommend, that the rolls be not opened up, but that proper legal authority be given the Secretary of the Interior to place upon the rolls those Indians—about 52 in number—whose applications were approved by the Commissioner to the Five Civilized Tribes and were transmitted to Washington before the 4th of March, 1907, but did not reach the department until after the rolls were closed; and, furthermore, that proper authority be given the Secretary of the Interior to examine and place upon the rolls the minor orphan children, incompetents, and Indians in incarceration whose claims were not presented in due time for adjudication. I am informed that this class numbers about 200. No one seems to have taken the responsibility of presenting the claims of this class for consideration. They could not look after their own interests. (See S. Doc. No. 1139, 62d Cong., 3d sess.)

Congress by the act of August 1, 1914, enrolled all of those recommended.

7. Assistant Secretary Samuel Adams on July 2, 1912, reported against the enrollment of the Mississippi Choctaws. After reviewing their case at length, he stated:

In fact, it may be urged by the tribes that responsibility, if any, rested upon the United States instead.

And concluded as follows:

In view of the fact stated above, I am of the opinion that the bill—

Referring to the Harrison bill to enroll the Mississippi Choctaws—

should not be enacted into law.

8. The report of the subcommittee of the Indian Committee on January 2, 1915, reported against the reopening of the rolls in a lengthy report. (Report on H. R. 12586.)

9. Senator WILLIAMS on June 19, 1914, admitted on the floor of the Senate that the Mississippi Choctaws had no legal right to enrollment. On this date he said, as shown on page 10716 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

I am not contending here that the Mississippi Choctaws, in the face of all that legislation and in the face of these decisions, have any right here that is enforceable in a court of law, but I am trying to get the legislative branch of this Government to change that law which was enacted against them and construed against them.

Continuing, Senator WILLIAMS says:

So far as the construction of the court was concerned, I hardly see how the Supreme Court could have come to any other conclusion. * * * I am not talking now, however—and I can not be thrown off the right scent—about what are their rights in court to-day. I am talking about what their rights ought to be.

10. The present Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Franklin K. Lane, reported January 8, 1915, against the reopening of the rolls, and reviewed this entire question at length, concluding in the following language:

In view of the facts as presented to me, I am of the opinion that no legislation should be enacted for the reopening of the rolls of the Choctaw Nation for the benefit of the Mississippi Choctaw claimants.

11. Congress, by a provision in the Indian appropriation bill last year, after extended hearings before the committee, and after extended debate upon the floor of the House, provided for

a partial distribution of this money in language similar to the provision in this bill.

12. The present Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs before the House Indian Committee—hearings on the Indian appropriation bill, pages 336 and 337—recommended the provision providing for a per capita payment to the Choctaws and Chickasaws.

The argument for the enrollment of the Mississippi Choctaws is based upon four grounds:

First. Upon the fourteenth article of the Treaty of 1830; and it has been shown that the Dawes Commission and the United States court in the Jack Amos case decided against their construction of this article.

Second. It is urged that Senator OWEN, while attorney for the Mississippi Choctaws, insisted that they should be enrolled. Senator OWEN, in extended hearings before the Senate Indian Committee (pp. 74–108, Jan. 18, 1915; and pp. 645–661, Feb. 5, 1915) stated that great generosity has been shown the Mississippi Choctaws, and that the rolls should now be closed, giving his reasons in detail why they should not be reopened. In other words, he makes the opposite contention. He shows that all differences were compromised by section 41 of the act of July 1, 1902.

Third. It is contended that the Eastern Cherokee case reported in Two hundred and second United States, 101, supports his contention. An examination of that case shows it does not support their contention, and that it was not a suit over the lands of the Cherokees west, or the proceeds thereof, nor for a division of their trust funds. On the other hand, the Cherokee case reported in One hundred and seventeenth United States, 288, is a case in point and is against their contention.

Fourth. It is urged that Judge Townsend, in an ex parte decision, held that the Mississippi Choctows were entitled to be enrolled without removing to the Indian Territory, now Oklahoma. This was when the Choctaw Nation was not represented, and later, in the case of Ikard against Minter, which was affirmed by the Indian Territory court of appeals, in an opinion written by Judge Gill (4 Ind. Ter. Repts., 214), after a full hearing and after the matter had been argued and briefed on both sides, Judge Townsend held that the Mississippi Choctaws were not entitled to be enrolled.

EVERY DECISION AGAINST MISSISSIPPI CHOCTAWS.

Judge Clayton, in the Amos case, decided against them; Judge Townsend decided against them in the case of Ikard against Minter, supra, and the court of appeals, speaking through Judge Gill, in the case of Ikard against Minter, affirmed the decision of Judge Townsend. All three of the Federal judges in the Indian Territory held against the enrollment of the Mississippi Choctaws.

Hence, it will be seen that the law is against the Mississippi Choctaws, the decision of every court is against them, and the report of every committee of Congress is against them, as well as the report of every Secretary of the Interior. They ask now to have the matter again referred to the courts, when for 20 years every court, committee, commission, or Secretary of the Interior to which this question was presented has decided against them.

Thus you will see that the Choctaw people are asking not for money from the Government but to have their own money paid them. Certainly this is a reasonable request. The Government promised it to them. It is theirs. They are in very great need of it. Many of them have long ago gone to their reward. Others are old and decrepit and diseased. Congress should do justice to them and give them this money.

Now, every person making an argument before the Indian Committee and before Congress in favor of the enrollment of the Mississippi Choctaws makes it admitting that the Mississippi Choctaws have no legal rights, makes it admitting that they did not remove to the Choctaw Nation, and makes it admitting that they are residents of the State of Mississippi, are citizens of that State and of the United States.

Everyone must admit that the Choctaw Nation has been more than generous with them, and all must admit that all the Choctaws who removed to the Choctaw Nation and became bona fide settlers there before the rolls were closed and remained there were enrolled.

Everyone making an argument in their behalf makes it admitting that their enrollment was provided for by section 21 of the act of June 28, 1898, and provided for by the act of May 31, 1900, conditioned only upon their removing to the Choctaw Nation and permanently locating there, and provided for by the act of July 1, 1902, similarly conditioned.

FINAL SETTLEMENT URGED.

Surely Congress will not longer delay the final settlement of Choctaw tribal affairs. It has now been too long delayed. This money should not only be paid but Congress should at once provide for the disposition of the coal lands and other tribal property belonging to the Choctaw and Chickasaw people, and all their money should be prorated among them.

It is generally known and it appears in the records that a great lobby has been organized to secure the enrollment of the Mississippi Choctaws and that contracts have been secured aggregating millions of dollars. Interested attorneys have made all sorts of speeches and arguments looking to a delay in the payment of the Choctaw money and urging the reopening of the rolls. Surely Congress will follow the decisions of the courts, the Dawes Commission, the Secretaries of the Interior, and the committees of Congress, who have given extensive hearings to this question, rather than the pleadings of interested attorneys, who will be enriched by the reopening of the rolls.

Almost 19 years have elapsed since the first Choctaw agreement was entered into in 1897. If the question of citizenship is again reopened, a settlement of it will not be reached within the next quarter of a century.

As a final word, I beg the Members of Congress to at least give a small measure of justice to the Choctaw and Chickasaw people and provide for a partial distribution of their funds now. [Applause.]

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I believe the time for general debate has expired, and I would ask that the bill be read under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that, as debate is closed, it is not necessary to commence the reading now.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 10385, the Indian appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent Mr. SLEMP was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies thereof, the papers in the following cases, no adverse reports having been made thereon:

James D. Cox (63d Cong.);
Thomas Swallow (63d Cong.); and
Mrs. Noble C. Burkhart (63d Cong.).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 8235. An act to provide for the maintenance of the United States section of the International High Commission.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, to meet to-morrow, Tuesday, February 1, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Pugsley Creek, N. Y. (H. Doc. No. 635), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BURNETT, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10384) to

regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 95), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. POU, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3654) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to audit and adjust certain claims of the State of North Carolina, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 96), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6180) for the relief of Lillie B. Randell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 97), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3896) for the relief of John H. Janssen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 98), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2209) for the relief of W. W. Blood, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 99), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6181) for the relief of Letitia W. Garrison, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 100), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6758) for the relief of the legal heirs of Hector M. McDonald, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 101), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. POU, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3447) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Robert B. Pearce, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 102), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2795) granting an increase of pension to Michael Shanahan; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6388) granting a pension to Howard E. Tolson; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10252) granting an increase of pension to Frank Kubacki; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8140) granting a pension to William Herbert Fish; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 10484) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 10485) to promote the safety of employees and passengers on railroads engaged in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 10486) to extend the Bureau of Markets in the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 10487) reserving or excepting all ores or minerals on the lands, with the right of mining the same, on the site of the proposed post-office building at Calumet, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 10488) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Saginaw, Swan Creek, and Black River Band of Chippewa Indians in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 10489) to provide for and aid in the construction and maintenance of a national paved highway to be constructed along the old Territorial roads of Michigan, Indiana, and Illinois, from the city of Detroit through the cities and villages of Ypsilanti, Ann Arbor, Dexter, Chelsea, Grass Lake, Jackson, Parma, Albion, Marshall, Battle Creek, Augusta, Galesburg, Kalamazoo, Paw Paw, Dowagiac, and Niles, in Michigan; thence through Michigan City, in the State of Indiana; thence through the State of Illinois to the city of Chicago, and to authorize and appropriate the sum of $1,000,000 therefor; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10490) to prevent fraudulent advertising in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10491) to punish the handling of bad checks in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 10492) providing for the erection of a public building at Paola, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 10493) to amend certain sections of the judicial code relating to the Court of Claims, to regulate appeals therefrom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 10494) providing for the enlargement of the Federal building at Missoula, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 10495) providing for the appointment of a board for the purpose of selecting a suitable site for a naval armor plant in the Upper Ohio Valley, in or near the city of Steubenville, in the county of Jefferson and State of Ohio, and to submit a report of the cost and availability of said plant; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 10496) to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation in interstate commerce of misbranded articles, to regulate the traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 10497) to provide for the erection of an addition to the Federal building in the city of Kenosha, county of Kenosha and State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 10498) authorizing the establishment of a plant at or near Knoxville, Tenn., for the manufacture of munitions and implements of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10499) to levy a tax upon the issuance of coupons, prize tickets, and other devices, and on the redemption, payment, purchase, or exchange of coupons, prize tickets, tags, bands, or other articles, things, or parts of articles or things that shall have been attached to, or packed in or with, or formed a part of, or encircling, or given with any manufactured tobacco, cigar or cigars, cigarette or cigarettes, or snuff, or any stamped package or receptacle thereof, and to forbid the packing of other things into packages of tobacco, cigars, cigarettes, or snuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 10500) to establish a United States Shipping Board for the purpose of encouraging, developing, and creating a naval auxiliary and naval reserve and a merchant marine to meet the requirements of the commerce of the United States with its Territories and possessions, and with foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOON: Resolution (H. Res. 114) authorizing the consideration of certain new legislation in H. R. 10484, a bill making appropriations for the support of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1917; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURNETT: Resolution (H. Res. 115) for the consideration of H. R. 10384; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Resolution (H. Res. 116) for the establishment of law and order in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEVER: Resolution (H. Res. 117) to provide for the consideration of H. R. 9419 and H. R. 10405; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOWELL: Resolution (H. Res. 118) providing for investigation and relating to the high price of gasoline and other petroleum products; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SISSON: Resolution (H. Res. 119) to pay Will H. Joyner; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. DAVIS of Texas: Resolution (H. Res. 120) providing for an investigation relative to an embargo on arms, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DYER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 124) proposing a national anthem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 125) proposing the establishment of a military academy on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 126) proposing the establishment of a naval academy on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 127) calling on the Secretary of State to urge the allied powers to permit the importation of condensed milk for the use of the babies and infants of Germany and Austria and their allies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHURCH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 128) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, urging the passage of House bill 7617, known as the rural post-roads bill; to the Committee on Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 10501) granting an increase of pension to George W. Reasoner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10502) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Powers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 10503) granting a pension to George Van Sickle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: a bill (H. R. 10504) granting an increase of pension to James L. Dyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 10505) granting a pension to Mary Glenn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10506) for the relief of Dr. F. C. Cady; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 10507) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Jolly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10508) for the relief of the estate of J. W. Pearson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 10509) for the relief of J. H. Cravey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 10510) granting an increase of pension to Asa B. Ecoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 10511) granting a pension to Ida E. Hazen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 10512) for the relief of Lizzie Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 10513) granting a pension to Rebecca E. Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10514) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Waters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10515) for the relief of Bennett C. Fuller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 10516) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Caryl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 10517) granting a pension to John Devon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10518) granting a pension to Mary A. Chambers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10519) granting an increase of pension to Peter McCabe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10520) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10521) granting a pension to Laura Wachtel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10522) granting a pension to Fountain Tankersley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10523) granting an increase of pension to John Huey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10524) for the relief of James Kane; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 10525) granting an increase of pension to James H. La Rue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 10526) granting a pension to Frank S. Graham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10527) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Pitner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 10528) granting a pension to Columbus L. Reese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 10529) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Good; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10530) for the relief of the heirs of Daniel Woolford; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10531) for the relief of Lenorah E. Copeland; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 10532) granting an increase of pension to Meda Mathey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10533) granting a pension to Mary Larkin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10534) granting a pension to Mary A. Blodgett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10535) granting a pension to William M. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10536) granting a pension to Jennie Crumpton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10537) granting a pension to Peter Harper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10538) granting a pension to Carl W. Trott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 10539) granting an increase of pension to John H. Burnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10540) granting a pension to Benjamin U. Earhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10541) granting a pension to Clarissa Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 10542) granting an increase of pension to Christian Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 10543) to correct the military record of William Andover; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10544) to correct the military record of Quincey Christian; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 10545) granting an increase of pension to William M. Meyers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 10546) for the relief of the Illinois Central Railroad Co., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10547) for the relief of the Kensington & Eastern Railroad Co., of Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 10548) granting a pension to Helen M. Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 10549) granting a pension to Clara G. Sovereign; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10550) for the relief of Morris Busch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 10551) granting an increase of pension to Albert E. Sherman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OAKEY: A bill (H. R. 10552) granting an increase of pension to Julius O. Deming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 10553) for the relief of the owners of certain cotton taken by the United States authorities in Adams County, Miss., in 1863, and shipped away on the steamer *Gladiator;* to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 10554) granting a pension to Francis A. Baxter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 10555) referring certain claims against the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 10556) granting a pension to Kate Orba Larrabee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 10557) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Weber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10558) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10559) granting a pension to Hiram M. Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 10560) to correct the military record of William A. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10561) to correct the military record of George E. Day; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 10562) granting a pension to James A. Wolf; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 10563) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Roe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEDMAN: A bill (H. R. 10564) to satisfy the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Thomas M. Brower and John M. Brower; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 10565) granting an increase of pension to Michael F. Conway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 10566) granting a pension to Alvah T. Hawes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 10567) granting a pension to Fred M. Scheetz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10568) granting a pension to Chesterfield Basford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10569) granting a pension to J. C. Glass; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 10570) for the relief of the heirs of John W. McCord; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 10419, for relief of Matilda Leach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: Petitions of sundry citizens of Mount Hope, Benton, Kechi, and Moundridge, Kans., against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of business men of Dysart, Pa., favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring congress of neutral nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of J. H. Emery and Edwin H. Burr, protesting against any curtailment of mail deliveries in New York City; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Travelers' Protective Association, in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Robinson & Co., protesting against any curtailment of mail deliveries in New York City; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petition of depositors in the banks of Kansas, protesting against a stamp tax on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial of M. Carpenter Baking Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against repeal of mixed-flour law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of Broadalbin (N. Y.) Knitting Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of Jones Dyeing & Bleaching Works, Janesville, Wis., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Racine (Wis.) branch of the National Security League, for preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, in reference to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Sacramento Federated Trades Council, favoring the contract convict-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of committee on provision for the feeble-minded, relative to suitable care of the feeble-minded in District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of National Association of Custodian Employees of United States Treasury Department, relative to increase in pay; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of John J. La Baie, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of the Booher bill, No. 6871, relative to convict-labor goods; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petition of Rochester (N. Y.) Chapter Sons of American Revolution, favoring bill for building for Government records and manuscripts; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DARROW: Memorials of Benjamin Harrison Council, No. 92, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Progress Council, No. 92, Daughters of Liberty, of Germantown, Pa.; Sellersville Council, No. 113, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Sellersville, Pa.; and Penns Park (Pa.) Council, No. 976, in favor of Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Capt. W. H. Humphrey, of Burlington, Vt., in favor of House bill 582; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of United Spanish War Veterans in behalf of preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Lumbermen's Exchange, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring House bill 9678; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Bethany Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Roxborough, favoring an embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Pennsylvania Lumbermen's Association, in behalf of House bill 9678; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring Senate joint resolution 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of B. J. Lanza, favoring a tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Pitkin-Holdsworth Worsted Co., in favor of a dyestuffs tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Henry Doherty Silk, the Winding Co., and Textile Building Co., favoring a tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELSTON: Memorial of Canners' League of California, relative to river and harbor improvement; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of Alameda County (Cal.) Medical Association, favoring adequate Medical Corps, etc., in Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Canners' League of California, relative to merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce, Sacramento, Cal., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Oakland Chamber of Commerce, favoring remedial legislation for the California oil industry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of grape growers of the twenty-second district of Ohio, against the Overmyer bill, H. R. 6035; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of W. C. Withers, of Mount Vernon, Ill., favoring House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of officers and guards of the United States penitentiary near Atlanta, Ga., relative to increase in pay; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of American Federation of Labor, against the repeal of the seamen's law; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GARNER: Petitions of citizens of Hidalgo County, Tex., relative to pardoning of soldiers who crossed the border and went into Mexico in a skirmish with Mexicans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HENSLEY: Resolution of the Madison County (Mo.) Medical Society, signed by Drs. C. A. Anthony, Charles U. Davis, and S. C. Slaughter, protesting against the prevention by the allies of importations of drugs, surgical instruments, and chemicals from Germany; also protesting against the speculation in or cornering of available supply in this country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of Challenge Cutlery Corporation, of Bridgeport, and Marinette & Menominee Paper Co., of Marinette, Wis., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Petition of Board of County Commissioners of Adams County, Colo., urging the passage of Senate bill 709; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Robert F. Risley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of Thomas Young, of St. Louis, protesting against House bill 743, for building for Department of Justice; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JAMES: Petitions of Ed J. Butler and Jones Balsti, of Michigan, opposing censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States favoring the establishment of a tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Providence (R. I.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Guerin Spinning Co., of Woonsocket, R. I., favoring House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of Lumberman's Exchange, of Philadelphia, and Pennsylvania Lumberman's Exchange, favoring passage of H. R. 9678, relative to compulsory pilotage; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of H. H. Green and 21 members of Geneva Grange, Midland County, Mich., against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial of City Council of Portland, Oreg., relative to disposition of grant lands in Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McFADDEN: Memorial of Y. P. B. Honesdale, Sunday Schools of Warren Center, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Otto Ott, John C. Miller, Sebastian Doegler, jr., and others, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring embargo on arms, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Petitions of 100 citizens of Watertown, 21 of Adams, 42 of Jefferson County, 24 citizens of Black River, N. Y., favoring tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLATT: Petition of Branch 22, National Civil Service Employees, of Newburgh, N. Y., relative to pension for Government workers; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of Canners' League of California, favoring the establishing of a merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of Ministerial Union, of Los Angeles, Cal., against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SELLS: Petition of 200 people of Tazewell, Tenn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Papers to accompany H. R. 10477, to increase the pension of Thomas Donohoe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Woman's Relief Corps, of La Grande, Oreg., favoring the increase of widows' pension to $20 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9646, granting a pension to Samuel W. Gilliard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of the Lawrence Webster Co., of Malone, N. Y., favoring the passage of H. R. 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George E. Britton and others, of Massena, N. Y., urging the passage of H. R. 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STINESS: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States, favoring a tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Providence, R. I., favoring a tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of sundry citizens of Tennessee, favoring prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of 200 people of McKenzie, 1,000 of Selmer, and 75 of Big Sandy, all in the State of Tennessee, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of Council No. 1183, Knights of Columbus, of Boulder, Colo., favoring October 12 for legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *February 1, 1916.*

(Continuation of legislative day of Monday, January 31, 1916.)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock m., on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate resumes the consideration of the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 381.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Harding	Myers	Smoot
Beckham	Hardwick	Nelson	Sterling
Brandegee	Hitchcock	Norris	Stone
Bryan	Hollis	Overman	Sutherland
Catron	Husting	Page	Thomas
Chamberlain	James	Poindexter	Thompson
Chilton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pomerene	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Ransdell	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Reed	Wadsworth
Colt	La Follette	Robinson	Walsh
Cummins	Lane	Shafroth	Warren
Curtis	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Weeks
Dillingham	Lippitt	Shields	Works
du Pont	McCumber	Simmons	
Fletcher	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	
Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I was requested to state that the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] is absent from the city on official business.

Mr. STONE. I announce the illness of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] and his inability to be present. He is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. BRYAN. I was requested by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] to announce his absence on business of the Senate.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I rise to announce the illness of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] and to state that he is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING].

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The pending amendment is the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I offer the following as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. Add a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, three commissioners to cooperate with the Philippine Legislature in preparing and submitting a constitution or plan of government for the people of the Philippine Islands as an independent nation. The constitution or plan shall be one best adapted to protect and preserve the rights and liberties of the people of the islands, and most likely to be efficient in maintaining law and order, and in promoting progress and prosperity.

Among other things, it shall provide for the complete possession and sovereignty on the part of the United States, in perpetuity, of such coaling stations and naval bases as may be prescribed by the President of the United States. The said constitution or plan of government shall be prepared by the Philippine Legislature and submitted to the said commissioners, and if approved by the said commissioners, or a majority of them, and adopted by the said legislature, it shall then be submitted to the qualified electors of the Philippine Islands for approval or rejection at an election to be appointed by the Philippine Legislature after not less than four months' notice.

If a majority of the electors voting at said election shall approve the said constitution or plan of government and thereby indicate their desire for complete separation from the United States, as well as their approval of the particular constitution or plan, the said Philippine Legislature shall proceed to the establishment of the government so authorized, and when it is ready to assume the full government of the islands, the President of the United States shall withdraw the military force of this country and all the representatives of this Government; and thereafter shall treat the government so established in the Philippine Islands as a separate and independent government; and the relation of the United States toward such government shall thereafter be the relation which is sustained toward all other foreign powers.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, it is with a great deal of reluctance that I enter upon any discussion of this very complicated although very interesting subject. It is vain for me to hope that I can aid Senators in reaching a conclusion upon it, for the debate has taken a wide range and, it seems to me, has disclosed every possible fact, material and immaterial.

I am speaking because I will be compelled to vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, and likewise I shall feel that it is my duty to vote against the preamble reported by the committee. It might be inferred from the votes that I shall so cast that I am opposed to complete separation from the Philippine Islands and the Philippine Government, and inasmuch as I sincerely believe that it is the duty of the United States to withdraw from those islands, assisting the people there to establish a government of their own, I must at least give to the Senate my reasons for opposing the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas and for believing that the time has come for the long-promised separation between the people of the archipelago and the people of the United States.

I listened with very great care and great interest to the observations made by the Senator from Arkansas. Generally speaking, his view is my view upon this subject, but the argument of the Senator from Arkansas is not embodied in the amendment which he has offered. The conclusions which he established and satisfactorily sustained are not found, as I look at it, in the amendment which he has submitted.

There has been a suggestion from time to time of partisanship in this question. So far as I am concerned I do not feel the burden of any political declaration with regard to the Philippine Islands, and I shall vote precisely as my judgment and my conscience lead me to vote, without respect to any declaration made by any political party.

But it is only fair to say that the amendment which I have proposed is not a fulfillment of the declaration of our friends upon the other side. As I view it, it is absolutely in harmony with the position which Republicans have heretofore assumed with respect to this very difficult subject. May I remark just here that in our last convention this was the statement made by the Republican organization:

> The Philippine policy of the Republican Party has been and is inspired by the belief that our duty toward the Filipino people is a national obligation which should remain entirely free from partisan politics.

I am endeavoring as best I can to exemplify this command of the Republican Party, for I agree, and you must all agree, that this subject should be dealt with entirely independently of any political organization, for our duty calls into exercise the highest, the most unselfish faculties of the mind and the heart.

We are not going to settle, and we can not settle, this problem by reference to any partisan advantage. May I at the same time suggest that the platform of the Democratic Party upon this subject in its last convention was a declaration of "purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established"; and, second, a guarantee of independence "until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers."

I am wholly opposed to that view of the matter. I can not believe that it is wise to make a declaration of independence to be fulfilled at some day, some distant time, and under conditions which may never arise. I can not believe that it is wise for the Government of the United States to hold the Philippine Islands until the great powers of the world shall guarantee their neutralization, for, in my opinion, that means to hold them forever.

I am not suggesting what our friends upon the other side of the Chamber ought to do with respect to this platform. I am simply making clear, if I can, that the amendment which I have proposed does not follow the direction of any political platform, much less the declaration of the platform announced at Baltimore in 1912.

I am in favor, Mr. President, of the complete separation of this Government from the Philippine Islands, because I believe that the time has come, under the view which all Republicans, or nearly all Republicans, have taken in the past for the separation. I believe that the separation ought to take place without any declaration and subject to no conditions whatsoever. In view of that position I desire to say a few words upon the general subject.

Is it not true that substantially all the people of the United States, without respect to party, have believed that our occupation of the Philippine Islands was to be temporary? Is there a word in the literature of this subject from any source—I care not what may be its partisan tinge—is there a single suggestion from any source in the last 18 years that the United States should permanently occupy the Philippine Islands and govern the Philippine people as a dependency? There is not. From McKinley, a man of the rarest wisdom, of the greatest foresight, of infinite comprehension almost of human needs and human rights, to the present moment, so far as I have observed, no citizen of the United States has ever suggested that our relation with the Philippine Islands, the relation established originally and still maintained, should be permanent.

Those who knew the great President of 1898 best know that he did not want to occupy the Philippine Islands at all. We all know how he struggled patiently and courageously against the tempest of passion which swept over the United States and which finally impelled him, against his better judgment, into the war of 1898. It is a part of the learning of the time, a part of the understanding of the time, that if he could have prevented it, after the brave and gallant Dewey had destroyed the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay, there would have been no landing of our soldiers and no occupation of those islands. I am not disparaging the admiral whose deeds are admired and whose courage is applauded all over the country; he did what he believed to be his duty; but I feel that I know if it had not been for a fortuitous circumstance that need not be related here, Dewey would have sailed away from Manila Bay after the destruction of the Spanish fleet, and there would have been no conquest of the Philippine Islands, no occupation by the United States.

I agree, however, that when we did occupy those islands there fell upon us a duty. We could not then depart; we could not abandon the Philippine Islands to the chaos that must necessarily have ensued. We did the best we could. I agree with every word that has been spoken here with regard to the character of our conduct toward the Philippines. It is without parallel in the history of the world. Our generosity, our liberality, our justice, our magnanimity, have no predecessor; possibly they will have no successor. We have accomplished almost a miracle amongst those people; but I assume we have accomplished it all with the end in view which the statesmen in 1898 and all the statesmen since have proclaimed, namely, that whenever we could leave those islands in honor and with safety to the people of the islands we would leave them. No other construction can be given to the statement of President McKinley quoted by my friend from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT]. I agree with him that there was no explicit promise of independence, but the language used by McKinley at that time is incapable of misunderstanding and it can not be harmonized with the proposal permanently to incorporate the Philippine Islands into the United States, unless we are willing to extend to them all the privileges, all the rights, that are now enjoyed by the citizens of our several Commonwealths.

I am not frightened with respect to conquest. It is the history of the world, and I could not but agree in great measure with the remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] upon that subject. He cleared away some of the mist that has so long obscured it. The history of the world is the history of conquest. As I said, interrupting some Senator the other day, all the territory, or practically all the territory, now held by the United States it holds by the title of conquest. With the exception of the Hawaiian Islands, a Government which came into the United States upon its own application, and with the exception of Alaska, and possibly with another little exception which did not occur to me at that time, all our territory has been acquired by conquest, not technically, but in fact. As I suggested, France had no title to the great expanse of territory, the vast empire, which she conveyed to us. She had a mere paper title, possibly respected among nations, but which had little substance; and it was the genius and courage of the American people which finally reduced that magnificent domain to the possession of the United States and opened it to the hardy adventurers and settlers of our country.

But I beg to remind the Senator from Ohio and all others here that in our acquisition of territory and of people we never acquired one inch of soil prior to the war of 1898 that was not intended to become a part of the Union. Hawaii intends to become a State. If you take away that hope and belief from the hearts of the people of the Hawaiian Islands you will produce a condition of discontent that will destroy their growth and prosperity. Alaska intends to become a State of the Union, or a part of a State, and no loyal American dare question the ultimate outcome of our relations with Alaska. It was not until the Spanish-American War and our occupation of the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico that there was established between our country and any other the relation of parent Government and colony or dependency, a dependency that we did not intend should ever become a part and parcel of the Government of the United States. If those who are opposed to separation from the Philippine Islands are willing to avow their purpose to ultimately consolidate those islands with the United States completely and perfectly and give them not only the

right to govern themselves as citizens of a State, but give them the right to help govern you and me as citizens of the United States, then there is presented a basis which may logically be considered upon its merits; but that is not the purpose of any Senator here.

I know the time of separation is vague and uncertain in the minds of many Senators; I know that the conditions of separation are not agreed upon; but we all agree that we are not working toward the admission of the Philippine Islands as a State or as a number of States into the Union, and that, so long as our relation to them continues, so long the Congress of the United States, which those people do not help to elect, over which they have no influence whatsoever, is master of their destinies.

We all have confidence in our altruism. We all believe that there will never come a time, no matter how long we may continue to occupy the islands, when we will treat them unjustly; but still we are the masters. We can withdraw any moment every right and privilege which we have granted to them. The bill which is now before the Senate, if it were passed, granting them further privileges, enlarging their opportunity for local self-government, could be repealed in a moment, and we could declare that the islands shall be placed in the hands of a dictator without any rule of law to govern or control him. I am not suggesting that this will be done, but it can be done. It is in the power which one nation has over another; it is in the power which one individual has over another that is found all the evils of supremacy and servitude.

I refer for just a moment to some of the things that distinguished men of the party to which I belong and which is represented on this side of the Chamber have said. President McKinley phrased it beautifully when he declared:

> The Philippines are ours, not to exploit, but to develop, to civilize, to educate, to train in the science of self-government.

Is there a man here who dares mar the memory of that great man with the suggestion that he intended that the United States should for all time control the Philippines as a colony or a dependency? I hope not, for the suggestion would assail not only the obvious meaning of his words but the purity and sincerity of his motives as well.

President Roosevelt said:

> I trust that within a generation—

And this was spoken some years ago—

> the time will arrive when the Philippines can decide for themselves whether it is well for them to become independent or to continue under the protection of a strong and disinterested power, able to guarantee to the islands order at home and protection from foreign invasion. But no one can prophesy the exact date when it will be wise to consider independence as a fixed and definite policy.

Wiser words were never spoken. No one could prophesy, and if the time has not now come no one can prophesy when it will come, and therefore there should be no declaration of purpose. If the hour has not arrived at which it is our duty to separate ourselves from the Philippine Islands, let us be silent with respect to the future.

President Taft said:

> It necessarily involves in its ultimate conclusion as the steps toward self-government become greater and greater the ultimate independence of the islands; although, of course, if both the United States and the islands were to conclude after complete self-government were possible that it would be mutually beneficial to continue a governmental relation between them like that between England and Australia, there would be nothing inconsistent with the present policy in such a result.

I agree with every sentiment there expressed; for if the Philippine people desire to continue relations with the United States it is our bounden duty, no matter what the burden is, no matter what the danger may be, to continue that relation. There is just one obligation, in my opinion, that rests upon the American people that can never be lifted save by the consent of the Philippine people themselves. We conquered the country. We have brought them, in a sense, into the American Government; and so long as they desire our protection and our help, so long we are bound to give them that protection and that help, and we are held in honor to maintain that relation.

I need not read further from the statements and speeches and declarations of men distinguished in the country and in the party. I concede to the Senator from Rhode Island that there is no binding promise here. No one has ever had authority to speak for the American Government, but all people have had authority to speak in order to create a sentiment among the American people. All people have a right to declare their opinions in order to widen and deepen the prevalent belief among the people. From the very beginning these views with regard to the Philippines have been so general, they have been so universal, that although we are under no technical obligation to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, we have created in America a sentiment which nothing can destroy.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator maintain, even assuming for the sake of the question that either now or at some time in the future the Philippine people are as well qualified to govern themselves as we are, that we should permit them to decide, without taking into consideration the interests or the views of our own people, whether or not their relationship to us should be severed?

Mr. CUMMINS. That is precisely the thought I tried to express.

Mr. NORRIS. Then I should like to ask the Senator, if that be his view, why in the amendment that he proposes and that he is now discussing he provides that the President, in giving them independence if they so vote, shall retain on behalf of our Government sovereignty in perpetuity over such coaling stations and naval bases as he may think best? If we are going to let the Philippine people decide, without consulting the American people, whether they should be independent or not, why does it not follow that our retention of a naval base and a coaling station should likewise be submitted to the Philippine people?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not attach nearly the importance to that subject that the Senator from Nebraska finds in it, but in the main I agree with him. The retention of a coaling station or a naval base does not involve government over anybody. It does not involve the subjection of any part of the Philippine people to the Government of the United States. I suppose the reason why that is in my amendment is because I followed what seemed to be an accepted form. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska; I see no benefit in either a naval base or a coaling station in the Philippine Islands, and if anyone moves to strike it out I may vote with him and strike it out of my amendment. But the Senator will notice that I have not made it obligatory on the President. It is within the discretion of the President to reserve these things or not, as he may think they are necessary or not for the welfare of the people of this country. I am entirely willing and frank to say, however, that I can see no reason for either a naval base or a coaling station.

Mr. NORRIS. The question was based, of course, on the theory that the Senator himself says he believes in; that is, that we should not turn the Philippines loose without the consent of the Philippine people. We should not turn them loose against their will. I suppose it would follow that we should not retain them against their will. In fact, that is what the Senator has provided, and I am in entire accord with him in the provision in that respect; but the coaling station and the naval base are to be retained under the sovereignty of the United States. They are a part of those islands; and if we ought to be moved by the decision of the Philippine people as to the islands, I do not see why the same logic would not apply to a part of the islands.

I should like to make a further suggestion to the Senator. I should be glad to move to strike out those words; but is it not true, in a parliamentary sense, that this amendment is already in the third degree, and that no amendment can be offered unless the Senator himself, who has full control over his amendment, modifies it?

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not sure whether it is in the third degree or not; but, at any rate, I have given no great thought or attention to the proposition to reserve coaling stations and naval bases. I am not much of a military man, and I do not know what the safety or welfare of our country requires in that respect. I will consider the suggestion just made by the Senator from Nebraska about striking them out. But, Mr. President, I think I have shown sufficiently——

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will permit me, before he leaves that point, I wish to call his attention to another suggestion. The Senator says that these words are not compulsory. As I read them, the only thing that is discretionary with the President is how much he shall retain; but it is compulsory under his amendment, as I read it, that he shall retain in perpetuity coaling stations and naval bases, and they are both in the plural.

Mr. CUMMINS. That was not my purpose, Mr. President.

Mr. NORRIS. I will read the words to the Senator and see if he does not agree with me.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am quite willing that that shall be made a part of the agreement between the Philippine people and ourselves. I do not follow the Senator from Nebraska, I think, to his conclusion, namely, that we have been a trespasser in the Philippine Islands. I think we have been rightfully in the Philippine Islands and that what we have done there has been done in the exercise of lawful authority.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, the Senator can not construe anything I have said to mean that we are trespassers.

If the Senator will permit me further, this is the language:

Among other things, it shall provide—

"It" means the constitution, I think, that they shall adopt.

Among other things, it shall provide for the complete possession and sovereignty—

"It shall"—

on the part of the United States, in perpetuity, of such coaling stations and naval bases as may be prescribed by the President of the United States.

Mr. CUMMINS. I still suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that if the President of the United States does not prescribe any coaling stations or naval bases there will be none reserved.

Mr. NORRIS. But the constitution of the Philippine people which the Senator has provided shall be adopted must make that provision; and does the Senator think that if Congress should pass this law the President would not make a selection, no matter what he might think about it? Would it not be his duty to do it?

Mr. CUMMINS. I think not. I did not intend, anyhow, that it should be made his duty to do it unless he believed, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, that such places were necessary for our military forces.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have noticed the willingness of the Senator from Iowa to have that provision of his amendment stricken out. If the amendment is to be agreed to, I hope it will not be stricken out. We are being told from the "seats of the mighty" at the present time that the air is surcharged with rumors of war and the possibility of war, and we have heard it repeated and reiterated over and over again, even in this Chamber, that there is a possibility of future war with the Empire of Japan. If that calamity should come, would it not be well for the United States to have a fortified base in the Philippine Islands where at least our ships that might be sent to that far-off land to fight a valiant foe, could coal and get supplies?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, that is just the question that I feel incompetent to answer. I do not know enough about military affairs to know whether a coaling station and a naval base in the Philippine Islands, after we have withdrawn from the islands, would be sources of strength or sources of weakness. I want them if the would be sources of strength. I do not want them if they would be sources of weakness, and I intended in my amendment to leave that discretion to the President of the United States.

Mr. GALLINGER. The wise nation that almost governs the world, situated on a little island, has not neglected to plant its outposts all over the world, so that in the event of war it might have the advantage of supplying its navy and its army with provisions and with coal and with every other accessory of war. It seems to me that if we are going to surrender the Philippine Islands—which I hope we will not do, because I think it is scuttling the ship at too early a date—if we are to do so, I hope we will be wise enough, at least, to provide against the contingencies of a war on the Pacific by retaining a sufficient portion of the islands to give us some advantage in a war of that character.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will answer that by saying that as a matter of pride I do not want anything there. As a matter of safety we may need these places, and I tried in my amendment to submit that question to one whose business it is to know whether we need them or not.

Mr. BORAH and Mr. NORRIS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. The Senator says he thinks we are scuttling the ship too early. When does the Senator think—and I ask the question in the utmost sincerity—that we could in all probability release the islands, if at all?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not know when we should release the islands, if we ever conclude to do it. Great Britain has not released Canada or Australia or her other possessions, and Canada to-day is furnishing a quarter of a million soldiers to help fight the battles of the mother country. We may need some native soldiers in the Philippine Islands in the future, if we retain them, to help us fight our battles. I do not know when the time will come. I believe it is a matter of very questionable statesmanship to think of doing it at the present time.

Mr. BORAH. Does not the Senator think that the alternative here is either to release them as soon as we can do so decently, or else to settle down to the proposition that they are ours to keep?

Mr. GALLINGER. No, Mr. President; not that. I am going to quote words that we hear uttered so often in this Chamber—that probably there are to be as wise men here after we are gone as we are, and the great questions of that time will probably be dealt with as wisely, as intelligently, and in as statesmanlike a manner as we can deal with them to-day. Why hurry? What is the haste? We are doing a magnificent work in the Philippine Islands—a work that has challenged the admiration of the peoples of the world. Why are we in haste to get out of the Philippine Islands and to leave them to possible internecine war, which, in my opinion, is sure to come if we yield our authority and take away from those people our sustaining and protecting hand? That is my view, and I am not in a hurry to get out.

Mr. BORAH. I simply wanted the view of the Senator as to when we probably would get out.

Mr. CUMMINS. I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska, if he desires to discuss this question.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know that I ought to take up the time of the Senator from Iowa in referring to what the Senator from New Hampshire has said, but if we did not have the Philippine Islands then I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa or anyone else why we need a coaling station in Asia, unless we expect at some time in the future to go on a war of conquest. If we are going to arm only to defend ourselves, and we have nothing over there to defend, then I should like somebody to explain why it is that we need a naval base for our Navy, which ought to be at home.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am not able to answer the Senator from Nebraska, because I am unable to conceive a reason for these military strongholds. I admit, however, that my judgment in regard to that matter is not entitled to very great weight, for I am not a military man, and I have not studied the affairs of the world from that standpoint. Therefore it may be that those who have given it comprehensive study would be competent to say why we should have these military points in the Orient, and therefore it was my purpose to leave it in the discretion of the President.

Mr. STONE rose.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, suppose we had never been authoritatively in the Philippine Islands, suppose the suggestion which has been made this morning by some Senator, and indeed has been often made, had been actually observed, and Admiral Dewey, after the Battle of Manila, had sailed away and we had never taken possession of the islands, would it not be advisable and really a wise thing at this time, treating with the Filipinos as a separate and independent people, to acquire a naval base and a coaling station in that part of the world for our uses?

Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, we as a people have great interests in the Orient. All nations have an interest in the Orient entirely aside from the mere desire to acquire and exercise sovereignty over territory. Away back we have had great commercial interests in the Orient. I need not elaborate that; everyone will agree. We have heard a great deal about the open door in China. That is a very well accepted policy in this country and in other countries. It has in large measure been universally agreed to by the leading nations. Now and then circumstances arise that create some degree of alarm, greater or less. The Senator and the Senate recall that not many years ago we joined with other nations in sending an expeditionary force to the capital of China, and we are to-day exercising conjointly with other nations certain power and authority in keeping an open way from that capital to the sea. Is it possible for us here now, looking down through the years that are to come when we have all disappeared, to tell how important, how sudden and imperative our interests may become in that region of the world?

If happily, as I think, we should rehabilitate our merchant marine, whether by one process or another, so as to increase our interests on the Pacific and in the Far East, would it not be wise, if to-day we had no connection with the Philippines, to establish a naval base and a coaling station, not merely to furnish fuel power to our warships, but as a refuge and shelter to our merchant ships and as a means of supplying them with necessities?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri has very ably and very clearly given his reasons for believing that we ought to have the coaling stations and the naval bases. I am still, however, unable to decide with respect to the wisdom

of doing it. It may be wise. I am not sure whether if we were offered a naval base on the coast of China it would be wise to accept it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. Or if offered a coaling station upon the coast of Japan I am not sure whether it would be wise to accept it, or one upon the coast of England or of France or of Germany. I do not know. I am rather old fashioned in my views. I remember the admonition of the Father of his Country and I like to avoid entangling alliances across the sea so far as it is possible to avoid them. I know we can not escape them as completely as they could have been escaped in those primitive days, but still we ought to have as little to do in a governmental way, in a sovereign way, with the powers on the Pacific or with the Continent of Europe as possible.

I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the Senator two questions. The first one is, if the argument of the Senator from Missouri, which the Senator from Iowa has very well said was perfectly plain and logical, is good, then does it not follow that we ought to make the same effort to get a naval base and coaling station in South America and stations to develop our trade in Europe and elsewhere?

Mr. STONE. We are endeavoring to do it.

Mr. NORRIS. If it be true that it is desirable to help our trade, how can the Senator account for the fact that we have such an enormous trade with other countries and other sections of the globe where we have no coaling stations and naval bases.

The other question which I will submit at the same time is this: What would the Senator from Iowa say if Japan, for instance, made arrangements with the Government of Mexico, as soon as they get one, to have a coaling station and a naval base in the Gulf of California?

Mr. GALLINGER. But, Mr. President, if Japan owned the Gulf of California and had jurisdiction over it, it would be a very different proposition from the existing one.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly; but we propose to give up the Philippines, and then we will own nothing. It is an exact parallel when we do that. It is not proposed by anyone to give up whatever naval bases and coaling stations we have until we do recognize the independence and surrender our sovereignty of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, it is impossible for me to perceive the relation between commerce and a naval base.

I have been very glad to hear the arguments on either side of this question, but I have carefully refrained from undertaking to decide for myself. I do not know; I only feel that if we get naval bases all over the world we shall have to distribute our Navy in such a way as that it will be very ineffective at any given point. I would rather, so far as possible, concentrate our Navy near our own shores; but I am willing to intrust that to the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, and such has been my purpose in the amendment now pending before the Senate.

I recapitulate for a moment because we have drifted far from the argument I was endeavoring to make. It seems to me that it has been very clearly shown, and everybody must feel, that it has not been the purpose of the American people to hold the Philippine Islands permanently. It has not been their purpose to admit the people of the Philippine Islands to full citizenship in the Government of the United States. If it has not been our purpose to hold them permanently, if it is not our purpose to give them admission to the Union, with all the rights and privileges of citizens of the Union, then we ask ourselves, shall we follow the course of Great Britain or other continental or Asiatic countries? I say no; I do not want within the territory of the United States one single foot that may not become a part of the United States in the fullest and completest sense. Whenever this country undertakes the colonization of the world, the conquest of the world, to gather in people or countries which are not to become a part of the United States, just so soon will we have entered upon the downward course that will lead ultimately and quickly, as I believe, to the destruction of free institutions in America.

Therefore, the only question with me is, has the time come; for I shudder when anyone suggests that we shall absorb the Malays and the Japanese and the Indians and the Chinese of the Philippine Archipelago as parts of the the citizenship of the United States. No man, as it seems to me, dare propose it, for although I have the highest opinion of the qualifications and the character of the Filipino people in some regards, I do not want them to govern me, and I do not want them to vote in any election that concerns the welfare of the hundred million people who are within the present limits of our national territory.

We have great problems to solve here. We have entered upon a career that has more difficulties it its way than any government ever encountered in the whole history of the world. We need all the intelligent, patriotic, unselfish help that we can summon. Is the Senator from New Hampshire willing that the people of the Philippine Islands shall vote as to the domestic policy of the United States in dealing with our own affairs?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. I mean when he thinks they are qualified to vote at all?

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not prepared to answer that question offhand. I know that there are 28 different nationalities voting in the city of Manchester, N. H., at the present time.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am perfectly aware of that, and I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire does not want to intensify that problem.

Mr. GALLINGER. They are governing us just as much as the Philippine people would if they voted. We have left that open door, and they are coming in by the million a year from the slums of Europe.

Mr. CUMMINS. Not with my consent nor with the consent of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, this matter as to when the time will come for us to abandon the Philippine Islands reminds me of a little anecdote that I will repeat, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. A good minister of the established church was debating with a minister of the Universalist church as to whether or not there was a personal devil. The Universalist minister said, "I do not believe there is a personal devil; if there is I should like to see him." "Well," said his clerical friend, "brother, can't you wait?" [Laughter.] Now, let us wait. I do not think there is great haste about this matter.

Mr. BORAH. Is the Senator from New Hampshire willing to follow out that logic in dealing with the Philippines?

Mr. GALLINGER. I am willing to wait.

Mr. BORAH. Knowing what it will be when you get into the hands of the devil?

Mr. GALLINGER. No; I do not know about that. I am willing to trust the man who succeeds me in this body, and one will in due time. I am willing to believe that he will have just as much wisdom as I have to deal with great questions like this.

Mr. CUMMINS. I can understand that; and it is a very logical and sensible position if one believes that the time has not come to act upon this matter.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, that is my belief.

Mr. CUMMINS. However, at this time it is no impeachment or disparagement of the judgment or intelligence of those who come after us. We have a situation. We must confront it. I can say that there is no citizen of the United States of whom I have ever heard who is willing to assert that hereafter it should be the policy of the United States to train the Filipinos to the end that they may finally become citizens of the United States and entitled to their part in the government of our hundred million people.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will not argue that with the Senator. The Senator assumes that we are going to make States out of Alaska?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. And out of Hawaii? It is a mere assumption on the part of anybody.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is verified by our whole past. Why did we make States out of the Southern States after the Civil War?

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course, that was the logical result. The Senator says that he is against holding any foot of territory that can not become an integral part of the United States. Now, what is the Senator going to do with the island of Guam? Is he going to make a State out of that?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have hunted a long time for the island of Guam. I believe I did find it once, but in reality I am not very familiar with it. But if Guam has people as well as territory in considerable number, everything that I am saying will apply to Guam as certainly everything I am saying applies to Porto Rico.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does Tutuila trouble the Senator?

Mr. CUMMINS. Oh, no; this——

Mr. GALLINGER. Then, again, I say I think we had better wait to solve these problems as they come along.

Mr. CUMMINS. But, Mr. President, those who come after the Senator from New Hampshire may shield themselves in the same way. It is a difficult problem to solve, a difficult question to answer, and they will say, "Let those who come after us settle these things." In the meanwhile the purpose of the people of the United States is challenged and repudiated. The

purpose of the people of this country is denied by the delay if now the time has come when we, with honor to ourselves and due regard to the people of those islands, can withdraw.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator, as he has quoted three or four great men as having suggested that we give independence to the Philippine Islands, can the Senator point to any declaration of the great party to which he belongs, as a party, or can the Senator point to any action that the American people have taken that would indicate that they are ready to scuttle the ship?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I decline to accept the terminology of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, I will substitute the phrase "abandon the Philippine Islands."

Mr. CUMMINS. It is easy enough to try to disparage a suggestion by calling it the "scuttling of the ship," because there is a certain dishonor and cowardice involved in those words.

Mr. GALLINGER. As I have said, I will withdraw that language and substitute the phrase "abandon the Philippine Islands." The Republican Party has made no such declaration in its great national platforms; they have never suggested it; the Democratic Party has suggested it and got defeated every time it went before the people on that issue.

Mr. CUMMINS. No; Mr. President. I think the Senator from New Hampshire could not have been here when I began my observations, for I quoted from the Republican platform upon that subject.

Mr. GALLINGER. I heard that.

Mr. CUMMINS. I quoted, or gave, the substance of the Democratic platform upon the subject, and I am certainly not in sympathy with the Democratic announcement. I quoted from McKinley, I quoted from Roosevelt, I quoted from Taft, and I could quote from a dozen other leading Republicans, declaring that it was not our purpose to permanently occupy the Philippine Islands, but that it was our purpose to do what we could for them; and whenever the time came when it could safely be done, to give them their independence. There has not been any other voice in the Republican Party; there has not been any other voice in the United States than that; and no man has dared to arise in this Chamber and assert any other purpose, so far as I have heard.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if I have read President Taft's utterances correctly, he makes the suggestion that it may be a hundred years before the time will come of which the Senator from Iowa speaks.

Mr. CUMMINS. No, Mr. President; he did not; and I do not remember President Taft having spoken in that way. President Roosevelt, one of the wise men of his time, used the words "within a generation." Those words, however, were used years ago. President Taft said that the time would come, with our training and education, when, if the Filipinos desired it, they ought to have independence. Now, the whole inquiry is with respect to the time.

Mr. President, I believe that the Filipinos will reach their ultimate destiny, assuming it now to be a happy one, more quickly, more surely, if we now withdraw from the islands than if we retain the sovereignty over them for years to come.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. If the Senator from Iowa will kindly permit me, I wish to call his attention, in connection with the matter which he is now discussing, to a joint resolution adopted by the Republican majority in the Senate a few days after the ratification of the Paris treaty, in which resolution the Republicans stated their position with reference to the future disposition of the Philippine Islands. The resolution reads:

> *Resolved, etc.*, That by the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain it is not intended to incorporate the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands into citizenship of the United States, nor is it intended to permanently annex said islands as an integral part of the territory of the United States; but it is the intention of the United States to establish on said islands a government suitable to the wants and conditions of the inhabitants of said islands to prepare them for local self-government, and in due time to make such disposition of said islands as will best promote the interests of the citizens of the United States and the inhabitants of said islands.

That resolution was adopted in the Fifty-fifth Congress, third session, and is reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that session, volume 32, at page 1847. It distinctly states that it never was the intention to hold the Philippine Islands permanently.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Arkansas. I did not know that we had taken that action so definitely as he has shown. I have known, however, that it was the universal sentiment of the people.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I remember that resolution very well, having been present at the time it was considered; but does the Senator from Iowa regard that resolution as being definite?

Mr. CUMMINS. Oh, there is nothing definite about it except in one thing; the universality of one idea can not be denied, namely, that we have not intended to incorporate the Philippine Islands as a part of the Government of the United States, but that at some time they were to be permitted to establish their own government and to control their own destinies. I can not impress that too often or too deeply upon the minds of Senators; and I again say that the only question is one of time.

I could add nothing to the analysis of this subject made a few days ago by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. It was so true that it was instinctively accepted by every Senator who heard it. There are differences between those people and ours that can never be eradicated and that no education can destroy; that will be accentuated rather than diminished as time goes on and as our efforts to train and control them are made. I believe this is the best time that will ever occur in the history of the Philippine Islands to withdraw from them. I believe that a withdrawal now will give them a better opportunity to achieve their victory over very difficult conditions, I agree, than though we were to withdraw 100 years hence or 50 years hence or 25 years hence.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Iowa has laid great stress upon the utterances of three ex-Presidents of the United States on this question, and there seems to be a little difference of opinion between the Senator and myself as to what ex-President Taft said about the time we should continue in the Philippines. I want to call the Senator's attention to a speech delivered by ex-President Taft before the Commonwealth Club, of California, in September, 1915, considerably less than one year ago.

Mr. CUMMINS. I only quoted what ex-President Taft said while he was in office.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, he certainly said nothing when in office as to the date we should grant the Filipinos independence.

Mr. CUMMINS. No; not as fixing a definite time.

Mr. GALLINGER. On that point President Taft said in the address I have called attention to:

> I am in favor of turning the islands over to their people when they are reasonably fitted for self-government.

There is the point that has been thrashed over here, as to what self-government means; and we shall not enter into that now, or, at least, I shall not. Ex-President Taft added:

> But this will not be for two generations.
>
> I believe a generation is 30 years, so that is 60 years.

Mr. CUMMINS. That was his opinion as a private citizen.

Mr. GALLINGER. I understood the Senator was quoting Mr. Taft——

Mr. CUMMINS. That was not President Taft's statement when he was burdened with the responsibility of office.

Mr. GALLINGER. He made no declaration on that point at all when he was President of the United States, as I understand.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, there is a path that every nation must walk toward complete and successful self-government, and it must walk that path alone, and any aid or any help that may be given to it by a superior power retards its progress rather than aids its advance.

What is the situation here? There are 7,000,000 people in the Philippine Islands who will be subject to the provisions of the bill that has been reported. I will assume, first, that one-fourth of them are men of more than 21 years of age. That makes about 1,750,000 men who, if they were citizens of this country, would be entitled to vote. Under the bill that is now reported, it is said—of course I am giving this only upon the authority of those familiar with the question—that 700,000 or 800,000 of these men will be qualified to vote; and if self-government is not now possible in a population of that kind, it will not be possible in the future, at least in that future of which we can take consideration.

I believe, Mr. President, while they may fall into disorder now and then, that while they may make many mistakes in the work they will attempt to do, they will succeed better now than after we have trained them for a quarter of a century more; for, after all, the underlying thing in every free and successful government is the spirit that demands liberty and self-government, and if that spirit is destroyed under the tutelage and control of the United States, then there will be no hope for a stable and separate government. But I have said all that I desire to say with regard to that phase of it. These considerations impel me to believe that the separation ought to be immediate and ought to be complete; and I now come very briefly to the reasons that make it impossible for me to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas and that have compelled me to offer the substitute which is now pending.

I can not vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, because it vests in the President of the United States a dangerous power. It gives him more power than we have ever given to one man; more than ever ought to be given to one man. It practically gives him the power, if he desires so to use it, to become dictator, without law and without restriction, of the Philippine Islands for a period of at least nine years. There is no guide given him with respect to the plan of government which is to be established in the islands before our withdrawal; there is no guide to his discretion with respect to his right to give a guaranty on the part of the United States for the independence of the islands during the five years that may ensue after the government is established.

I am opposed to it, secondly, because it does not give the Filipino people the right to vote upon the adoption of their government upon their separation from the United States. I believe it is craven for us to attempt to withdraw our sovereignty from the Philippine Islands until the people of the Philippine Islands express their desire that we shall withdraw.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I thought I might suggest to the Senator that he was mistaken somewhat in what he is now saying, or else I misunderstand the purport of this provision of the so-called Clarke amendment. In enumerating the powers the President may exercise in describing the duties which rest upon him, it says:

> And he shall on behalf of the United States fully recognize the independence of the said Philippines as a separate and self-governing nation, and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the government instituted by the people thereof

Not by him, but by the people of the Philippine Islands.

Now, I will recall to the Senator's attention the provision of the resolution adopted by the Republican majority of the Senate the day after the treaty of Paris was ratified, in which they described the kind of government they desired to see set up in the islands before they acknowledged that the time had arrived when they might be turned loose. It says:

> But it is the intention of the United States to establish on said island a government suitable to the wants and conditions of the inhabitants of said islands.

That is the kind of government that the Republican Party promised them, and that is the kind of government that this amendment leaves them to adopt.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know that, but upon this subject the Senator from Arkansas will remember that I began with an emancipation from the declarations of any political party. I do not intend that my vote upon this subject shall be influenced by the declaration of a political convention or the majority in the Senate at that time. I am glad the Senator from Arkansas corrected me with respect to the other matter, although I still think that I was substantially accurate in my statement. The President is given no authority, it is true, over the plan of government that shall be established, except that it must be one that will preserve the rights of the people of this country and possibly of other countries; but I am not so much concerned about that as I am in insisting that it must be a government that is adopted by a vote of the people of that country. I am not willing that a few men in the Philippines shall establish a government which shall be recognized by the President, and that we then shall withdraw. I think it is our bounden duty to see that the government which we leave there is one which, in our judgment, is calculated to be enduring, and that will protect not only our rights, but the rights of the Filipino people as well.

Let us see how it will work. The President, at the end of two years, we will say, recognizes the Filipino government, and if he does not secure a guaranty from any other country in the world with regard to Philippine independence, he will enter into an agreement of guaranty for ourselves. He must then remain there with his Army and his Navy, or with such other force as will properly represent our power and accomplish our purpose, for five years during the pendency of the agreement of guaranty. That is not separation, in my opinion. I fear at least that our relation with the Philippine Islands will be very much more unsatisfactory at the end of that time than it is now.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The fact that the United States Government was standing sponsor for the independent existence of the Philippines for five years would be a sufficient guaranty to protect them without the presence of an armed force, except for the purpose of keeping internal peace. We do not maintain an army in South America nor in Cuba, nor elsewhere, in order to maintain the guaranties that are implied by the existence of the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. CUMMINS. This is the provision, if I may read it, in the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas:

> And pending the existence of such separate guaranty by the United States, the United States shall be entitled to retain and exercise such control and supervision in the said Philippines as may be necessary to enforce order therein and to avoid external complications.

All that is with the President.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That is exactly what we do in Cuba under the so-called Platt amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not responsible for the Platt amendment. I want to get out of the Philippines; I want to see a government established there, and then I want to bid that government Godspeed and sail away and have no more concern with the affairs of the Philippines thereafter than we have with any other country with which we have friendly relations.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I sympathize very completely with the purpose the Senator has stated, and if I thought I could secure the enactment of that statement into law, I should be very glad to do it. The fact is that it would represent my real opinions. But the difference between the Senator from Iowa and myself is that he wants to do something that is theoretically correct, whereas I am forced to accept the prospect of getting something that is practicable, something that is within reach, something that will get us started upon the road to a dismissal from the Philippine Islands—because I regard it as dismissing ourselves rather than dismissing the Philippine Islands. It is not a fact that the Philippine Islands will be helpless in the event that the United States shall withdraw its interference, because they will be remitted to every power that any independent government ever had to make new alliances, if, in fact, alliances are required to perpetuate the existence of that people as a separate government.

Mr. CUMMINS. I assure the Senator from Arkansas that I appreciate and believe I understand all the difficulties with which he has been surrounded. I can only wish for him better success in future efforts in opening the minds of his associates to the reasonable, defensible course to pursue. I can not believe that we ought to withdraw from the Philippines without a vote of the people of that country. I am not willing to accept the representation of one or two men sent from the Philippines that they desire separation. I can understand how their ambitions and their hopes for the future might very greatly influence their opinions. I want a vote of the 800,000 men who will be entitled under this bill to express their opinion upon public affairs; and if a majority of them vote for an independent government and for separation from the United States, then I want them to have their way. But, Mr. President, after the vote is taken, the suggestion that we ought to ask the Governments of the earth to guarantee the independence of the Philippines for a period of five years is to me unthinkable—I almost said absurd.

Why should any Government in the world join us in a guaranty of the independence of the Philippine Islands? Why? There is no reason; and if they were willing, I would not be willing to joint with them in a guaranty of that kind. Again, I summon the wisdom of the forefathers against these entangling alliances. But I have no fear, really, of entangling alliances, so far as this point is concerned, because there would be no common treaty. There are no great powers who would join us in this undertaking; and then we have given the President, in this proposed amendment, the power to execute the guaranty alone, on behalf of the United States. Why should we guarantee the independence of the Philippines for five years or for any period? If for five years, why not for a quarter of a

century? It belies and condemns the very spirit out of which the amendment grew.

The Senator from Arkansas perceives that. He understands that; and I am unable to see why men who believe that the time has come when the Philippine people should establish a government of their own also believe that for a period thereafter the United States, either alone or in conjunction with any other power, should guarantee the independence of the islands.

Suppose the government that is to be established should not desire a guaranty of that sort, with whom is the contract to be made? You can not have a contract of guaranty unless there are two parties, at least, to it. Suppose your independent government that is to be established does not desire supervision of that sort—the supervision that inevitably flows from the contract of guaranty—what then? You have accomplished nothing; and I predict that if the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas instead of the real desire of the Senator from Arkansas is enacted into law, nine years will pass and we will not have gone from the Philippines. There will be no independent government there, and our relations will be more complicated, intricate, and difficult than they are now.

If you do not believe that an independent government, such as they desire, can be carried on in these islands with fair promise of success, then let us defer action until that time comes. I believe the time has come; and it seems to me that my Democratic friends forget the very basis of the argument they have been making when they insist that independence shall be accompanied with a guaranty and a supervision which amounts practically to sovereignty over the islands and over the government which they are seeking to establish.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. It seems to me that in considering this question we ought to draw a line of separation here, namely, whether we should enter into agreements with other powers respecting a guaranty in some form of the independence of the Philippines, or whether the United States, acting alone, should do that.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am very clear that we ought not to do either.

Mr. STONE. I understand that to be the Senator's view; but in my mind I draw a line between our national policy of asking other nations to join us in a movement of this character or, aside from that, undertaking to guarantee their independence on our own part.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think there is a very clear line of distinction between the two things.

Mr. STONE. Yes; the Senator, of course, sees that. Now, we might consider those two things as separate things. We might consider one distinct and separate proposition—whether we should seek to make agreements with other powers that in some form or another guaranteed the independence of the Philippines, whether the Congress should direct the President to endeavor to do that, or, on the other hand, considering that now as a separate proposition, we might consider putting into the law the declaration that the United States alone will guarantee that independence.

Mr. CUMMINS. The difference between the two things is perfectly manifest, and the reasons which may be urged for or against the two proposals are different.

Mr. STONE. I think entirely so.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think it would be very unwise for this Government to ask any other Government to join it in a guaranty of independence. It might not be so unwise to ask it, but it would be very unwise to accept it if it were given, for the Senator from Missouri, skilled as he is in diplomacy and in the relations of nations to each other, can easily see what trouble may follow a joint agreement of that sort.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, if the Senator please, I turn my thought now to one of these suggestions—that of a mutual agreement or understanding between our Government and the other Governments, as distinct and separate from the other proposition of the United States alone guaranteeing the independence of the Philippines. As to the one to which I say my thought is now directed, I make this observation, which is in the nature of an inquiry as well as a suggestion:

Are there not two ways by which that might be approached?—the first that which is proposed in the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, that we ask other nations to agree with us to maintain the independence of the Philippine Islands against outside force—I need not elaborate on that; every Senator understands what that means; and another suggestion that we ask the cooperation of other nations, an agreement with them that so far as they are concerned, individually and separately, they will never infringe or intrude upon the independence of these islands; that they will respect the independence that we confer upon them.

I think the Senator a moment ago expressed the opinion that we would not be able to find other nations that would enter into any agreement of the one kind or the other.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is true.

Mr. STONE. Well, let us see. The United States is the sovereign over the Philippines. It is a great possession. It is in the Orient. The presence of the United States there, in the form in which that presence appears, I imagine is not altogether satisfying to some of the larger nations of the world. They would be very glad, I think—some of them, at least—if we withdrew from that region of the world; for it has been asserted elsewhere as well as upon the floor of the Senate that our presence there is, in a way, an attempt on our part to extend what we call the Monroe doctrine to the Orient.

If we get out of the Orient, and please other nations in so doing, does the Senator think that in consideration of our action—let us call it a generous action, if you please, the high and ennobling act upon our part of absolutely surrendering control over a great and valuable possession and conferring independence upon the people—they would not agree at least to say that they would respect the independence of the country which had been conferred by our own, let me say again, generous act? Does the Senator think that Japan, for example, or Great Britain or Germany, would not tell us, "If you do this magnificent thing, this almost unexampled thing, we will respect the thing you have done and we will not interfere with it," just as was done on one occasion with respect to the Hawaiian Islands?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the view taken by the Senator from Missouri does very great credit to his confidence in the justice of the nations, but I am still skeptical about it. I do not believe, so far as one can see at this moment, that any nation will attempt to overthrow the independence of the government established in the Philippine Islands. I can not see any temptation, or serious temptation, which is presented to any nation that would lead it into a war of conquest, but a nation is usually unwilling to bind itself by an agreement that will circumscribe and limit its energies and its power unless there is some consideration for it, unless broadly or narrowly it has compensation for it.

I am very sure that the great powers of the world would not agree to defend the Philippines; that is to say, they would not agree to go to war with any other nation with which they might be entirely at peace and on the most amiable terms in order to defend the independence of the Philippines. I am not so sure that some nations might not agree to respect the independence of the Philippines, but that of course is not this amendment. That was the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], which was voted upon adversely. I, however, would be very reluctant to see the United States become the guarantor in the event that other nations would not make the agreement proposed in the amendment. We never would get out of the Philippines. They will have their troubles. They are bound to have their troubles. Every nation in the world has its troubles.

Remember what happened in the United States. The Senator from Missouri will remember that after the War of the Revolution closed there were four, five, six years of chaos and disorder when the most enthusiastic and optimistic and earnest patriots believed that the war had been in vain. It was only by the overpowering greatness of one man that we finally emerged into the Constitution and Government that has been so stable and successful. If a country like ours had to meet these discords and dissensions and revolts, what may be expected of the diverse population that now occupies those islands? Of course, there will be difficulties, of course there will be disorders, but happily they will not overturn the government that we hope to see established. But if the United States is there with its Army, with its power, to calm and quell, to overcome, the Philippine government will never be more than a mere technical and paper establishment, contributing little or nothing to the happiness of its people.

No, Mr. President, if the time has come to separate from the Philippines, and I believe that it has come, our duty is first to cooperate and collaborate with the Philippine Legislature in the formation of a plan of government and constitution; and when that plan or constitution receives the concurrence of the commissioners to be appointed by the United States and the Philippine Legislature as constituted in this bill, then it will be submitted to a vote of the men who under this bill are given the right to vote, and if the constitution or plan receives the approval of the people, then the government being established, we

shall bid them good-by and Godspeed, and thereafter deal with that government precisely as we deal with all other independent nationalities or Governments in the world. That is the amendment which I have proposed.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. STONE. I am under the belief that any further discussion of this subject is somewhat a waste of time; that considered from the point of view of discussion it is not likely to change or affect the opinions of Senators. It looks to me as if interest has been largely lost in the discussion. I think the Senator from Iowa appreciates that view. I am sorry it is true.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am like a noted man who was about to visit a friend to secure a drink. When asked by another what his emotions were, he said, "This friend has two brands of whisky; one very good and the other very bad. I always go there hoping for the best but expecting the worst." [Laughter.] Whenever I address my Democratic friends after they have either formally or informally, in caucus or conference, agreed upon a measure, I really have not that high-glowing hope of changing their minds that I had when I was younger. While hoping for the best, I really am expecting the worst.

Mr. STONE. I am rather sorry the Senator made his last remark. It was hardly justified by the circumstances.

Mr. CUMMINS. No? I have been told by many of the Senators upon your side of the Chamber that my amendment could not pass. I hope the Senator from Missouri will not take what I said seriously, however.

Mr. STONE. I usually take what the Senator says seriously. I am glad he assures us that in what he just said he was not serious. I think the consideration of this measure ought to be taken seriously.

Mr. CUMMINS. Oh, I am sure there never was a more important and serious one.

Mr. STONE. I do not think, Mr. President, that we are going to engage upon legislation likely to be of greater importance. When I said that I thought further discussion was in a large measure without value, I had no thought of the subject in any partisan aspect. The Senator from Iowa need only to look around him to convince him that the interest in the discussion lags as well upon that side as this, for if any Senator upon that side could bring his party colleagues to listen to a subject to which he has been devoting his attention, I should think it would be the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. No, Mr. President, I hardly compliment myself so much as that. It is perfectly manifest, and I know it to be true, that a great many of my party associates do not look upon me as orthodox upon this question. I have tried to treat it, and I intend to treat it in the future, in a nonpartisan spirit. I have given my view upon the subject with absolute frankness, without regard——

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I intended to say when I was on the floor a moment ago by the courtesy of the Senator that making an arrangement with foreign powers might depend, and I think would depend, upon the time when the attempt to make the arrangement was made. I agree with what some other Senators have said; indeed, I have so said myself——

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. STONE. In just a moment. I have said myself that if we postpone the effort to make an arrangement looking to the neutrality of the islands until after we have conferred independence upon them, there would be no reason that I can see why any other nation should care to enter into such arrangement; but if we made our recognition of the Philippines and our action looking to the conferring of independence upon them conditional upon or in some way dependent upon the agreement by which their independence would be guaranteed on the one hand, as provided for in the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas or respected and observed, upon the other hand, by these foreign powers, as I have suggested, I think we would have a better chance to come to some agreement with them.

I expect to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, as I have already said, although I am not well satisfied with its provisions. I would be glad to have some changes in it, but I am going the full length of that amendment, if need be, to do the thing I am so profoundly anxious to do—to grant independence to the Philippines.

Mr. CUMMINS. Might I suggest to the Senator from Missouri that I have about finished?

Mr. STONE. But I wish to ask the Senator about his amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. Oh, the Senator desires to ask a question.

Mr. STONE. Yes; I wish to ask the Senator some questions about the amendment he has offered. I think there is a very great deal of real merit in this amendment. I look upon it with some favor. I do not know what the Senate is going to do about it. The Senator said a moment ago that it had been passed around in some informal way that it was not to be agreed to. I know nothing about that.

Mr. CUMMINS. May I explain that? I desire to say that I have had quite as much encouragement for it upon the Senator's side of the Chamber as I have upon my own. I did not intend to confine my suggestion to one side. I still hope that it will pass.

Mr. STONE. The Senator does not speak as if he had a very intense hope.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have been doing my best. I have been standing here for two hours now.

Mr. STONE. I know; the Senator has made a great speech; but now the Senator informs us that he has very little hope. He is hoping rather against hope.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. His amendment provides that the President shall be authorized and directed to appoint, with the consent of the Senate, three commissioners who shall cooperate with the Philippine Legislature in preparing and submitting a constitution or plan of government for the people of the Philippine Islands. The three commissioners are to cooperate with the Legislature of the Philippine Islands. How does the Senator expect them to cooperate? Suppose the commissioners and the legislature disagree as to the constitution or plan of government, will it fall to the ground and will that be the end of it?

Mr. CUMMINS. It would happen then precisely as would happen under the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, if the President did not accept the constitution or plan prepared.

Mr. STONE. I do not now care for a comparison between one amendment and another.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is true. The President appoints three commissioners to cooperate with the Philippine Legislature. The Philippine Legislature initiates the constitution and submits it to the three commissioners. If the commissioners, or a majority of them, within the limits and within the scope of the authority that is prescribed in the amendment approve it, then it is submitted to the Philippine people. If they do not approve of it, it is not submitted, and Congress would have to act again or the President would appoint three other commissioners.

Mr. STONE. Would it not be better, if this plan should be agreed to, to put a controlling power somewhere? For example, why not let the Legislature of the Philippines, representing the best intelligence of that people, line out their constitution and plan of government and submit that to the people of the islands? Whether or not, following that, the approval of the matter should be referred back to the Congress of the United States is another question; but if it is a constitution and government which the Legislature of the Philippines approve, and being submitted to the qualified voters of the islands is approved by them, what more have we to do with that?

Mr. CUMMINS. There would be no great objection to that plan. I preferred this one because I thought it would be more practical and believed that it would result in a constitution that would preserve their independence and maintain order and stable affairs in the islands. But I would have no great objection to the other plan.

Mr. STONE. That plan, it seems to me, would be really the only practical one; the other would put two forces in operation that would be independent and yet coordinate. One might desire a certain constitution and plan of government and the other be wholly opposed to that. It seems to me, if the Senator please, in going through this, if his idea should prevail, the people who are concerned, who are to live under the constitution and administer it, who are to live under the government and be subject to its sovereignty and laws, are the people who ought to make the form of government, and if it should be a government agreeable to them and which they preferred, why should we here, 7,000 miles away, undertake to interfere with that popular choice?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Missouri that I desire to close my argument and take my seat, because really I have already occupied the time of the Senate much too long.

Mr. STONE. I have no wish to detain the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. I wish to answer the question just proposed by the Senator from Missouri and then I hope that he will make any further criticism of my amendment the subject of his own remarks.

Mr. STONE. If the Senator will permit me, I will say that after that I shall not make any further remarks in his time.

Mr. CUMMINS. I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that abstractly what he has just stated is true, and it would be true under my amendment. The people of the Philippine Islands have the right to determine what government they shall establish. But I think there is a duty on the part of the United States to see that the government of the Philippine Islands shall begin with due regard to the fundamental principles of organized society, and therefore these commissioners, I think, fairly representing the President who appoints them, and fairly representing the people of the United States, because the Senate is to confirm them, would exercise a wise and just discretion in approving or refusing to approve the proposed constitution. If they approve it, it is submitted and the people can either accept it or reject it, according to their desire.

Mr. President, I feel that I must apologize to all Senators for occupying so much time, although it is well known that I have used but a small part of it. I understand the difficulty of this subject. I thoroughly believe in the sincerity and honesty of purpose of all Senators, differing as they do with respect to it. I have no doubt that each of them will vote as his conscience tells him to vote, having just one thing in mind, namely, the welfare of the people of the Philippine Islands and the conscience of the men and women who make up the Republic of the United States.

I am praying, I am hoping that what is done here will be done to the credit and honor not only of the American name but for the welfare of the 7,000,000 of people we are now attempting to control and govern.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, before the Senator from Iowa takes his seat I wish to get his viewpoint as nearly correct as I possibly can. I have listened to his argument and I have also read over his amendment. I wish to ask the Senator if he contends or takes the position that if the Filipino people should desire us to remain and by their vote express a desire to remain a part of the United States, and if the people of the United States should be convinced that it was to our own interest to abandon Asiatic possessions, we should be in duty bound to retain them just as long as they desired to be under our protection?

Mr. CUMMINS. No; I have attempted to state my view of that matter heretofore. I do not attempt to bind, or would not suggest binding, the future. What I do say is that if the Filipino people at this time desire to maintain their relations with the Government of the United States, we can not abandon them.

Mr. McCUMBER. Suppose they would want to do it 10 years from now, or 20 years from now, would the Senator think that we should still allow them to govern the hundred million——

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not express an opinion on that. I do not assert it as a principle governing a long period of years. I only say that I believe the time has come when we in honor and with due regard to all our obligations can leave the Philippine Islands subject to one thing, namely, their desire to retain their relation to us. What the conditions may be years hence I am not able even to imagine. I do not assert, of course, that for all time to come the 100,000,000 people within the territory of the United States must be subordinated to the 7,000,000 people in the Philippine Islands. I only assert that we went there in 1898; that we conquered the Philippine Islands and imposed our government upon them; and that without their consent, in my judgment, the time has not come to separate ourselves from them.

Mr. McCUMBER. I thank the Senator, Mr. President. I think I understand his position quite well. If, however, in his own judgment, and that judgment is backed by the opinion of the American people, as he believes it is, that we should now sever our relations with the Philippine people, I can not understand why he could also take the position that that should be subject to the whim or to the belief of the Filipino people that they wish to remain with us for any length of time, either in perpetuity or for 10 years or for 20 years. It does seem to me that we are in a position where we ought to determine, from the standpoint of the United States, whether we ought to get out of the Philippines, and not leave it to the judgment of any people or of any other nation upon the face of the earth.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I could cheerfully support this amendment except for one thing. There could be no objection, perhaps, to appointing commissioners to cooperate by way of advice and consultation with the Philippine Legislature; but the amendment as it is now leaves it absolutely in the power of a majority of those three commissioners to indefinitely prevent the independence of the Philippine people, for the constitution planned by the legislature will have to be approved by the commissioners or by a majority of them. It does seem to me that, with the guiding influence of the commissioners and the tutelage of 17 years, recognizing the difference in the character and makeup of their people and ours, if we are going to grant them independence, we ought, in the last analysis, to leave it absolutely in their power to determine what their constitution shall be, inasmuch as no constitution imposed by us would prevent them from afterwards making their constitution according to their own views. It simply leaves it in the power of two men, if they were captious, to indefinitely postpone their independence. Of course I recognize that the differences are very vital ones, but I want to ask the Senator if he would be willing to eliminate the provision which requires the approval of a majority of the commissioners?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I recognize the general justice of the suggestion made by the Senator from Minnesota; but I am myself unwilling to abandon, if you please, the Philippines without some supervision over the character of the government that shall be there established. For instance, suppose the Filipino people wanted to establish a military dictatorship, not dependent upon the vote of the people at all, I would not be willing to withdraw the sovereignty of the United States in favor of a government of that kind, even though it might be said abstractly that it was the government the people of the islands wanted. I think we have just that obligation toward them, of exercising our judgment, not with respect to what would be best for us, but with respect to what would be best adapted for them before we leave them to care for themselves.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, that might be if there were any way by which we, with our 125 years or more of experience in self-government, with reference to some great fundamental of free government, could permanently read into their constitution some such great fundamentals; but we could not do that. The moment they once became independent under any form of constitution they themselves could amend the constitution. We may force those people, just as we forced the people of Arizona, to accept a constitution that we knew they did not want and which they would not maintain, and which they modified the moment they got beyond the leading strings of Congress.

Mr. CUMMINS. I assume that the representatives of the United States would act with wisdom and with justice. Any other plan ought to be just in two lines, namely, commanding the President to-morrow to move out of the Philippines, before they have any government at all. Why do we wait there until there is any government?

Mr. CLAPP. Until there is some organized government——

Mr. CUMMINS. But why?

Mr. CLAPP. With which we can treat.

Mr. CUMMINS. Well, why?

Mr. CLAPP. We would want to treat with somebody.

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes; and therefore it seems to me that our full obligation will not be discharged unless in the formation of that government the fundamental principles of humanity and of modern affairs are recognized. Much as I am in favor of separation, I would not be in favor of withdrawing our power in favor of a dictator.

Mr. CLAPP. No; but the Senator does, so far as he as a Senator of the United States is concerned, absolutely and forever withdraw his authority when this proposed law is passed.

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly; our obligation.

Mr. CLAPP. No; it is not our obligation then. It then is vested in three men, two of whom constitute a majority. They may dictate to those people the kind of constitution that they must start under, even though they are not favorable to it, even though they must practice duplicity in the apparent acquiescence in it, so as to get themselves into a status where they can then frame a government to suit themselves.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I very much regret, of course, that my amendment does no commend itself to the Senator from Minnesota. I have drawn it in a way that I think will be best adapted to accomplish the result.

Mr. CLAPP. I will tell the Senator why I have my doubts as to the amendment. The Senator says we must not assume that anything of that kind will happen. The Senator was a member of this body, as I was, when a people about to become a part of the United States had overwhelmingly expressed themselves upon a great fundamental question; but they were forced to go back to the ratification of a constitution striking out that proposition, when everybody knew the moment they got away from our leading strings that in the adoption of a new constitution they would immediately reassert their views in that new constitution. We forced a great number of men about to become citizens of the United States to purchase the

right to be a part of this Union by the exercise of duplicity. They had to surrender temporarily, and without any intention of a permanent surrender, their convictions upon a great fundamental question.

I am not in favor of putting it in the power of three men to either indefinitely hold up the independence of the Philippines or to require those people to adopt something which they do not want and which they will not retain the moment they get free.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, in my opinion, it is the only practicable way, notwithstanding the unfortunate incident referred to by the Senator from Minnesota. I suppose the Senator would not be in favor of withdrawing all power on the part of Congress with regard to the admission of a State, and allow the State to be admitted no matter what sort of constitution it adoped.

Mr. CLAPP. Not at all, because the proposed State becomes an integral part of our own Government and our own Union.

Mr. CUMMINS. But the principle is just the same. We are dissolving our relations with that country instead of forming them, and it seems to me we ought to exercise some care in that dissolution. Otherwise we ought simply to pass a law that would require the President five months or two months hence to withdraw all our representatives and forces there, without regard to the question of whether a government had been established or not.

Mr. CLAPP. Oh, no; not at all. I think the idea of appointing three commissioners, with the experience of our public history behind us, to cooperate with them and advise, suggest, and counsel would be good; but the Senator forgets that the moment this amendment is adopted and becomes a law, that moment the Senator is as powerless to say what the constitution of those islands shall be as would be one of the employees of this body.

Mr. CUMMINS. No.

Mr. CLAPP. It is thrown entirely into the hands of three men, two of whom constitute a majority, and Congress has nothing left, the Senator has no more voice; and yet we leave the matter to two men.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. CLAPP. Unless the Senator from North Dakota desires to ask me a question, I am through.

Mr. GRONNA. I want to ask the Senator a question. The Senator from Minnesota is a member of the Committee on the Philippines. I want to ask him if there was presented to the committee any testimony indicating that more than about 10 per cent of the Philippine people were able to read and write?

Mr. CLAPP. Not quite 10 per cent of the entire population—men, women, and children—could do so; but over one-half of what would become the electorate under this bill can read and write.

Mr. GRONNA. Does the Senator think it will be possible to set up, even if the United States should attempt to set up, a form of government for a class of people who are unable to read or write or who are without any education whatever? Does the Senator believe that it would be possible for a people of that kind to maintain the kind of government that we should like to see them maintain?

Mr. CLAPP. I do not know whether they would maintain the kind of government we would like to see. We had to go to work after the adoption of our own Constitution and absolutely reverse the original Constitution in four great particulars, every one of them fundamental. We had to go through the greatest insurrection the world ever knew before we reached our present condition of unity and harmony as a people. We had to see the great cities of this country, from San Francisco to New York, locked in the embrace of mobs and terrorized by mobs. I do not know what the success of the Filipino people will be; but I believe that the Filipino people are perfectly competent to govern themselves under the form of government best suited and best adapted to their temperament and conditions.

Mr. GRONNA. Does not this bill indicate that we shall set up a republican form of government?

Mr. CLAPP. This bill indicates not our desire as to what they shall do, but authorizes and directs that there shall be a republican form of government. It does not leave it to the people. We prescribe the form of government in the bill.

Mr. GRONNA. There being only about 10 per cent of the people educated and fit to maintain a government, is it not reasonable to believe that the only kind of government that they could maintain would be an aristocracy or oligarchy; that it would be a government controlled absolutely by a few or by those best fitted to carry on a government?

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, it is not so very long ago that a former Member of this body in a public speech in the city of Albany deplored the fact that the great State of New York, after one hundred and twenty odd years of experiment, had been governed by what was first so graphically described by the late Senator Dolliver, which he characterized as an "invisible government." Governments will always be in the hands of some one. There may not be a population where there is the equation of a high plane of what we call school education, but the sense of right, the sense of justice, the sense of protecting people and seeking to get away from wrong and injustice may find a lodgment in a man's heart and mind although he does not bear the right to attach the title or degree of doctor of laws to his name. It is not a question of book learning; it is a question of the character and intelligence generally of the people.

While we have made great progress, while we may well be proud of our history, we have seen that we have ulcers and cancerous spots in the body politic. It is insisted by some that the Filipinos before they undertake the experiment of self-government must demonstrate that they can have a government free from these cancers and these ulcers. Of course in the Philippine Islands, as in every State in this Union, as in the Nation at large, certain men will become leaders, and I would hope that they would be leaders by power and virtue of mentality, by the power and virtue of their intelligence. More than 10 per cent of the electorate are able to read and write. The Senator from North Dakota had reference to 10 per cent of the entire population.

It does seem to me, Mr. President, that when we decide to let the Philippine people go we should adopt some plan whereby, in the last analysis, either those people or this Congress should determine whether the law should be operative.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CLAPP. I am through, unless the Senator desires to ask a question.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to submit a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair. It is this, Mr. President: Is the amendment of the Senator from Iowa now pending subject to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment. On page 1 strike out lines 11 and 12 and lines 1 and 2 on page 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On pages 1 and 2 it is proposed to strike out the following words:

> Among other things, it shall provide for the complete possession and sovereignty on the part of the United States, in perpetuity, of such coaling stations and naval bases as may be prescribed by the President of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this question has been very thoroughly discussed, and I do not care to detain the Senate more than a few moments by what I have to say; I desire to speak briefly merely in order to give my reasons for the votes which I shall cast.

I happened to be for many years chairman of the Committee on the Philippines and took a very great interest in all the legislation that was passed and everything that was done in regard to the islands when they first came into our hands. I had a large part in drafting the organic act, which, on the whole, I think has worked well as a constitution for those islands.

It seems to me—and I have always been of the opinion—that there are only two courses to be pursued in regard to the Philippine Islands. One is to abandon them entirely, give them their independence, and separate ourselves from them wholly; the other is to remain in control of the islands as we now are. The one situation of all others which I think we ought to avoid is to put ourselves in a position where we shall be responsible for those islands and yet have no power over them.

Of late the war in Europe has brought home very strongly, I think, to everyone's mind the military weakness involved in our possession of the Philippine Islands. A strong argument can be made in favor of complete abandonment and withdrawal from the islands based on the fact that they are a source of military weakness to the United States, and a strong argument in opposition can be made on the basis of our duty and obligation to those people to retain and administer the islands as we have been doing. One thing is certain, if we are to withdraw from those islands, the withdrawal ought to be complete. No mistake would be so great as a halfway measure.

The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], it seems to me, as has been pointed out by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], is defective in the fact that it does not do what it proposes to do. It puts us in the position of guaranteeing the safety of those islands for four years, and yet giv-

ing up our control. It also opens the door by the proviso, as I understand, to a return to our present situation. It does not, in fact, settle anything. If we are to go, we ought to go; and if we are to stay, we ought to stay and keep the power. Power without responsibility is bad; but responsibility without power is even worse.

Whether or not the Philippine people are fit for what we call self-government or for independence, they are certainly not in a condition where we can afford to put ourselves in such a relation to them that they can involve us in all sorts of difficulties and troubles, both with other nations and in the islands themselves, while we at the same time are deprived of all power to prevent it. In other words, if we are to go, let us go; and if we are to stay, let us stay with power in our hands so long as we are responsible. My own belief is that we have an obligation to those people which makes it a great dereliction of national duty to abandon them at this time; but if, as is argued here, they are so entirely fitted for self-government, then they are fit for the necessary accompaniment of self-government, which is complete independence.

What I most object to is our undertaking to give a guaranty to protect those islands and leave the people of those islands to do anything they please. The people of the Philippine Islands are nearly all Malays or of the Malay race. There are, of course, now considerable bodies of Spanish and Chinese mestizos there, but, broadly speaking, they are Malays.

The Spaniards divided the people of the Philippines, not on ethnical principles, but according to their religious beliefs. They called those who had accepted Christianity "Filipinos"; they called the wild tribes "infieles" or heathens, and they called the Mohammedans "Moros" or "Moors." Of course, they were not Moors; they were simply Mohammedan Malays of the same race as the rest; but they divided them in that way; and then there were the aborigines, a smaller number of people, known as the Negritos. Of the last there are not more than 25,000, so that they constitute a negligible element; but there is a very large element of the wild tribes, some 600,000 of them. There are 200,000 of them, according to the statistics, in the island of Luzon alone. Now, those people and the Moros will, under this bill, be left practically, if we remain responsible and exercise no power, to be dealt with by that portion of the Filipinos who have the actual legislative authority. I do not think we ought to leave those people, so long as we have any connection with the islands, in any such way. I do not think we ought to make ourselves responsible for what the Filipino legislature may see fit to do and not have the power to control their action. I do not myself think that the Filipinos are fitted for self-government according to our theory of what self-government is.

The English-speaking people have been, in round numbers, a thousand years working up to the stage of self-government which we possess and which some other people possess, and I am not sure that we have made such a very brilliant success of it that we can assert with confidence that another people, to whom all those ideas are new, can reach that same point in 20 years.

There is the view of my friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] that a people have the right to misgovern themselves in their own way. It may be misgovernment according to our ideas, but they have a right to misgovern themselves in their own way. I quite accede to that theory. I do not dispute it. I think we have a right to misgovern ourselves, and we occasionally do so very badly. But that is another proposition. As to the capacity of the Filipinos for self-government, and for independence—which ought to go with self-government—I have very grave doubts. But the one point I wish to reiterate and press home is this: It is one thing for them to have the right to govern or misgovern themselves in their own way, or the right to independence. It is quite another thing to make us responsible for the way they govern or misgovern themselves.

If we are going to take responsibility, we must have power. If we are going to be responsible for the people of those islands in their relations to each other, and still more in their relations to the rest of the world, we must have power there ourselves. We can not afford to put ourselves in the position of being responsible for any people and yet have no power to control what they do.

Putting aside the question whether we ought as a matter of national obligation still to remain in the islands, and taking it on the question of abandonment and withdrawal, my objection to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] as it stands is that it leaves us guaranteeing the islands in regard to all the rest of the world and with no sufficient control over their actions. In the course of four years they might easily embroil us and involve us in very serious trouble with other nations. If we are to remain, then we still ought to exercise the power, out of deference to the different elements of the population in the Philippines, as well as in regard to their relations to other nations.

For these reasons I do not feel able to vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas, nor do I feel able to vote for the bill, for I think the bill simply weakens the control which we ought to have if we are to be responsible for the islands in any measure, and I see no object in weakening that control. Least of all do I believe in the preamble. I do not like preambles to statutes in any case. A statute ought sufficiently to declare its purposes, without having a "whereas" at the beginning, and the preamble to this bill is simply another vague promise as to the future, injurious, as all vague promises of that sort are.

As it appears to me, the best way is to leave the islands just as they are, and I shall vote in that sense. But if we are not to leave them as they are—if the plan is to go—then let us really go and leave them their independence, after having made proper provision, of course, for the protection of those Americans who have acquired property rights there and invested money there—the protection of our own people. After having made proper provision of that kind, let us go and leave them independent. Let us at least have the military and other benefits of complete adandonment. The people of those islands have not shown a degree of gratitude to us for all we have done—and I think we have done an immense deal for them—they have not shown any degree of gratitude which tends to soften my heart particularly if we decide to leave them; but do not let us take any half-way measures about it. Whatever we do, let it be decisive. If we are to continue as we are, let us continue as we are—responsible for their government and controlling their government—so far as necessary. If we are going to go, let us go and leave them independent to find their own way. If they really are what they are described to be by enthusiasts here, so admirably equipped for self-government, then they are able to be independent. But whatever we do, let us avoid getting into that worst of all positions of having a great and dangerous responsibility and no power to control the people for whom we are responsible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of South Carolina in the chair). The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have no desire to discuss this amendment. I have already discussed it. I simply wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the effect of this amendment is to strike out of the amendment of the Senator from Iowa the provision requiring the President, when the islands are turned over, to retain a naval base, or naval bases, as they are described, and coaling stations; so that if the amendment prevails, and the islands are turned over to the Filipinos, we will retain neither a naval base nor a coaling station.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Gronna	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Harding	Martine, N. J.	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Hardwick	Myers	Smoot
Brandegee	Hitchcock	Nelson	Sterling
Bryan	Hollis	Norris	Stone
Catron	Husting	Oliver	Sutherland
Chamberlain	James	Overman	Swanson
Chilton	Johnson, Me.	Page	Thomas
Clapp	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Thompson
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Pittman	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Poindexter	Townsend
Colt	Kern	Pomerene	Underwood
Cummins	La Follette	Ransdell	Vardaman
Curtis	Lane	Reed	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Walsh
du Pont	Lewis	Shafroth	Warren
Fall	Lippitt	Sheppard	Williams
Fletcher	Lodge	Shields	
Gallinger	McCumber	Simmons	

Mr. CHILTON. My colleague [Mr. GOFF] is detained from the Senate on account of illness.

Mr. KERN. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY]. He is paired with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, before the yeas and nays are ordered, I hold in my hand a letter received last evening from the present head of the department of journalism of the

State University of South Dakota. This gentleman has spent two years in the Philippine Islands as a political reporter for one of the Manila papers. He is known as a very competent, able man, and a keen observer of men and affairs; and I should like to have this letter read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
Vermilion, January 29, 1916.

Senator THOMAS STERLING,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR STERLING: I thought from the progress on the Philippine bill during the last session of Congress that the Philippine question was going to be settled with foresight. I thought so particularly after the war had shown us pretty conclusively that nations are moved by the nonmoral force of self-interest. It has been surprising to me, therefore, to find Senator HITCHCOCK proposing his four-year limit to United States sovereignty in the Philippines, and proposing it without much seeming opposition. From Senator BORAH'S remarks there seems to be a general disposition to unload the Philippines before they get us into trouble, regardless of what happens to them. I was for two years (at the time when Gov. Gen. Harrison and his cohorts came into power) political reporter for the Manila Times and I am interested in the situation. At the risk of presuming on your time I wanted to ask you about the situation in Congress on the Philippine bill. I am planning on writing some articles in the State papers on the question. Does it seem to you that the islands are going by the board? I should like to know also how you and Senator JOHNSON stand on the question.

It seems to me that a proposition of neutralization of the Philippines by various powers is folly. We have seen how that has worked in the cases of Belgium and the Balkan States. And the trouble with it in the case of the Philippines is that it does not free us of responsibility, as some of the Congressmen seem to think. It leaves us with the same responsibility and at the same time makes us clear out and leave the Philippines free for all kinds of trouble making on the part of different factions inside and of such powers as Japan without. For even if the various powers do agree to guarantee the independence of the Philippines, the United States will have to be the real guardian of Philippine rights still, and then when any of the powers sees it to its interest to muss things up the United States will be morally bound to interfere or be eternally dishonored. Neutralization has not proved very efficient in Europe; it certainly will prove disastrous "east of Suez" where "there ain't no 10 commandments" and where international intrigue is rampant.

It seems to me that the fate of the open door of China is sufficient proof of what will happen in the Philippines if we leave them as a prey. Our open-door policy certainly had come to be considered a fundamental American foreign policy—freedom of opportunity in trade in China for all and the integrity of Chinese territory. Japan has violated that policy time out of hand, and smilingly tells the American people that she has not, relying upon their ignorance of foreign affairs to put it across. But the evidence is plentiful. Now, if we establish the independence of the Philippines, Japan will surely begin her game in the archipelago, violating in petty ways at first the neutralization agreement, trying us out to see how far we will go. Then it will be a case of backing down and turning them over to Japan, which seems to me dishonorable. We lose our only trade outpost. I shouldn't say that is the biggest argument, however. We have taken the Philippines as wards; we have embarked upon a wonderful experiment in government; we are in the Far East extending the principles of equality of opportunity. We have a real mission out there. That is what makes me wonder how Congressmen can go ahead to cut the thing short when it hasn't been given a fair trial and when there are a long train of serious consequences coming with independence.

I had not meant to go into the question when I started this letter to you. But I feel strongly in the matter and hope that Congress does not make the serious blunder of launching this little bamboo ship of state, which surely can not yet resist the buffeting of the high seas.

Yours, very truly,

ALFRED M. BRACE.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I rise on a very small matter—a matter of wording. I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska in charge of the bill [Mr. HITCHCOCK] if there is not an error in the wording on page 5, lines 9 and 10? The words "sectarian institutions" ought, it seems to me, to come after the words "sect, church, denomination," so as to read "sect, church, denomination, sectarian institution, or system of religion"; and the words "as such" are obviously intended to apply only to clergymen. I suggest that simply to make it read properly, that is all.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is, the Senator thinks the words "as such" should be stricken from line 10 and inserted in line 9?

Mr. LODGE. No; I think the words "sectarian institutions" ought to come above, with "church, denomination, or system of religion." The words "as such" evidently apply to the clergymen. You can hardly say "church, as such," or "sectarian institution, as such."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That would require the insertion of the words "as such" after the word "dignitary," striking it out after the word "institution."

Mr. LODGE. I suggest, merely as the simplest way of getting at it, to strike out the words "or sectarian institution," in lines 9 and 10, and insert them after the word "denomination," in line 7.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will consider that. I suppose, at the present time, we have to dispose of the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly, if the Senator will simply bear it in mind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has called for the yeas and nays on his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. I withhold my vote for the present.

Mr. COLT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS]. In his absence I will withhold my vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (when his name was called). Mr. President, I have just come into the Chamber. I should like to ask what the question is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the proposal of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to strike out lines 11 and 12 on page 1 of the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I vote "yea."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). I understand that the senior Senator from Michigan, who is absent, has a general pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I desire to have this announcement stand on all votes for the day.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. REED (after having voted in the negative). I voted inadvertently. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair, however, to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES], and having made the transfer will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. JAMES. I transfer the general pair I have with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CHILTON. I transfer my pair, heretofore announced, to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have been requested to announce the absence of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] on official business.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY] and to state that he is paired with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. OLIVER (after having voted in the negative). I observe that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has not voted. I therefore withdraw my vote, having a general pair with him.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I observe that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has not voted. I therefore withdraw my vote, having a pair with him.

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—14.

Borah	Husting	Lane	Thomas
Clapp	Johnson, S. Dak.	McCumber	Vardaman
Gronna	Kenyon	Norris	
Hitchcock	La Follette	Smith, Ariz.	

NAYS—58.

Ashurst	du Pont	Kern	Overman
Bankhead	Fletcher	Lee, Md	Page
Beckham	Gallinger	Lewis	Phelan
Brandegee	Gore	Lippitt	Pittman
Bryan	Harding	Lodge	Poindexter
Chilton	Hardwick	McLean	Pomerene
Clark, Wyo.	Hollis	Martin, Va.	Ransdell
Clarke, Ark.	James	Martine, N. J.	Reed
Cummins	Johnson, Me.	Myers	Robinson
Curtis	Jones	Nelson	Shafroth

Sheppard	Smoot	Thompson	Warren
Shields	Sterling	Townsend	Williams
Simmons	Stone	Underwood	Works
Smith, Ga.	Sutherland	Wadsworth	
Smith, S. C.	Swanson	Walsh	

NOT VOTING—24.

Brady	Culberson	Newlands	Sherman
Broussard	Dillingham	O'Gorman	Shively
Burleigh	Fall	Oliver	Smith, Md.
Catron	Goff	Owen	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Hughes	Penrose	Tillman
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Saulsbury	Weeks

So Mr. NORRIS's amendment to the amendment of Mr. CUMMINS was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. CUMMINS. To perfect the amendment which I have offered, I desire to insert in line 1, page 2, after the word "bases," the words "if any." I do this in order to make it perfectly clear that it is not compulsory upon the President to retain coaling stations or naval bases if he thinks the welfare of the country does not require it. I intend to leave it in his discretion.

I also ask to insert, after the word "them," in line 6, page 2, the words "or by the Congress of the United States." That is for this purpose: If the commissioners shall not approve the constitution or plan adopted by the Philippine Legislature, then Congress may approve it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask that it be read as it would read if the amendment were modified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read that paragraph of the amendment as modified.

The Secretary read as follows:

Among other things, it shall provide for the complete possession and sovereignty on the part of the United States, in perpetuity, of such coaling stations and naval bases, if any, as may be prescribed by the President of the United States. The said constitution or plan of government shall be prepared by the Philippine Legislature and submitted to the said commissioners, and if approved by the said commissioners, or a majority of them, or by the Congress of the United States, and adopted by the said legislature, it shall then be submitted to the qualified electors of the Philippine Islands for approval or rejection at an election to be appointed by the Philippine Legislature after not less than four months' notice.

Mr. CUMMINS. Upon the amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, before the question is taken whether the yeas and nays shall be ordered, I wish to say just one word about the pending amendment and a word about the bill. It will not take more than three minutes, I should think.

I am inclined to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Iowa as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, because if the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands shall decide that they want to separate, it does get us out of the position in which we are at present. It does one thing or the other. I would not vote for the amendment of the Senator from Iowa as a separate proposition. I would not vote for the amendment if it was attached to the bill. I would not vote for the bill with the amendment upon it. I want it distinctly understood that in casting my vote for this amendment I do it as taking what I consider to be the lesser of the two evils.

Mr. President, in relation to the bill, I think if the preamble could be gotten rid of I should be inclined to vote for the bill; but the parliamentary situation, if I understand it correctly, is that the bill must be voted upon first, and, if the bill is passed, then the question comes upon the adoption of the preamble. I am perfectly certain if I contribute to the passage of the bill the preamble will then be put upon the bill in spite of any protest that I should make. Therefore I should be recorded in favor of a bill in which I did not believe, when it had the preamble attached to it.

I will state the reason why I am opposed to the preamble. I can not conceive that it will serve any useful purpose. I do not think the question of Philippine independence could have possibly been raised at a more inopportune time than the present. I think the world is in no condition for us to make a declaration about the Philippine Islands or their independence. I do not believe the Philippine people would be at present able to maintain an independent government if we gave it to them. I think such a mention of the question of independence as is involved in the preamble will be utilized by people having ulterior motives in the Philippine Islands, by demagogues and local politicians, to stir up all sorts of strife and trouble there and to excite all sorts of unjustifiable expectations on the part of the people of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. President, while I regret that we ever went to the Philippine Islands, I think the course of our public officials, of our Congress, and of the speeches of our public men throughout those islands and this country do involve us in a pretty definite moral obligation not to abandon them, and especially not to abandon them for some of the reasons that have been urged upon this floor as justifying such abandonment. I think we should all feel very much ashamed—I know I would—if, after having voted for this bill, within a year or two we should see the Filipinos fall into a state of anarchy and the great work that I believe we have done in that country all torn to pieces. I think that in history we would not stand well. I do not think this great, powerful Nation would gain any glory in regard to those people, whom we have described repeatedly as our wards and for whom we have legislated as though we were their trustees, by deliberately abandoning them to their own devices at this time of their development. I am confident they would be unable to maintain any civilization one would recognize or characterize as a stable government. I think if they were let alone by the other powers of the world they would revert into an uncivilized form of government. Whether they did or not, I think they would soon be subjected to the influences of more powerful nations far removed from us. I agree entirely with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that whatever we do we should never withdraw power and control and guidance and then continue to assume responsibility.

I shall therefore vote against all the amendments that I am acquainted with which have been so far proposed to the bill, except the amendment of the Senator from Iowa as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, and I shall vote against the bill and against the preamble.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I voted for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] because I believe in the sentiment that if we let the Philippine Islands go we should assume no further responsibility. I can not vote for the substitute proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], for two reasons. In the first place, Mr. President, I believe that the Filipino people are unfit for self-government. In the hearings, which I have read to some extent, the fact is disclosed to me that the small percentage of 10 per cent of the Filipinos are able to read and write. We therefore can not hope that the people of those islands would be able to set up a form of government such as we would desire they should set up. The only kind of government they could have in the Philippine Islands, according to the testimony as I have read it, would be an aristocracy, a government by a few, an oligarchy.

It has been said during the debate on this floor that to a certain extent we have that form in this country, but that is a different proposition, Mr. President. The people of this country can read and write; the people of this country know what form of government they desire. It is not so with the Philippine people. What good would it do to leave it to the people of the Philippine Islands to say what kind of a government they want so long as they are unfit for self-government? I think a majority of them have no conception of what government is or what representative government means.

Another reason why I shall vote against this amendment is this: I believe it is unfair to the President of the United States to say that he shall decide whether or not we shall maintain a naval base or a coaling station in the islands. The Congress of the United States ought to be courageous enough and it ought to be willing to say whether or not we should maintain in the islands a coaling station for the United States.

I think, Mr. President, we have learned a lesson from the country south of us—Mexico. It might be said that those people are not fit for self-government. I do not believe they are fit for a government as a democracy.

Mr. President, I am one of those who have said very little about Mexico. I have refrained from speaking about the conditions in Mexico, because I believe the President of the United States is right in taking the position he has taken that we shall not interfere in the affairs or with the conditions of Mexico. For that reason I have remained silent.

But with reference to this bill, Mr. President, I feel that the people of the United States have an obligation to perform. We are morally responsible for the welfare of the Filipino people, and we can not say that those people are fit to govern themselves. If they are fit for self-government, let us give them their independence now. If they are not fit for it, it is our duty to hold the islands until such time as the Filipinos may be able to govern themselves.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I have a brief statement as to the cost of the Philippine Islands to this Government. There has been a good deal said about the cost. This memorandum was prepared by the Bureau of Insular Affairs.

The administration of the civil government in the Philippine Islands does not cost this Government a cent. It is entirely

self-supporting. The only cost this Government has ever been to in the Philippines, aside from the Army and Navy establishment, was one-half the upkeep of the Coast and Geodetic Survey work around the islands, which runs something over $150,000 a year and has never been over $200,000 a year.

There has also been an appropriation by this Government of $3,000,000 for the relief of suffering on account of famine in the Philippine Islands. These are the only costs the Philippine Islands have been to the United States aside from the cost of the Army and Navy. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] says, "How about the coast defenses?" They are a part of the Army and Navy establishment.

A good deal of reference has been made to the great expense in the past and the great number of lives that have been lost, as though if we granted independence to the Philippine Islands some of that cost would be recovered or some of the soldiers who have been sacrificed brought to life again. Of course, that all belongs to irrevocable history and can not be relevant in the decision of this question.

There is one other point, Mr. President, I should like to call attention to before the vote is taken. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] the other day called particular attention to the island of Mindanao and to the situation in which the so-called Moros in that island would find themselves upon the passage of this bill. He put into the RECORD some statements upon very good authority indicating that a state of civil war would exist and that a continuous and almost perpetual state of insurrection against the Filipino government by the inhabitants of the island of Mindanao would grow out of the passage of this bill. He is undoubtedly correct about that.

I have a statement here, which I am going to ask the Secretary to read. It is pretty brief. It was made by a Democratic investigator in the islands. I say Democratic because he is in sympathy with all the Democratic platform pledges in favor of independence for the islands—Mr. James H. Blount. He was an officer in the American Volunteers during the fighting there, and was afterwards for four years a judge in the Philippine Islands, so that he is certainly a disinterested and unprejudiced witness from a Democratic standpoint. He is also a competent one, on account of the length of time he resided in the islands. I have marked on page 224 the passage. I ask the Secretary to read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

> While the great Mohammedan island of Mindanao, near Borneo, with its 36,000 square miles of area, requires that the Philippine Archipelago be described as stretching over more than 1,000 miles from north to south, still, inasmuch as Mindanao only contains about 500,000 people, all told, half of them semicivilized, the governmental problem it presents has no more to do with the main problem of whether, if ever, we are to grant independence to the 7,000,000 Christians of the other islands, than the questions that have to be passed on by our Commissioner of Indian Affairs has to do with the tariff. Mindanao's 36,000 square miles constitute nearly a third of the total area of the Philippine Archipelago, and more than that fraction of the 97,500 square miles of territory to a consideration of which our attention is reduced by the process of elimination above indicated. Turning over Mindanao to those crudely Mohammedan semicivilized Moros would indeed be "like granting self-government to an Apache reservation under some local chief," as Mr. Roosevelt, in the campaign of 1900, ignorantly declared it would be to grant self-government to Luzon under Aguinaldo. Furthermore, the Moros, so far as they can think, would prefer to owe allegiance to, and be entitled to recognition as subjects of, some great nation. Again, because the Filipinos have no moral right to control the Moros, and could not if they would, the latter being fierce fighters and bitterly opposed to the thought of possible ultimate domination by the Filipinos, the most uncompromising advocate of the consent of the governed principles has not a leg to stand on with regard to Mohammedan Mindanao. Hence, I affirm that, as to it, we have a distinct separate problem, which can not be solved in the lifetime of anybody now living. But it is a problem which need not in the least delay the advent of independence for the other fourteen-fifteenths of the inhabitants of the archipelago—all Christians living on islands north of Mindanao. It is true that there are some Christian Filipinos on Mindanao, but in policing the Moros our Government would, of course, protect them from the Moros. If they did not like our Government, they could move to such parts of the islands as we might permit to be incorporated in an ultimate Philippine republic. Inasmuch as the 500,000 or so Moros of the Mohammedan island of Mindanao and the adjacent islets called Jolo (the "Sulu Archipelago," so called, "reigned over" by the sultan of comic-opera fame) originally presented, as they will always present, a distinct and separate problem, and never did have anything more to do with the Philippine insurrection against us than their cousins and coreligionists over in near-by Borneo, the task which confronted Mr. Root in the fall of 1899, to wit, the suppression of the Philippine insurrection, meant practically the subjugation of one big island, Luzon, containing half the population and one-third of the total area of the archipelago and six neighboring small ones, the Visayan Islands.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment I have offered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the proposed amendment which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] proposes to his own amendment.

I agree with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] that Congress ought to determine the question as to whether we will retain coaling stations and fortresses in the Philippine Islands. That great question ought not to be left to the determination of any one man. We do not, I think, find any good reason for turning an important question of that kind over to the President of the United States. We can not, of course, know who will be President four or six years hence. Why turn over to the President, whoever he may be, however wise he may be, a problem of national and international importance? The question pertains to the defense of our country. It has an intimate relation with our commerce; it affects radically our foreign policy; it is a question that comes plainly within the purview of congressional duties.

We are growing in the habit, whenever a problem becomes difficult of escaping the burden of solution, by referring it to some board or to some officer of the Government, whereas the greater the difficulty the greater is the necessity for that common counsel which can only be obtained in Congress.

We have generally had wise men for Presidents. I make no intimation that they have not always been wise and patriotic; and yet they are not necessarily wiser than Congress or more patriotic than the Members of Congress. Indeed, I can pretty nearly demonstrate that they are not as wise as the collective wisdom of Congress by citing the important circumstance that there are about five or six Members of this body thoroughly convinced of the fact that they are proper stuff for the presidential office. I am inclined to admit that they are much better material than some that has been suggested from the outside.

We ought not to dodge this important question. I appeal to the Senate that it shall exercise its best judgment and that we shall treat this question as of the first magnitude.

I want to make an observation preliminary to what I am about to say. There has been so much said about our country never engaging in anything but a war of defense that some of us at least are taking the view that when we do engage in a war of defense we thereby bar ourselves from making any attack or doing anything except along our own shores or on our own soil. So it is here argued with great solemnity that as we are never to engage in any but a war of defense, there is no necessity for a coaling station or a fortress at any place far removed from our shores.

Senators advancing that argument overlook the fact that a war of defense necessarily implies a war of offense. Once a war is started we can not pick our ground; we can not always select the place where we prefer to fight. When a war is started it is the duty very frequently as a matter of defense to become the attacking party. A nation waging war against us will not only seek to attack our coasts but it will perhaps first of all seek to destroy our war fleet. Surely it will at once try to sweep our commerce from the oceans of the world. Such a result, with its attendant irremediable damage and injury, is certain unless we are able to drive our enemy from the high seas.

It should not be forgotten, once we are at war, the enemy will not always be so accommodating as to make the fight in our waters. It may even be necessary to pursue them or to meet them thousands of miles from our coasts. Inability to do so may place us at a desperate disadvantage. We ought to consider these facts seriously before we abandon the coaling stations in the Philippines which we now control and which we can continue to control.

Let us take a single page from recent history. When we declared war against Spain, in our own defense and in defense of human rights, where was the first effective blow struck? Was it not in the waters of the Philippine Islands? It was necessary to strike there. It was due to the fact that a deadly blow was struck 7,000 miles from our shores that the War with Spain terminated as quickly as it did. It is, therefore, idle to talk about not needing a station in the Philippines because we are hereafter going to wage only defensive wars. It may be both necessary and desirable to fight a defensive war thousands of miles from our coasts. Indeed, I hope the enemy may never get any nearer.

When war is begun, I repeat, it becomes a war general. It must be fought wherever the enemy can be found. To illustrate by a case which I trust never can arise: If we had war with Great Britain to-morrow and wanted simply to defend ourselves, is it not entirely probable that one of our first acts would be to invade Canada, not because we wanted to make an aggressive war, but because an invasion of Canada might be the best way to defend ourselves? I do not want that illustration, Mr. President, to be taken as indicative of a fear that we are likely to have trouble with England. It seems to me, for the reasons stated, that before abandoning our fortresses and coaling sta-

tions in the Philippines we must take into account the relations of such advantages to our commerce, as well as their importance in time of war.

It might be, and it certainly has been, the opinion of many military experts that the possession of a coaling station protected by fortresses in the Far East will be of inestimable value to us in some hour of national peril. Let me cite an imaginary case to the Senator from Nebraska, who has so eloquently argued in favor of abandoning these fortresses. Let us suppose that a portion of the American fleet is in Chinese or Japanese waters; that war is suddenly declared; that our enemy has anticipated war, and has thrown a much larger fleet into those waters, so that our vessels can not escape and return to the United States, what a wonderful advantage it might be to us if our ships could run into a harbor under the guns of an American fort, and be preserved to this Nation for future use instead of being sent to the bottom of the ocean!

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator permit me to suggest, in the case which he has put, that this foreign fleet which is superior to ours, instead of going after our fleet, would take our naval base and our coaling station, unless we had expended as much money in their fortification as we would expend if we retained the islands themselves?

Mr. REED. Well, that is an assertion by the Senator. I know he makes it in good faith; the Senator always speaks in good faith; and yet I have no hesitation in saying that the Senator probably is very greatly mistaken. The fact is that ships are generally helpless in face of the fire from a first-class fortress.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator explain, if the foreign fleet, as the Senator has put the question, is larger than our fleet, even though he does not admit that that foreign fleet could take the coaling station, why could not the foreign fleet capture our fleet and prevent it from getting into the harbor with safety?

Mr. REED. The Senator is asking a question that answers itself. It is entirely possible that I could not capture the Senator if I started after him now before he got over to his office and locked the door, and yet, if he had no office to retreat to I might capture him in the next block. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. Well, the Senator will not have to go as far as the office. I agree not to go there.

Mr. REED. The Senator must not take my illustration unpleasantly. He knows I am joking. I know I would not have to go so far as the Senator's seat to find him. He would no doubt meet me more than half way. I never yet saw a real disciple of universal peace who would not himself fight at the drop of a hat; and I know the Senator is in that class. The Senator's retort illustrates the general fact.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator explain why this foreign fleet would not capture our fleet before it could get into the coaling station or the naval base?

Mr. REED. Well, I thought I had answered that with my illustration, which I hoped was so pertinent as to argue the case. It is easy enough to understand that our fleet might be warned by wireless or otherwise of the approach of a superior enemy fleet in ample time to run under the guns of a near-by fortress when it might be cut off and destroyed if compelled to undertake a voyage of thousands of miles to reach our home ports. Likewise it is easy to understand that we might have a fleet superior to that of the enemy and yet a fleet entirely helpless because it could not receive coal with which to move and fight.

Mr. NORRIS. Then let me ask the Senator this question: If that happened, how could our fleet ever get out to do any service? They would be in there, the other fleet would be outside, and our fleet would have to stay in.

Mr. REED. But can not the Senator see that the enemy fleet would not have to stay outside if our fleet was at the bottom of the ocean? If our fleet, however, was under the guns of a fort and the enemy's fleet had to stay outside and blockade it that much of the enemy's fleet would be useless for business in other territory.

Mr. NORRIS. And so would our fleet.

Mr. REED. Yes; but if our fleet had been sent to the bottom the enemy fleet would be free to go elsewhere. Why, there is no use arguing questions of that kind; they are too plain to require argument. If, for instance, the German fleet, which today lies under the guns of a German fortress, had been compelled to fight upon the high seas and were lying on the ocean's bottom England would be free; she could do as she pleased with her entire Navy instead of being obliged to use a large part of it to keep the German fleet in German ports.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator from Missouri yield there?

Mr. REED. Yes; although I am taking more time than I expected to do and but for interruptions should have concluded.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator's illustration is good, then the place for our fleet, like the place for the German fleet, is in our own ports.

Mr. REED. Oh, pshaw!

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator wants to go on a war of conquest, then I concede his argument is good. The German fleet was not over in some coaling station thousands of miles away from its base, but it was in its own waters, and is yet there.

Mr. REED. Well, it was not all in its own waters, for some of its vessels got under German guns——

Mr. NORRIS. There was only one place——

Mr. REED. One moment—and some of them did not, and those that did not went to the bottom of the ocean.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. REED. I will if it serves any purpose.

Mr. NORRIS. The only place in the world where the German Government had a naval station distant from its own ports was over in Asia, and it was completely defeated there, as we would probably be defeated if we had a station 8,000 miles away from our shores.

Mr. REED. Well, yes, the German Government lost its half-completed fortress, but it lost it only because a great military power attacked Germany at a time when Germany was already at grips with three other first-class nations. Under such conditions any Government may lose any fortress. Let it also be noted that it required the fleet and Army of Japan to subdue that single fortress; and if Germany had not had her hands tied very probably the eagle of Germany would still have been defiantly floating above the battlements of her distant fort. I can indefinitely multiply illustrations showing the advantage of a coaling station and a naval base. The imagination of man might almost exhaust itself in bringing forward particular conditions and still half the possible cases not be covered. What I do say is that it is utter foolishness to assume that a war of defense must be waged on our own soil or in our own waters. It frequently happens that the very best defense can be made at a distant point.

I give one illustration that may appeal to some Senators. Assume that we had a war with a naval power; assume that we had a great naval base in the East; and that under the guns of our forts there our vessels would be secure, it is probable that the presence of three or four vessels in eastern waters would enable us to so harass the commerce of an enemy that we would oblige it to use a large part of its fleet for the purpose of keeping penned up even a small unit of our war fleet. Besides, can we not take a lesson from the experience and wisdom of other nations. Let us not forget the fact that Great Britain, France, and Germany all are eagerly embracing every opportunity to establish coaling stations and naval bases in all the seas of the world. Are we so wise we can set up our opinions in opposition to those who make war a science and devote to its problems the best genius of their people. So it seems to me when we consider relinquishing this coaling station and naval base we should proceed with great care.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] gave some figures on the cost of the Philippines. I do not know that I understood him correctly. If I did, then I think he is in error. I sent to the Bureau of Insular Affairs for a statement as to the cost of the Philippines to this Government as nearly as it could be estimated. Here is the information furnished: Under the treaty with Spain we paid $20,000,000; on March 3, 1901, we purchased additional islands for $100,000; we expended for the relief of the inhabitants up to March 3, 1903, $3,000,000; we expended in taking the census in 1903, $351,925.50; the coast and geodetic survey cost $1,947,379.82; and the total cost of the Army from 1903 to 1914, inclusive, was $113,711,371.82, making a grand total from 1903 up to and including the fiscal year of 1914 of $139,110,677.14. If we take the average cost per year and add that for the last year, we have a grand total of $148,586,624.79—almost $150,000,000.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that that does not include the cost from the beginning of the insurrection, but only includes the cost from 1903 to the present time.

Mr. REED. I was about to make that statement, but that additional cost I have not been able to obtain in a way that is satisfactory to me.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves that subject, may I suggest that that does not take into account at all that indefinite sum, difficult to estimate, which it has cost the American people in the maintenance of the Army and Navy due to the fact that we had the Philippine Islands on our hands?

That is an indefinite amount about which we can only speculate, but which must be taken into account in the consideration of this matter.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator is correct. If we could get the actual amount in dollars and cents that we have expended because we took possession of the Philippine Islands, it probably would be more than double the figures I have named; but the figures I have given are definite, at least according to the officers of the Insular Bureau.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I will state that there was a statement made by the War Department of the cost up to the 1st day of May, 1902; and it was certified that the amount up to that time was $169,853,572, and that did not include any of the incidental expenses which were caused by the increase in the Army or the increase of the Navy, which evidently had to take place in order to effect the conquest of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. REED. Then, according to the Senator's idea and taking that estimate in connection with the figures I have just given, we have expended first and last, in excess of $300,000,000. And even that vast sum does not include the expenses referred to a moment since by Senator CLAPP. Now, Mr. President, the question is this: Having expended over $300,000,000 on account of the Philippine Islands, are we warranted in abandoning the islands, abandoning every fortification we have built, abandoning everything we have done, and retaining nothing whatever for ourselves? I am perfectly willing and ardently desire that this country shall sever its relations with the Philippine Islands at the earliest possible moment, but I am unwilling to surrender the advantage of a naval base and a coaling station in those islands.

It can not be claimed that by retaining them we shall treat the Philippine people unjustly, because the benefits we have conferred a hundred times over exceed the amount we would have had to pay the Philippine people for a coaling station if in 1898 they had possessed a government of their own competent to grant us the right to establish a coaling station. It seems to me, therefore, that we ought to keep a naval base and a coaling station, not only for the reasons I have given but for many others that I do not mention now, because I want to get through with my remarks.

The next question I want to consider for a moment is the claim that we are under some moral obligation to the Philippine people. If by a "moral obligation" it is meant that we are under any duty whatever to continue to occupy the Philippine Islands and expend large sums of money upon them, then I deny such obligation. The briefest kind of historical review demonstrates that fact. The Philippine people as a people never were a nation. They came under the flag of Spain over 300 years ago. They remained a dependency of Spain until we took possession in 1898. During all that period they had not cultivated such a national spirit as to be able to throw off the sovereignty of Spain. Shortly before we took possession they were engaged in a war of rebellion, which did not appear to be progressing very satisfactorily. We then substituted for Spanish rule American rule. That is the change which we effectuated. What man is there in the Senate who will say that by changing Spanish rule for American rule we did not confer a distinct benefit and blessing upon the Philippine people? What man is there here who will say that when the flag of the United States supplemented the banner of Spain the condition of the Philippine people was made worse? If it did not make the condition of the Philippine people worse, if it bettered their condition, then, instead of America owing them an obligation, they owe America a debt of gratitude.

What have we done since that time? We have expended this enormous sum of money; we have introduced improved schools; we have gradually enlarged the privileges of the people; we have done nothing but kindnesses to those people. We have improved their sanitary conditions; we have released them from the thraldom of many of their evil laws; we have built highways, including railroads. In all we have done we have been conferring benefits. Now, if we owe them an obligation it must be on the ridiculous theory that the granting of repeated benefits ripens into a right on the part of the beneficiary, so that he may justly demand as of right that which was originally a gratuity. Therefore I hold that we are under no obligation to the Philippine people to stay there a single day longer than is necessary to permit them to set up a government of their own. Of course, we should not abandon them and leave them without any opportunity to set up such a government.

If we owe the Filipino people nothing except a mere right to set up a government, the question then occurs, What do we owe ourselves? I think we do owe ourselves something. We went into this undertaking to civilize and Christianize and teach and elevate a people. We had no business to undertake it in the first instance. It may be to the credit of the hearts, but it is very little to the credit of the brains of the men who undertook it. Is this Government to assume the task of going into every foreign land and establishing governments and schools for their people? Is it to undertake the business of teaching them civilization and religion and agriculture and science? Is that our business as a Government? If it is, the field is large; the task is eternal; and the raw material illimitable. We would very much better employ the money of our Government among the poor, the lowly, and the unfortunate of our own land. But since we did enter upon this quixotical scheme in the islands, since we have made these enormous expenditures, we owe it to ourselves, as we depart from that country, to take reasonable precautions to guarantee the preservation of such benefits as we have conferred. Therefore I think when we propose to leave at a fixed period we ought to see to it that those liberties we so often boast we have conferred upon ourselves, and which we claim we have in part conferred upon the Philippine people, and that those other blessings which we have sought at this enormous expense to confer upon them, shall be preserved to them so far as is possible.

So I think one of the things that ought to be guaranteed in any bill that we may pass is that the Philippine people shall be given a republican form of government. If you do not guarantee them at the inception a republican form of government, no man here can say that the Philippine people ever will have the opportunity to set up a popular government. If we march away from the islands without having made provision whereby the people of that country shall at least at the first have the opportunity of fairly voting upon the kind of government they desire, if we do not guarantee them that liberty of speech and liberty of debate and liberty of peaceable assemblage which is necessary to the expression of a popular choice, then no man here can say that they ever will have that opportunity unless they gain it at the point of the sword.

How do we know that the Philippine people will be permitted to set up a government that is representative of the Philippine people? How do we know that they ever will have the opportunity to express a choice or an opinion, unless before we go we see to it that they shall at least have one free election, and that they shall set up a government which leaves to the people the right of future choice?

And here I come to a criticism of the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. I do not know whether it was his purpose to omit any expression on the subject—as to that, he, of course, will speak for himself—but it is not found within his amendment anywhere that the government must be republican in form. A government that is not republican in form is essentially a government of a class or of an individual. If we go away from these islands, if we bind this country now to leave the islands at the end of a given period of time, without specifying that there shall be left there a republican form of government, then a few powerful men may arise, seize the reins of government, set themselves in authority, declare that they constitute the Philippine government, and forever crush and destroy the people of the islands. In such case all that we have taught them of liberty will be a thing that is dead and buried even at the moment we abandon the islands.

I agree that we can not guarantee these people the continuance of a republican form of government. I agree that no man can justly say that if we set up a republican form of government they will forever maintain it. I think there is much in the statement that that form of government which fits the Anglo-Saxon may not fit the brown races. But certainly this is true: Before we leave the Philippine Islands we ought to see to it that every man in the Philippine Islands, however humble, has an opportunity to vote as to the kind of government he wants in the islands. If we do not do that, if we make no provision in regard to that, if we go away from the islands without that, no man can say how soon a few powerful men will plant their feet upon the necks of the great body of the people of the Philippine Islands. Thus the effect of our occupancy may result in imposing upon millions of human beings a government more tyrannical than was that of Spain. So in the end our occupancy of the islands may bring a curse upon them.

Does not this great Nation that stands for liberty, that has expended from three to four hundred million dollars in the acquisition of these islands and in assistance to their inhabitants, owe it to itself that when it goes out it shall leave behind it a free government? That, sir, is not provided for in the Clarke amendment. Under that amendment a small part of the people might set up a government, a few powerful families might set up a government, a military autocrat might arise and, with

fire and sword, establish himself, and we would be obliged to yield possession of the islands to such a government.

Is that wise? Should not the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, or any other amendments that may be adopted, contain the language that the government set up shall be republican in form? And should it not contain some guaranty that that government, republican in form, shall have been peacefully established?

It seems to me the question is not open to serious argument, and yet such is the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. You find the defect is remedied in every other amendment, I think.

Mr. President, an amendment has been prepared by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] which will be offered, I think—I hope it will be offered—which, in my opinion, contains all there is of good in all of the amendments. It contains what there is of good, I think, in the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. It contains, I think, what there is of good in the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], and also what there was of good in the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER]. It is drawn with some degree of care, and has the safeguards in it which I think ought to be in this bill if we propose to abandon the islands.

Now, I want to offer another observation with reference to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. The matter has already been discussed, and yet so many Senators have been absent that nearly everyone who gets on his feet has a new audience, and so I do not hesitate to refer to it again.

I am unalterably opposed to abandoning the Philippine Islands—withdrawing our governmental power from those islands, sailing away with our troops, abandoning all power to control the governmental policies of the islands, at the same time continuing our responsibility toward the islands; yet that is the proposition of the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri pardon a question?

Mr. REED. I will; yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not understand that that is involved in the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, except for the limited period of four years. Am I correct about that?

Mr. REED. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the Senator think that getting rid of our power and our responsibility after four years is a good deal better than leaving it indefinitely, never to be gotten rid of except by future affirmative action?

Mr. REED. Why, certainly it is better to end a responsibility in four years than it is never to end it; but I am talking about ending the responsibility at the same time our power ends.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In that connection, if the Senator will pardon another question, did we end our responsibility in Cuba at the same time that our power ended—except, of course, our physical power with a Navy and an Army which we could order there at any time? Did we reserve any physical power to enforce the Platt amendment, which now controls our relationship with Cuba?

Mr. REED. No; we did not. We withdrew our Army, we withdrew our Navy, and reserved certain rights in our treaties with Cuba; but the question as to Cuba and the question as to the Philippine Islands are just 7,500 miles apart, geographically and every other way. One of them is at our coast, the other is in the distant East. One of them is composed of one class of people, the other is composed of many classes of many peoples. One of them is in close touch with us, the other is distant. One affects our vital interests, the other does not. I think the two cases are in no respect parallel.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon me a moment further, of course geographically the two cases are in no respect parallel; but the principle of our relationship to the two peoples seems to me to be exactly similar. If it be wrong in the one case to withdraw power and leave a certain degree of responsibility—not a very large degree—and if it be true that we risked that, and that it has succeeded, then I ask the Senator if it does not seem to him that that is a sort of a reason tending to show that we may risk the same experiment once more?

Mr. REED. But, Mr. President, we are not making the same experiment. The two cases have so many points of difference that I do not want to spend much time pointing them out. I will mention one or two. Everybody knows that the United States never would tolerate the taking of Cuba by any foreign power. The Monroe doctrine itself would prohibit that. Everybody knows that Cuba lies at the gateway of our southeastern coast. It is, in fact, the military key to the Gulf of Mexico. Everybody knows that we have a direct and intimate and close relationship with that island, and always will have. Besides, the guaranty as far as Cuba was concerned is quite different from that which is proposed with reference to the Philippine Islands.

I want to conclude what I have to say as to my objection to the proposition of the Senator from Arkansas. Here is the language. While it has been read many times, I want to read it into my remarks. After providing that the President shall endeavor to secure the cooperation of other nations in a guaranty of the independence of the Philippine Islands, it proceeds:

> If any of the nations so invited to join the United States in such undertaking shall decline to do so, then the President shall include as parties to such convention or agreement such nations as may be willing to join therein and to assume such obligations; and if none are willing to so unite therein—

If none are willing—

> then the President is authorized to give such guaranty on behalf of the United States alone for the period of five years from and after the expiration of said period of four years, or any extension thereof, and pending the existence of such separate guaranty by the United States, the United States shall be entitled to retain and exercise such control and supervision in the said Philippines as may be necessary to enforce order therein and to avoid external complications.

Mr. President, either these people are capable of self-government or they are not. We have been in the islands 16 years. At the end of the four-year period, when it is proposed to grant to the Philippines the right to set up a separate government, we will have been there 20 years. If at the end of that time the Philippine people are incapable of maintaining a government of their own, who will say that at the end of a further period of five years they shall be able to maintain a government of their own? And what greater right would there be on our part to abandon them to the tender mercies of all the nations of the world at the end of 25 years than there is at the end of 20 years, counting the time from the date we took possession? Why guarantee them for five years and then quit? If they are capable of self-government and of maintaining a nation, they will be just as capable at the end of the four-year period that we propose to have elapse as they will be at the end of nine years. If they are incapable of self-government now and are to be incapable of self-government at the end of a further four-year period, if they are incapable of maintaining themselves now and will be incapable of maintaining themselves four years hence, then why not nine years hence?

I submit that the right way to deal with the Philippine people is this: First, to get out of the islands honorably, fairly, and justly; second, to retain in the islands a coaling station and a naval base, and by retaining that we do not treat the Philippine people unjustly, for we have paid for it in an expenditure of nearly $400,000,000; but I want to get those privileges by honest and fair agreement with the government that the Philippine people shall select; third, before leaving——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a suggestion?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I wanted to suggest to the Senator that under the standing order the Senate will adjourn automatically at 5 o'clock, and I should like to inquire whether he would be willing to yield for a motion concerning a recess, and then hold the floor until to-morrow?

Mr. REED. I am going to get through in five minutes.

Third, when we go out of the islands I want to know that the Philippine people have a government that represents the Philippine people, as sound a government as we can help them set up, and I want to know that it is a republican government in form. I am perfectly willing that our Government shall negotiate with other governments to gain for this new nation all international protection possible; but I am unalterably opposed to this Government undertaking to guarantee the independence and integrity of the Philippine people for one hour after we have relinquished our sovereignty over that soil.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer a resolution which I send to the desk, and I ask like consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 88), as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the order fixing the time of the beginning and the adjournment of the daily sessions of the Senate made December 6, 1915, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:
>
> "The daily sessions of the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall begin at 12 o'clock noon, and adjournment shall be not later than 6 o'clock p. m.: *Provided*, That at any time after 5 o'clock it shall be in order to move to proceed to the consideration of executive business, to take a recess, or to extend the session for that day, and any of said motions may be made while a Senator is addressing the Senate without forfeiting any rights of such Senator."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the proviso of the resolution just read certainly conflicts with the rules of this body.

Mr. CHILTON. There is no question about that. It conflicts with Rule VII, and if there is any objection it would have to go.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the first part of the resolution, but I certainly should object to having a part of it conflict with the rules of the Senate, for Senators know that a motion to go into executive session is in order at any time when any question is pending before the body.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I object to that part of the resolution which relates to executive sessions.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President——

SEVERAL SENATORS. Ask for a recess.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, that is all right. I have the floor. I still insist that that language does not prevent any Senator at any other time from moving for an executive session. I ask that the resolution be referred to the proper committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go to the Committee on Rules.

REPORT OF CAPITAL TRACTION CO. (H. DOC. NO. 639).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Capital Traction Co. for the year ended December 31, 1915, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO. (H. DOC. NO. 638).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington Gas Light Co. for the year ended December 31, 1915, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO. (S. DOC. NO. 272).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. for the year ended December 31, 1915, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO. (S. DOC. NO. 269).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the year ended December 31, 1915, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO. (S. DOC. NO. 244, PT. 2).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year ended December 31, 1915, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

CITY & SUBURBAN RAILWAY CO. (S. DOC. NO. 273).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington for the year ended December 31, 1915, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

GEORGETOWN & TENNALLYTOWN RAILWAY CO. (S. DOC. NO. 271).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Georgetown & Tennallytown Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1915, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 270).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Louis H. Andrews, administrator of John Williams, deceased, *v.* United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. EAGAN, and Mr. CANNON managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 8235) to provide for the maintenance of the United States section of the International High Commission, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a resolution adopted at the twenty-fifth annual convention of the United Mine Workers of America, held at Indianapolis, Ind., urging Congress to designate The Star-Spangled Banner as the national anthem, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for an investigation into the foreign and domestic commerce of the country, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide for appointment of clerks of United States courts by the President, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the repeal of the so-called seaman's law, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WILLIAMS presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Mississippi, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass the bill now pending before Congress, appropriating the cotton-fund tax, the fund from captured and abandoned and confiscated property from the Southern States, now in the United States Treasury, approximating $100,000,000 to the pensioning of ex-Confederate soldiers, their widows and orphans.

Whereas in the creating of this Republic and the securing to its people their independence the South, in the name of Washington, Jefferson, Adams, and other distinguished patriots gave to this country a service that should be held in grateful remembrance by this Nation; and

Whereas in the Spanish-American War and in the arm of service as shown by our Navy and Army of defense to-day, the South loyally stands as a monument to her fidelity to this country; and

Whereas since the Civil War for 50 years the old Confederate soldiers and the southern people have paid tribute in taxation to aid in the pensioning of the Federal soldiers of the North and the negroes of the South who served in the Federal armies, this proportional taxation of the moneys appropriated by this Government since 1866 for Federal pensions, aggregating the enormous sum of $4,614,000,000 as shown by the report of the Commissioner of Pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915; and

Whereas as there has remained in the United States Treasury for a number of years the sum approximating $100,000,000 illegally collected from the people of the South; and

Whereas after passage of so many years it becomes impossible to secure the return of this money to the rightful owners; and

Whereas, recognizing it is the wish and desire of the people of the Southern States and their descendants that this fund now held by the United States Treasury be paid out for the pensioning of old ex-Confederate soldiers and their widows and orphans; and

Whereas, as a matter of justice and right, this appeal should not only receive the approval of the Government of the United States but the sympathy and support of every ex-Federal soldier of the North, to whom the ex-Confederate soldier and his descendants of the South for 50 years have given their aid and help to lessen the hardship of their declining years, then let a kindly hand be extended to the remaining old ex-Confederate soldiers of the South, that this fund may give some relief to lighten their burden before taps shall sound over their grave; and

Whereas the bill now before the Congress of the United States by JOHN M. TILLMAN, Member from the third Arkansas district, provides:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That upon passage of this act there shall be paid to each soldier who served in the Confederate Army, and to each widow of any Confederate soldier, the sum of $500, and that, in addition to this payment, such soldiers and such widows shall be paid quarterly the sum of $30 per month each during the remainder of their lives.

"SEC. 2. That this act shall be administered by the United States Pension Office.

"SEC. 3. That to carry out this act the sum of $100,000,000 be and the same is hereby appropriated.

"SEC. 4. That this act shall be in force from and after its passage."

Therefore be it now

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, That they respectfully invite the support and cooperation of all Southern and of all Northern States in securing the passage of this measure.

I, John Falkner, jr., secretary of the Mississippi Senate, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of the resolution passed by the Mississippi Legislature, 1916 session.

Witness my signature this 26th day of January, 1916.

JOHN FALKNER, Jr.

Mr. WILLIAMS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Forrest County, Miss., remonstrating against the imposition of excessive license fees on retail wagon men who are selling domestic and stock remedies, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of sundry citizens of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to pro-

hibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Saranac Lake and sundry citizens of Burdett, Clifton Springs, and Albany, all in the State of New York, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. TILLMAN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Easley, S. C., remonstrating against an increase in the price of gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 4093) to establish a naval academy of the United States on Lake Michigan, at the city of Chicago, State of Illinois; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 4094) to provide for a Government munitions plant and supply depot at or near Pueblo, Colo.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 4095) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church at Keyser, W. Va.; and

A bill (S. 4096) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Keyser, formerly New Creek, W. Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4097) granting a pension to Margaret Huling; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 4098) granting a pension to John E. Hall (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 4099) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to certain lands of James Payne, his heirs and assigns; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PENROSE:

(By request.) A bill (S. 4100) to appoint George W. Littlehales a professor in the corps of professors of mathematics in the Navy (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 4101) to correct the military record of Samuel Snyder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(By request.) A bill (S. 4102) for the relief of Maj. F. C. Boggs; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

A bill (S. 4103) granting a pension to Annie R. North; to the Committee on Pensions.

THE JUDICIAL CODE.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1412) further to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. BRYAN, and Mr. WARREN conferees on the part of the Senate.

RECESS.

Mr. CHILTON. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m. Tuesday, February 1, 1916) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 2, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *February 1, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who art mighty to deliver, strong to uphold and sustain, deliver us, we pray Thee, from evil and sin and make us strong to pursue and do the right, that as instruments in Thy hands we may hasten the coming of Thy kingdom upon the earth in all its fullness and glory. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KELLEY rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. KELLEY. To ask unanimous consent for the reading of a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is it?

Mr. KELLEY. It is a resolution relating to the ships of the Navy?

Mr. FITZGERALD. What is it?

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of a resolution is it?

Mr. KELLEY. If the gentleman will let the Clerk read it, he will understand.

Mr. FITZGERALD. You can not have every resolution read here. What is it about?

Mr. KELLEY. The resolution, I will say to the gentleman from New York, recites the ships of the Navy that are now under construction.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, what does it propose to do?

Mr. KELLEY. And in view of the speeches made by the President of the United States in the Middle West, it calls upon the Secretary of the Navy to take up the question with contractors and shipyards to determine the earliest date practicable——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let it go in through the basket.

Mr. FOSTER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Washington rise?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. To ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a copy of an interview I gave to newspapers on the question of preparedness.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wasaington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an interview which he gave out himself?

Mr. FOSTER. A newspaper interview?

The SPEAKER. Yes; a newspaper interview on the subject of preparedness.

Mr. FOSTER. How long is it?

Mr. NEELY. How deep is it? [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It is shorter than if it were delivered.

Mr. FOSTER. I am willing that it should go in.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes on the subject of the ships of the Navy.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let us do some business first. The gentleman can get five minutes in committee on the bill that is pending.

Mr. KELLEY. It will not take any longer now than then.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes on the subject of the ships of the Navy.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman ought not to ask that now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the urgent deficiency bill (H. R. 9416), disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the urgent deficiency bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have a few minutes on the proposition, if I may.

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. MANN. Ten or 15 minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. On these amendments?

Mr. MANN. On one of the amendments and incidental matters relative to them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York to take the bill from the Speaker's table, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference?

Mr. KELLEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what does the gentleman from Illinois want to talk about?

Mr. FITZGERALD. About Senate amendments to the urgent deficiency bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, one of the Senate amendments to the urgent deficiency bill is for traveling expenses of the Civil Service Commission, $6,000. I do not know what the merits of the amendment may be, though I have seen their estimates, and it may be entirely proper to allow the amount. I notice that for the present fiscal year—of course it is not affected by this deficiency estimate—one of the civil-service commissioners made a trip to California at an expense of $535.17 for traveling expenses, and then another one of the commissioners made a trip to California at an expense of $503.60. There are but three commissioners.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What happened to the other one? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I should have supposed that possibly the other one was ill, or he would have visited the exposition out of the funds provided for traveling expenses. It may have been entirely proper that they should make this trip. I do not know. But the traveling expenses of the various officials of the Government in connection with the San Francisco Exposition are almost startling. But they do not stop at expositions, and these traveling expenses are not confined to any administration or to any party.

I think it quite appropriate to call attention to the fact that less than a year ago we made a deficiency appropriation of $2,500,000 in regard to the foot-and-mouth disease, and I am sure it will be interesting to gentlemen, both on the Committee on Appropriations, which made that report, and to gentlemen on the Committee on Agriculture, which carried the annual appropriation in regard to the foot-and-mouth disease, to know how that fund has been expended for traveling expenses.

Here is an item:

Arthur G. Bell, to inspect the colts in the feeding experiments at the bureau experimental farm, $42.45 traveling expenses.

Charged to the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease.

I shall not give very many of the numerous items, although it may seem that I give quite a number. Here is one:

To inspect the cooperative carriage-horse breeding experiment being conducted at Fort Collins, Colo., and arrange the breeding schedule for the spring of 1915, $139.90.

Charged to the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease.

Here is another:

To inspect creameries in connection with the refrigeration, water, and power problems, $174.58.

Charged to the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease. [Laughter.]

Here is another:

To deliver addresses on subjects relating to the dairy industry, and at Pawnee, to ascertain qualifications of an applicant for a position in the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Charged to the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. GARNER. How much?

Mr. MANN. One hundred and forty-four dollars and thirty-eight cents. Here is another one:

To inspect financial records of local offices at New York and Boston.

Charged to the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease.

Here is still another:

To investigate the cost of different operations of city milk plants at Philadelphia and New York.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease. [Laughter.]

And another one:

To inspect a renovated-butter factory at Frederick, Md.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

Also:

To inspect renovated-butter factories and creameries at various places, $478.62.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

To confer with parties interested in cow-testing associations, etc.

Charged to the same appropriation.

To attend a meeting of the Southern Wisconsin Dairymen's Association, at Monroe, to deliver an address on the effect of skimmed milk on quality of Swiss cheese.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease. [Laughter.]

To consult with the State department of agriculture in reference to the establishment of cheese factories in the mountain districts of North Carolina.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

To investigate the cheese industry in the Western States, and the practicability of establishing cheese factories.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

To perform an operation on a Government stallion used in military horse breeding.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease. [Laughter.]

To collect samples of milk for bacteriological analysis.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

And they sent somebody from Washington to Chicago for that purpose, to collect some samples of milk.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. How does the gentleman account for the fact that these vouchers got by the Auditor for the Agricultural Department?

Mr. MANN. I do not account for it.

To attend a meeting of the potato growers of Bangor, Me.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

To deliver addresses, and score and analyze the milk entered in competition at various places.

Charged to the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MANN. I can not; I have not the time.

To inspect Karakule sheep.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

To organize cow-testing associations—

And so forth.

A large sum, charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

To visit colleges regarding work on the cost of milk production.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

I read only a few of these items.

To assist in the cooperative community poultry breeding work being conducted in the vicinity of Winchester, Va., and New York City.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

To inspect the cooperative ostrich breeding work being done in Arizona and other points.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

To consult breeders concerning the turkey and guinea industries—

And so forth.

Two hundred and seventy-one dollars and eighty-one cents, charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

To investigate creamery conditions in the Southern States.

Three hundred and seventy-seven dollars and twelve cents, charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

To make a study of the preparation of wools for the market and work in connection with the sheep industry of the West; to study the market classes and grades of wool; to supervise the shearing of Government flocks at Laramie, Wyo.—

And so forth.

Four hundred and seventy-six dollars and thirty cents, charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

To attend convention of National Canners' Association in the interest of condensed-milk investigation.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

To supervise the erection of the two story and basement brick and concrete building at the United States experimental station.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

I might go on with a number of these.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. If I have time, in a moment.

To investigate the horse-breeding work being conducted at the Morgan horse farm.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

To supervise the horse and mule investigations being conducted at the United States experimental station.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

To give instructions to officials selected to inspect butter for the Navy Department.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

To select and purchase short-horned cows for proposed breeding work that is to be carried on in cooperation with the Kansas Agricultural College.

Charged to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

I do not know who is to blame, or whether anybody is; but it does seem to me that where we are asked to make an emergency appropriation of a large sum of money for one purpose, it is a gross violation of the proprieties, if not of the law, to seize that fund immediately and send men from Washington, traveling all over the United States upon other matters entirely apart from the purpose for which the appropriation is made, and then charge the expense to that appropriation.

Now I yield to my colleague [Mr. FOSTER].

Mr. FOSTER. I fully agree with my colleague. I want to ask him, Does he know the total amount that has been expended in these ways which he has enumerated?

Mr. MANN. I do not. There are a great many of these items. This is a report of traveling expenses for the Department of Agriculture for the last fiscal year, which reached us in print yesterday. I was looking up another matter in it and found these items.

Mr. FOSTER. Could the gentleman put in his remarks the total amount that has been charged to this fund for these other purposes?

Mr. MANN. I could, but it is too much trouble; and I am not going to take either the time or the trouble. Any gentleman can get House Document 113 and read the statement of these traveling expenses. I have thought I would address the House some time upon a number of the others, but very likely I shall not get the opportunity.

I think it quite proper to call attention to this in connection with this item where we are asked to make a definite appropriation of $6,000 to take care of our friends in the Civil Service Commission, who have been very free about expending money to take travel trips at the expense of the Government to the San Francisco Exposition. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, I will say that the Committee on Appropriations declined to recommend this item in the bill, which appears as a Senate amendment. We have committees on expenditures in the various departments of the Government, whose duty it is to examine and analyze these questions, and if improperly passed upon by the auditor to report whatever remedial legislation is necessary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. EGAN, and Mr. CANNON.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the following joint resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I shall be forced to object. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10385, the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. FOSTER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10385) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the survey, resurvey, classification, and allotment of lands in severalty under the provisions of the act of February 8, 1887 (24 Stat. L., 388), entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians," and under any other act or acts providing for the survey or allotment of Indian lands, $100,000, to be repaid proportionally out of any Indian moneys held in trust or otherwise by the United States and available by law for such reimbursable purposes and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of said sum shall be used for the survey, resurvey, classification, or allotment of any land in severalty on the public domain to any Indian, whether of the Navajo or other tribes, within the State of New Mexico and the State of Arizona who was not residing upon the public domain prior to June 30, 1914.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this paragraph. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I noticed in the last appropriation bill under this paragraph there was unexpended $92,897, and there was expended last year under this paragraph $146,344. May I ask the chairman of the committee this question: Why is it necessary to appropriate this year more than was appropriated and expended last year?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If the gentleman will examine the bill, he will see that the appropriation for this year is only $125,000.

Mr. HARRISON. The gentleman's bill appropriates this year but $100,000.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not think the gentleman understood my question. There was expended last year $146,344, and unexpended $92,897. Now, the committee appropriates in this bill $100,000 and the unexpended balance, which would be about $192,000. Why should you want to appropriate $192,000 this year when you only expended last year $146,000, practically $50,000 more appropriated this year than was expended last year?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The department recommended $125,000, but the appropriation is cut to $100,000, to be reimbursed out of the funds of the Indians.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that they are appropriating in this item at least $50,000 more than they expended last year. I would like to ask the gentleman if the department thinks that it will need more money this year than last year?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I think it does.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If the gentleman will look at the first page of the report, he will see that the committee has appropriated $817,000 less than the estimate.

Mr. HARRISON. That strikes me as a potent reason why the appropriation should not be as much this year as it was last year. If the appropriations are $850,000 less than the estimates, I think the gentleman's statement reinforces what I said.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What is the gentleman driving at?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order and offer this amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, in line 11, page 2, by striking out "$100,000" and inserting "$50,000."

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, in support of the amendment I want to say that I think the statement of the chairman of the committee is quite enough to sustain the adoption of the amendment. The last appropriation bill carried for this item $125,000. This bill carries $100,000 and the unexpended balance. There was unexpended last year $92,897.18. There was expended last year under this paragraph $146,344.39. In other words, there is to be appropriated under this paragraph $192,897.88, when the department only expended last year, under this paragraph, $146,344.34.

Now, in view of the fact, and in view of the further fact that the chairman of the committee states that the estimates for last year were $856,000 more than they are for this year, and the work of reclassifying and reallotting, and those things that come under the provisions of this paragraph, are constantly decreasing and the work diminishes, it strikes me that $50,000, together with the unexpended balance, is ample enough to appropriate in the bill. Here is an opportunity to save at least $50,000, according to the statement of the chairman of the committee and the hearings. I submit that the amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, of the expenditures under this item we find that $79,410.26 was made by the General Land Office, which is chargeable to this fund for this reason. The General Land Office, in making surveys on public domains, also surveys Indian reservations, and under agreement between the two different departments, both of which are under Secretary Lane, the expenditures between the two departments are regulated in this way. Therefore we have $79,000 here used by the Land Department and not by the Indian Department. We have cut the appropriation as close as

we can by reducing the amount. The gentleman misunderstood my statement. I said that we had reduced the estimate $800,000 for this year—that is, up to June, 1917. We have cut this bill $800,000 below the estimate, and I am sure that the committee gave every item of the bill very close and careful consideration, because there were many new Members on the committee who desired to know all about every possible item.

We had before us, as the hearings will show, the Secretary of the Interior and his assistants and such other persons as he desired to go before us for explanation of these items, and I assured the gentleman that this item especially was given very close consideration. We have cut it as close as we dare do it for the efficiency of the service. Another matter is this: They state that there are many contracts let out at the present time through the department for certain work done that is necessary to allot this land among the Indians, and that these men have contracts with the Government that have to be met between this time and the end of the contract term, and it is necessary to have a small balance for that purpose.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. I understood the gentleman to say that out of this fund $79,000 was spent by the Land Office. Is that true?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. HARRISON. Then there was $79,000 expended out of this fund that should not have been expended out of it?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It should have been expended, because of an agreement in the department, as I have already stated, between those two different bureaus under the Secretary of the Interior. The Land Department, having these surveyors in the field, can much better make these surveys for the purpose of allotting these lands to the Indians. Many of these lands have not been surveyed.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And let me explain further, for the gentleman seems not to be able to understand. This was set apart on the public domain by Executive order of the President as an Indian reservation, and it became necessary to extend the public-land surveys over these reservations and in doing that the Public Land Department, the Land Commissioner and his department, have extended these surveys. Therefore it should not be charged to their department, but it is charged to the Indian Service in order to have a proper system of keeping the books. I hope the gentleman understands it now.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not exactly understand, because the gentleman has not explained the proposition that I stated, that last year there was $146,000—and I do not think the gentleman is catching what I am asking him now—expended under this item. This year you propose to expend $100,000 and the unexpended balance which was $92,000, which makes $192,000 for this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Texas may be extended for one minute. Is there objection?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I object. I do not want the time, and it is apparent what the gentleman is after.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that these unexpended balances do not represent what the department has actually on hand at this time. These estimates were made prior to the 1st of December, and a great deal of this money which had been contracted for had not been disbursed, and therefore was carried in the balance at that time. A large portion of these amounts has already been contracted for and is perhaps by this time expended. This is a work that really is doing something for the Indians. It is allotting their lands, classifying them, putting the Indian upon reservations, and should, if properly administered, eventually work out the transformation of the Indian to self-sustaining citizenship. It is one item which I think should not be reduced below the amount carried in the bill. We reduce it $125,000 lower than was estimated for.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman speaks of the allotment of Indian lands. What is there in the law in the way of restrictions upon alienation by these allottees?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. All of the lands when allotted are restricted.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. To what extent?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. They are restricted from sale. Sales of the lands can not be made unless passed upon by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to answer the question?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In the Qui-nai-elts Indian Reservation, in southwestern Washington, an enormous reservation, a few allotments have been made, and the result is that these Indians are timber rich and starvation poor. They have their allotment and the timber on it, but they can not sell it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. And they can not eat it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And they can not eat it, and are dependent on this Government for little supplies handed out from Government stations. Yet these Indians may be worth, in timber, from $100,000 to $200,000, and this whole fund could be used in attempting to survey that Qui-nai-elts Reservation and not make a dent in it.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to believe that the gentleman from Washington is correct. When the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] questioned Mr. Meritt he insisted that this fund ought not to be decreased. I read from the hearing, at page 12:

Mr. NORTON. As a matter of fact, you could get along with $75,000, could you not?

Mr. MERITT. No, sir; because we will need at least $75,000 for survey work, and if we had only an appropriation of that amount we would not have any money for allotment work.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. To return to the question I asked a moment ago, has it not been the experience where Indian lands are allotted in severalty and in fee that white men have speedily gotten hold of the land and, in some instances, at ridiculously low prices?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. We have had some very notable examples of that.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Much of this argument, not all of it, but some of the argument in favor of the allotment of Indian lands for the alleged purpose of having the Indian develop himself and become a business man is primarily for the purpose of enabling the white man to get hold of the Indian's land at a small figure and to work an outrageous fraud.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. In reply to the gentleman, I will say that all lands of the Indians, when they are allotted, have restrictions placed upon the alienation, and most generally have restrictions placed upon the leasing of the land for agricultural, grazing, and all other purposes. These restrictions now can only be removed by the Secretary of the Interior upon application made by the allottee under the present law.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is that true in respect to every allottee?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. That is true with respect to every allottee that is being allotted now.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But it was not true in the past?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. No. It has not always been true in the past, and this Congress has often removed restrictions from Indians after their lands had been allotted. Years ago the Government sometimes allotted Indian land without any restrictions at all, but that policy has been abandoned.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But those restrictions were removed upon the plea that it was necessary to remove them in order that the Indians might benefit themselves.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Undoubtedly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And the white men took advantage of the situation and got the land.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman is correct as to some cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction, repair, and maintenance of ditches, reservoirs, and dams, purchase and use of irrigation tools and appliances, water rights, ditches, lands necessary for canals, pipe lines, and reservoirs for Indian reservations and allotments, and for drainage and protection of irrigable lands from damage by floods, or loss of water rights, including expenses of necessary surveys and investigations to determine the feasibility and estimated cost of new projects and power and reservoir sites on Indian reservations in accordance with the provisions of section 13 of the act of June 25, 1910, $235,000, reimbursable as provided in the act of August 1, 1914, and to remain avail-

able until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended on any irrigation system or reclamation project for which specific appropriation is made in this act or for which public funds are or may be available under any other act of Congress; for pay of one chief inspector of irrigation, who shall be a skilled irrigation engineer, $4,000; one assistant inspector of irrigation, who shall be a skilled irrigation engineer, $2,500; for traveling and incidental expenses of two inspectors of irrigation, including sleeping-car fare and a per diem of $3 in lieu of subsistence when actually employed on duty in the field and away from designated headquarters, $3,200; in all, $244,700: *Provided also*, That not to exceed seven superintendents of irrigation, six of whom shall be skilled irrigation engineers and one competent to pass upon water rights, and one field-cost accountant, may be employed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I notice that it is proposed that this appropriation shall be available until expended. That is not the way we passed it last year in the House. What is the necessity of making this appropriation available until expended in paying for current expenses?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will say this to the gentleman: They are letting contracts for the completion of certain items and there are 80 irrigation items or projects in the United States under this department. It is very often that they have new projects originated, but anything beyond $30,000 must come to Congress for approval before any item can draw money from the Public Treasury. Now, when these items are approved by Congress, then the department lets the contract for the completion of that separate item, but it is necessary that they have some leeway in order to make it reimbursable when they carry out the project.

Mr. MANN. Of course if a contract should be let the current fiscal year under this item the item is available to pay any amount due on the contract for two years after the fiscal year. I do not think that is the purpose of it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That was the purpose given by the department.

Mr. MANN. Every department likes to pile up appropriations which may remain available until they are expended, and as a rule, no one here knows how much they are. We make these appropriations annually.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say to the gentleman that the department has another reason why this appropriation should remain available until expended. It is urged that there ought to be a considerable balance on hand to take care of emergencies. Very often irrigation projects are injured or destroyed by unexpected floods. For example, a dam may be washed out and it may be necessary to repair it immediately. The gentleman will notice we have made a cut of $100,000 in this amount on account of the large unexpended balance that has accumulated in the past years.

Mr. MANN. I notice that last year the item as it passed the House was $250,000. The item in this bill is $230,000, which is very far from being a cut of $100,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. The amount actually appropriated last year was $345,700.

Mr. MANN. There was no amount appropriated last year at all except by resolution that extended the appropriation of the previous year.

Mr. HAYDEN. The law two years ago carried that amount, then, so that the Indian Bureau has accumulated a considerable unexpended balance. We therefore thought that we were justified in making this cut.

Mr. MANN. That they have accumulated a considerable unexpended balance is the very reason why we ought not to make an expenditure for current expenses available until expended. Annual appropriations ought to be made annual, it seems to me, unless there is some special reason. I understand if they are appropriating for a specific project it may be perfectly proper and quite desirable to make that appropriation available until expended, because that is not an annual item; but the same reasoning that has been given by the gentleman so far would apply to every appropriation which we make in every department of the Government.

Mr. HAYDEN. Well, all departments of the Government are not liable to have the work they are doing destroyed by floods. That is the reason why it is urged that this money should be made available until expended.

Mr. MANN. Every department of the Government that has any public works is liable to have them destroyed by floods, by storms. The Lighthouse Service, the Life-Saving Service, the Forest Service, all of those departments of the Government are quite on all fours in that respect.

Mr. HAYDEN. And many of them have appropriations available until expended.

Mr. MANN. And not one of them has; they have annual appropriations. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, against the words, page 3, line 8, "and to remain available until expended."

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. We concede the point of order.

Mr. MANN. The word "chef" ought to be spelled correctly in line 13, page 3. It should be "chief."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I have no objection to that.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors among Indians, $150,000.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, end of line 25, insert "*Provided*, That no private residence or office within the Indian country outside of Indian reservations, or any baggage or personal effects checked or consigned to any point within the Indian country, outside of Indian reservations, shall be searched by any of the officers for whom appropriation is made in this act, except by authority of a search warrant issued by some competent court or commissioner based on an affidavit that there is probable cause to believe that intoxicating liquors will be there found: *Provided further*, That when the situation is such that the benefit of such search will be lost unless the same is forthwith made, then in such event, if there be a probable cause to believe that intoxicating liquors are there present, such search may be made without said warrant, based upon such probable cause, but any officer making such search without a warrant as aforesaid, shall be liable to the person aggrieved to respond for damages in an appropriate action, in either State or Federal court, if there be not probable cause for making such search."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that, if the gentleman from Illinois desires to make a statement.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Yes; I desire to be heard on the amendment, briefly.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated to the gentleman who spoke to the question that I discussed yesterday, it was no part of my purpose or desire in any way to interfere with the proper protection of those who are the wards of the Nation.

Having that object in view I have offered this amendment.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs raises the question of a point of order upon this amendment, and at the conclusion of the remarks which I desire to make I shall in all probability concede the correctness of his position.

It is my desire, if possible, to offer such an amendment to this bill as will to no degree limit or affect the fullest measure of protection that the wards of the Nation should receive, but at the same time I do not want the thin pretext and the thinner guise of protection to the Indian to result in the infliction of a positive wrong upon the inhabitants who reside within this country, who are not of Indan blood and who it was not contemplated should be within the provisions of the treaty.

Here, gentlemen, is the very anomalous situation that arises from the treaty of 1855: Certain territory was ceded to the United States, and by treaty with the Indians it was provided that the laws then existing for the protection of the Indian from the liquor traffic should be extended to this territory.

But at that time the Indians were scattered through the length and breadth of what is practically one-half of the State of Minnesota. Now, they are nearly all withdrawn from that territory.

There are many places where you could travel 50 to 75, or perhaps even 100, miles without encountering a single Indian. These Indian agents, of whom I made complaint here, say, as they travel up and down this country, by reason of the laws of the United States and this treaty, they have the right not only to regulate the morals, manners, and the habits of the white citizens, but also to invade the privacy of homes and personal effects, which is now guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, and it is with this last phase only that I am concerned.

I care nothing about the liquor traffic in this section of the country. And I want to say that my entire record as it has been made elsewhere will sustain the statement that I make to you now. There is nothing in my life or nothing in my record, so far as its public aspect is concerned, that would indicate that I am a friend of the traffic in intoxicating liquor.

In the case of Johnson *v.* Gearlds (234 Ill., p. 422) it was stated that it was true that by terms of the treaty of 1855 this country was protected from intoxicating liquor, but the court also said that it was quite apparent—I do not quote the exact language—that the need for the protection of this treaty had passed and it had become a question upon which Congress should act.

President Taft in his message to Congress, I think the last one, called the attention of Congress to this subject, and he there said that it was now very apparent that the treaty had become obsolete and that the need for it no longer existed. I care nothing whether the need for this treaty exists so far as the sale of intoxicating liquor is concerned, but I do care whether or not the rights of the citizens of the United States are to be invaded by the search which I mentioned yesterday and which I will not here repeat.

Gentlemen of the committee, it is time a halt was put upon invasion of the private rights of the citizen. Even the Post Office Department recognizes the rights of no man to the privacy of the mail, and the question of where the law ceases and strong arm of seizure commences has been questioned during the last two years. I do not charge it as the fault of one administration or another. There is no partisanship in it. But the rights of the individual should be protected under the Constitution of the United States from inflictions of this irritating kind by any administration.

And that is the only reason why I have offered this amendment. If the gentleman insists upon the point of order, in all probability it will be held as good, and it will require me then to introduce an amendment that will go further than I desired to go in the amendment now offered, which I have thought would cover the situation, of which I think I make proper complaint.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no question but that this changes existing law and is a limitation on an appropriation bill, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 3, at the end of line 25, by inserting the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the above appropriation shall be used for the purpose of searching any private residence or office outside of an Indian reservation or for searching any baggage or personal effects consigned to any point outside of an Indian reservation."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that amendment also, unless the gentleman desires to speak to it.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I merely wanted to address myself to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] reserve a point of order or make it?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. You can make the point of order if you please.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I make the point of order, then, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take any time, because I am frank to say, with my limited experience in this House, that I feel that my views would be of no particular interest and of no great weight to either the Chair or the membership, and for that reason I will refrain from saying more than that this is a limitation upon the appropriation and I think is very clearly within the rules of this House.

From the limited investigation which I have had an opportunity to make, it is amply sustained by a wealth of authority that holds the right does exist to offer an amendment limiting the use of the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] make the point of order?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes; I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is purely a limitation on the appropriation and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I call for a vote, then.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I simply desire to say that this amendment is directed to the accomplishment of one purpose, and that is to provide that no private residence or office and no personal baggage or effects consigned to any point outside of an Indian reservation shall be subject to search.

Now, the law provides stringent penalties for the purpose of protecting the Indian against the sale of intoxicating liquors. If I recall correctly—and I would thank any gentleman to correct me if I do not state it correctly—the law at the present time provides in regard to the sale of liquor to the Indians that the penalty therefor shall not be less than 60 days in jail nor less than a fine of $200. I think the extent of the punishment depends on the state of mind of the judge before whom the case would come.

Mr. Chairman, there should be—and it occurs to me that there could be—no diversty of opinion among the Members of this House; there should be a limitation on the right of the officers for whom this House makes an appropriation to carry on, in a vindictive and most annoying and oftentimes a highly insulting manner, the invasion of the rights of men and women who have occasion to go in and reside within the boundaries of what is called the Indian country.

There is no greater travesty in the use of the English language that the mind can imagine than to say that this great northern part of Minnesota and the other country that has been ceded by the various Indian tribes and now is devoted to the useful pursuit of agriculture and trade and commerce is still "Indian country," and that throughout the legnth and breadth of that country the will of the Indian officer for whom this House makes an appropriation shall be the controlling law.

I protest against it now, as I did yesterday, and say that, in my judgment, it is not within the spirit of our institutions.

I sincerely trust that the House will adopt this amendment, and, while continuing protection to the Indians, they will say that those who are unfortunate enough to be of white blood shall also be protected in the enjoyment of their rights. [Applause.]

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not be adopted, because it would seriously interfere with the Indian Department in preserving the Indians from the curse of liquor.

I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TILLMAN] the rest of my five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas will be recognized in his own right.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment reads as follows:

Provided, That no part of the above appropriation shall be used for the purpose of searching any private residence or office outside of an Indian reservation or for searching any personal effects consigned to any point outside of an Indian reservation.

That would destroy the present law, enacted to protect the Indians from the illegal traffic in intoxicants. If a liquor dealer chooses to set up a saloon or a tiger on the outside of a reservation 10 feet from the border, or if he should set up his tiger a short distance from where there are Indians, the officers of the law would have no right to go into his baggage or his office or his place of business without invoking slow-moving legal machinery, which is often wholly ineffective.

People who do not want to violate the law need have no fear from the appropriation of this money to suppress the traffic or introduction of whisky among Indians. The object of this appropriation is to protect the Indians and not to encourage white men in violating law. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is opposed to the amendment. Its experience teaches it that it is necessary to have this appropriation, and that it is necessary to cover the entire country, and not Indian reservations alone. They are limited in number and extent of territory. If this amendment is adopted, you will have no law worthy the name or sufficiently potent to protect the Indians. The Indian is fond of whisky. He will go wherever he can to get it, and he will leave his reservation to make a purchase of liquor. The favorite method of introducing whisky into Oklahoma Indian reservations and elsewhere is to carry it inside of grips and trunks. They sometimes use coffins in which to convey it to the Indians. Various unique methods are adopted for the purpose.

Now, the outrageous incidents mentioned by the gentleman from Illinois to-day and yesterday are very rare, and aside from that the man invested with the right to make seizures in behalf of the Government is usually an honest man and can be trusted to enforce these protective laws without unnecessary harshness. If this amendment is adopted, it will be done against the advice of the Indian Bureau, which bureau is making an honest effort to enforce the liquor law for the benefit of the Indians.

There was one gentleman only who appeared before the committee favoring the extension of the wet territory in Minnesota. That gentleman represented a brewery, as stated. We have not yet heard from the other side. There ought to be no backward step taken in the business of putting down the traffic that has not only injured the Indian but the white man as well. Liquor never yet made a man better or permanently happier. It has done an infinite amount of harm. I take it for granted that a majority of the Members of this House are opposed to the enlargement of wet territory; in fact, favor a constitutional amendment to prohibit the sale and manufacture of intoxicants.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois attempts to amend a section of the Revised Statutes which has been upon the statute books since

March 15, 1864. This is the law at present relating to the right of search and seizure:

That if any superintendent of Indian affairs, Indian agent, or subagent—

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Will the gentleman kindly give us the number of the section?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is section 2140 of the Revised Statutes:

If any superintendent of Indian affairs, Indian agent, or subagent, or commanding officer of a military post, has reason to suspect or is informed that any white person or Indian is about to introduce or has introduced any spirituous liquor or wine into the Indian country in violation of law, such superintendent, agent, subagent, or commanding officer may cause the boats, stores, packages, wagons, sleds, and places of deposit of such person to be searched; and if any such liquor is found therein, the same, together with the boats, teams, wagons, and sleds used in conveying the same, and also the goods, packages, and peltries of such person, shall be seized and delivered to the proper officer, and shall be proceeded against by libel in the proper court and forfeited, one half to the informer and the other half to the use of the United States; and, if such person be a trader, his license shall be revoked and his bond put in suit. It shall, moreover, be the duty of any person in the service of the United States, or of any Indian, to take and destroy any ardent spirits or wine found in the Indian country, except such as may be introduced therein by the War Department. In all cases arising under this and the preceding section Indians shall be competent witnesses.

That is the law under which we have been operating all these years. It has worked well. It seems to me to-day is not the time in which well-established law should be amended. I agree with the gentleman that it is possible for some officer of the law to act in an arbitrary manner, but that is no reason why the law itself should be repealed, as he seeks to do by his amendment. I am sure this House will not go back on the policy which Congress has pursued all these years in our effort to prevent the Indians of the United States from obtaining liquor, which is the curse of their race.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, it is well that the committee should know the effect of this amendment if it is adopted. The proposed amendment provides that no part of the appropriation shall be used for the purpose of searching any private residence or office outside of an Indian reservation, or for searching any baggage or personal effects consigned to any point outside of an Indian reservation.

Indian country and Indian reservations are two very distinct terms. An Indian reservation has well-defined limits. For illustration, in the northern part of Minnesota most of the region is known as "Indian country." It is recognized in law as "Indian country," but only a small part of it is included in Indian reservations. If this amendment is adopted, this money can be used only for enforcing the law on Indian reservations. Its adoption, as the gentleman from Arizona so clearly stated, will mean, in effect, a repeal of existing law. If this amendment is adopted, it means that an agent of the Indian Bureau may not obtain even a warrant to make search outside of an Indian reservation for evidence of violations of laws against traffic in alcoholic liquors among the Indians, and use any part of this item of appropriation for payment of his salary or expenses in making search under the warrant. Now, it has been left to Congress to repeal, if in its wisdom and judgment it deems such repeal proper, the provisions of the treaty of 1855, providing that no intoxicating liquors shall be sold or brought into the "Indian country" in Minnesota. The repeal of the provision against the sale and use of intoxicating liquors in that section of Minnesota covered by treaties made with the Indians subsequent to 1855 was left to the discretion of the President of the United States. As is well known, a President of the United States has exercised that discretion placed in him, and by Executive order has set aside the provision of the treaty relating to the sale and use of alcoholic liquors. If Congress desires to use the authority vested in it by the treaty of 1855 and repeal these provisions of that treaty, it seems to me it should do that by direct legislation rather than indirectly by an amendment of this character.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested——

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I should like to limit the debate. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. LENROOT. Five minutes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does any other gentleman desire time?

Mr. EMERSON. I should like five minutes.

Mr. HARRISON. I may want five minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I should like five minutes.

Mr. MANN. I should like five minutes on the paragraph.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that at the end of 25 minutes debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto may be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] asks unanimous consent that at the end of 25 minutes debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in this proposed amendment, because I have four Indian reservations in my congressional district; and although the condition does not prevail there that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] has detailed with reference to Minnesota, yet the adoption of this amendment would most seriously affect the enforcement of the liquor laws in the district which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. MURRAY. And all the others, would it not?

Mr. LENROOT. And all the others. Now, the effect of the gentleman's amendment will be to largely nullify the laws of the United States with reference to the introduction of liquor, not only into the Indian country but Indian reservations themselves, and the laws with relation to the sale and possession of liquor by Indians, who are wards of the Government. To illustrate, supposing an Indian off the reservation has liquor in his house and is selling it to other Indians. If you adopt this amendment, there is no way of searching that house belonging to an Indian, who is a ward of the Government, for the purpose of getting evidence to enforce the law.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield for a question?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Would not all the penalties against the sale of intoxicating liquors, which are severe, still be applicable and in force?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; but I want to say that you may write penalties with reference to any subject upon which this Congress may choose to legislate, but if you deprive the officers of the law of the opportunity of getting the evidence upon which to prosecute, your penalties are dead letters, every one of them.

The gentleman realizes that very well. Now, I do not question the specific instances that the gentleman stated yesterday with reference to the abuses which exist, but this is not the way to reach abuses of this kind. It is not proper to reach a few abuses of the law by nullifying the law.

With reference to the general nature of the abuses complained of by the gentleman, I want to say that last summer I was all through this territory which the gentleman speaks of, in every one of the larger towns in that territory, engaged in a lecture tour. I never had my baggage interrupted or examined, never met an Indian officer, and I did not hear during the week or two that I was in the Indian country of a single instance suggested by the gentleman, nor did I hear any complaints on the part of anyone except those who were engaged, or wanted to be engaged, directly in the liquor traffic. I therefore hope that the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to address myself to the subject of the amendment, but I would like to make an inquiry about the appropriation. I do not recall now just when this item was first inserted in the Indian appropriation bill, but a few years ago the appropriation was $50,000. Then we increased it to $75,000, then to $100,000, and the bill of last year carried $125,000, and now this bill carries $150,000. May I inquire of the gentleman what is the reason for this increase; is it because it is so much harder now to prevent liquor being sent into the Indian country than it used to be?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I understand that it is. A great many of the Indian reservations have been opened up in Oklahoma, and in those reservations whites are intermingled. A person who is on Indian land alternates with the whites.

Mr. MANN. There have been no Indian reservations opened up in recent years.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is much harder for various reasons to prevent the liquor traffic now than it has been in the past.

Mr. MANN. When you were making appropriations for $50,000 the situation was identical with what it now is, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I want to state to the gentleman that we examined into this matter very closely. Of course, we can not tell how wisely an appropriation is expended, because we are not on the ground. It does seem to me that we are expending quite a lot of money for this purpose.

Mr. MANN. I am willing to expend all that is absolutely necessary, but I would like to have an idea whether this is to be increased each year by $50,000, and I would like to know somewhere near when the limit is to be reached, when we are likely to reach the summit of appropriation for this purpose. We would suppose that as the Indian territory was opened up and they were given better rights of citizenship in the State, and the State having become a prohibition State—we would suppose

that the cost to the Government of enforcing the law against the introduction of liquor into Indian territory would be less; but, on the contrary, it seems to be steadily and rapidly increasing.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I want to say to the gentleman that in New York they have recently extended the jurisdiction of the Government over some Indians that we did not have jurisdiction over heretofore, and we have to protect them, and also Indians in Florida and North Carolina.

Mr. MANN. I know that the Indian Office has for years been trying to find some excuse for spending money on the Seminoles, who do not need it. They will be a great deal better off if the Government lets them alone. Are we now engaged in trying to enforce the law as to the Seminole Indians in Florida and the Everglades?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If the Government has supervision over them it must try and prevent the introduction of liquor.

Mr. MANN. It seems that the more we civilize the Indians the more it costs to support them; the more we give them land so that they can work, the more money we have to spend to feed them; the more we give them opportunities, the more we have to spend to clothe them; the more opportunity we give them to raise crops and own stock, the more money we have to spend to house them. It is a peculiar situation, to say the least.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the gentleman from Illinois that he should inquire of the gentleman from Texas to defend the increase in this item. Last year in the Indian appropriation bill the item appeared at $75,000. We offered an amendment raising it to $125,000. The gentleman from Texas was defending his bill and argued against the amendment, and in the course of his remarks, when asked why the committee had reduced the appropriation from $200,000 to $150,000, said:

> For the reason that nearly all the Indians, I presume 75 per cent of them, are in States now that have State prohibition, and it is the duty of the State courts and the State sheriffs and the State constables and the entire constabulary force of every State to prevent the sale of these intoxicants; and you will find in every State where these Indians are living that the officers of the county and State are doing their best to protect the Indians from the sale of these intoxicating liquors.
>
> And not only that, but let me state to the gentleman further that the Federal courts have jurisdiction, and the Federal courts have their marshals and deputy marshals all over the United States, and they are seeking out these bootleggers and they are sending them by swarms to the various United States penitentiaries; and the State officers are doing the very same thing.

He most eloquently argued against that increase, notwithstanding the fact the Commissioner of Indian Affairs had recommended an appropriation of $200,000 for this work. It is gratifying to those of us who last year made a fight to suppress this outrageous traffic in the sale of liquors to the Indians, to see this committee, among whom are the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Oklahoma, who last year so vigorously and persistently and insistently opposed an increase in this item to $125,000 now bringing into this House a provision carrying $150,000 appropriation, increasing it $50,000 over what it was last year and $25,000 over the action of the House last year. We congratulate the gentlemen on their change of front.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am opposed to this amendment on general principles. In the first place, I do not believe that all of the officers of the Government are so discourteous as my friend from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] would have us believe they are. I am too poor to travel very much, but I have been through Canada some and in my approach to the Canadian line and in my return to the American line I have found the officials not only of this Government but of the Canadian Government very courteous in their treatment of people who were traveling upon the trains, and I do not think he should let any personal inconvenience interfere with the greater authority and power of the Government to enforce such laws as it makes. What would be the use of having law if the Government could not enforce it? When an officer attempts to arrest a man, whether it be for murder or for intoxication, he apparently is transgressing his individual rights, yet it is for the good of the greater number that the rights of the individual are suppressed. That is the difference between law and license. License is where there is no restraint placed upon the individual, and law is where the individual gives up a part of his individual rights for the good of the many. That is civilized government. I say to you now that if you are going to appropriate this money to suppress the liquor traffic among the Indians, there should be no restraint placed upon it in any such form as this amendment proposes.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Does the gentleman think that the right to search and seize should be exercised at a point 50 miles from any Indian reservation where there is not an Indian residing or coming?

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with the Indian situation. There are no Indians in my district—that is, red Indians; there are a great many white ones—but I think the Government should not be restrained or restricted in its right to search inside the reservation or outside the reservation for people who may be engaged, as I was led to believe by the statement of the chairman of the committee and other gentlemen, in practices that take place in or about the reservation.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Why should not the same practice prevail in your own State, allowing the cellar of the gentleman's house or his friends to be searched for intoxicating liquors?

Mr. EMERSON. It is.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. On complaint.

Mr. EMERSON. Without complaint or warrant.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Oh, no.

Mr. EMERSON. Does the gentleman mean to say that if an officer suspects a crime is committed in some house—a murder or a theft—that he would not have the right to enter it without getting a warrant? I should say not.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. But the gentleman confuses the heinous crime of murder with that of keeping a pint of beer in one's cellar.

Mr. EMERSON. A crime is a crime, whether stealing a lump of coal or murder. There should be no difference in the enforcement of the law, whether against a poor man or a rich man.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. Does the gentleman maintain that it is a crime to keep a quart of beer in one's house?

Mr. EMERSON. Personally I do not drink myself, but if my friend wants to have a quart of beer in his house he may do so.

Mr. MEEKER. It is not a crime per se?

Mr. EMERSON. No; that is true; but that is not the point. If some one would attempt to take it into an Indian reservation in a casket or a coffin or a suit case or a trunk, I think the officers of the Government should have the right of search, and even the right to enter a compartment of some gentleman who is traveling on the train. Personally I have never been able to afford to ride in a compartment, for I have considered myself fortunate to get even an upper berth.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the House to section 21 of the act of March 30, 1902, and I will state to the House that this was the origin of the protection of the Indians afforded by the General Government from the sale of these intoxicating drinks:

> *Be it further enacted*, That the President of the United States be authorized to take such measures from time to time as to him may appear expedient to prevent or restrain the vending or distributing of spirituous liquors among all or any of the said Indian tribes, anything herein contained to the contrary thereof notwithstanding.

From that time up to the present time this Government has protected its wards, and I hope nothing will occur at this time to interfere with that law.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I am very much obliged to my friend from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] for paying me the compliment he did, but really it is not justified, because I feel that a part of this money may not be used as intended. I am somewhat in sympathy with the gentleman from Minnesota respecting conditions in his country. I am as good a prohibitionist as there is on the floor of this House. I have advocated prohibition from one end of Oklahoma to the other and have voted for prohibition both at home and on the floor of this House, but I do not believe money appropriated for suppression of liquor traffic among Indians in an Indian appropriation bill is intended to be used to enforce the liquor law in countries where there are no Indians. The statement was made to the committee that there were no Indians in a part of the country where this money has been used, and that statement was not sufficiently controverted to make me believe otherwise.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to repeat what he said.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The statement was made before the Committee on Indian Affairs that there were no Indians in a certain portion of Minnesota from which whisky was excluded, and my further statement was that that was not sufficiently controverted to convince me to the contrary.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I will.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is it not a fact that this amendment, if adopted, would affect every Indian reservation?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Most certainly it will, and this amendment should be rejected; but there is no necessity for increasing the amount. In addition to the amount used here supplemental of this $150,000 there are various other funds from which the enforcement of the liquor traffic can be drawn. For instance, the Indian police, $200,000. Any part of that sum can be used, and a great deal of it is used, for the suppression of the liquor traffic. Then we have the Indian inspectors, $30,000. A good deal of that can be used for the suppression of the liquor traffic. More than that, every superintendent, every employee of the Indian Bureau is authorized by the laws to suppress the liquor traffic. The committee felt that an ample amount was allowed by the House last year, but, yielding to the will of the House when this amount was raised to $125,000, and yielding to the sentiment in another body with which we knew we would have to deal, we felt that it would be futile to attempt to curtail expenses and economize upon this proposition, because if we put it at $75,000 or $100,000 the chances were it would be raised to $200,000 or $225,000 before getting into law, so we discussed with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs the proposition as to whether a raise would be asked for in this amount if we would put it at $150,000, and he said the bureau would not insist upon a raise if the committee would agree to the $150,000.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state that only three minutes of time remain.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I desire more than three minutes of time; was the time fixed by unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. The time was fixed by unanimous consent. Debate was limited and three minutes still remain.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. But, Mr. Chairman, I tried to get recognition several times, but was unable to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Members of the committee were recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as this item now before the committee concerns more particularly the northern part of Minnesota perhaps than any other portion of the United States, and inasmuch as I have personal knowledge of conditions existing there, I feel justified in requesting five minutes in which to address the committee.

When I became a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs seven years ago the amount appropriated for this purpose was $40,000. We increased it from year to year until it had reached the sum of $100,000 last year, and now it is proposed by the committee to appropriate $150,000. I have always been among those who were ardently in support of any movement or law or appropriation designed to keep liquor from the Indians. It is our bounden duty to take every precaution and every possible step in that direction. Now, I think this committee ought to be aware of the exact facts when it votes on this proposition. In the northern part of our State is a most peculiar and anomalous situation. A treaty was made with the Indians in 1855, when that territory was a wilderness, which said that liquor should be kept from that territory until Congress ordered otherwise. That treaty was forgotten for half a century. It was resurrected a short time ago. It was resurrected and used for the purpose in some places of keeping liquor from the Indians. So far, well and good. It had my support, and always will have it, in that direction. It has also been used for the purpose of enforcing prohibition in purely white territory. Everybody knows that a big part of the territory covered by the treaty of 1855 is not more Indian than the city of Washington. I see more Indians in the city of Washington each winter than four-fifths of the people residing in that territory ever see in their whole lives. That law still stands until it is changed by Congress.

I believe the amount appropriated, if that law is to be the law of Congress and the Nation, should be ample and sufficient to make prohibition absolute within the entire limits of the area, and I so told the committee when they were considering this bill. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars, Mr. Chairman, will never do it. The amount asked by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, $200,000, is probably not too great. If it is the opinion of the Congress that we should enforce prohibition in white territory as well as Indian in the northern part of that State, then appropriate every dollar that is needed for that purpose. I do not want to see bootlegging; I do not want to see illicit traffic in liquor; I do not want to see blind pigs and blind stills and other methods, or any means of getting liquor either to the Indians or to the whites. As I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, it is to restrict the expenditure of this fund to those regions where the Indian question is distinctively involved. If it is so restricted the amount appropriated is ample, perhaps excessive. The wisdom of that course you can decide for yourselves. And I want to say to you, gentlemen, and I want to say to you as one who knows the facts, that a good part of the appropriation here contained will be used and must be used in the enforcement of prohibition among the whites. Now, if you want it, vote for it; if you do not, vote the other way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I think I am within my limits in stating that I have a mutual understanding with the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs for the purpose of not offering other amendments which are prepared and in the interest of saving time, and therefore I would like to ask the committee for the privilege of five minutes to speak to the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The gentleman is correct; I think it will save time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman is not going to speak for an increase or a decrease of this amount?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I desire to speak to the pending amendment which I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that I will not unduly consume the time of the committee, but ask leave to insert in my remarks as an extension thereof an opinion by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Johnson against Gearlds, Two hundred and thirty-fourth United States Reports, on page 422, and also to include in that extension of my remarks, as throwing light on this question from a historical standpoint, that portion of the message of President Taft which relates to the situation in this so-called "Indian territory."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. That being out of the way, I can make the balance of my remarks extremely brief. The gentleman on the Indian Affairs Committee who spoke in opposition to the amendment, it seems to me, inferentially at least, sounded the keynote of his objection when he asked the Members of this House if they desire to extend the wet territory of the United States. Now, I sympathize with his view upon the liquor question, and I say to you in all sincerity that it is not so very different from my own. Because of the fact that the first amendment which I offered, but which was not so broad as the present amendment, was ruled out of order, it becomes necessary, if I am to present the question to this House, to present an amendment perhaps somewhat broader than was the original scope of the previous amendment, and that is the reason why this amendment was not limited solely to prevent unlawful searches, as the first amendment was limited.

Now, the gentleman has said that we take as illustrations extreme cases, and my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] points out very pertinently and very cogently, and, I have an idea, somewhat convincingly, as the basis for his objection to the amendment that while he was traveling in this country during the last summer delivering his very instructive and, I will venture to say, wonderfully entertaining lecture he was not troubled with any search of his baggage.

I congratulate him on his very happy experience and the fact that whatever his baggage contained was undisturbed and reserved for his own use. [Laughter.]

The gentleman points to what he calls an extreme case, and it was also adverted to by the gentlemen upon our own side, who, opposing the amendment, said that I had no right to permit a personal experience to affect an entire situation.

I have had in the complaint which I have made no personal experience that was unpleasant.

But I do resent most bitterly and most deeply the indignities that were offered to a young girl who was a guest in my home, and you all share with me in the same feeling without question. I have no doubt whatever about that.

But advantage is sought to be taken of the fact that one of the cases I mentioned is an extreme case, as the gentleman says; and as the foundation for the argument which he so ably presented he points to the fact that there may be a house within 10 feet of an Indian reservation and that house could not be searched.

Surely, now, the illustration used by him is not an extreme case, is it? It is used for the purpose of making the same kind of argument of which the gentleman complains.

If there is a house within 10 feet of an Indian reservation, it occurs to me that under the Constitution of the United States and its guaranties, which are too often lost sight of in this House, the courts of the United States and the States are open for the process that will give the officers, in the name of the law and using the majesty of the law as the foundation for their action, the right to go into such house and make such search as the law authorizes them to make instead of making them arbitrarily.

I care nothing about the house 10 feet from the reservation, but I do care about the house that is 50 miles from the Indian reservation, where, because of an Indian treaty and under changed conditions which now exist, rights are to be invaded and search and seizure is to be made in defiance of the Constitution of the United States. I am interested not only in protecting the home against liquor but also in protecting it against unlawful invasion and improper violation of its privacy. I want to say—and that there is no subterfuge in what I am saying—and, using the language of the street, if ever a remark was made "on the level" the remark I am about to make is.

I have no interest, directly or indirectly, in the liquor traffic. I have no more tender regard for it than have any of the gentlemen who are opposed to the amendment.

There is no double meaning in my statement, and my course in this House will prove the correctness of what I state to you.

But I am opposed in this day, when the rights of the citizens are being constantly violated, not only by one but all the departments of the Government, to further taking the rights of the citizen away from him.

And whenever occasion offers, no matter what the result will be, no matter whether I am sustained by a single vote in this House or not, I will raise my voice against the further violation of the constitutional right of the citizen. [Applause.]

Opinion of Johnson against Gearlds (234 U. S. Repts., 422):

JOHNSON *v.* GEARLDS.

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA.

[No. 802. Argued May 1, 1914. Decided June 8, 1914.]

Where complainant's entire case rests on the construction of treaties with Indians in regard to reservations and on the claim that certain of such treaties have been repealed by the subsequent admission of the Territory within which the reservations are situated, this court has jurisdiction of a direct appeal from the district court under section 238, Judicial Code.

The provision in article 7 of the treaty with the Minnesota Chippewa Indians of 1855 that the laws of Congress prohibiting the manufacture and introduction of liquor in Indian country shall be in force within the entire boundaries of the country ceded by that treaty to the United States until otherwise provided by Congress, relates to the outer boundaries and includes all the reservations that lie within.

It is within the constitutional power of Congress to prohibit the manufacture, introduction, or sale of intoxicants upon Indian lands, including not only land reserved for their special occupancy, but also lands outside of the reservations to which they may naturally resort, and this prohibition may extend even with respect to lands lying within the bounds of States.

Article 7 of the Chippewa treaty of 1855 was not repealed directly or by implication by the subsequent act of Congress admitting Minnesota into the Union, nor was that article repealed by the effect of the subsequent treaties with the same bands of Chippewas of 1865 and 1867, but the intent of treaties of 1855, 1865, and 1867, as construed together, was that the acts of Congress relating to the introduction and sale of liquor in Indian country should continue in force within the entire boundaries of the country in question until otherwise provided by Congress.

Article 7 of the Chippewa treaty of 1855 has not been superseded by any of the provisions of the Nelson Act of 1889, or the cessions made by the Indians to the United States pursuant thereto, nor has that article been superseded by reason of any change in the character of the territory affected by the treaty and the status of the Indians therein.

The abrogation of an article in an Indian treaty prohibiting the sale of liquor within territory specified therein until Congress otherwise provides is, in the absence of any considerable number of Indians remaining in that territory, a question primarily for Congress and not for the courts.

The fact that there has been a recent communication and recommendation from the President to Congress on a particular subject and Congress has not acted thereon is evidence that the problem is not so entirely obvious of solution that the courts can declare it to be beyond the range of legislative discretion.

Article 7 of the Chippewa treaty of 1855 having provided for the prohibition against sale of liquor within the entire territory ceded by that treaty until Congress should otherwise provide, held that notwithstanding the subsequent admission of Minnesota to the Union, and the later treaties with the Chippewas of 1865 and 1867 and the changed condition of the country and the status of the Indians, Congress not having otherwise provided, the prohibition is still in force throughout that entire territory, including the city of Bemidji, in which there are but few Indians and in the vicinity of which there is a large area of territory unrestricted by the prohibitions of article 7.

One hundred and eighty-third Federal Reports, page 611, reversed.

This is a direct appeal from a final decree of the district court, rendered April 20, 1912, granting to appellees (who were complainants below, and will be so designated) a permanent injunction against appellants (defendants below) in accordance with the prayer of the amended bill of complaint. It appears that complainants are severally residents and citizens of the city of Bemidji, Beltrami County, Minn., and at the time of the filing of the bill were, and for a considerable time had been, engaged in business there as saloon keepers, selling at retail spirituous, vinous, and malt liquors at their respective places of business in that city, each of them having paid to the Federal and State governments, respectively, the necessary tax and license fees, and having a receipt from the Federal Government and a liquor license issued under the authority of the State of Minnesota by the municipal council and officials of the city. The bill alleged that each of the complainants had refrained from selling or disposing of any liquor to Indians or individuals of Indian blood and had complied with the Federal and State laws in this and in other respects; that each of them had built up and established a profitable and lucrative trade, and that the jurisdictional amount was involved. It averred that defendants, being citizens of other States, and acting in conjunction as special officers under the Interior Department of the United States Government, were threatening to enforce within the city of Bemidji the provisions of sections 2139 and 2140 of the Revised Statutes of the United States and amendments thereto, and on December 9, 1910, had ordered complainants and other licensed saloon keepers in Bemidji to close their saloons and cease sales of liquor and ship away their stock, threatening that otherwise they would destroy the stocks of liquor in the possession of complainants, on the ground that under article 7 of a treaty made on the 22d day of February, 1855, between the United States and certain bands of Chippewa Indians, certain territory mentioned in the treaty, including what is now the city of Bemidji, was subject to the laws of the United States respecting the sale of liquors in the Indian country.

To the bill as originally filed defendants interposed a demurrer, which was overruled, and a temporary injunction was granted. (183 Fed Rep. 611.) Thereafter the cause was brought to final hearing upon an amended bill and a reamended answer, and the court, adhering to its former conclusion, rendered a final decree, as already mentioned.

The pertinent historical facts, as deduced from the averments of the amended pleadings, are as follows: On and prior to February 22, 1855, certain bands of the Chippewa Tribe of Indians, known as the Mississippi Bands and the Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands, were in possession of the greater portion of the lands north of parallel 46, within the boundaries of the then Territory of Minnesota. Their country constituted a wilderness, almost wholly uninhabited by civilized people. On the date mentioned, these bands entered into a treaty with the United States, which was approved by the Senate and proclaimed by the President shortly thereafter (10 Stat., 1165). By its first article the Indians ceded and conveyed to the United States "all their right, title, and interest in, and to, the lands now owned and claimed by them, in the Territory of Minnesota, and included within the following boundaries": [Here follows a particular description, by natural boundaries, of a tract of country said to contain about 21,000 square miles.] By the same article the Indians further reliquished and conveyed to the United States any and all right, title, and interest, of whatsoever nature, that they then had in and to any other lands in the Territory of Minnesota or elsewhere. This article mentions no exception or reservation from the lands ceded or granted. By article 2 there was "reserved and set apart, a sufficient quantity of land for the permanent homes of the said Indians; the lands so reserved and set apart to be in separate tracts, as follows." The separate tracts were then briefly described or indicated. For the Mississippi Bands seven reservations were set apart, which came to be known as the Mille Lac, Rabbit Lake, Gull Lake, Pokagomon Lake, Sandy Lake, and Rice Lake Reservations; and besides these, a section of land was reserved for one of the Indian chiefs. For the Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands, three reservations were set apart, known from their respective locations as the Leech Lake, Lake Winnibigoshish, and Cass Lake Reservations.

The seventh article of the treaty is as follows:

"ARTICLE 7. The laws which have been or may be enacted by Congress, regulating trade and intercourse with the Indian tribes, to continue and be in force within and upon the several reservations provided for herein; and those portions of said laws which prohibit the introduction, manufacture, use of, and traffic in, ardent spirits, wines, or other liquors, in the Indian country, shall continue and be in force, within the entire boundaries of the country herein ceded to the United States, until otherwise provided by Congress."

By act of February 26, 1857 (11 Stat., 166; ch. 60), the inhabitants of a portion of the Territory, including the lands ceded by the Chippewas as above, were authorized to form a State government and come into the Union on an equal footing with the original States. The act contained no condition with reference to the treaty of 1855 or the rights of the Indians to any lands within the boundaries of the State. A State constitution was formed, by which Indians were given the right to vote under certain circumstances, and persons residing on Indian lands were declared entitled to enjoy the rights and privileges of citizens as though they lived in any other portion of the State, and to be subject to taxation. This constitution having been ratified and adopted by the people, Congress, by act of May 11, 1858 (11 Stat., 285; ch. 31), admitted the State "on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever." And by section 3 it was enacted that all the laws of the United States, not locally inapplicable, should have the same force and effect within that State as in other States of the Union.

Another treaty was made between the Mississippi, Pillager, and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands of Chippewas and the United States under date May 7, 1864, which was ratified and proclaimed in the following year and is known as the treaty of 1865 (13 Stat., 693). It took the place of a treaty of March 11, 1863 (12 Stat., 1249). By its first section the Gull Lake, Mille Lac, Sandy Lake, Rabbit Lake, Pokagomon Lake, and Rice Lake Reservations, as described in the treaty of 1855, were ceded to the United States, with an exception not now pertinent; and in consideration of this cession the United States agreed to set apart for the future home of the Chippewas of the Mississippi a considerable tract of land—part of the great tract ceded in 1855—embraced within designated boundaries, expressly excepting, however, the reservations made in the treaty of 1855 for the Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands, which were included within the boundaries mentioned. The lands thus set apart for the Chippewas of the Mississippi contained all the territory now within the limits of the city of Bemidji and the lands adjacent to it for a distance of several miles in all directions.

By a treaty made between the United States and the Chippewas of the Mississippi, dated March 19, 1867, ratified and proclaimed in the same year (16 Stat., 719), these bands ceded to the United States the greater portion, estimated at 2,000,000 acres, of the lands secured to them by the treaty of 1865, and in consideration of this cession the United States set apart for the use of the same Indians a tract, to be located in a square form as nearly as possible, with lines corresponding to the Government surveys, the reservation to include White Earth Lake and Rice Lake, and to contain 36 townships. This reservation came to be known as the White Earth Reservation. It lies within the exterior boundaries of the cession of 1855.

The territory ceded to the United States by the treaty of 1867 contains what is now the city of Bemidji and the country about it for miles in every direction.

By an act of January 14, 1889, known as the Nelson Act (25 Stat., 642; ch. 24), the President was authorized to designate commissioners to negotiate with all the different bands of Chippewa Indians in Minnesota for the complete cession and relinquishment of their title and interest in all their reservations, except the White Earth and Red Lake Reservations, and in so much of these two reservations as in the judgment of the commission was not required to make and fill the allotments required by this and existing acts. The act provided that a census should be taken, and that after the cession and relinquishment had been approved all the Chippewa Indians in the State, except those on the Red Lake Reservation, should be removed to the White Earth Reservation, and lands should then be allotted to the Indians in severalty, in conformity with the act of February 8, 1887 (24 Stat., 388; ch. 119), and the surplus lands disposed of by sale and the proceeds placed in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of all the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota as a permanent fund, to bear interest, payable annually, for 50 years, and at the end of that period the fund to be divided and paid to all of said Chippewas and their issue then living in cash. By the first section of this act the acceptance and approval of the cession and relinquishment of the lands by the President of the United States was to be deemed full and ample proof of the assent of the Indians, and to operate as a complete extinguishment of the Indian title without further act or ceremony. Commissioners were appointed accordingly, and agreements were entered into between them and the several bands of Chippewas by which the Indians accepted and ratified the provisions of the act and ceded to the United States all their right, title, and interest in their reservations, excepting portions of the White Earth and Red Lake Reservations, and these cessions were approved by the President on the 4th day of March, 1890.

Since the making of the treaty of 1855 the country then ceded to the United States, with the exception of the portions set apart as Indian reservations, has been largely developed, gradually at first, but with great rapidity during recent years, and all the land has become populated by white people and opened up to settlement and organized as political subdivisions of the State, and in the larger portion of the territory industries have been established and commercial interests have grown up, so as to materially change the situation that existed at the time of the making of the treaty. According to the census of 1910, the counties affected by that treaty show a total white population of 382,191. Bemidji is the county seat of Beltrami County and is a municipal corporation, organized under the laws of the State as a city, containing within its corporate limits about 7,000 inhabitants, and, in connection with adjacent municipalities, constituting a population of about 9,000 people. The city is reached by five lines of railroads, three of which have transcontinental connections. The country surrounding it is highly developed, and there are no Indian habitations within 20 miles in any direction from the city.

The original Red Lake Indian Reservation lay immediately north of the great tract covered by the cession of 1855 and was not subject to the treaty of that year. Pursuant to the Nelson Act of January 14, 1889, a considerable portion of this reservation was relinquished to the United States, and has been opened up to settlement, with the result that there is now a strip of territory about 15 miles in width lying a few miles north of Bemidji, which is admittedly exempt from the provisions of any treaty or law relative to the introduction of intoxicating liquors in the Indian country; and in that strip the sale of intoxicating liquors is actually conducted without interference on the part of the Government of the United States.

Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace for appellants:

This court has jurisdiction under section 238, Judicial Code, because the construction or validity of article 7 of the treaty of 1855 is drawn in question; the construction or application of the Constitution is involved; the construction of treaties of 1865 and 1867 is drawn in question. (United States v. Wright, 229 U. S., 226.) "Validity" involves existence of treaty. The Minnesota enabling act did not expressly repeal article 7.

The question of implied repeal depends on the relative potency of State police power and the Federal interstate-commerce power.

The court below erred in holding that the State police power was dominant.

Article 7 of the treaty was in force in 1910.

It was not repealed by the Minnesota enabling act.

Webb Case (225 U. S., 663) and Wright Case (229 U. S., 226) control this case.

The Perrin, Dick, and Whisky Cases are like the case at bar, except that Congress acted here before, and there after, statehood.

If Congress still had power after statehood, implied repeal by enabling act is not possible.

A reservation of power in enabling act is not necessary.

Congress could not reserve a power it might not enjoy without reservation.

The State has no police power over Indian commerce.

The McBratney and Draper Cases are distinguished in the Donnelly Case, and Ward v. Race Horse (163 U. S., 504) is distinguished.

The Friedman Case was overruled by the Circuit Court of Appeals (180 Fed. Rep., 1006).

Article 7 was not repealed by treaties of 1865 or 1867, and there has been no express repeal.

It was not necessary to repeat prohibition in 1865 or 1867, because article 7 in the 1855 treaty covered and protected the whole area.

The need for protection of article 7 was as great in 1865 and 1867 as in 1855.

The rule that reconveyance to a grantor cancels existing covenant is not applicable in this case, because there has been no such reconveyance in fact and because that rule does not apply to treaties.

Article 7 had not become a purely arbitrary regulation in 1910.

Three classes of Indians are concerned—full-blood White Earth and all Leech Lake allottees holding prior to act of May 9, 1906. These may be citizens, but can not alienate lands.

All of the above are holding allotments only since the act of 1906. These are not citizens and can not alienate.

Mixed-blood White Earth allottees are citizens of the United States and of the State.

All save class 3 are still in wardship (without regard to other reasons), because the trust period has not expired.

The wardship of mixed-blood White Earth allottees depends on whether they are still regarded as a dependent people by the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

The pleadings do not show that this protection is purely arbitrary as applied to tract A.

The open 15-mile strip never was protected by treaty.

There is present need of 10,000 Indians for this protection, and there is inadequacy of State laws to keep the liquor out.

In support of these contentions, see Altman & Co. v. United States (224 U. S., 583); The Cherokee Tobacco (11 Wall., 616); Champion Lumber Co. v. Fisher (227 U. S., 445, 451); Cornell v. Green (163 U. S., 75); Couture v. United States (207 U. S., 581); Coyle v. Oklahoma (221 U. S., 559); Dick v. United States (208 U. S., 340); Donnelly v. United States (228 U. S., 243); Draper v. United States (164 U. S., 240, 247); Ex parte Webb (225 U. S., 663); Foster v. Neilson 2 Pet., 314); Friedman v. United States Express Co. (180 Fed. Rep., 1006); Georgia Railroad, etc., Co. v. Walker (87 Georgia, 204); Green v. Edwards (15 Tex. Civ. App., 382); Holder v. Aultman (169 U. S., 81); Hallowell v. United States (221 U. S., 312); Jones v. Walker (2 Paine, 288); Loeb v. Township (179 U. S., 472); Matter of Heff (197 U. S., 488; Matter of Rickert (188 U. S., 432); McKay v. Kalyton (204 U. S., 458, 466); Mosier v. United States (198 Fed. Rep., 54); Muse v. Arlington Hotel Co., 168 U. S., 435); People's Bank v. Gibson (161 Fed. Rep., 286, 291); Perrin v. United States (232 U. S., 478); Petit v. Walshe (194 U. S., 216); Pollard v. Hagan (3 How., 212); Silverman v. Loomis (104 Ill., 142); Tiger v. Western Investment Co. (221 U. S., 286); United States v. Celestine (215 U. S., 287); United States v. Holliday (3 Wall., 407); United States v. McBratney (104 U. S., 621); United States v. Pelican (232 U. S., 442); United States v. Sandoval (231 U. S., 28); United States v. Sutton (215 U. S., 291); United States v. Wright (229 U. S., 226); United States v. 43 Gallons of Whisky (93 U. S., 188); United States Express Co. v. Friedman (191 Fed. Rep., 673); Ward v. Race Horse (163 U. S., 504); Wilson v. Shaw (204 U. S., 24, 33).

Mr. Charles P. Spooner, with whom Mr. Marshall A. Spooner, Mr. John C. Spooner, Mr. Fred W. Zollman, and Mr. Joseph P. Cotton, were on the brief for appellees:

This court has not jurisdiction of this appeal under section 238, Judicial Code, because the construction or validity of article 7 of the treaty of 1855 is not drawn in question; the construction or application of the Constitution is not involved; the construction of the treaties of 1865 and 1867 is not drawn in question.

Article 7 of the treaty of 1855 was repealed by the Minnesota enabling act; it was also repealed by the treaties of 1865 and 1867; and it had expired in 1910 because of the act of January 14, 1889, and the change in the character of territory and the status of Indians.

In support of these contentions, see Bates v. Clark, 95 U. S., 204; Balt. & Poto. R. R. Co. v. Hopkins, 130 U. S., 210; Champion Lumber Co. v. Fisher, 227 U. S., 455; Clough v. Curtis, 134 U. S., 361; Hamilton v. Rathbone, 175 U. S., 414; Linford v. Ellison, 155 U. S., 503; Matter of Heff, 197 U. S., 488; McLean v. Railroad Co., 203 U. S., 38; Miller v. Cornwall R. R. Co., 168 U. S., 131; New Orleans v. Water Works Co., 142 U. S., 79; Snow v. United States, 118 U. S., 346; Swearingen v. St. Louis, 185 U. S., 38; Tiger v. Western Invest. Co., 221 U. S., 286; United States v. Celestine, 215 U. S., 278, 290; United States v. Dick, 208 U. S., 340; United States v. Fisher, 2 Cranch, 358; United States v. Forty Gallons of Whisky, 93 U. S., 188; United States v. Lynch, 137 U. S., 280; United States v. Perrin, 232 U. S., 478; United States v. Sandoval, 231 U. S., 28; United States v. Wright, 229 U. S., 226; Wiggan v. Connolly, 163 U. S., 56.

Mr. Justice Pitney, after making the foregoing statement, delivered the opinion of the court.

This direct appeal is taken under section 238, Judicial Code (act of Mar. 3, 1911, c. 231, 36 Stat., 1087, 1157), which allows such an appeal (inter alia) "in any case that involves the construction or application of the Constitution of the United States; in any case in which the constitutionality of any law of the United States, or the validity or construction of any treaty made under its authority is drawn in question." Our jurisdiction is invoked upon three grounds: (a) That the construction or validity of article 7 of the treaty of 1855 is drawn in question; (b) that the construction or application of the Constitution is involved; (c) that the construction of the treaties of 1865 and 1867 is drawn in question. There is a motion to dismiss, based upon the ground that none of these contentions is well founded. We think the motion must be denied. The court below, in overruling the demurrer, based its decision upon the ground that the treaty of 1855 was necessarily repealed by the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union upon an equal footing with the original States. This decision was based upon the bill as originally framed, but the amendments made no change affecting this ground of decision; and it is evident from the record that in granting the final decree the court adhered to the view expressed in overruling the demurrer. It is insisted by appellants, with some force, that this view was based upon grounds that involved the construction or application of the Constitution of the United States; and that for this reason the direct appeal lies. We find it unnecessary to consider the point, since it seems to us that the entire case for complainants rests at bottom upon grounds that involve the construction of the three treaties referred to, especially that of 1855.

The bill, either in its original or its amended form, did not expressly assert as a ground for relief that the treaty of 1855 had been repealed, in whole or in part, by the admission of the State. On the contrary, relief was prayed upon the ground that the second clause of article 7 (that which related to the liquor traffic and was to remain in force until otherwise provided by Congress) applied only to the ceded territory and not to the reservations set apart within that territory; that by the treaty of 1865 those reservations were ceded to the United States, and ceased to be Indian country in any sense; and that by the subsequent cession in the treaty of 1867 the reservation of 1865 in turn was vested in the United States, and therefore ceased to be Indian country; and, finally, that article 7 of the treaty of 1855 had expired at the time of the acts complained of in the bill (1910) by virtue of the provisions of the act of January 14, 1889, and the cessions made to the United States by the Chippewas of Minnesota pursuant to that act, and because of the changes wrought by time in the character of the territory included in the treaty of 1855 and the status of the Indians therein. These grounds of relief are reiterated in the amended bill, and the averments of the amended answer are cal-

culated to meet them. And the principal force of the arguments on both sides is addressed to the construction of the several treaties referred to. For this reason, if for no other, the direct appeal is well taken.

Upon the merits, we may well begin with the disputed portion of the treaty of 1855:

"ARTICLE 7. The laws which have been or may be enacted by Congress, regulating trade and intercourse with the Indian tribes, to continue to be in force within and upon the several reservations provided for herein; and those portions of said laws which prohibit the introduction, manufacture, use of, and traffic in, ardent spirits, wines, or other liquors, in the Indian country, shall continue and be in force, within the entire boundaries of the country herein ceded to the United States, until otherwise provided by Congress."

The reference to previous laws clearly points to the act of June 30, 1834, entitled "An act to regulate trade and intercourse with the Indian tribes, and to preserve peace on the frontiers" (c. 161, 4 Stat., 729), and kindred acts. The act of 1834 was a revision of previous enactments, and contains many provisions for the regulation of trade and intercourse. Its twentieth and twenty-first sections (4 Stat., 732) prohibit the introduction or manufacture of, or traffic in, spirituous liquor or wine within the Indian country. From them, sections 2139, 2140, and 2141, Revised Statutes, were derived.

By the first section of the act of 1834, the term "Indian country" was defined, for the purposes of that act, as meaning land to which the Indian title had not been extinguished. At the making of the treaty, therefore, the restriction respecting the liquor traffic was in force within the ceded area, because until then the Indian title had not been extinguished. It was the evident purpose of article 7 to continue the restriction in force in the ceded territory, notwithstanding the extinguishment of the Indian title. Such stipulations were not unusual. A contemporaneous treaty with the Winnebagoes contained a similar one (10 Stat., 1172, 1174, article 8). And it has been uniformly recognized that such stipulations amount in effect to an amendment of the statute, so as to make the restriction effective throughout the ceded territory. United States *v.* Forty-three Gallons of Whisky (93 U. S., 188, 196); Bates *v.* Clark (95 U. S., 204, 208).

The fundamental contention that underlies the entire argument for complainants is that the first part of article 7 had for its object that the laws of Congress, present and future, regulating trade and intercourse with the Indian tribes, were to continue and be in force within the reservations created by the treaty; while the latter portion of the article had for its object to keep in force in the ceded country—which, it is said, excludes the reservations—those portions of the laws that prohibited the introduction, manufacture, use of, and traffic in ardent spirits, etc., in the Indian country until otherwise provided by Congress; the particular insistence being that the latter clause applies merely to the so-called ceded territory, and not to the lands included within the reservations.

With this construction of the treaty we can not agree. We think it rests upon a misconception of the fair import of the terms employed in article 7, whether considered alone or together with the context, and fails to give due effect to the reason and spirit of the stipulation.

It seems to us that in the qualifying clause—"within the entire boundaries of the country herein ceded to the United States"—the words "entire boundaries" are equivalent to "outer boundaries," and therefore include the reservations that lie within. And this agrees with the context: for, if we turn back to see what is "herein ceded," we find, that by the terms of article 1 the cession is of all the right, title, and interest of the Indians in the lands owned and claimed by them included within designated boundaries—this being the great tract in question—and then, in a separate clause, a relinquishment and conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the Indians in any other lands in the Territory of Minnesota or elsewhere.

There is here no suggestion that the reservations are excepted out of the cession. On the contrary, article 1 in terms vests the Indian title in the United States as to all the described lands, including the reservations mentioned in article 2. The latter article reserves a number of comparatively small and isolated tracts "for the permanent homes of the said Indians." Of these, all are within the outer boundaries of the cession excepting the Mille Lac Reservation, which lies outside. Reading the two articles together, it is evident that the framers of the treaty intended that the reservations themselves should become the property of the United States, subject only to a trust for the occupancy of the Indians. This is placed beyond controversy when we observe that by the latter part of article 2 it was provided that the President of the United States might cause the reservations or portions thereof to be surveyed; assign a reasonable quantity, not exceeding 80 acres in any case, to each head of a family or single person over 21 years of age for his or their separate use; issue patents for the tracts so assigned, which tracts were to be exempt from taxation, levy, sale, or forfeiture, and not to be aliened or leased for a longer period than two years at one time, unless otherwise provided by the legislature of the State with the assent of Congress; not to be sold or aliened in fee for a period of five years after the date of patent, and not then without the assent of the President; and that prior to the issue of the patents the President might make rules and regulations respecting the disposition of the lands in case of the death of the allottee, etc.

The subdivision of the reservations, allotments to individual Indians, and the ultimate alienation of allotments, being thus in view at the making of the treaty, it is unreasonable to give such a construction to the stipulation contained in the second portion of article 7 as would defeat its object, by removing the restriction from scattered parcels of land whenever it should come to pass that the Indian title therein was extinguished. The restriction would be of little force unless it covered the entire ceded area en bloc, so that no change in the situation of the reservations by way of extinguishing the residue of Indian title or otherwise should operate to limit its effect. And so, upon the whole, we deem it manifest that the second clause of article 7 dealt with the entire ceded country, including the reservations, as country proper to be subjected to the laws relating to the introduction, etc., of liquor into the Indian country until otherwise provided by Congress. It was evidently contemplated that the bands of Indians, while making their permanent homes within the reservations, would be at liberty to roam and to hunt throughout the entire country as before. The purpose was to guard them from all temptation to use intoxicating liquors.

That it is within the constitutional power of Congress to prohibit the manufacture, introduction, or sale of intoxicants upon Indian lands, including not only lands reserved for their special occupancy, but also lands outside of the reservations to which they may naturally resort; and that this may be done even with respect to lands lying within the bounds of a State, are propositions so thoroughly established and upon grounds so recently discussed that we need merely cite the cases. Perrin *v.* United States (232 U. S., 478, 483); United States *v.* Forty-three Gallons of Whisky (93 U. S., 188, 195, 197); Dick *v.* United States (208 U. S., 340).

And we can not agree with the district court that article 7 of the treaty of 1855 was repealed by the Minnesota enabling act or by the admission of that State into the Union upon equal terms with the other States. Neither the enabling act nor the act of admission contains any reference to the treaty, although the latter was so recent that it can hardly have been overlooked. The court seems to have considered that the continued existence of article 7, so far as it prohibited the introduction, manufacture, and sale of liquors within the ceded country outside of the reservations, was inconsistent with the "equal-footing" clause of the enabling and admitting acts. That there is no such inconsistency results very plainly, as we think, from the reasoning and authority of the cases above cited. The court deemed that United States *v.* Forty-three Gallons of Whiskey, supra, and Dick *v.* United States, supra, were distinguishable upon the ground that in each of those cases the treaty under consideration was made after the State had been admitted into the Union. But if the making of such a treaty after the admission of the State is not inconsistent with the "equal footing" of that State with the others—as, of course, it is not—it seems to us to result that there is nothing in the effect of "equal-footing" clauses to operate as an implied repeal of such a treaty when previously established.

In Ex parte Webb (225 U. S., 663) we had to deal with the effect of the Oklahoma enabling act (June 16, 1906, c. 3335, 34 Stat., 267) upon a previous statute (act of Mar. 1, 1895, c. 145, sec. 8, 28 Stat., 693, 697), which prohibited, inter alia, the "carrying into said [Indian] Territory any of such liquors or drinks," in view of the fact that the enabling act itself required that the constitution of the new State should prohibit the manufacture, sale, or otherwise furnishing of intoxicating liquors within that part of the State formerly known as the Indian Territory; and we held that in view of the existing treaties between the United States and the Five Civilized Tribes and because the enabling act and the constitution established thereunder dealt only with the prohibition of the liquor traffic within the bounds of the new State, the act of 1895 remained in force so far as pertained to the carrying of liquor from without the new State into that part of it which was the Indian Territory.

In United States *v.* Wright (229 U. S., 226) we held that the prohibition against the introduction of intoxicating liquors into the Indian country found in section 2139, Revised Statutes, as amended by the acts of July 23, 1892 (c. 234, 27 Stat., 260), and January 30, 1897 (c. 109, 29 Stat., 506), was not repealed, with respect to intrastate transactions, by the Oklahoma enabling act, in spite of the provision respecting internal prohibition contained therein as already mentioned.

Upon the whole, we have no difficulty in concluding that article 7 of the treaty of February 22, 1855, was not repealed by the admission of Minnesota into the Union.

We come, therefore, to the principal contention of complainants and appellees, which is that the article was repealed by the effect of the treaties of 1865 and 1867. The argument in support of this contention may be outlined as follows: That by the earliest of the three treaties the several bands of Indians ceded to the United States the great tract of approximately 21,000 square miles, but excepted from that cession the several reservations created for the Mississippi bands and for the Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish bands; that when the treaty of 1865 was made the Mississippi bands were the owners of their reservations within the exterior limits of the cession of 1855, which reservations were not covered by the second portion of article 7, but were subject to all of the laws of the United States regulating commerce and intercourse with the Indian tribes, simply because of being Indian country in fact; that by the treaty of 1865 the Mississippi bands ceded outright to the United States these reservations, and in return the United States ceded to them the tract of territory already mentioned (including Bemidji and the country surrounding it), excepting those portions included within the reservations of the Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish bands; and that when, in 1867, in return for the White Earth Reservation, the Mississippi Chippewas re-ceded to the United States the greater portion of the tract set apart for them in 1865, they ceded the same title and the same right and power over the lands that the three original tribes would have had; that is to say, they ceded them free and clear of article 7 of the treaty of 1855.

It will at once be observed that the argument rests at bottom upon the erroneous construction to which we have already called attention, viz, that the second portion of article 7 did not apply to the reservations that were within the exterior limits of the ceded territory. We repeat that, in our opinion, the restriction applied to all the territory that was included within the terms of the cession; as much to those portions set apart for reservations as to the surrounding territory. There was nothing in the treaty of 1865, therefore, to make the receded reservations unrestricted territory, nor was there anything in the treaty of 1867 to remove the restriction from the territory then receded. Reading the series of treaties together, it is plain enough, we think, that the contracting parties in all that was done were resting upon the plain language of the second part of article 7, which declared that the laws relating to the introduction, etc., of liquor in the Indian country should continue in force within the entire boundaries of the country in question until otherwise provided by Congress.

Finally, it is contended that article 7 of the treaty of 1855 had been superseded at the time of the acts complained of in the bill (1910) by virtue of the provisions of the Nelson Act of January 14, 1889 (c. 24, 25 Stat., 642), and the cessions made to the United States by the Indians pursuant to that act, and by reason of the change in the character of the territory included in the treaty of 1855 and the status of the Indians therein.

As already pointed out, this act provided that commissioners to be appointed by the President should negotiate with the different bands of Chippewas in the State of Minnesota for the complete cession and relinquishment of their title and interest in all their reservations in the State, except so much of the White Earth and Red Lake Reservations as was not required for allotments, and that acceptance and approval of such cession and relinquishment by the President should be deemed full and ample proof of the cession and should operate as a complete extinguishment of the Indian title without other or further act or ceremony.

From the averments of the amended bill and answer it is not easy to gather a precise statement of the present situation of the Indian lands and of the Indians themselves, so far as it affects the question before us. Some reference is made to the situation at the Red Lake

Reservation, but since it is not clear that the restriction contained in the treaty of 1855 was intended for the protection of the Indians within that reservation we prefer to confine our attention to the situation as it existed in 1910 within the boundaries of the great tract that was the subject of the cession of 1855. Within those bounds there would seem to be remaining only fragments of the White Earth and Leech Lake Reservations; both reservations being in process of allotment under the acts of February 8, 1887 (24 Stat., 388; ch. 119), and of January 14, 1889 (25 Stat., 642; ch. 24), and amendatory acts.

Of the lands that have been allotted a considerable portion are still held in fee by the United States and are nonalienable by the allottees until the expiration of the trust period. Upon the White Earth Reservation, and also at Leech Lake, the Government maintains an Indian agency and superintendent as well as Indian schools. At the White Earth Agency 5,600 Indians are carried upon the annuity rolls; at Leech Lake, 1,750 Indians. The majority of these reside upon lands embraced within the original reservation, and they are the same Indians, or descendants of the same, that were parties to the treaties of 1855, 1865, and 1867. In consequence of their elevation to the plane of citizenship by the operation of the allotment acts, tribal relations have for most purposes ceased to exist, but are recognized for the purpose of the distribution of annuities under the Nelson Act. And it is admitted that for purposes of business, pleasure, hunting, travel, and other diversions these Indians traverse parts of the region comprised in the cession of 1855 outside of the reservations, and thus visit the towns, villages, and cities in the Territory, including Bemidji. On the other hand, it is admitted that their visits to Bemidji are infrequent, and that there are no Indian habitations within a range of 20 miles in any direction from that city. And, as pointed out in the prefatory statement, the diminished Red Lake Reservation is admittedly surrounded by a strip of land, approximately 15 miles in width, which never was subject to the treaty of 1855, and upon which saloons are maintained in close proximity to that reservation. This strip extends along the northerly boundary of the cession of 1855, which is perhaps 10 or 12 miles north of Bemidji.

The argument for treating the restriction of 1855 as no longer in force rests not upon any denial of the fact that there are some thousands of Indians at the White Earth and Leech Lake Agencies who are still more or less under the guardianship of the Government, and for whose protection the liquor restriction ought to be maintained, but rather upon the fact that these Indians are surrounded by territory in which liquor is lawfully obtainable. In support of this it is said that the former Mississippi reservations ceded to the United States in 1865 are unrestricted territory; that so much of the Leech Lake and Lake Winnibigoshish Reservations as were conveyed to the United States in 1890 are such territory; that every allotment from either of these reservations as to which the trust period has expired is such territory; and that lands sold to white men in the reservations is such territory. It will be observed, again, that each of these contentions rests upon the fundamental error that the reservations mentioned in the treaty of 1855 are not within the liquor restriction of article 7.

In view of the interpretation we have placed upon that article, it seems to us that the contention as to changed conditions must be based not upon the supposed fact that the tract covered by the cession of 1855 "is already dotted with wet territory," but rather upon the question whether the restriction—entered into more than half a century ago, when the country was a wilderness—ought to be treated as still in force, in view of the small number of Indians entitled to protection as compared with the large population of whites who now form the great majority of the inhabitants, and in view of the high state of civilization and development of the territory in question.

In Perrin *v.* United States (232 U. S., 478, 486) we had to deal with a somewhat similar question. That was a review of a conviction for unlawfully selling intoxicating liquors upon ceded lands formerly included in the Yankton Sioux Indian Reservation in the State of South Dakota. The reservation was created in 1858, and originally embraced 400,000 acres. A considerable part of it was allotted in severalty to members of the tribe under the act of 1887, the allotments being in small tracts scattered through the reservation. By an agreement ratified and confirmed by Congress August 15, 1894 (28 Stat., 286, 314, 318; ch. 290), the tribe ceded and relinquished to the United States all the unallotted lands, and by article 17 of the agreement it was stipulated:

"No intoxicating liquors nor other intoxicants shall ever be sold or given away upon any of the lands by this agreement ceded and sold to the United States, nor upon any other lands within or comprising the reservations of the Yankton Sioux or Dakota Indians as described in the treaty between the said Indians and the United States, dated April 19, 1858, and as afterwards surveyed and set off to the said Indians. The penalty for the violation of this provision shall be such as Congress may prescribe in the act ratifying this agreement." In the ratifying act a penalty was prescribed. The ceded lands were opened to disposition under the homestead and town-site laws and passed largely into private ownership, and the place at which the intoxicating liquors were sold was within the defendant's own premises in a town located upon a part of the ceded lands held in private ownership by the inhabitants, none of whom was an Indian. After overruling the contention that the restriction was invalid because the power to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors upon all ceded lands rested exclusively in the State (citing United States *v.* Forty-three Gallons of Whisky, 93 U. S., 188; and Dick *v.* United States, 208 U. S., 340), the opinion dealt with the further contention that the power of Congress was necessarily limited to what was reasonably essential to the protection of Indians occupying the unceded lands, and that this limitation was transcended by the provision in question because it embraced territory greatly in excess of what the situation required, and because its operation was not confined to a designated period reasonable in duration, but apparently was intended to be perpetual. As to this the court said (p. 486):

"As the power is incident only to the presence of the Indians and their status as wards of the Government, it must be conceded that it does not go beyond what is reasonably essential to their protection, and that, to be effective, its exercise must not be purely arbitrary but founded upon some reasonable basis. Thus a prohibition like that now before us, if covering an entire State when there were only a few Indian wards in a single county, undoubtedly would be condemned as arbitrary. And a prohibition valid in the beginning doubtless would become inoperative when in regular course the Indians affected were completely emancipated from Federal guardianship and control. A different view in either case would involve an unjustifiable encroachment upon a power obviously residing in the State. On the other hand, it must also be conceded that, in determining what is reasonably essential to the protection of the Indians, Congress is invested with a wide discretion, and its action, unless purely arbitrary, must be accepted and given full effect by the courts."

Although the circumstances of the present case are different, and we are here dealing with a question of obsolescence rather than of original invalidity, the language just quoted indicates the point of view from which the question should be approached. But we must not forget that the question is one, primarily, for the consideration of the law-making body; nor are we in danger of doing so, since by the very terms of the stipulation now under consideration the prohibition of the liquor traffic was to continue "until otherwise provided by Congress." We do not mean to say that if it appeared that no considerable number of Indians remained wards of the Government within the territory in question, the courts would not be justified in declaring that since the constitutional warrant for the restriction no longer existed the restriction must expire with it. But where the question confessedly turns not upon a total, nor even upon an approximately complete, emancipation of the Indians from the Federal guardianship, but upon their unimportance as compared with the interests of the population at large, we think the question is legislative rather than judicial.

Indeed, it has only recently been under consideration by Congress. On February 17, 1911 (S. Doc. No. 824, 61st Cong., 3d sess., vol 85), the President, in a special message called attention to the situation in Minnesota resulting from the operation of the old Indian treaties under present conditions; and with respect to the area ceded by the Chippewas in 1855, he stated: "The records of the Indian Bureau show that there are within said area, under the jurisdiction of the superintendents of the White Earth and Leech Lake Reservations, 7,196 Indians, who can be amply protected by limiting the territory as to which said treaty provisions shall remain in force and effect to the area within and contiguous to said reservations, particularly described as follows: * * * I therefore recommend that Congress modify the article of said treaty quoted above so as to exclude from the operations of its provisions all of the territory ceded by said treaty to the United States except that immediately above described."

That Congress has not yet acted upon this recommendation is evidence that the problem is not so entirely obvious of solution that it can be judicially declared to be beyond the range of legislative discretion.

Since it must be admitted that complainants have no ground of relief against defendants if the restriction remains in force at Bemidji, as we hold that it does, it follows that the degree of the district court should be reversed and the cause remanded with directions to dismiss the bill.

Decree reversed.

Mr. Justice McKenna and Mr. Justice Lurton dissent upon grounds expressed in the opinion of the district court, reported in 183 Federal Reporter, 611.

Message of President Taft:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

Half a century ago treaties were entered into with Indian tribes occupying a portion of the present State of Minnesota, in all of which were contained provisions prohibiting the introduction, manufacture, use, and traffic in intoxicants in the country which was the subject of the treaties. In the years which have elapsed since making these treaties conditions have largely changed, the Indian population has been reduced, large white settlements have been made, and great cities like St. Paul and Minneapolis have come to occupy a portion of what, at the date of the treaties, was denominated Indian country.

Notwithstanding these facts, this territory still remains subject to the regulations respecting the traffic in liquors originally imposed for the protection of the Indians. Such an anomalous condition of affairs should no longer continue, and the regulation of traffic in liquors in those areas now almost exclusively occupied by white people should be left to them. In those instances where the treaties authorize the President to repeal or modify the provisions, I have exercised that right. Some of the treaties, however, provide that the provisions referred to shall continue and be in force until otherwise provided by Congress.

By the treaty of February 27, 1855 (10 Stat., 1172), with the Winnebago Tribe of Indians that tribe ceded to the United States a tract of land granted to them by the treaty made October 13, 1846, within the Territory—now the State—of Minnesota, lying north of St. Peters River and west of the Mississippi River, estimated to contain about 897,900 acres, and in part consideration of the cession the United States agreed to grant to the said Indians as their permanent home a certain tract to be selected as therein provided. The treaty contained the following provision:

"ART. 8. The laws which have been or may be enacted by Congress regulating trade and intercourse with the Indian tribes shall continue and be in force within the country herein provided to be selected as the future permanent home of the Winnebago Indians; and those portions of said laws which prohibit the introduction, manufacture, use of, and traffic in ardent spirits in the Indian country shall continue and be in force within the country herein ceded to the United States until otherwise provided by Congress."

As there are but few, if any, Indians residing within said area, and the Indian Office reports that there is no occasion for the continuance in force and effect of the treaty provision above referred to, I recommend that legislation be enacted declaring the treaty provision above quoted to be of no further force or effect.

By the treaty of September 30, 1854 (10 Stat., 1109), made with the Chippewa Indians of Lake Superior and the Mississippi, ceding to the United States a large area comprising the extreme northeastern portion of the State of Minnesota, it was provided:

"ART. 7. No spirituous liquors shall be made, sold, or used on any of the lands herein set apart for the residence of the Indians, and the sale of the same shall be prohibited in the territory hereby ceded until otherwise ordered by the President."

No legislation has ever been enacted pursuant to this stipulation, and for this reason the same has remained entirely ineffective.

According to the latest Indian census reports, there are within the area ceded by this treaty about 1,253 Indians, most of whom are located within the portion of said territory hereinafter described, whose welfare requires effective laws restricting traffic in liquor in their neighborhood.

I therefore recommend that appropriate legislation be enacted, extending the laws of the United States prohibiting the introduction and sale of spirituous liquors in the Indian country throughout that portion of the territory ceded by said treaty, particularly described as follows:

"Begining at a point where the line between townships 45 and 46 north intersects the line between ranges 15 and 16 west of the fourth

principal meridian; thence north along said line to the northeast corner of township 53 north, range 16 west; thence west along the line between townships 53 and 54 north to the point where it intersects the western boundary established by said treaty of September 30, 1854; thence following the said treaty line in a southwesterly direction to the point where it intersects the line between townships 45 and 46 north; thence due east along said line to the point of beginning, and all that portion of the State of Minnesota which lies east of the fourth principal meridian."

By the treaty of February 22, 1855 (18 Stat., 1165), with the Mississippi bands of Chippewa Indians, an area extending almost entirely across the northern part of the State of Minnesota and from its northerly boundary practically to its center was ceded to the United States, the provision thereof concerning intoxicating liquor being as follows:

"ART. 7. The laws which have been or may be enacted by Congress, regulating trade and intercourse with the Indian tribes, to continue and be in force within and upon the several reservations provided for herein; and those portions of said laws which prohibit the introduction, manufacture, use of, and traffic in ardent spirits, wines, or other liquors in the Indian country shall continue and be in force within the entire boundaries of the country herein ceded to the United States until otherwise provided by Congress."

The records of the Indian Bureau show that there are within said area, under the jurisdiction of the superintendents of the White Earth and Leech Lake Reservations, 7,196 Indians, who can be amply protected by limiting the territory as to which said treaty provisions shall remain in force and effect to the area within and contiguous to said reservations, particularly described as follows:

"Beginning at the mouth of the Wild Rice River; thence in a northeasterly direction along the line established by said treaty of February 22, 1855, to the point where it intersects the line between townships 32 and 33 west of the fifth principal meridian; thence south along said line to the northeast corner of township 146 north, range 33 west of the fifth principal meridian; thence east along said line to the northeast corner of township 146 north, range 25 west of the fifth principal meridian; thence north along the third guide meridian to the northwest corner or fractional township 58 north, range 27 west of the fourth principal meridian; thence east to the northeast corner of said township; thence south along the line between ranges 26 and 27 west of the fourth principal meridian to the southeast corner of township 53 north, range 27 west of the fourth principal meridian; thence west to the southwest corner of said township; thence south along the third guide meridian to the point where it crosses the Mississippi River; thence down the said river to the mouth of Crow Wing River; thence in a westerly direction, following the southern boundary of said treaty to the point where it intersects the line between townships 35 and 36 west of the fifth principal meridian; thence north along said line to the northeast corner of township 136 north, range 36 west; thence west along the line between townships 136 and 137 north to the point where it intersects the boundary line established by said treaty; thence along said boundary to the point of beginning."

I therefore recommend that Congress modify the article of said treaty quoted above so as to exclude from the operations of its provisions all of the territory ceded by said treaty to the United States, except that immediately above described.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 17, 1911.*

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the paragraph. I move to strike out the figures "$150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$200,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 23, strike out the figures "$150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$200,000."

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I do this because, as I understand it, that is the estimate submitted by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to inquire if the debate is not closed on the paragraph?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, there can be no debate. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] may each have five minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. And that thereafter the debate be closed on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] each have five minutes on this amendment. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. May we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 25, strike out "$150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$200,000."

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer this in the utmost hope that it will be adopted by the committee. By a recent vote you have decided that the provision of the law as it stands shall be carried out, and by adopting this amendment you will provide that the provision shall be carried out effectively. I know of my own knowledge that the amount asked for by the commissioner, namely, $200,000, is not too much, and I doubt if it is sufficient to pay the expenses of enforcing what the court has decided is the law in the territory in Minnesota affected. It is an empire in extent. Do not think for a minute that it is with the active cooperation of all the white people in the district. Many of them are assisting, many others of them are opposing, and so when I say it will not be enforced with the cooperation of the whites I mean not with the cooperation of all whites, a part favoring one way and a part favoring the other—the liquor question again. There is only one way to do it effectively, and that is to keep liquor out of the territory. There must be an agent watching every train. There must be agents in practically every community. This means not 10 agents, not 20 agents, but probably 50 or 100 employed in this specific work. Now, give the Indian Office money enough to handle it and handle it effectively, because unless it is effectively handled prohibition will not be enforced throughout the territory and liquor may get to some Indians, there being some Indians in some parts of the territory. If there is looseness in the enforcement of the law, and there will be unless Federal enforcement be complete, as the white communities can not be expected to enforce this or any other liquor law under the circumstances, there will be liquor going in there. It is to be noted that the claim by the Federal authorities that the Federal and not the State laws apply results in there being no enforcement of the State laws controlling the liquor traffic and the burden falls in its entirety upon the Federal authorities. So I say give the Commissioner of Indian Affairs ample funds to protect the Indian where he may be and also ample funds to enforce prohibition among the whites in the purely white territory.

There is one further reason why I ask that the appropriation be increased. There are some places in the State, quite a number of places in the State, not within the territory affected by the treaty of fifty-five, where liquor at this hour is being sold to Indians. I have repeatedly complained to the Indian Office of certain places where a large number of Indians are located and where they are getting liquor every day and night and living in debauchery, and up to the present hour they have been paralytic in the degree of protection they have extended to those Indians.

Now, let us give them some money, so that they can never urge as a reason for their inactivity the fact that they do not have funds sufficient to do the work. There are some places in the State, where Indians are getting liquor, not protected or controlled by the treaty provisions. Give the Indian Office plenty of money to enforce the provision within the treaty territory and outside, too, and let us make it as tight as a drum from one end to the other. As gentlemen who are members of the Committee on Indian Affairs well know, Minnesota is not the only spot on the map. There are some other places in the United States where the Indians need protection, and I think the sum of $200,000 is not too great to cover the items I have mentioned, because you are now to protect the Indians and also to enforce prohibition in a large area purely white, and contrary to the laws the white people themselves have enacted for their government.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to repeat what I said a few moments ago, to the effect that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs thought this amount was ample and sufficient for the protection of the Indians against the liquor traffic, and I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] to the fact that not $200,000 but only $150,000 was estimated for, and that only $150,000 was asked for by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If the gentleman will permit, I may have been misinformed. The gentleman knows.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I have the estimate here. The estimate sets out $150,000, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs assured us that would be amply sufficient. With $100,000 last year they had 96 persons engaged in the suppression of the liquor traffic over the different States. As I have already stated, we have $200,000 for Indian police, making $350,000 which is used for the suppression of the liquor traffic, and we have $30,000 for inspectors. In addition, I repeat, as the gentleman from Minnesota well knows, every Indian superintendent and every employee of the bureau is fully authorized

to exert himself and to use his services in the suppression of the liquor traffic.

I am in full smypathy with the suppression of the liquor traffic among the Indians. It has been the Indian's worst enemy. It is the Indian's curse. I suppose they are more addicted to drinking liquor than any other class of people on the face of the earth. When I say that I mean drinking liquor intemperately. They ought to be closely supervised. Their territory should be closely supervised with reference to the sale of liquor among them. But that is no reason why we should undertake, through the Indian bill, to suppress the liquor traffic in a country where there are not Indians.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Assuming that it would require at least $100,000, as I think it will, to protect the territory entirely from liquor—the territory occupied by whites purely and alone in Minnesota—does not the gentleman think that at least $100,000 ought to be appropriated?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman from Minnesota knows that I do not think that should be done. If there are Indians in Minnesota they should be protected against the liquor traffic, I have no hesitation in my mind at all about that, and if there are Indians in Oklahoma they ought to be protected against the liquor traffic.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MANN. If we have a treaty under which it is the duty of the United States to forbid the introduction of liquor into that territory up there, does not the gentleman think we ought to obey that and forbid the introduction?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. If we had a treaty with Indians?

Mr. MANN. We have a treaty, so they say.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I think we ought to do it if there are Indians there needing protection.

Mr. MANN. If there is an Indian treaty, does not the gentleman think we are obligated by that treaty—whether there are Indians or not—to enforce it? The treaty is still in force, is it not?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The treaty is still in force, but it was made for the suppression of the liquor traffic among the Indians.

Mr. MANN. The treaty is still in force, they say. Congress has the right to repeal it, and will not. Congress is free to repeal it, but refuses to do that. Under those circumstances, does not the gentleman think it is our duty to enforce the provisions of the treaty?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The executive department also has that right. That is not left alone to Congress. The executive department has repealed this same treaty with regard to certain sections of Minnesota.

Mr. MANN. Repealed another treaty; not this same treaty.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Perhaps the gentleman is correct about that.

Mr. MANN. This has to be acted upon by Congress, and as we refuse to repeal it and as it is still the law of the land, is it not our duty to enforce it?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Well, the gentleman asks a hypothetical question I think.

Mr. MANN. No. It is a practical question. It is right here before us.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The treaty is not before us for repeal.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. Can the gentleman give the House any idea as to whether the increased appropriation that has been granted has been accompanied by a decrease of drunkenness among the Indians?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. No; I regret I can not give any information on that line.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Let us have a division, Mr. Chairman. Let us see who are in favor of temperance. The Democrats are all opposed to it, as usual.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 25, noes 29.

Mr. MANN. I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. MILLER and Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 32, noes 42.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the relief and care of destitute Indians not otherwise provided for, and for the prevention and treatment of tuberculosis, trachoma, smallpox, and other contagious and infectious diseases, including transportation of patients to and from hospitals and sanatoria, $350,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $90,000 of said amount may be expended in the construction and equipment of new hospitals at a unit cost of not exceeding $15,000: *Provided further*, That this appropriation may be used also for general medical and surgical treatment of Indians, including the maintenance and operation of general hospitals, where no other funds are applicable or available for that purpose: *Provided further*, That hereafter physicians regularly employed in the Indian Service may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, be allowed in addition to annual leave educational leave not to exceed 15 days per calendar year, such leave to be cumulative for two years, for postgraduate work: *And provided further*, That out of the appropriation of $350,000 herein authorized, there shall be available for the maintenance of the sanatoria and hospitals hereinafter named, and for incidental and all other expenses for their proper conduct and management, including pay of employees, repairs, equipment, and improvements, not to exceed the following amounts: Blackfeet hospital, Montana, $10,000; Carson hospital, Nevada, $10,000; Cheyenne and Arapaho hospital, Oklahoma, $10,000; Choctaw and Chickasaw hospital, Oklahoma, $20,000; Fort Lapwai sanatorium, Idaho, $40,000; Laguna sanatorium, New Mexico, $17,000; Mescalero hospital, New Mexico, $10,000; Navajo sanatorium, New Mexico, $10,000; Pima hospital, Arizona, $10,000; Phoenix sanatorium, Arizona, $40,000; Spokane hospital, Washington, $10,000; Sac and Fox sanatorium, Iowa, $25,000; Turtle Mountain hospital, North Dakota, $10,000; Winnebago hospital, Nebraska, $15,000; Crow Creek hospital, South Dakota, $8,000; Hoopa Valley hospital, California, $8,000; Jicarilla hospital, New Mexico, $8,000; Truxton Canyon camp hospital, Arizona, $8,000; Indian Oasis hospital, Arizona, $8,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I should like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma in charge of the bill first with reference to these new hospitals at a unit cost of $15,000. Here is a provision for $90,000, which may be expended for hospitals at a unit cost not exceeding $15,000. As we have that unit cost in existing law, does the Indian Office, which habitually disregards the act of Congress, pay any attention to this provision of the law?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman doubtless recalls that we had a similar limitation in the last act passed, and several hospitals were erected under its provisions. Perhaps I anticipate other queries of the gentleman when I say that a request was made for an additional allowance of $2,000 each for several of these hospitals already authorized, which request, as the bill disclosed, received adverse action by the committee. It has done that much good anyway, and will certainly do no harm if it remains in the bill.

Mr. MANN. I do not think that limitation will do any damage, but will it do any good? Do the Indian Office pay any attention to it? Or is it their habit to go ahead and provide for a hospital which they know will cost more than $15,000, notwithstanding the provision of the law, with the intention of then coming before the House, or, more likely, before the distinguished body at the other end of the Capitol, where all things slip through easily, and get an increase in the authorization of cost.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. It would not surprise me at all to see another legislative body authorize a deficiency appropriation of $2,000 additional for these hospitals that have already been built; but if this House will stand by the committee, I think we will try to prevent any appropriation exceeding the authorization already made.

Mr. MANN. Of course we all know perfectly well that the conferees of the House will yield and will authorize the additional amount, because the Indian Office, using an expression which I wish I could use in the House but can not, because it would not be parliamentary, will say, "We pay no attention to the law or the House; we are going to build a hospital at such cost as we please, and, having started it and spent $15,000 on it, if it is not finished, you must give us the money to finish it," and you will do it.

Now, I should like to ask about another matter. Why do you put in here a provision that all of these funds may be used for the maintenance and operation of general hospitals where no other funds are applicable or available for that purpose? Does not the committee know, or does not the Indian Office know, whether there are any funds available? Can you not tell at the beginning of the fiscal year whether funds are available for the maintenance of other hospitals, and if so, specify what this money may be appropriated for? That is the loosest language I have seen in an appropriation bill for many years.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. In what line is that language found?

Mr. MANN. On page 4, in lines 11 and 12, at the bottom of the second proviso.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. That likely comes about on account of a change made in the arrangement of the language of the bill. The original draft of the bill submitted to the committee carried $300,000 for "relief and distress, and so forth," authorizing the expenditure of $90,000 for constructing hospitals. Four other hospitals were provided specifically in other parts of the bill. Our committee thought it would be better to bring all these items, specific and general, together under one head so that we might find the sum total at a glance. In doing this we perhaps neglected to strike out this language "where no other funds are applicable or available."

Mr. MANN. I can give the gentleman the reason why that item was inserted. They go ahead and ask for the maintenance of hospitals at certain places. We give it. That is inserted here. Then they want to have some money that nobody knows anything about to spend for general medical and surgical treatment of Indians, as they call it, to pay somebody some money. They want to hide it. They are afraid to come out in the open and say what they want, and so they sneak in a provision which will probably stay in the bill, giving them authority to use this money, if they do not use it on these specific hospitals. The committee knows nothing about it. Probably nobody in the Indian Office knows about it except the man who prepared it. The head of the Indian Office, I suppose, can not use it to advertise himself, but he will find some way to use it.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I think that language was left in by mistake of the committee. If the gentleman will indulge me just a moment, I will explain to him again what was done with this item. I do not think he quite caught what I said.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks that his time be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. When we came to this one item we found a recommendation of $300,000 for relieving distress, and so forth, including the building of hospitals. Then we found other items, for four different hospitals, aggregating $100,000. The four different hospitals were brought under this paragraph in order that the House might know exactly, as nearly as possible, what is being done.

Mr. MURRAY. The items were scattered through the bill.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The items were scattered through the bill, and I think this language that the gentleman mentions was left in the bill by an error of the committee. So far as I am individually concerned, I have no objection to the language going out. For the information of the House I will place in the RECORD some data from the Indian Bureau:

HOSPITALS ERECTED OR UNDER CONSTRUCTION DURING FISCAL YEARS 1914 AND 1915.

HOSPITALS FROM "RELIEVING DISTRESS AND PREVENTION, ETC., OF DISEASE AMONG INDIANS, 1915."

Blackfeet, Mont., 6 miles from agency, frame, completed; approximate cost, $14,466.66⅔. (One of six hospitals under contract with W. D. Lovell.)

Carson, Nev., 1,500 feet from school, frame, completed; approximate cost, $14,466.66⅔. (One of six hospitals under contract with W. D. Lovell.)

Cheyenne and Arapaho, Okla., at agency; approximate cost, $14,466.66⅔. (Under contract, but not under construction.) Frame.

Mescalero, N. Mex., at agency, frame, completed; approximate cost, $14,466.66⅔.

Pima, Ariz., at agency, frame, completed; approximate cost, $14,466.66⅔.

Turtle Mountain, N. Dak., at agency, frame, completed; approximate cost, $14,466.66⅔.

Navajo, Ariz., at agency, frame, completed; approximate cost.

HOSPITALS FROM "RELIEVING DISTRESS AND PREVENTION, ETC., OF DISEASE AMONG INDIANS, 1914."

Albuquerque Pueblo, Laguna, N. Mex., frame, completed; approximate cost, $12,990.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION CONTEMPLATED, FISCAL YEAR 1916, OUT OF "RELIEVING DISTRESS AND PREVENTION, ETC., OF DISEASE AMONG INDIANS."

Hoopa Valley, Cal.
Jicarilla, N. Mex.
Indian Oasis, Ariz.
Colorado River, Ariz.
Crow Creek, S. Dak.

HOSPITALS FROM "INDIAN SCHOOL AND AGENCY BUILDINGS."

Fort Peck, Mont., at school, brick, completed; approximate cost, $9,864.

Moqui, Ariz., at school, stone, completed; approximate cost, $15,000. (Open-market construction.)

Navajo, Ariz., at Tohatchi school, completed, frame; approximate cost $5,431.18. (Open-market construction.)

San Juan, N. Mex., at agency, frame, uncompleted; approximate cost, $9,543.67. (Open-market construction.)

Spokane, Wash., at old Fort Spokane (remodeling), frame; approximate cost, $5,367. Completed.

Winnebago, Nebr., at agency, brick (remodeling); approximate cost, $8,692. (Open-market construction.) Completed.

HOSPITALS FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS.

Canton Asylum, South Dakota, at asylum, brick, completed; approximate cost, $31,149; from "Support Canton Asylum."

Cherokee, N. C., at school, frame, uncompleted; approximate cost, $3,030; from "Indian school, Cherokee, N. C., repairs and improvements, 1915." (Open-market construction.)

Fort Totten, N. Dak., at school, frame, completed; approximate cost, $3,500; from "Indian school, Fort Totten, N. Dak., buildings." (Open-market construction.)

Genoa, Nebr., at school (addition), completed; approximate cost, $3,957; from "Indian school, Genoa, Nebr., repairs and improvements, 1915." (Open-market construction.)

Wahpeton, N. Dak., at school, brick, completed; approximate cost, $17,960; from "Indian school, Wahpeton, N. Dak., buildings."

HOSPITALS FROM TRIBAL FUNDS.

Cheyenne River, S. Dak., at agency, brick, completed; approximate cost, $34,700.

Choctaw Sanatorium, Oklahoma, 4 miles from Talihina, Okla., frame, uncompleted; approximate cost, $48,954.

Fond du Lac, Minn., 1¼ miles from agency, frame, uncompleted; approximate cost, $24,537.75.

Kiowa, Okla., one-third mile from agency, brick; approximate cost, $37,280. Completed.

Leech Lake, Minn., at agency (remodeling), frame; approximate cost, $3,500. Uncompleted. (Open-market construction.)

Pine Ridge, S. Dak., at school, brick, completed; approximate cost, $8,000.

Red Lake, Minn., at agency, frame, completed; approximate cost, $20,105.

Rosebud, S. Dak., one-half mile from agency, brick; approximate cost, $33,200.

Standing Rock, N. Dak., one-half mile from agency boarding school, frame; approximate cost, $26,000. Completed.

HEALTH ITEMS INCLUDED IN INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1917.

"Relieving distress and prevention, etc., of disease among Indians"	$300,000
Support Canton Asylum	45,000
Choctaw and Chickasaw Hospital	20,000
Support of Fort Lapwai	40,000
Support of Sac and Fox	25,000
Support of Winnebago	15,000
	445,000

This does not include support of Red Lake and Fond du Lac hospitals, which, I understand, are to be supported from Chippewa in Minnesota funds; or if not from tribal funds, from "Relieving distress."

Mr. MANN. Then I ask in reference to this further proviso, proposing to give leave to the physicians in addition to their annual leave. How much annual leave do they now get—30 days?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I think it is 30 days. The gentleman knows more about that than I do, I think.

Mr. MANN. Government employees here in the District get 30 days' annual leave and then 30 days extra for sick leave, but that does not apply to employees outside. We generally give them 15 or 30 days. What is the specific special reason for giving these physicians extra time at Government expense?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. My recollection is that the commissioner explained that that was necessary in order for them to attend medical lectures.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt that many of them need to attend medical lectures in order to learn something about the science of medicine. I have not found any lack of facilities for these people to go off at the Government expense. Under this provision one of these physicians in Oklahoma or Arizona will be ordered under his leave to go to New York City, traveling expenses paid by the Government, salary paid by the Government, to learn something which may be very valuable. I fear that this is such a marked departure that it will lead to leave being granted to everyone in the Government service, because there is no place in the Government service where men are so wise that they can not learn something by studying somewhere else.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. If I thought that this would lead to the general practice of extending leave in this way, I would oppose it. This was a special case of physicians who wanted to attend postgraduate lectures once per annum, and we thought it might be advantageous so to do. I want to say that if there are any of these physicians in Oklahoma, it is more than I know. I am sure there are none of them with the Choctaws and Chickasaws.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I am not charging the gentleman with any personal interest; I know that he does what he thinks is right. I am satisfied of that. But if you extend the privileges to one class and do not extend them to another class, it is difficult to differentiate. For instance, we wanted to make some recognition of Gen. Goethals and Gen. Gorgas in reference to the Panama Canal. When it was proposed to do that we met with opposition from the War Department unless we included the other officers of the Army and Navy who were appointed in connection with the Panama Canal. That legislation finally went through, embracing a large class of Army and naval officers, and now we are asked, because we tried to give recognition to Gen. Goethals and Gen. Gorgas, and did give them recognition,

with all the Army and Navy officers—we are asked to give special recognition to 30,000 civilians connected with the Panama Canal. When we do that we will be asked to extend it to all other civilians in the Government service. Of course we can draw the line, but we seldom do after it is once started. Mr. Chairman, I will make a point of order on that provision.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Perhaps the gentleman has read what the Commissioner of Indian Affairs said about it.

Mr. MANN. Yes; I do not take the commissioner too seriously. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, against the provision, line 12, page 4, down to the proviso commencing in line 17, page 4.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The point of order will have to be conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order on the provision in the proviso beginning in line 12 and ending in line 17. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to the remainder of the paragraph. I see last year there was carried an appropriation of $300,000. There was expended last year $228,706. There was an unexpended balance of $71,233. I understood the gentleman from Oklahoma to say that there was $100,000—new items—transferred from another part of the bill to this paragraph.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. No; the estimates, to begin with, were $400,000. There was eliminated from it $50,000 and the items which appeared later in the bill brought under this paragraph.

Mr. HARRISON. As a matter of fact, there is an increase of $50,000 over the appropriation of last year.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. No; last year about the same number of hospitals were provided for at about the same price. Year before last there were $50,000 appropriated for one hospital.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand that last year there was appropriated $300,000. This year you appropriate $350,000.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman is speaking of a joint resolution passed last year, and not the appropiration bill.

Mr. HARRISON. I mean the appropriation bill two years ago.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Two years ago we had appropriated $150,000 and then $100,000 for a specific hospital, which run the item up to more than it is this year.

Mr. HARRISON. Has the department been permitted heretofore to erect hospitals without being designated in the bill where they were to be located and the amount each would cost?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. In some cases yes, in others no.

Mr. HARRISON. At the places named on pages 4 and 5, where hospitals are to be erected——

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Those are merely for maintenance.

Mr. HARRISON. The provision that "not exceeding $90,000 of said amount may be expended in the construction and equipment of new hospitals at a unit cost not exceeding $15,000" is the only provision in here that would give them a right to construct new hospitals altogether?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. We may have one or two provided for from tribal funds. No; I am just informed that these were stricken out.

Mr. HARRISON. The committee appropriates in that item $15,000 to be expended in the erection of five hospitals, and yet at the bottom of the page in some places $40,000 are allowed for maintenance.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. That is perfectly true, perfectly proper and necessary. Some of these hospitals originally cost more than others and are larger than others, while it might be possible for some to use more for maintenance than construction, and vice versa.

Mr. HARRISON. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] read this morning to the House respecting the expenditure of money appropriated for the foot-and-mouth disease for so many unauthorized things, may I ask the gentleman how much of this appropriation last year of $300,000 was expended for the relief and care of destitute Indians?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I think that is shown in the hearings, though I am not able to turn to it at once.

Mr. HARRISON. I think that it is very important in this connection that we should know how much was expended for the relief and care of destitute Indians, as well as for the suppression and treatment of tuberculosis, trachoma, and smallpox. When we appropriate $350,000 and give authority to the commissioner to expend it in any way he sees fit, we are liable to have more such cases as that reported by the gentleman from Illinois this morning.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The committee went over the justifications carefully, but it has been some time since then, and, as this committee knows, this bill was reported and taken up by the House before the Committee on Indian Affairs thought it would be brought in. Some of us perhaps have not had time to mark out the provisions about which questions might be asked. I think the gentleman will find that fully set out in the hearings, beginning on page 41.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for three minutes, in order to get this information.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I looked through these hearings, and I would say to the gentleman that I found no statement in there from Mr. Meritt or otherwise that showed how much money was expended under these different headings.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I think the gentleman will find it there if he looks carefully. I remember Mr. Meritt did make the statement about it, and I am sure that it was taken down.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Those things run throughout the bill quite a good deal.

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that I presented a statement for the RECORD yesterday, giving in detail an account of the expenditures of the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915. When that statement is printed in the RECORD, as it will be to-morrow, it will give the gentleman the information that he now asks. The reason the statement and my remarks were not printed in the RECORD to-day is that the Printing Office was unable to have set up last night in time for to-day's RECORD the tables of figures and other data contained in the statement.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the gentleman if the committee, of which he is a very valuable member, had any statement before it as to just how much was expended of this total appropriation of $300,000 last year for the relief and care of destitute Indians, and then how much was expended for the prevention and treatment of tuberculosis, trachoma, smallpox, and other contagious and infectious diseases?

Mr. NORTON. I will say to the gentleman that the committee had no such statements before it and no such statements were made to the committee by the Indian Bureau.

Mr. HARRISON. How could we get that information, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. NORTON. That information could be obtained, I presume, by application to the Indian Bureau. I judge that it would take some little time for the Indian Bureau to present that to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRISON. Does not the gentleman think, in view of the statement this morning of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr MANN], that it would be well to have a report from them upon that proposition?

Mr. NORTON. I quite agree with the gentleman from Mississippi, and the RECORD of to-morrow I think will show that somewhat in detail. I believe that from the RECORD to-morrow the gentleman will be able to secure, in part, at least, the information he desires.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the chairman of the committee a question in this connection? I notice there is appropriated $20,000 for a Choctaw and Chickasaw hospital in Oklahoma. May I inquire if this money is to come out of the funds of the tribe or out of the Government of the United States?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is a gratuity.

Mr. HARRISON. Does not the gentleman think that a tribe as rich as the Choctaw ought to pay for their own hospitals?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think not. While they have some money, yet a great many of them are aged, and decrepit, and blind, and not in a condition to yield up funds necessary, and those are the Indians that will have to go to the hospitals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. HARRISON. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support of Indian day and industrial schools not otherwise provided for, for other educational and industrial purposes in connection therewith, and for tuition of Indian children in public schools, $1,550,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $40,000 of this amount may be used for the support and education of deaf and dumb and blind Indian children; *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation, or any other appropriation provided for herein except appropriations made pursuant to treaties, shall be used to educate children of less than one-fourth Indian blood whose parents are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they live and where there are adequate free school facilities provided and the facilities of the Indian schools are needed for pupils of more than one-fourth Indian blood: *And provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the support of Indian day and industrial schools where specific appropriation is made.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to that paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What is the point of order?

Mr. MANN. The point of order is that it makes an appropriation not authorized by law. I see this paragraph carries an item for tuition of Indian children in public schools, amount not named, included in the item of $1,550,000, which, I believe, is an increase of $110,000 over what the paragraph carried last year. Also, on page 39, there is carried a specific appropriation of $275,000 to aid the common schools in Oklahoma, and on page 41 there is another item carried for aid in the schools. Can the gentleman tell us how much it is expected under this bill, if passed in this shape, there would be expended for the aid of Indians in the common or public schools—not the Indian schools?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman means in the public schools?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Oklahoma, who has been very much interested in this subject for years, I should think would be able to know how much he expects to extract from the Treasury at this specific time without much thought.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Well, last year there was spent from this appropriation $7,526.69.

Mr. MANN. There is no such item as this in last year's bills.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Well, two years ago.

Mr. MANN. They had no such authority.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Speaking of last year, I mean during the year ended June 30, 1915.

Mr. MANN. Well, there was no such authority then.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Containing this item?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I think so. I notice in the justification that the commissioner sets out for such expense, tuition of pupils in public schools, $7,526.69.

Mr. MANN. And you increase the amount of appropriation over the bill of last year $110,000?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes; I think so.

Mr. MANN. And then propose to provide $275,000 in addition to the common schools, which theoretically may be said to be in part for the payment of——

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. It is provided for, I am just informed, in the old law. This provision under the old law was the same as it is now.

Mr. MANN. Why was it left out of the bill last year?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Well, last year we passed a joint resolution continuing the appropriation.

Mr. MANN. I am speaking of the bill as it passed the House. We passed the Indian bill last year in the House, and it passed the Senate.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. It was stricken out on a point of order, if I remember correctly.

Mr. MANN. This is a very good example. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language, page 5, lines 16 and 17, "and for tuition of Indian children in public schools."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, in this connection I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that there are a great many school districts, particularly in the Northwest, where the Indians live on untaxed land. Their children go to the public schools. The people who support these public schools have their land taxed and the tax is increased because of the Indian children whose parents pay no tax whatever but who go to these schools. That is particularly true of the Northwest, and I speak of the Northwest because I am familiar with that part of the country. It is thought wise that the education of these Indian children should be paid for, at least in part, by the Government, since the lands upon which their parents live are not taxed, and that demand has been made upon the Indian Department very often. That is the purpose for which the increased appropriation was asked in this bill. It seems only justice that those Indian children who are being sent to white schools and the lands of whose parents are not being taxed, that from the Indian Department, or from some department of the Government, somewhere, should come the money to help support those schools. That is the cause of this appropriation being put in here with the language to which the gentleman objects.

Mr. MANN. There is a good deal in what the gentleman says. Most people who send their children to school do not pay any taxes in the way of a school tax. I pay a large amount of school tax every year and I have no children to send to the schools; I pay it very willingly, but the moment we start in, after giving land to people who go and settle upon it and they get the benefit of that land, to pay tuition for all the Indian children who may go to those schools we have entered upon a large contract. We have already got a considerable contract to feed, clothe, and house the Indians, buy farms for them if they do not happen to have them, as we do in a number of cases. Now, if we start in to say that in addition to maintaining a very large number of very expensive Indian schools we are going, besides that, to maintain the white schools for all the people in those localities, we have got quite a job on our hands.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. It is not my time; my time has not expired.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, my attention has been just called to the bill which passed the House last year, and on page 6, beginning line 4 to line 6, this same item is contained, and it is not in italics, so I take it it was carried in the former bill.

Mr. MANN. Page 6? Where in the bill as it passed the House last year?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Page 6 of the bill as it passed the Senate.

Mr. MANN. Oh; I have this item in the bill as it passed the House last year, but it is not in the bill——

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. This is the bill as it passed the Senate. As the gentleman knows, Senate amendments are always printed in italics.

Mr. MANN. And numbered.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. And I find this provision here is not numbered and is not printed in italics.

Mr. MANN. It is not in this item. I do not think that is very important. That was a provision for the appropriation of $50,000; this item carries an appropriation for $1,550,000.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. In the House it carried $1,440,000 with this proviso.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. And carried in that paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Not more than $50,000.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted for a moment to speak in regard to what the gentleman from Illinois was saying about supporting the white schools, I would remind the gentleman that the children who are taken care of in these white schools are children who live away from the reservation and who must either be transported several miles in many cases to Indian schools or Indian schools must be built in their own neighborhood. Now, it seems to be wise to send these children to the white schools, and, as their parents live on allotments in a country that has been opened to settlement and whose allotments are not taxed, the community is compelled to bear the burden not only of educating its own children but the children of Indian parents who own land not taxed. The contracts of the Indian Department that have been made in those communities provide for pay at 15 cents per day for these Indian children in white schools, which is far less than the actual expense to the community of those schools. And if this point of order is to be sustained against the bill—that is, the point of order which would make it impossible to pay tuition—then I think an amendment ought to be introduced somewhere to carry out the contracts already made by the Indian Department in paying the bills for the coming year.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] makes the point of order against the language.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman, I think, will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is willing, as I understand, to strike this out and insert an amendment which will be a limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] make the point of order?

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 5, by inserting in line 17, after "$1,550,000," the following: "*Provided further*"——

Mr. MANN. Better insert it after the word "children," in line 20.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes. That is better, I think. After the word "children," in line 20.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, after the word "children," in line 20, the following:
"*Provided further*, That not not more than $100,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be expended for the tuition of Indian children enrolled in the public schools."

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think that the amount is a little large?

Mr. HARRISON. Very large. There was only $50,000 granted last year.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. There was $50,000 granted last year, but every year they are trying to get these children as fast as they become capable to go into white schools, as that is the best place to educate them.

Mr. MANN. I agree with that.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. And as they become more civilized, more come into the white schools, and it takes more money to educate them in the white man's school. How much do you want to make it?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will $75,000 be satisfactory?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] suggests he thinks we might compromise on $75,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] makes the point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. I reserve the point of order.

I want to say in this connection that in the hearings before the committee Mr. Meritt stated he hoped there would not be a limitation placed upon this expenditure. He said:

Yes, sir; and under the appropriation of $1,550,000 we can care for the education of those Indians in public schools, and we would suggest that there be no limitation on the amount to be used, because we are gradually working the children into the public schools, and it is possible we may need more than $20,000; and we will also take care of the education of the Papago Indians out of this appropriation.

So it was suggested by some of the committee that $20,000 would probably be enough, and objection was raised to that amount. Now, in the appropriation bill carried last year the limitation was $50,000. It strikes me that $75,000 is too much.

Mr. MANN. I do not think a great abuse could come up from an appropriation of $75,000. The danger has been, and always is, that in these things where you give the whole sum of money which may be utilized for a certain purpose no one knows what one of the bureaus of the Government will undertake to do.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman let me suggest that the Papago Indians have not been supplied with schools before. Those Indians are nomadic. They travel over the country, and it is hard to get them confined to a settlement and get them to go to school. The department has tried in every way they can to get them to do so.

Mr. Meritt says:

We would suggest that there be no limitation on the amount to be used, because we are gradually working the children into the public schools, and it is possible that we may need more than $20,000; and we will also take care of the education of the Papago Indians out of this appropriation.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, I am certain that there is a continued increase in the demand for money for the purpose of paying tuition of Indian children in the public schools, and I believe that $75,000 is the proper amount.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] make the point of order?

Mr. HARRISON. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be amended to read "seventy-five thousand" instead of "one hundred thousand."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that his amendment may be modified by changing it from "one hundred thousand" to "seventy-five thousand." Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, line 33, page 5, by striking out "one-quarter" and inserting "one-half."

Also, in line 2, page 6, by striking out "one-quarter" and inserting "one half."

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, up to a few years ago evidently there was a great abuse of the privileges of this paragraph. In other words, children with one-eighth Indian blood or less would go to these schools and would be educated by the Federal Government under the provisions of this paragraph, and in the wisdom of the Congress a limitation was put upon this expenditure. That limitation reads as follows:

That no part of this appropriation, or any other appropriation provided for herein, except appropriations made pursuant to treaties, shall be used to educate children of less than one-fourth Indian blood, whose parents are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they live.

When Mr. Meritt was before the committee he was asked about this proposition, and he stated:

You recall, Mr. Chairman, that you incorporated that legislation in the Indian bill two or three years ago, and it has been very helpful in getting out of these nonreservation schools children of less than one-fourth blood who ought to be educated in the schools in the immediate vicinity where they live, and it has been also helpful in enabling us to provide education for the more worthy Indians and children who are Indians in fact.

Now, it strikes me, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that if it was helpful in putting a limitation of one-fourth Indian blood upon the children going to these schools, we ought to go further and limit it to one-half, because white children ought not to be permitted to go to those nonreservation schools. If this provision is in the interest of the Indian children, to educate them, and so on, then we ought to make it more so. I submit that my amendment would do that; and if that is the purpose of the committee, it ought to be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings, including the purchase of necessary lands, and the installation, repair, and improvement of heating, lighting, power, and water systems in connection therewith, $400,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to allow employees in the Indian Service, who are furnished quarters, necessary heat and light for such quarters without charge, such heat and light to be paid for out of the fund chargeable with the cost of heating and lighting other buildings at the same place: *Provided further*, That the amount so expended for agency purposes shall not be included in the maximum amounts for compensation of employees prescribed by section 1, act of August 24, 1912.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What is the objection?

Mr. MANN. Every portion of the paragraph is subject to a point of order. I would like to get a little information. What is the necessity of including in this $400,000 item the right to use any portion of it or all of it for the purchase of lands?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is this way: Some nonreservation schools have changed from the ordinary educational schools for Indians to educational schools by farming and stock raising, and so forth, and it is necessary to have more land than the original school was located upon, probably 5 or 10 acres. If it becomes necessary to change it to an industrial school, it is necessary to have something to farm upon. That is the reason given by the department.

Mr. MANN. They are able to furnish that information to the committee, are they not; where they need land?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. They have done so in many instances. The gentleman will find it in the report.

Mr. MANN. Where they need it, it is perfectly proper to have an item for the purchase of land, as was done in some other items in this bill.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think they ought to be educated more along industrial lines than on educational lines.

Mr. MANN. That has nothing to do with the making of the appropriation.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It has something to do with the purchase of land.

Mr. MANN. Yes; it is all right to purchase land where needed, without giving them blanket authority to go out and purchase land. There is not a single place in the Government where that blanket authority is given. It ought not to be given here. The Indian Office is quite capable of informing the committee and the Congress, both in its estimates and its testimony, as to whether and where they need to purchase land. They can ask for an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will state to the gentleman that this question was asked and the answer was given:

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a fact that you did not have the right before to include the purchase of necessary lands? What do you mean by that?

Mr. MERITT. The law read "sites," but we wanted to make it perfectly plain that we had authority to purchase lands for school purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The word "sites" was not strong enough to include the purchase of necessary lands?

Mr. MERITT. It might not include enough land for a garden or for a little farm in connection with maintaining the day schools.

Mr. MANN. It says "a little farm." It may be a thousand acres or a little farm. They may want to go and buy homesteads and anything they please under the authority granted. They have no right to such an authority.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. This says "necessary lands" for necessary school purposes.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I know; but they are the judges of that.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If we permitted them to buy land at all, what amendment would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. MANN. I suggest that they inform Congress and the committee where they want to buy land and ask for an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The gentleman will see from the reading here that this applies to the reservation schools and the setting apart of land for that purpose, and not for schools other than those on the reservation.

Mr. MANN. Certainly. They do not need to buy land on the reservations. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. They will need to buy land in many instances. Where the land is allotted to the Indians, the Indians will not give up their allotment for the purpose of putting a school upon it, and no one else will. Many of these lands have been allotted to the Indians.

Mr. MANN. They can furnish the information to Congress. I notice, Mr. Chairman, in this paragraph it is proposed to make a permanent law of the provision that we have carried sometimes, giving to the employees of the Indian Service light and heat, in addition to quarters furnished them, free of charge. It may be a proper thing to give them that. I suppose next they will want gasoline and wood and coal, like the Army and Navy officers in Washington do, frequently at less than the ordinary cost. It seems to me it is sufficient to carry that annually, so that there may be some control over the abuse of it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I am willing for the word "hereafter" to be stricken out, if the gentleman so desires.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language in lines 7 and 8, page 6, "including the purchase of necessary lands," and also against the word "hereafter," in line 10.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I admit that the gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves a point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I merely do so for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Texas a question. This provision, beginning on line 16 and concluding on line 20, says:

The amount so expended for agency purposes shall not be included in the maximum amounts for compensation of employees prescribed by section 1, act of August 24, 1912.

What is meant by that, I will ask the gentleman? I was just wondering what is meant by the wording of the paragraph in lines 16 to 20, inclusive.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. On what page?

Mr. HARRISON. On page 6.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I read:

That the amount so expended for agency purposes shall not be included in the maximum amounts for compensation of employees prescribed by section 1—

And so forth. You will find that on page 49.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman will find that means that they can not include in the maximum compensation the cost of light, heat, and quarters that are furnished.

Mr. HARRISON. Is it proper for it to be in this particular place?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think so. This is exactly the language of the department.

Mr. HARRISON. That would not make it so, would it?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is a matter of regulation. That was the way that they desired it.

Mr. HARRISON. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The gentleman from California [Mr. KETTNER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of line 20, on page 6, the following:
"*Provided*, That of this amount there may be expended for construction of a sewer system and purchase of necessary easements therefor for the Pala Indian Reservation, Cal., $4,000."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I reserve a point of order for the purpose of allowing the gentleman from California to explain his amendment, if he desires to do so.

Mr. KETTNER. Mr. Chairman, I had this proposition up with the Indian Office, and, after considering the same, I received the following letter from Assistant Commissioner Meritt:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, January 24, 1916.

Hon. WILLIAM KETTNER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. KETTNER: Referring further to the matter of a sewer system in the Pala Indian Reservation, Cal., I am informed that 75 per cent of the proposed sewer line would be on allotted Indian lands and the remainder of the system would be across Government lands. Under the circumstances and because a legal question might arise as to the applicability of the general appropriation, "Indian school and agency buildings, 1917," for an improvement of this character, I would suggest that the safe course would be to have the Indian appropriation bill contain a specific item authorizing the use of funds for this definite purpose.

Very truly, yours,

E. B. MERITT,
Assistant Commissioner.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. As I understand it, then, three-fourths of this sewer line would be on Indian land?

Mr. KETTNER. Three-fourths of the line, according to Assistant Commissioner Meritt's letter.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And one-fourth on the public domain?

Mr. KETTNER. And one-fourth on the public domain.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And the object of this is to get authority to build it through the public domain?

Mr. KETTNER. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I have no objection to it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his point of order. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collection and transportation of pupils to and from Indian and public schools, and for placing school pupils, with the consent of their parents, under the care and control of white families qualified to give them moral, industrial, and educational training, $72,000: *Provided*, That not exceeding $5,000 of this sum may be used for obtaining remunerative employment for Indian youths and, when necessary, for payment of transportation and other expenses to their places of employment. The provisions of this section shall also apply to native Indian pupils of school age under 21 years of age brought from Alaska.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I can see the purpose of the committee and the department in reference to the education of children from Alaska, but as a matter of interest I would like to inquire whether the Eskimo children are Indians?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think not. That has been quite a mooted question for many years, but I am of the opinion that the Aleuts would come under the provision. They are the only Indians that I know of in Alaska who receive education by the United States. It is doubtful whether the Eskimos have any standing that would admit them to the schools of the United States, but I think the Aleuts would come under this classification.

Mr. MANN. It is not intended by inserting the word "Indians" to call the Eskimos Indians.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think not.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. I renew the point of order.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the gentleman from Illinois I will say that in a law pro-

hibiting the sale of liquor to Indians in Alaska, passed some years ago, it was provided:

That the term "Indians" in this act shall be construed as including the aboriginal races inhabiting Alaska when annexed to the United States, and their descendants of whole or half blood.

So that the word "Indian" in Alaska includes anyone who is a descendant of the aboriginal races inhabiting Alaska.

Mr. MANN. That was a definition for the purposes of that act.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. For the purposes of that act.

Mr. MANN. They might have said that for the purposes of that act it should include natives of Asia or Europe.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. That is the only definition of an Indian in Alaska that is found in the statutes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. But I understand from the department that they have let in the Aleuts only, under any definition we have had of the word "Indian."

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the gentleman in connection with this item—

For collection and transportation of pupils to and from Indian and public schools—

How much money is expended in collecting them and transporting them to and from these schools?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. For the transportation of Indians the amount requested was $75,000, and the analysis of expenditures found on page 53 shows, traveling expenses, $67,205.

Mr. HARRISON. Does not that include the traveling expenses of the employees of the department also?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I suppose it does. I think always, when they send Indian pupils to and from nonreservation schools, some one attends them.

Mr. HARRISON. Suppose they should send one pupil from a reservation in California to the Carlisle School?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. They very often do that.

Mr. HARRISON. In that event, sending one pupil, would they send some employee of the department all the way with that pupil?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think not. I think pupils are gathered together from a group of States, and then they cross the continent together.

Mr. HARRISON. They do not always supply some employee to attend them, then?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is a matter of regulation that the department must control—the department controlling the education of the children.

Mr. HARRISON. How many Indians are there who are furnished transportation to Carlisle or to the Sherman School?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think in the Carlisle School they have something like a thousand pupils, and I think seven or eight hundred in the Sherman School; but the Sherman School is much nearer the Indians than the Carlisle School.

Mr. HARRISON. Then they supply transportation for a thousand pupils to the Carlisle School and 700 to the Sherman School?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No.

Mr. HARRISON. I understood the gentleman to say that.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. There are that many in the school. I do not know how many are supplied with transportation.

Mr. HARRISON. I asked the gentleman if he knew how much was expended.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The amount for traveling expenses is stated at $67,205.11. They do not state how many pupils or their names.

Mr. HARRISON. I think it would be very easy for them to state that. In view of the use of money for traveling expenses by the Department of Agriculture called to our attention this morning, it is well for us to know how this money is being expended and whether it is doing any good; and if it is not doing any good, we ought to stop making the appropriation. I think, really, that is very valuable information, but I understand the gentleman to say that he has not it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No; I have not.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

All moneys appropriated herein for school purposes among the Indians may be expended, without restriction as to per capita expenditure for the annual support and education of any one pupil in any school.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that that it is a change of existing law.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is correct; I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purposes of preserving living and growing timber on Indian reservations and allotments, and to educate Indians in the proper care of forests; for the employment of suitable persons as matrons to teach Indian women and girls housekeeping and other household duties, for necessary traveling expenses of such matrons, and for furnishing necessary equipments and supplies and renting quarters for them where necessary; for the conducting of experiments on Indian school or agency farms designed to test the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, grains, vegetables, cotton, and fruits, and for the employment of practical farmers and stockmen, in addition to the agency and school farmers now employed; for necessary traveling expenses of such farmers and stockmen and for furnishing necessary equipment and supplies for them; and for superintending and directing farming and stock raising among Indians, $425,000: *Provided*, That the foregoing shall not, as to timber, apply to the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $25,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be used to conduct experiments on Indian school or agency farms to test the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, cotton, grains, vegetables, and fruits: *Provided, also*, That the amounts paid to matrons, foresters, farmers, and stockmen herein provided for shall not be included within the limitation on salaries and compensation of employees contained in the act of August 24, 1912.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. May I ask the gentleman from Texas how much is paid to these matrons, and how many are there?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is given in the hearings. There are 60 in number.

For the employment of suitable persons as matrons to teach Indian women and girls housekeeping and other household duties, and for furnishing necessary equipment and supplies, and renting quarters for them where necessary.

All field matrons (60 in number) receiving $600 and over per annum devote their entire time to the work. Fifteen matrons, paid $300 each per annum, are employed for half their time. However, this practice does not obtain the best results, and it is now the policy to reduce the number of half-time matrons as rapidly as practicable. The number now in the service on this basis (15) represents a reduction of 4 from the preceding year.

Mr. HARRISON. Do you propose by this bill to increase the pay of the matrons?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No.

Mr. HARRISON. What is this last proviso for?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Some of the matrons work half time and get $300 now, and the department is to change so that they will work full time and get $600.

Mr. HARRISON. If the law is changed, it will pay them more money than they are now receiving.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is what is stated in the hearings.

Mr. HARRISON. If the last proviso should be adopted, there would then be no limitation as to the salary placed upon it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That would be a matter for the construction of the department.

Mr. HARRISON. How many farmers are employed under this paragraph?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Two hundred and ten, I think.

Mr. HARRISON. How much is their salary?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The statement of the department is that there are 210 farmers. It further says:

The number of farmers now employed is entirely too small to adequately cover the territory involved in the 643,843 acres of cultivated land (averaging 2,420 acres to each Government farmer) or to give each Indian farming that close personal attention so necessary to successful results. In addition, there are 11,962 able-bodied male adult Indians not now engaged in farming, with 6,948,768 acres of uncultivated agricultural land on the different reservations. Many of these Indians are, of course, engaged in other industrial activities, but by far the greater number of them should be farming, and it is the task of the Indian Service farmers to increase the number of Indians farming and the total cultivated acreage to the greatest possible extent, as well as to see that proper and remunerative methods are used. In view of these facts, it is felt that the additional amount asked for is absolutely essential to the effective prosecution of the important work assigned to this particular branch of the service.

Mr. HARRISON. Are they under the civil service?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. And are the matrons under civil service, too?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. How many stockmen are employed under the provisions of this paragraph?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The gentleman will find that in the hearings, on page 64.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. How much do these farmers get?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. All the way from $300 to $1,200. Some are on larger reservations than others. They do not all get the same salary, of course.

Mr. HARRISON. How much was appropriated last year?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is stated on page 65 of the hearings that the total amount of salaries paid the farmers was $47,840.

Mr. MANN. This item is the same as in the bill of last year. I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that this last proviso is essential to the paragraph. The paragraph is good for nothing without it.

Mr. HARRISON. Why does the gentleman from Illinois say that?

Mr. MANN. You can not get these employees, which never were intended to be included in the limitation, at the salary fixed in the limitation. The original limitation, in the main, was for employees embraced in schools where, as a rule, they are provided with quarters, light, and heat, and in many cases subsistence. That very frequently does not apply to these people, both as to matrons and farmers and stockmen. In many cases it is quite essential to get good farmers and good stockmen, and you can not bring those people within this limitation and do the work at all. I looked this matter up at one time very carefully.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the gentleman think it would give the commissioner or the Secretary full discretion as to how much he should pay these various employees if the law should be changed?

Mr. MANN. This limitation has been carried for years. I think it gives the Secretary full authority to pay large salaries, but I think, as a matter of fact, he does not pay large salaries except in employing first-class men, where you have to pay a reasonable salary. I think in the main all of the salaries are too small. It is very much the same class of work, or in many cases, as the work of the agricultural extension work in the South has been. It is not the same, but very much along that line.

Mr. HARRISON. That is what I thought.

Mr. MANN. And I think the salaries paid are probably about the same. That is my recollection of it. I know I looked it up a few years ago.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, in view of what the gentleman from Illinois says and not the justification of the committee I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of goods and supplies for the Indian Service, including inspection, pay of necessary employees, and all other expenses connected therewith, including advertising, storage, and transportation of Indian goods and supplies, $300,000: *Provided*, That no part of the sum hereby appropriated shall be used for the maintenance of to exceed three permanent warehouses in the Indian Service: *Provided further*, That section 3709, Revised Statutes, in so far as that section requires that advertisement be made, shall apply only to those purchases and contracts for supplies or services, except personal services, for the Indian field service which exceed in amount the sum of $50 each, and section 23 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stats. L., 861), is hereby amended accordingly.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I want to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma or the gentleman from Texas or some of the committeemen why this new proviso is placed in the bill at the bottom of page 8?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman is drawing attention to the item that excludes amounts under $50 from being advertised? Is that what the gentleman is asking about?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I think that is apparent on the face of it. It would be an endless amount of trouble to advertise for any purchase under $50. If a man wanted to buy or sell a cow he would have to advertise, and if he wanted to trade a cow he would have to advertise.

Mr. HARRISON. Heretofore there has been no limitation, but everything has had to be advertised.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I think that is true.

Mr. HARRISON. For any amount they would have to advertise?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. I will state that where the amount is less than $50 when you advertise the cost of the article is very much increased ordinarily.

Mr. HARRISON. Formerly there were five of these permanent warehouses.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. When were these warehouses first established?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. A great many years ago, but I do not remember exactly.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I do not remember exactly.

Mr. HARRISON. Can the gentleman give me the year?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. It is a number of years ago. I thought I could find it in the estimates, but I do not see it here. I do not think I have that information.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a few years ago I reported to Congress and had passed a bill reorganizing the Lighthouse Service, and among other provisions inserted in that bill was an authority to make purchases without advertising, where the purchase was under a certain amount, an essential provision, especially in the Lighthouse Service, making for both economy and efficiency. Since that time every department of the Government has been trying to get authority to do away with the necessity for advertising for small purchases. I think we have had or will have a provision authorizing certain officials in the Army, possibly, to purchase up to the extent of $500. If you want to buy a file for immediate use to sharpen a hoe, it is rather inconvenient to have to advertise for it. I do not say that is necessary now, but there are many purchases where delay and cost of advertising is expensive many more times than the cost of the article itself. In the Lighthouse Service we require an annual report to be made of every article that is purchased without advertising.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the language "is hereby amended accordingly" in line 4, on page 9.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 4, strike out the words "is hereby amended accordingly."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, it is not amended.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And change the comma to a period at the end of line 3.

Mr. MANN. The Clerk will attend to that.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment on page 8, line 20, by striking out the word "three" and inserting the word "one."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 20, strike out the word "three" and insert the word "one."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I hope that amendment will not be adopted. This matter has caused a great deal of trouble in Congress from time to time, and we have agreed upon this policy and I hope it will not be disturbed.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, one of the gentlemen on the committee just said that the committee was with me, and now I find that the committee is not with me, so that I do not know just where I am. I find in the hearings in respect to this matter that there were formerly five of these warehouses carried throughout the country—one at Chicago, one in St. Louis, one at San Francisco, one at New York, and one at Omaha. Some years ago two of these warehouses were abolished—the one in New York and the one in Omaha. There are now three—one at Chicago, one at St. Louis, and one at San Francisco. Mr. Meritt before the committee had the following to say about this paragraph to a question propounded to him by the chairman:

Are you able to estimate the amount of savings effected by abolishing those two places?

Speaking of New York and San Francisco, he said he thought there would be a saving of at least $10,000. All through the hearing, with reference to the warehouses, it will be seen that most of these supplies are purchased and stored at Chicago or at St. Louis. I believe it is shown that at Chicago the weight of supplies shipped from the warehouse during the fiscal year 1915 was 31,000,000 pounds and in St. Louis 34,000,000 pounds, and that of those amounts there was handled in the warehouse in Chicago 3,768,000 pounds and in the warehouse at St. Louis 1,163,000 pounds, while at San Francisco there was much less handled. So that we are maintaining a warehouse at a cost of approximately $20,000, as I believe the hearings show, when the Indian Office purchased only three or four million dollars' worth of goods last year for the Indians, and practically all of these goods went through the warehouse either at Chicago or St. Louis. The reason why the warehouses at New York and San Francisco

were abolished was in the interest of economy. They were costing too much money to maintain, as the Indians were not close to those places, and it seems to me if the reason was good there that the reason is just as good now to abolish two more of these places, and especially at San Francisco, because there are hardly any goods stored there. Now, if the committee, for which I have such a high regard, really wants to economize in that item, they can abolish two of these warehouses.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I think it is only necessary to call the attention of the committee to the fact that this amount was overdrawn $33,000 last year, and Mr. Meritt says:

> You will notice we have been overdrawing this fund for a number of years. It has been almost impossible to keep the amount down to a certain sum because of the difference in freight charges, and it is exceedingly difficult to estimate the exact amount that will be used; but we think that with the abolition of these two warehouses and the procuring of this legislation enabling us to buy locally, we will be able to bring the appropriation within the $300,000.
>
> Mr. NORTON. And the total amount expended on account of Indian warehouses was $333,094.70? That will be smaller by about $10,000 for the next fiscal year?
>
> Mr. MERITT. We think we can make a saving of at least $10,000 by the abolition of the two warehouses mentioned.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, I find a statement made here in the hearings of expense at the Omaha warehouse during the past year. That expense was incurred before the Omaha warehouse was abolished. Subsequently the Indian Department used a warehouse belonging to the War Department there called the Government corral to store merchandise for transshipment, and no charge was made therefor, so that this charge made in these hearings is not fair toward the Omaha warehouse. The charge made here is up to the time the warehouse was abolished. The question of whether you can buy goods cheaper at one point or city than another is a question for argument. It has been shown conclusively that with or without the Government rates merchandise could be shipped to Indian points or final destination cheaper from Omaha or Kansas City than from any point in the Union. The commissioner's department has never been able to successfully contradict the freight-rate showing made to it.

Mr. HARRISON. If the gentleman will permit, the object of the amendment I have offered does not affect Omaha.

Mr. LOBECK. I was not asking for Omaha, because that has been decided against us.

Mr. HARRISON. I thought possibly the gentleman——

Mr. LOBECK. But I want to say that the Indian Bureau used the Government warehouse in Omaha for the distribution of merchandise to Indian destinations all throughout the summer, without costing the Indian Department a cent, except for what help it had there. There is no rent. The rent shown in this hearing was rent up to the time when under the last law the Omaha warehouse was abolished, when Mr. Jordan, in charge of the office and warehouse at Omaha, was transferred to San Francisco last May, and the charge for rent, $399, which shows in this hearing, was up to that time.

The Omaha warehouse during its existence had a record for handling the merchandise assembled there for transshipment to Indian schools and agencies which will compare favorably with any Indian warehouse in the country for efficiency in service and cost of maintenance, and there has been no showing made that cost of supplies was less at any other city or warehouse. The Omaha merchant meets all competition with pleasure.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, it seems—and it has been for years—a difficult matter to sever these warehouses from the Indian bill. I believe the record will show that an effort was made several years ago to reduce the number of warehouses. In the Indian appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, it was provided that only three warehouses should be paid for, but that provision was not complied with. In the hearings on the bill now before the committee the Assistant Commissioner of the Indian Bureau, Mr. Meritt, stated that he thought it might be economy to have but one warehouse. Still the warehouses have been such a prized part of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the past that he felt just at this time the department did not care to separate from all but one of them, and wished to continue during the next year with at least three warehouses. The hearings will show that one of the chief purposes of these warehouses has been to have places where sample goods might be brought and displayed and where the buyers for the Government might make selections and purchases. It occurs to me that for the reason that conditions in the wholesale trade have greatly changed during the past few years and that we have larger wholesale houses throughout the country to-day than in the past, and that most of our wholesale houses have large display rooms, the necessity of having a Government warehouse does not exist to-day as it did in years gone by. I am rather inclined to favor the amendment; in fact, I do favor and shall vote for the amendment proposed, to authorize but one warehouse. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has shown no particular necessity for more than one.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division. I want to see who are in favor of economy.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 20, noes 12.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the vote by which line 4, on page 9, was stricken out of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to vacate the vote whereby the amendment was adopted striking out all of line 4, page 9. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. And I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

> For expenses of the Board of Indian Commissioners, $10,000.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on lines 16 and 17.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. TRIBBLE. I reserve the point of order; and I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia reserves the point of order.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What is the question?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I see in the evidence here that the witnesses testifying in the hearing——

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. To what page does the gentleman refer?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Page 9. This is a provision for $10,000 for the expenses of a Board of Indian Commissioners. It is admitted in the hearing here by witnesses testifying, which indicates that there is no authorization for this appropriation. In fact, it is stated here in sections 2039 and 2072 that this board of commissioners is created without any salary. Is it not a fact——

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The law itself states that they serve without salary, and it is only for traveling expenses and other expenses of the board of commissioners, including a secretary that they are obliged to employ.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Where is the authorization for including the expenses?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It runs back originally to 1868, if I remember.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman will permit me, I will read him the law. Section 2039 of the Revised Statutes provides:

> There shall be a Board of Indian Commissioners, composed of not more than 10 persons, appointed by the President solely from men eminent for intelligence and philanthropy, and who shall serve without pecuniary compensation.

Section 2040 provides:

> The board of commissioners mentioned in the preceding section shall have power to appoint one of their own number as secretary, who shall be entitled to such reasonable compensation as the board may designate, payable from any moneys appropriated for the expenses of the board.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Now, the gentleman does not mean to claim that this $10,000 goes to the secretary?

Mr. HAYDEN. His salary can be paid out of this amount under authority of law.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Do not the hearings here specify the items this money was paid out for last year?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. They do not specify what it is to be paid out for this year.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Well the gentleman does not deny it is to be used for the same illegal purposes as heretofore?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I neither deny it or affirm it.

Mr. HAYDEN. The secretary is entitled to be paid out of money appropriated for the expenses of the board.

Mr. TRIBBLE. This sets forth that it is to pay the expenses of a board of commissioners, $10,000. There is nothing said about a secretary.

Mr. HAYDEN. But the law says that the secretary shall be entitled to such reasonable compensation as the board may designate, payable from any money appropriated for the expenses of the board. Now, we appropriate money for the expenses of the board, and under the authority of law the board

has the right to hire a secretary and pay him a salary. It is perfectly clear.

Mr. TRIBBLE. It may be clear to the gentleman, but it is not clear to me. It is shown in the hearings that last year nearly $9,000 went out for salaries, and the hearings show here that this board of commissioners has been traveling around over the country on junketing trips to San Francisco and elsewhere, and the commissioner held up the sum that one received and required it to be paid back into the Treasury, and here the gentleman proposes to defend it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the item is subject to a point of order. The law specifically provides for the appointment of a board of Indian commissioners and provides for a lot of duties which they may or shall perform. All of the law was not read by the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], though doubtless he could add, if he took the time, that the law specifically contemplates that these Indian commissioners shall travel throughout the country, that they shall go to Indian reservations, that they shall pay attention to the opening of bids for the purchase of supplies, that they shall know how the Government is treating the Indians, and what are the necessities of the Indians, in order that they may recommend to Congress and to the administration what ought to be done. If we are entitled to make the appropriation for their expenses, the law provides for that. As a matter of fact, the Board of Indian Commissioners, composed of gentlemen who, I think, are wholly disinterested, have rendered great service to the Government and to the Indians in times past, and doubtless will in the future. I think if my friend from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] would make an investigation as to the various reports which this board has made in the past he would modify his views very materially as to its value. I question whether there is any money expended by the Government in connection with the Indian Service which is of more value, both to the Government and to the Indians, than the money expended for the Board of Indian Commissioners. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] makes the point of order to the paragraph on lines 16 and 17. The section as quoted by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Chair thinks, wholly covers the authorization of law for this appropriation, and therefore overrules the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of judges of Indian courts where tribal relations now exist, $8,000.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the item:

For pay of judges of Indian courts where tribal relations now exist, $8,000.

May I inquire of the committee how many of these judges there are?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. We have the statement right here somewhere. It says:

Several years ago there was appropriated for the pay of Indian judges, $12,000. This was reduced to $10,000, and then again to $8,000, and restrictions added that these courts are to be maintained only where tribal relations existed.

This has been the law for a number of years.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask what is the salary of these judges?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Eighty-four dollars a year. That is a munificent sum to give a judge.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; that is a very poor sum. How many days out of the month do they work?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. They have cases to try just as other magistrates would have, and they have had that to do from time immemorial, and the Indians would consider they had been greatly injured if we should take these judges away from them. It was for the purpose of having sanitary conditions surrounding their camps and places of residence. They are elected by the Indians. It is an Indian court.

Mr. HARRISON. How many of these are in Oklahoma?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. None.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The tribal relations have been dissolved there.

Mr. HARRISON. Where are the most of these Indian judges located?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. In the Dakotas and in Montana, I think. They are on reservations where the land has not been divided among the Indians.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Permit me to state that they have the Indian courts in the Indian villages in New Mexico to the extent of about 8 or 10. They have a government of their own, similar to a municipal government in the city.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has expired.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask that the gentleman have two minutes, just in order to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. HERNANDEZ] may have two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. What is the character of these men who act as judges out there?

Mr. HERNANDEZ. They are just like the other Indians.

Mr. HARRISON. Just like an ordinary justice?

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Not as much, I suppose, but a man of fair understanding usually. One of the chiefs acts as judge.

Mr. HARRISON. Are they appointed by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, or by whom?

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Usually by the superintendent.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the superintendent in making these appointments go on the recommendation of the tribe?

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Yes; they usually elect a man.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I will call the gentleman's attention to the hearings on page 96. It says they are usually selected by the tribal council or the superintendent.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. They are a sort of mayor.

Mr. HARRISON. The gentleman is not in favor of striking out this item, I presume?

Mr. HERNANDEZ. I do not care anything about it. We have very little to do with those courts.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi withdraws his point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of six Indian Service inspectors, exclusive of one chief inspector, at salaries not to exceed $2,500 per annum and actual traveling expenses, and $3 per diem in lieu of subsistence when actually employed on duty in the field, $30,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. How is the chief inspector of the Indian Service inspectors paid? Out of what fund is he paid? I see this provision is "For pay of six Indian Service inspectors, exclusive of one chief inspector." Where is the provision in law for the chief inspector, and how does he get his money?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What page of the bill is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. MANN. Page 10, line 12.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The salaries are stated there. They are $2,500 per annum and $3 per day in lieu of subsistence, and so forth.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. My recollection is, Mr. Chairman, that the chief inspector is carried on the legislative bill, although I would not be positive about it.

Mr. MANN. Why would you put in here "exclusive of one chief inspector," then?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. This amount, I presume, is only to be paid to the assistant inspectors.

Mr. MANN. Plainly, if the chief inspector is carried in the legislative bill, that language does not belong here. You make provision here for the pay of six Indian Service inspectors at a salary of $2,500 each. That covers the six inspectors. It would not make any difference if we provided for 6,000 somewhere else. What I want to know is whether that provides for six and the chief inspector?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I do not think it provides for the chief inspector. I think he is provided for outside of this bill.

Mr. MANN. Of course, I take it that language like this is sent to the committee by the department. The committee itself is not to be criticized because it brings in sometimes very crude language that no one can tell the meaning of, except the man who wrote it, and he can only tell what he intended it to mean. That language can not mean anything within the comprehension of anybody here, I think, "exclusive of one chief inspector."

Mr. KONOP. Mr. Chairman, on page 102 of the justifications it is stated that these five officers are required to supplement the special force of supervisors. From that I would conclude that the chief is included. You will find that on page 102 of the hearings, where they speak of five inspectors.

Mr. MANN. The language heretofore has been "For pay for six inspectors." Now, you say, "exclusive of one chief inspector." I want to know whether that is intended to add a man or whether it is thrown in with the intention of adding nothing.

Mr. KONOP. The commissioner, on page 102 of the justifications, speaks of five officers. That is all I know about this.

Mr. MANN. After the very careful consideration which the committee evidently gave to this subject I will withdraw my inquiry.

Mr. NORTON. That language is the same as the existing law.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will state that there are seven names given here on page 9 of the hearings. I presume that includes the chief inspector.

Mr. KONOP. In the bill of last year the language of the House did not include that provision, but the Senate inserted the words "including one chief inspector."

Mr. MANN. Well, I bow in deference to the Senate for once. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws his pro forma amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purpose of determining the heirs of deceased Indian allottees having any right, title, or interest in any trust or restricted property, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, $90,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to use not to exceed $20,000 for the employment of additional clerks in the Indian Office in connection with the work of determining the heirs of deceased Indians, and examining their wills, out of the $90,000 appropriated herein: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to the Osage Indians nor to the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma: *And provided further*, That hereafter upon a determination of the heir to any trust or restricted Indian property or after approval by the Secretary of any will covering such trust or restricted property, there shall be paid by such heirs, or by the beneficiaries under such will, or from the estate of the decedent, or from the proceeds of sale of the allotment, or from any trust funds belonging to the estate of the decedent, the sum of $15, which amount shall be accounted for and paid into the Treasury of the United States, and a report shall be made annually to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior, on or before the first Monday of December, of all moneys collected and deposited as herein provided: *Provided further*, That if the Secretary of the Interior shall find that any inherited trust allotment or allotments are capable of partition to the advantage of the heirs, he may cause such lands to be partitioned among them, patents in fee to be issued to the competent heirs for their shares, and trust patents to be issued to the incompetent heirs for the lands respectively or jointly set apart to them, the trust period to terminate in accordance with the terms of the original patent.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the last paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. HARRISON. There is no doubt that a change of existing law is made here in several instances.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Mississippi reserve his point of order for a moment?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman remember the reason for this?

Mr. HARRISON. They broadened the statute and changed the law.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. As stated by Mr. Meritt, it is intended to give the Secretary of the Interior and the Indian Commissioner a broader discretion in these allotment and trust-fund cases.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will recall that a few years ago there was a good deal of discussion in reference to the frauds that had been practiced upon Indian minors and Indian estates by certain people in Oklahoma, including some judges and attorneys. There has been some legislation in Oklahoma since that time, designed to remedy or prevent those frauds—not entirely satisfactory to many people who wish to preserve the rights of the Indians.

This plan was adopted of permitting the Indian Department to protect the rights of the minors down there in these estates. I will say candidly to the gentleman from Mississippi that I am sure he was on the other side of the question, in favor of this proposition, when it came up, because we were endeavoring to prevent the natural tendency, to say the least, of white people in a new territory where there were many Indians to get away all they can from the Indians, and then some in addition.

Mr. HARRISON. I notice in reading it that this does not apply to the Five Civilized Tribes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Nor to the Osage Indians.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, in view of that, I will withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi withdraws his point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That not to exceed $200,000 of applicable appropriations made herein for the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be available for the maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of superintendents, farmers, physicians, field matrons, allotting, irrigation, and other employees in the Indian field service: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000 may be used in the purchase of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, and not to exceed $30,000 for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and that such vehicles shall be used only for official service.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. The bill last year carried the item of $200,000 for the maintenance and repair and operation of automobiles, and so forth, and I see the bill carries the same amount this year. Are the gentlemen on the committee entirely satisfied that this amount is sufficient, in view of the extraordinary increase in the cost of gasoline and tires, and so forth? If $200,000 was required for the current year in the estimation of the committee a year ago, how are you going to get along with $200,000 for next year? If the committee are able to give information to the House and to the country at large, telling how an automobile can be operated during the next year as cheaply as during the past year, the committee will confer untold benefits upon a very large number of people.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I do not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. MANN. I do not own an automobile, but I think we ought to know about that.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Not owning an automobile myself, I am not able to give the gentleman any information.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; but the gentleman is a moving spirit upon the great Committee on Indian Affairs, and besides that he represents a region that produces a very large proportion of the oil for which we have to pay fancy prices after it has been properly refined. Now, if in the estimation of the committee it took $200,000 a year ago, when gasoline was selling at 9 or 10 cents a gallon out there in the West, and when automobile tires were not very high, how are you going to get along with the maintenance and operation of the same number of automobiles next year, with gasoline running, the gentleman from Oregon says, out in his country as high as 60 cents or perhaps $2 a gallon by this time, and certainly above 20 cents the country over; and with automobile tires just having gone up 10 to 20 per cent and liable to go up again, what are you going to do?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. One reason why we did not increase this amount was that the department did not ask for any more.

Mr. MANN. When the department made its estimate, it did not know what the necessary amount would be. Did the committee give any consideration or did the gentleman from Oklahoma, representing the great Oklahoma oil fields, give any consideration to the question as to how we ought to go about it to keep the price of gasoline down to reasonable limits?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I suppose some of my constituents would not be very much interested in keeping the price of gasoline down. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I suspected that that would be the gentleman's very natural answer.

Mr. KONOP. The usual way in such cases is to have a committee of Congress investigate, and then the price goes down.

Mr. MANN. If an automobile could be operated with gas of a certain kind, instead of gas produced from gasoline, then it would be sufficient to have an investigating committee; because, goodness knows, there would be plenty of gas of that kind then. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does the gentleman mean the preparedness gas that is being produced over the country so much now?

Mr. MANN. No; I am not referring to the President of the United States, though it is quite evident that the gentleman from Texas is.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No; I am not.

Mr. MANN. I have some respect for the President. I do not refer to him as a mere gas-producing machine. I see that the gentleman from Texas does.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. FERRIS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and

had appointed Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. BRYAN, and Mr. WARREN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President had, on January 28, 1916, approved and signed bill of the following title:

S. 1773. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Warfield, Ky., and Kermit, W. Va.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Texas withdraws the pro forma amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That so much of section 4 of the act of May 11, 1880 (21 Stats. L., 132), as prohibits granting permission in writing or otherwise to any Indian or Indians on any Indian reservation to go into the State of Texas, under any pretext whatever, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order upon the paragraph. I appeal to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS], who is opposed to the President, to tell us why any Indian should want to go into the State of Texas.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Very few of them have gone there. We have in that State only the original tribe of Alabama Indians, and I understand that there are only about 200 of them. I hope that the Government will never get them under supervision and control. I have opposed that all the way through, and I hope we will never have an Indian agency in the State or have a Texas Indian under the supervision and control of the United States Government.

The gentleman from Illinois refers to the paragraph which has just been read, which proposes to repeal section 4 of the act of May 11, 1880, which prohibits reservation Indians from going into the State of Texas.

Immediately after the Civil War the Secretary of War had control of these Indians. They were known as blanket or wild Indians. They were the Comanches, Kiowas, and other wild tribes west of the ninety-eighth meridian.

Mr. MANN. That was in 1880.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Those Indians were on the warpath, and about once a month, during moonlight nights, we would have a raid from them. They were required by the War Department not to cross the Red River. That was under a provision of law which permitted officers of the Army to set bounds for those Indians. But this is an old law, which has now become useless. I will state that I lived within 10 miles of the Comanche and Kiowa Reservation. Geronimo's band of Apache Indians, who were for many years prisoners on a military reservation, have been to our town frequently to trade. They were, however, under the supervision and control of another Indian named Quanah Parker.

Mr. MANN. If Geronimo was lured into the gentleman's town at some time, was that the cause of the outbreak? [Laughter.]

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. As I am trying to explain, this law has become useless, and for that reason the department has asked that it be repealed.

Mr. MANN. I do not quite understand what the gentleman means when he says the law is useless. If the law is useless, there is no object in repealing it. Does it keep the Indians out of Texas?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It does not.

Mr. MANN. Why, no! No Indian wants to go there. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Possibly not; and in the past we felt that we were honored by their not coming there as much as they wished to, because when they used to come there we chased them back.

Mr. MANN. If we could segregate all these peace Indians in Texas who are afraid to fight, possibly it would be a good thing to pass a law to keep them in Texas. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. At the time this law was passed the Indians were on the warpath, and when they came to our side of the river we chased them back. In fact, the first time I ever crossed the Red River I was with the Texas Rangers. We crossed the river, at the risk of being put in the Kansas penitentiary if we had been caught; but we took our chances on that, and were not captured.

Mr. MANN. While I have the greatest respect for Texas and her citizens, yet I think probably, judging by some of the people from Texas whom I have seen, it would not hurt the State very much to have some of these blanket Indians go down there; so I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is the reason why we want the law repealed.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Last year when this appropriation bill was up I offered this paragraph as an amendment on the floor and asked that it be adopted. I made the same appeal at that time that my good friend from Texas makes to-day. He had it in his power at that time to make the point of order, and he made it to this item. Not only did I appeal to him in the interests of Texas, but other men did, not to make the point of order because he knew as he knows now that it was subject to a point of order. If it was not for the good graces of my friend from Illinois in withdrawing the point of order, saying it is a dead letter, he could make it and it would be sustained by the Chair. Now, I want to congratulate my friend from Texas on his change of front on this particular proposition. Evidently it was the argument used last time which created in his breast a conviction that caused him to sway the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. MURRAY, and the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. CARTER, to have this incorporated in this bill and to ask of the committee at this time to incorporate it.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Mississippi is some younger in the House than I am.

Mr. HARRISON. A good deal younger.

Mr. MANN. It will be of some consolation to him, I think, if I say that my observation and experience is that you never get anything really soaked into the Committee on Indian Affairs short of a year. [Laughter.] The argument that you make to-day may appeal to them a year from now. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

That section 2 of the act approved March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. L., p. 1221), entitled "An act providing for the allotment and distribution of Indian tribal funds," be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"That the pro rata share of any Indian who is mentally or physically incapable of managing his or her own affairs may be withdrawn from the Treasury in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior and expended for the benefit of such Indian under such rules, regulations, and conditions as the said Secretary may prescribe."

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the lands, buildings, fixtures, and all property rights granted to the State of Colorado for educational purposes by section 5 of the act of Congress approved April 4, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 273), may, in lieu of the use designated in said grant, be utilized by said State for the care of the insane, as an agricultural experiment station, or for such other public purposes as may be authorized by the legislature of the State: *Provided*, That Indians shall always be admitted to such institutions free of charge and upon an equality with white persons.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. The gentleman will have to make a pretty good explanation to get by the point of order.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I will try to explain this matter, I hope to the satisfaction of the gentleman from Illinois. The act of Congress granting the Teller Indian School, at Grand Junction, to the State of Colorado was passed April 4, 1910. At that time the school had become practically abandoned. The Interior Department and Indian Bureau and the Indian Affairs Committee of the House had decided to discontinue nonreservation Indian schools; so they were not using it much for Indians at that time. The Government agents in charge of the property had allowed the full amount of the Government water rights from the canal above the land to run on to this land practically all of the time, both when it was needed and when it was not needed, so that the land had become seeped; it was so full of alkali that the land had become almost worthless in that form. It would not grow anything. It even affected the foundations of the brick building. The irrigation above the land and the lack of proper drainage also affected the land injuriously. The Government intended, as I say, to abandon this school under a general policy of withdrawing the Indian children from the nonreservation schools and placing them in reservation schools. So there was a provision put in the Indian appropriation bill of April 4, 1910, at my request and with the approval of the Interior Department, ceding the property to the State of Colorado, to be used for educational purposes.

At that time I and the Senators and other Representatives from Colorado expected that the State would convert this property into a State normal school, or at least establish a branch agricultural experiment station there, but afterwards the funds of the State were in such a condition that they could not build a normal school. We have five State educational institutions in our State already. I may say that Colorado has practically all the State institutions of every kind that the rich, Eastern States have, with only about 10 per cent of the revenue to support them. As a matter of fact, the State has not during the past five years had the money, nor has it had the pupils, to

warrant another educational institution at this place. It would have required a large amount of money to repair and rehabilitate these buildings. On May 31, 1911, the governor of Colorado accepted the grant in compliance with that act (36 Stat. L., 273), but the State has not yet complied with that grant, and the last legislature memorialized Congress to modify and enlarge the grant whereby the institution is given to the State for educational purposes so as to vest the title in the State and provide that the property may be used for such purposes as the General Assembly of Colorado may provide. So I introduced a bill, H. R. 19, on the first day of this session to carry out the wish of my State as expressed by the last legislature; and the language of this paragraph is practically the same as my bill. Although my bill does not contain the provision concerning the care of insane Indians, however, I may say that the legislature had in view the using of these buildings for a branch insane asylum, and we also may want to use some of the land for an agricultural experiment station, if it can be made suitable. The State wants to try to reclaim that seep land and drain it so as to make it productive and valuable.

I submitted my bill to Gov. Carlson, of Colorado, and asked him to write me an official statement as to why the State had not complied with the former grant of Congress and why we want this modification of that grant. The governor has written me a very frank and clear statement of the situation and the objects of the State in regard to this property. I will insert his letter to me in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF COLORADO,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Denver, January 29, 1916.

Hon. EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN TAYLOR: We are greatly interested in the bill introduced by you having for its object the amendment to the act of Congress granting the property known as the Grand Junction Indian School to Colorado, so as to permit the State to use the property for other purposes than as an educational institution.

It has been suggested to me that some objection might be made on the ground that this school was built by the Government to afford educational opportunities to the Indians of Colorado, and that it would be an injustice to these wards of the Government if its character were changed. This objection, if it should be made, is absolutely without justification. It is probable that at the time the school was built there were some Indians within close proximity, but at the present time the only Indians that I know of on the western slope of Colorado are on the Ute Reservation, which is in the very extreme southwest corner of the State, and I believe another reservation some distance south of this. Altogether there are not a thousand Indians in the entire State, and in my many visits to Mesa and adjoining counties I do not remember ever having seen one. As a matter of fact, the United States Government had practically abandoned the school before it was transferred to Colorado. I do not believe it possible to induce any practicable number of Indians to come several hundred miles from their reservations and attend this school, no matter how attractive the curriculum might be made. It would certainly be a most uneconomical procedure, even if willing Indians were found.

You may be asked why Colorado has not fully complied with the previous grant. The answer is found in the fact that the buildings were simply unfit for use, on account of the seepage of water into them from grounds which were badly in need of systematic drainage. Shortly after the transfer of this property to the State $5,000 was spent for extension teaching in the district and for keeping the property in repair. A very careful drainage survey was made of the land, records were kept of the level of the ground water, and from the results of all of these a plan was worked out for the drainage of the ground. This plan was submitted to the nineteenth general assembly, which on account of the chaotic condition of the finances of the State at that time was unable to make the necessary appropriation.

There is a strong demand that these buildings be used as an insane asylum for the western slope of Colorado. I presume you will point out to the committee and to Congress the great expense of transporting insane patients from the western slope to the State asylum at Pueblo, and so I will not dwell upon this feature. At the present time there are 16 counties on the western slope unable to place their insane in a State institution.

Last year the expense to the different counties of the State in maintaining their insane in private institutions was $92,701.38. I have not available the proportion of this borne by the western slope, but from the large number of western-slope counties represented in the total amount you will see it must have amounted to considerable.

The twentieth general assembly made an appropriation of $5,000 to take up the drainage of the property. The lands have been included in the drainage district and surveys are being made of this district by the United States Reclamation Service. Actual work on drainage will be begun just as soon as the main drainage channels have been located by the surveys. When once drained the property will again be serviceable for school purposes. The buildings have suffered through nonuse, but can be put in serviceable shape at very reasonable cost, excepting in the case of very old buildings, where cost of repairs will prove excessive.

It will be a pleasure to me to furnish you on demand any further facts desired, and you may use this letter before the committee having the bill in charge if you so desire.

Very truly, yours, GEORGE A. CARLSON, *Governor.*

Mr. MANN. How much land is there?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. One hundred and seventy acres.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think that they could get an insane asylum and an agricultural experiment station on 170 acres of land?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Well, I can not speak with absolute certainty as to just what the Colorado Legislature will do. But I know we expect to make the best use of the property that we can.

Mr. MANN. You are just fishing, taking the land for what it may be worth.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The land is not worth anything now; but we are going to try the best we can to utilize this property and put it to some beneficial public use. It is no use to either the Government or the State the way it is now.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not know whether they will use it for an insane asylum or an agricultural college, or a place to herd sheep.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. We will have to spend considerable money on it before we can use it for anything.

Mr. MANN. How can the gentleman tell? There is no limitation here. First, you ask for it for a normal school, and I remember the gentleman's very persuasive speech. I can remember the eloquent remarks he made on the subject on how necessary it was to educate the youth of the land to provide teachers, and therefore we ought to give them the place for a normal school. Now, they want it for an insane asylum and an agricultural experiment station, or anything else that the legislature happens to think of.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Sells, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, has sent Mr. Kneal, an Indian agent, over there just a few days ago and he made an exhaustive examination of this property as it is to-day, and he reports that the Government does not want this property at all for any purpose, and that it is of no use under the sun for an Indian school or anything else, and that it will cost the State of Colorado $50,000 in money before she can do anything with it. It is a deplorable situation that property upon which the Government has spent nearly $700,000 should have been allowed to run down until it is, in its present condition, comparatively worthless. The State is not getting a very big bargain in taking the property for nothing.

Mr. MANN. It is never very difficult to get one department officer to say, if the Government has got something of value that it does not want to use, that it ought to give it away.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman listen and permit me to read the memorial of the Colorado Legislature on this subject?

Mr. MANN. Yes; but I do not pay much attention to memorials of legislatures or a memorial of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask that the gentleman from Colorado be given five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks that the time of the gentleman from Colorado be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The memorial of our legislature to which I refer is as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 5 (by Senator Kluge), that the grant of the Grand Junction School heretofore made to the State of Colorado by the United States for educational purposes be enlarged so as to include charitable and other purposes.

Whereas by section 5 of chapter 140, approved April 4, 1910, the Sixty-first Congress of the United States of America did grant to the State of Colorado the property known as the Grand Junction School, including the lands, buildings, and fixtures pertaining to said school, provided that said lands and buildings should be held and maintained by the State of Colorado as an institution of learning, and that Indian pupils should at all times be admitted to such school free of charge of tuition and on terms of equality with white pupils; and

Whereas the governor of the State of Colorado did duly file an acceptance of said grant with the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the terms and conditions of said grant, and the said school has been under the control of the State of Colorado since said acceptance; and

Whereas the State of Colorado has now five separate institutions of learning that are in active operation in different parts of the State, and the needs of which, financially, are constantly increasing; and

Whereas the State of Colorado has only one asylum for the insane, being the insane asylum located at Pueblo, Colo., and said asylum is now greatly overcrowded, and there is not room for the insane patients of the State; and

Whereas costs and charges for transporting patients from that part of Colorado west of the Continental Divide to the said insane asylum are excessive and constitute an undue burden upon the people of the western slope of Colorado; and

Whereas the said the Grand Junction Indian School is centrally located on the said western slope, so as to accommodate patients from that portion of the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the twentieth general assembly and the house of representatives thereof concurring, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, requested to enlarge the grant heretofore made by it to the State of Colorado, of said the Grand Junction School so as to vest the title thereto in the State of Colorado, and to provide that the same may be used for such purposes as the General Assembly of Colorado may provide; be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the President of the Senate of the United States and to the Secre-

tary of the Interior, and that this resolution be entered of record of the twentieth general assembly; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Representatives of Colorado in the Congress of the United States.

Approved April 9, 1915, 11.50 a. m.

MOSES E. LEWIS,
President of the Senate.
PHILIP B. STEWART,
Speaker of the House.
GEORGE A. CARLSON,
Governor of the State of Colorado.

(Indorsed:) Filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Colorado, on the 9th day of April, A. D. 1915, at 2.35 o'clock p. m. Recorded in book —, page —.

JOHN E. RAMER,
Secretary of State.
By GEORGE M. WILLIAMS, *Deputy.*

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows that if it were in order for a Member of the House here to rise and offer a memorial, we would probably pass 50 of them a day upon every conceivable subject of which the human mind could take cognizance, and not any of us would know what they were about. That is the way with the legislatures.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. But the Legislature of Colorado has not memorialized Congress without knowing all about this matter.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the Legislature of Colorado has sent more memorials to Congress about more things about which it knows nothing than any other legislature of the country, at this session of Congress, occupying page after page of the RECORD. Of course, this was something they had an interest in. Usually they have memorialized Congress in respect to some matter that is none of their business.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It seems to be true that the Western States memorialize Congress more than the other States do. But I have not observed that Colorado exercises that right any more than others. The legislatures have a right, in fact a duty, to express to Congress the sentiment of their States, and we should give those memorials due consideration. At the present time Colorado has an insane asylum in the city of Pueblo. That insane asylum has for years been overcrowded. There are several hundred insane patients scattered around over the State of Colorado in private institutions and in jails or one place and another, and the State wants to take these buildings and repair them and use them as a branch insane asylum to properly care for these unfortunates.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I can say one thing here that might be applicable—perhaps they would better have the insane asylum conduct these agricultural experiments. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not know about that; but the same provision is contained in this bill that is in the present law, allowing the insane Indians to go there upon the same terms as the white, if the Government wants to put them there. We are not trying to escape any obligations, if there are any, to the Indians. I am not sure but what the Indians would have more use for the property as an insane asylum than they have as an educational institution, because of its being a nonreservation school.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman would not say that that would apply to Colorado generally?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; that would not apply to Colorado by any means. We will beneficially use this property if Congress will give us the permission. But, of course, we can not spend $50,000 on the property unless Congress modifies the grant and authorizes us to make this change. I presented this matter very fully to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and to the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and obtained the approval of all of them, and I hope that the gentleman will not insist upon the point of order and let us adopt this paragraph of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, once again I am overpersuaded by the eloquence of the gentleman from Colorado just as I was the last time when he wanted this property for another purpose, and I shall withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO.

SEC. 2. For support and civilization of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, including pay of employees, $330,000.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. I want to ask the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] a question. Three hundred and thirty thousand dollars are appropriated in this item for the support and civilization of Indians in Arizona. How many Indians are there in Arizona?

Mr. HAYDEN. About 42,000.

Mr. HARRISON. How many in New Mexico?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think there are 20,000 or 21,000.

Mr. HARRISON. I notice in the hearings before the Committee on Indian Affairs that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs recommended to the committee a provision of law to enable the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the condition of the Indians living in Mississippi and report to Congress on the first Monday of December as to their need for additional land and school facilities, and that $1,000 was proposed to be appropriated for that purpose, to be immediately available. He offered his justification for that, and the chairman asked him the question, "About how many Indians are there in Mississippi," to which he replied that there are 1,235 living in that State. The question I want to propound to the gentleman, because this Arizona and New Mexico item for $330,000 is clearly subject to a point of order, as well as many other items under headings of other States for support and civilization of Indians, including, I notice, under the Oklahoma heading items for similar gratuities. May I ask the gentleman—and I respect him highly, both on account of his ability and congeniality—does he not think that the committee is a little unfair to the Indians of Mississippi when the Commissioner of Indian Affairs recommends to them a provision that carries $1,000 not for the support and civilization of the Mississippi Indians but merely to investigate their condition, that the committee should turn it down, brush it aside, and go on and write into the bill $330,000 for the Arizona and New Mexico Indians, not for their investigation but for their support and civilization, as well as carrying similar provisions for other States that are represented on the House Indian Committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman that I was under the impression that the recommendation of the department relative to the thousand dollars for the Indians in Mississippi had been adopted by the committee, and I should be very glad to vote for such an amendment if the gentleman would offer it on the floor.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will state to the gentleman that it was subject to a point of order, and some gentleman on the committee made the point of order and the Chair sustained it.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, the gentleman can not get out of it on the question of a point of order.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It was new legislation.

Mr. HARRISON. For the reason that there was just incorporated into this bill a provision that repealed a law passed in 1880, I think it was, that prohibited the Indians from Oklahoma going into the gentleman's State of Texas, and that was incorporated in this bill when the gentleman knew it was subject to a point of order, because he had made a point of order to a similar amendment that I offered last year. It matters not now whether it is subject to a point of order or not. This provision carrying the appropriation of $330,000 for the Arizona and New Mexico Indians is subject to a point of order, and I want to say to the chairman of the committee as well as to this committee that, knowing the condition of the Indians in my State, knowing that by this bill they get no relief, I am not going to be as unfair, I am not going to be as unjust as the Committee on Indian Affairs has been in this matter—when the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has recommended to the committee the incorporation of a thousand-dollar provision merely to investigate the conditions down there, which recommendation has been turned down by the committee.

I say I am not going to be as unfair as the gentleman is, because I have it within my power to make the point of order—for it will be sustained, because it is conceded not to be authorized by law—and wipe out this $330,000 for these Indians in Arizona and New Mexico. I think too much of the Indians of this country and have their welfare too much at heart. I am going to be fair and more just than the committee, and will therefore withdraw the point of order.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman expect——

Mr. HARRISON. If the gentleman wants me to make it, I will do so.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I still reserve the point of order.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman want to insist on the amendment for the $1,000 for the Indians in Mississippi? If he does, I will tell him that I think the committee really struck that out in order that the gentleman might offer the amendment and make a speech. That, I think, is about all the committee had in mind when it was stricken out.

Mr. HARRISON. The gentleman is very courteous and gracious. I know he does not like for me to speak that much. He can not offer that as an excuse. The gentleman knows

the facts bear down too heavily upon him and his committee for that, and the gentleman knows there is an explanation due this House for their action in turning down a little recommendation for the needy, poor Mississippi Indians, under the circumstances, and he can not brush it aside in that manner.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. There is no attempt to brush anything aside, and if the gentleman will permit me to say, without violating the rules of the House, something had happened in the committee. I will say to the gentleman that I protested against that item going out of the bill, and I insisted it should remain. It was thrown out over my protest.

Mr. HARRISON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman from Mississippi answer a question?

Mr. HARRISON. I will.

Mr. NORTON. How long have the Indians in Mississippi been without Government aid?

Mr. HARRISON. Always; they have never received any Government aid.

Mr. NORTON. Never have been self-supporting?

Mr. HARRISON. Why, they have supported themselves only by hunting, fishing, what people would give them, and by working at times in the fields. They have not been as fortunate as the Indians in the gentleman's State in receiving support from the Government.

Mr. NORTON. They have been self-supporting?

Mr. HARRISON. Always.

Mr. NORTON. For many years?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman think the Government at this time should pursue a policy of hunting up these Indians, who have been self-supporting for a hundred years, and offer to them Federal aid?

Mr. HARRISON. There is no man in this House who knows my views in reference to these poor Indians better than the gentleman from North Dakota, because I have spoken before his committee for hours and hours, giving him the views I entertain in reference to this matter. I am not of the opinion that the Government of the United States at this time should appropriate money for the Indians in Mississippi, and the gentleman knows the reason why I am not in favor of that. I believe they are entitled to share in the funds of the Choctaw Tribe, and I have not favored up to now even a bill introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY], that would give the Mississippi Choctaws land to be paid for out of the Treasury of the United States, for the reason that I know the Representative from Oklahoma would have the Government pay them and would not have their own tribe pay them. Now, if the gentleman will permit me to further answer the question——

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. It is in order that the Treasury of the United States be protected that I am making the fight I am, because other gentlemen have seen that it is a question of time if all the funds of the Choctaw Tribe are dissipated then they are bound to come to the Government of the United States for aid.

Mr. NORTON. Then the gentleman does not purpose to have the Government extend any Federal aid to the Indians in Mississippi in reference to this $1,000 appropriation which the gentleman asks for——

Mr. HARRISON. I did not ask for it; the Commissioner of Indian Affairs asked for it; and let me say to the gentleman that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs—and I dislike to say it very much—but it looks to me that he is partial in this matter. The gentleman will recall last year when this fight was made on the floor of the House, there came a report into this House, just before the vote was taken, which was signed by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Lane, and the gentleman knows, and this House knows, that when those reports are made they are made by some clerk in the office and not by the Secretary or the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Let me say further to the gentleman: I asked the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to let the Mississippi delegation be heard, or some of us, in support of our contention about this matter before any report was made to your committee, and I have not, up to this good day, received any word from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to come up and he would let us be heard in the matter, and it strikes me very much like there is some partiality about the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more to say a word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to limit debate on this paragraph to five minutes.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I shall object to that, because the gentleman may be so gratuitous in his remarks I might want to say something in reply, and I would ask that it be made 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that debate has been limited; debate has been already exhausted. Is there objection to the gentleman having five minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have always been very much interested during my short service here in Congress in what the gentleman from Mississippi has had to say in presenting the purported claims of the Choctaws in Mississippi for a part of the lands and funds of the Choctaws in Oklahoma. From the forceful and able manner in which the gentleman from Mississippi has presented his subject as I have frequently heard it presented by him I have been forced to believe and am now fully convinced that if the Choctaws in Mississippi had even the smallest peg on which to hang any just and reasonable claim to a right to share in either the funds or the lands and other property of Oklahoma Choctaws that claim would have been long since recognized and conceded by the Congress.

It would have been granted by this Congress long before this time. There is no man that I have heard in this House who has shown himself more able to present a poor claim more favorably than the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

I do not believe that this House should concur in a recommendation of anybody, not excepting the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, for an appropriation to seek out in some State a few Indians that the United States may make appropriations to aid, particularly Indians who for 50 years or more have been self-supporting and who have made their own livelihood without any aid from State or Federal Government. That is exactly the kind of policy that the Government should to-day be trying to escape rather than to enter upon. While I did not make a point of order against the proposed appropriation of $1,000 to investigate the conditions among the Indians of Mississippi, if the matter had come to a vote in the committee I certainly should have voted against it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi make the point of order?

Mr. HARRISON. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the work of constructing the irrigation system for the irrigation of the lands of the Pima Indians in the vicinity of Sacaton, on the Gila River Indian Reservation, within the limit of cost fixed by the act of March 3, 1905, $10,000; and for maintenance and operation of the pumping plants and canal systems, $10,000; in all, $20,000, reimbursable as provided in section 2 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L., p. 522), and to remain available until expended.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] whether these expenditures are to be made on and about the pumping plant that was built by the Reclamation Service?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MONDELL. This is the very extensive plant that the service built and that we paid for?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Reimbursing the Reclamation Service for it. My recollection is that for a long time the Indians refused to use any of this water?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true.

Mr. MONDELL. Insisting that the water carried a good deal af alkali and that it injured their land?

Mr. HAYDEN. Of late years the Indians have been growing Egyptian cotton and other crops very successfully with this water, and the prejudice they had against it has largely disappeared. I think credit is due in a large measure to the very efficient superintendent they now have on that reservation in inducing these Indians to use this water.

Mr. MONDELL. They are now actually using this water, are they?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MONDELL. The plant was supposed to be complete. The Reclamation Service built a very complete and very expensive plant and dug the canals and laterals, and left the work in what was supposed to be a very perfect and very complete condition.

Mr. HAYDEN. I never heard that. I always understood that the main canal was constructed and a number of pumping plants installed, but that the smaller laterals for carrying the water to the land have not been built until of late.

Mr. MONDELL. I notice the item is supposed to be reimbursable. As a matter of fact, it is probably true, is it not, that these particular Indians will not be able to reimburse the Government for this expenditure?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not think it would be possible for the Pima Indians to reimburse the Government in the near future. They are very industrious Indians, and have progressed as fast as they can, considering the hardships under which they have labored. It is not to be expected they can repay any money right away.

Mr. MONDELL. Taking into consideration the suggestion of what we will do in irrigating further lands on this reservation, and the fact that some of the lands have not any value until irrigated, there is not much hope that they will reimburse the Government for this expense?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not in the near future; that is certain.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to understand a little more about this reimbursable proposition, which I have been trying to have put in bills for years. Is not this expense in a way a charge upon the Indian land there?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is.

Mr. MANN. Well, if the Indians continue to own the land and use it, taking care of it themselves, the funds will probably not be reimbursable as long as that continues, but if the Indians should endeavor or propose to dispose of the land, especially to white settlers, would it not necessarily be the case that out of the proceeds of a sale the Government would be reimbursed for its original expense?

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman correctly quotes the terms of the act mentioned in the bill, referring to reimbursement.

Mr. MANN. I am quite willing, as long as they support themselves, to make this provision, but it does seem to me that in these irrigation schemes the time ought to come when the Indians can maintain the plants. It is not a very encouraging feature for the gentleman to say, "we will spend a million or half a million or two millions or $100,000 constructing an irrigation system for Indians, in order that they may earn money and have a livelihood, and be better off than they were before," and then, after having devoted that much money for that purpose, continue to spend the money to operate the plant year after year—a permanent annual expense against the Government, which can only be made on the theory that the original expenditure was a gross waste of money. Conceding that these Indians at this plant are doing a good work, is there not a time coming when they will be able to make enough, over and above other expenses of their own, to maintain the operation of the plant?

Mr. HAYDEN. In reply to the question of the gentleman from Illinois, I will say that I was on this reservation last summer and I asked that very question of the superintendent in charge. He said that he was very anxious to see the time come when the Indians would pay for the maintenance of the project, that he thought it would be a good thing for them to have a sense of responsibility, that they might know that it costs money to pump water, and that they ought to be careful in the use of the plant.

The gentleman should understand that originally the Indians refused to have anything to do with this pumping plant, so that it was necessary to make an appropriation to get the water pumped and used. Now that they are using it, I do not believe that after a few years there will be any reason why the Indians should not pay the charges for maintenance.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction and repair of necessary channels and laterals for the utilization of water in connection with the pumping plant for irrigation purposes on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., as provided in the act of April 4, 1910 (36 Stat. L., 273), for the purpose of securing an appropriation of water for the irrigation of approximately 150,000 acres of land and for maintaining and operating the pumping plant, $15,000, reimbursable as provided in said act, and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be prepared plans and specifications showing the approximate cost of the construction of the necessary irrigation works for the reclamation of all of the irrigable lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation in Arizona and California, which plans and specifications, together with a report upon the feasibility of irrigating the lands within said reservation, shall be submitted to Congress on the first Monday in December, 1916, or as soon thereafter as may be practicable. In said report the said secretary shall recommend a method for the disposal of the surplus and unallotted lands within said reservation and a plan for the repayment of the cost of the necessary irrigation work. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this proviso there is hereby appropriated the sum of $5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is pending.

Mr. MONDELL. The point of order is withheld, I understand.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming moves to strike out the last word. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I notice the proviso in this paragraph proposes an investigation, the preparation of plans, estimates of cost of construction of necessary work for the reclamation of all the irrigable lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, in Arizona and California, and so forth. I would like to ask the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] if it is not true that the question of the irrigation of these lands has heretofore been pretty carefully considered, and it is probable that the situation is such that no successful project could be carried out for the irrigation of all the lands of this reservation unless there should be built some very large storage works on the headwaters of the Colorado?

Mr. HAYDEN. On the contrary, I will say there has never been any consideration given by the Indian Department to any sort of plan for the irrigation of that land.

Mr. MONDELL. Not by the Indian Bureau, possibly, but the matter has been investigated by the irrigation service, has it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. There has been no plan or investigation made relative to the land on this irrigation project. When I first came here the Delegate from Arizona, my predecessor, had a bill pending to open up these lands, and he could not get a report on it from the department. I introduced a similar bill, and on that I could not get a report from the department. Then I introduced another bill, and on that I could not get a report from the department; so I took up the matter with the Committee on Indian Affairs, and offered this amendment, which was adopted by the committee, to try to get the department to say what it would do.

There are 100,000 acres of the finest land on this continent in the Colorado River Indian reservation. It is lying idle, and no use is made of it. Other people, not only in the United States but in Mexico, are making appropriations of the waters of the Colorado. Unless something is done, the Indians will lose their rights to the use of this water. I wanted to get somewhere, and for that reason I offered this amendment. The committee was willing to allow a small appropriation in order to get a report from the Department of the Interior as to what should be done. I have not been able to get any information from the department whatsoever as to any plan for the irrigation of those lands.

Mr. MONDELL. I was under the impression that the Indian Bureau has made some investigation touching these particular lands. I know the Reclamation Service has made some investigation of the general situation. As a matter of fact, the Reclamation Service has for some years past been studying the general situation on the Colorado River.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was a favorite idea of the late director, Mr. Newell.

Mr. MONDELL. I think it is a very wise idea. The State which I have the honor to represent here has been contributing for a couple of years past to a joint investigation of the situation on the Green, one of the large tributaries of the Colorado River, with a view to working out some plan for the utilization of the waters of the Green and the Grand, the two principal tributaries, and the main river.

I think the item a very excellent one. I hope there will be no objection to it. I was under the impression that the Indian Bureau had made an investigation, independent of the work that has been done by the Reclamation Service, in regard to the general question of the irrigation of the lands of the Colorado River Reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the proviso beginning with line 19, on page 15, and ending with line 10, on page 16.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of the Interior to carry into effect the provisions of the sixth article of the treaty of June 1, 1868, between the United States and the Navajo Nation or Tribe of Indians, proclaimed August 12, 1868, whereby the United States agrees to provide school facilities for the children of the Navajo Tribe of Indians, $100,000: *Provided*, That the said Secretary may expend said funds, in his discretion, in establishing or enlarging day or industrial schools.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. How much is the current appropriation for this purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. One hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is sure about that, of course?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; the last Indian appropriation act carried an item in the same language appropriating $100,000 for this purpose, and the continuing resolution carried on that appropriation.

Mr. MANN. Was it carried in the bill last year?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is explained at page 168 of the hearings, about the middle of the page.

Mr. HAYDEN. It was carried in the bill last year.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. About the middle of page 168 of the hearings it says:

The $100,000 appropriation for 1915 was used for increasing school facilities for Navajo children on the following reservations: Navajo, Western Navajo, Pueblo Bonito, and San Juan.

Mr. BORLAND. How many Navajo children are there?

Mr. HAYDEN. This is one of the largest tribes in Arizona. There are about 25,000 Navajos.

Mr. BORLAND. How many children are there among them?

Mr. HAYDEN. About 5,000. They are very poorly provided with schools.

Mr. MANN. How is this money expended?

Mr. BORLAND. How can they expend $100,000 a year?

Mr. HAYDEN. The money is expended for certain schools on the Navajo Reservation. In the last year the Indian Service spent money for the construction of a school building at the Chin Lee Boarding School, with a capacity for 200 pupils, $20,000; for repair of the old dining hall at the Fort Defiance Boarding School, $4,000; for an addition to the dormitory at the Western Navajo School, costing $25,000; for two dormitories at Toadlena, in the San Juan jurisdiction, costing $18,000, and so on.

Mr. MANN. This is used, then, as a method of getting money to construct buildings which would not be authorized otherwise? Do I understand the gentleman to mean that?

Mr. HAYDEN. The analysis of the expenditures, given on page 168 of the hearings, shows:

Traveling expenses	$33.65
Transportation of supplies	1,144.01
Printing, binding, and advertising	145.33
Subsistence supplies	22.26
Dry goods, clothing, etc	18.33
Equipment, material, etc	135.50
Construction	45,610.25
Repairs (to plant)	6,591.31
Total	53,700.64

Mr. MANN. Here is an item for education. The whole item being $100,000, $45,000 is spent for buildings and $10,000 or something like that for repairs. Is there any item in the expenditure at all which shows that any of it was used for educational purposes?

Mr. HAYDEN. This money is used to construct schools that the Indian Service is building on the Navajo Reservation. The Navajos had no schools or other educational facilities until this expenditure was begun by Congress in accordance with the treaty.

Mr. MANN. I understand it is to provide school buildings. That is legitimate; but is any of it used for education?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If the gentleman will read at the bottom of page 168 and the top of page 169, he will find it is there stated that there are between 25,000 and 30,000 Navajo Indians, and it is estimated that there are 5,000 Navajo Indian children without school facilities. The Government is under treaty to provide the Navajos with school facilities, and we have within the last three years begun to carry out that treaty provision, which has been on the statute books since 1868.

Mr. MANN. I am trying to find out whether a cent of the $100,000 that we appropriated was used for the purpose of education, and thereupon my distinguished friend from Texas reads a provision of the treaty stating that we are under obligation to do this. Do we do it?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I was giving the gentleman the analysis of the expenditure.

Mr. MANN. But not for educational purposes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I understand that all of it is for educational purposes.

Mr. MANN. Of course, in one sense erecting a school building is making provision for education, but it is not for educational purposes. Do I understand that any of this money was paid for teachers to teach the children?

Mr. HAYDEN. I read from page 168 of the hearings:

The total expenditures of this appropriation plus the outstanding obligations amount to $99,034.97, leaving of the $100,000 an unused balance of $965.03. These expenditures have added a capacity of 260 pupils, making the present capacity of the Navajo schools 1,500 pupils in a country where it is estimated there are yet 5,000 children eligible for school for whom facilities have not yet been provided.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, if I understand, the gentleman from Illinois wishes to know whether any part of this $100,000 was used for salaries for teachers. I should say no; that it appears that the greater part of it was apportioned for the construction of new school buildings. The department apparently secured the money for paying the salaries and expenses of teachers out of some other fund.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt that we already make an appropriation under the provisions and in accordance with the treaty for the education of these children; but the Indian Office comes in with this item and the committee reports it as though we were making an original appropriation for carrying out the treaty which we have been carrying out for years, regardless of this appropriation.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If the gentleman will turn to Document 121, Sixty-second Congress, page 2, he will find a complete statement of the whole matter. The whole amount expended is $164,569.80.

Mr. MANN. Is that paid out of this item?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No.

Mr. MANN. Then I can not see the pertinency of the gentleman's statement.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. But it gives the salaries and wages of the teachers that the gentleman was inquiring about.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the point of order, although I have not secured the information.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the development of a water supply for the Navajo Indians on the Navajo Reservation, $25,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, reimbursable out of any funds of said Indians now or hereafter available.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. Why is this made immediately available?

Mr. HAYDEN. Because it is in line with the request of the department in all irrigation items. They claim they ought to have it immediately available to take care of contingencies like a flood from the breaking of a dam and things of that kind. They need the money at once.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How much money has been appropriated for this purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. The appropriation of the last Congress was $25,000, and they spent $23,500. They have an unexpended balance of $1,077 on hand.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is that the total balance?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee determined to rise; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 10385, the Indian appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

WILLIAM M'KINLEY.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an address by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] at the McKinley memorial banquet in Pittsburgh on Wednesday last.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an address by Dr. FESS at the McKinley memorial banquet in Pittsburgh. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bill:

H. R. 8235. An act to provide for the maintenance of the United States section of the International High Commission.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 2, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, giving reasons why the data requested in House resolution 103 should not be made public (H. Doc. No. 636); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, recommending the consideration of an emergency appropriation for the purpose of dredging Buttermilk Channel, leading to the Brooklyn Navy Yard (H. Doc. No. 637); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting detailed statement of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co., with a list of its stockholders, for the year ending November 31, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 638); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the president of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Co., transmitting report of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Co. for the year ending December 31, 1915 (S. Doc. 267); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the president of the Capital Traction Co., transmitting report of the Capital Traction Co. for the year ending December 31, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 639); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the president of Georgetown Gas Light Co., transmitting annual statement of the Georgetown Gas Light Co., of Washington, D. C., for the year 1915 (S. Doc. No. 266); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the treasurer of the Washington-Virginia Railway Co., transmitting report of the Washington-Virginia Railway Co. for the year ending December 31, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 640); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. to the Congress of the United States for the year 1915, to be substituted for the report submitted on January 10 (S. Doc. No. 244); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Manchester Harbor, Mass., with a view to straightening the channel by the removal of Bow Bell Ledge (H. Doc. No. 641); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

10. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Belle River, Mich. (H. Doc. No. 642); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. RUBEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10405) for securing the uniform grading of grain, preventing deception in transactions in grain, and regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 107), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Delaware, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5096) for the relief of Nabor and Victoria Leon, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 105), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIES, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2536) for the relief of Joseph A. Buckholdt, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 106), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3895) for the relief of F. W. Schultz, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 108), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2184) providing for the refund of certain additional duties collected on pineapples, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 109), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5079) for the relief of certain civilian employees of the Engineer Department at Large, United States Army, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 110), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Delaware, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8145) for the relief of Elvira D. Gregg, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 103), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6733) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Eleazer L. Sarsons, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 104), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5818) granting a pension to Jacob Schwagler; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1367) granting a pension to Florence B. Eckert; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5748) granting an increase of pension to Walter S. Hall, alias Walter McLauchlin; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5749) granting a pension to William Long; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7136) granting a pension to R. B. Honeycutt; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6664) granting an increase of pension to Howard G. Cleveland; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 10571) to create the national board of rural industrial schools for mountain children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 10572) to advance to the State of Washington the sum of $100,000 for the construction of a road within and adjacent to the Columbia National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 10573) to amend subdivision 2 of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 10574) to authorize the construction of a wagon road from Government Camp, in Clackamas County, Oreg., to a point in Upper Hood River Valley, Hood River County, Oreg., with certain branch or lateral roads, all situate in the Oregon National Forest, in the State of Oregon, and to provide an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 10575) making an appropriation for the equipment of the United States sheep experiment station; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10576) to regulate the Rural Mail Service and fixing compensation of rural mail carriers in the second congressional district of Florida; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10577) authorizing the establishment of a plant at or near Ocala, Fla., for the manufacture of munitions and implements of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10578) to establish an aviation school and station at or near Fernandina, Fla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 10579) to provide for enlarging the United States building at Houlton, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 10580) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri (by request): A bill (H. R. 10581) to provide for payment of yearly special tax by manufacturers of wine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 10582) to amend section 2 of an act to increase the pensions of widows, etc., approved April 19, 1908; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 10583) to provide revenue for the Government by increasing the duty on granite, freestone, etc., imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 10584) to pension widows and minor children of officers and enlisted men who served in the War with Spain, Philippine insurrection, or in China; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 10585) to create a United States tariff commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 10586) restoring homestead rights to certain individuals; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 10587) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to investigate, examine, and report upon sites along the entire coast of California for the establishment of a third navy yard and naval station, to prepare for adequately defending the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10588) to amend the acts of May 11, 1912, and March 4, 1913, granting pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE: A bill (H. R. 10589) making an appropriation for the investigation and promotion of rural education, industrial training, and the elimination of adult illiteracy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 10590) making an appropriation for the relief of flood sufferers in the Mississippi and Ohio Valleys; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: Resolution (H. Res. 121) requesting the Secretary of Labor to furnish information as to accidents at factories manufacturing munitions; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Resolution (H. Res. 122) to amend the standing rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BORLAND: Resolution (H. Res. 123) directing the Federal Trade Commission to make investigation relative to certain packing companies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Resolution (H. Res. 124) providing for the appointment of a select committee to investigate certain matters relating to the meat-packing industry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 129) to enable the Department of Agriculture, through the Bureau of Statistics and Animal Industry and any other bureau, to gather and distribute information relative to live-stock conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 130) making appropriations for the relief of sufferers from floods in the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VENABLE: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, urging Congress to pass the bill pending providing that the cotton-fund tax, etc., be applied to the pensioning of ex-Confederate soldiers, their widows, and orphans; to the Committee on Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 10591) for the relief of George T. Ayers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 10592) granting a pension to Harriet J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 10593) for the relief of the estate of John R. Martin; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10594) granting an increase of pension to S. M. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 10595) granting a pension to Frank Watzek; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10596) granting a pension to Albert N. Oakleaf; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE: A bill (H. R. 10597) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Billings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10598) granting a pension to Henrietta L. Eggert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 10599) granting a pension to Edward N. Cooke; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 10600) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Cloyes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILLON: A bill (H. R. 10601) granting an increase of pension to James Olin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 10602) for the relief of the heirs of Sarah P. Nix; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 10603) for the relief of Lieut. Commander Jerome E. Morse, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 10604) granting an increase of pension to John H. Condon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10605) granting an increase of pension to Peter Beichler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10606) granting an increase of pension to William A. Ellis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10607) granting an increase of pension to William J. Shirley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10608) granting a pension to Margaret J. Longacre; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10609) granting a pension to Della A. Daubenspeck; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 10610) granting an increase of pension to J. B. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10611) granting a pension to Owen B. Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 10612) granting an increase of pension to Nelson W. Haskell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 10613) granting a pension to Florence W. Ball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10614) granting an increase of pension to Leonard H. Washburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEATON: A bill (H. R. 10615) to appoint George W. Littlehales a professor in the corps of professors of mathematics in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 10616) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Gooding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 10617) granting a pension to Thomas Harlan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10618) for the relief of Cyrus J. Wilsey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 10619) granting an increase of pension to Edward Craft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 10620) granting an increase of pension to U. S. Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 10621) granting an increase of pension to Sitha J. Sholly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10622) for the relief of the heirs of Robert Harris; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10623) to correct the military record of Christopher P. Rhodes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 10624) to appropriate a sum of money to pay Rhoda Menz, W. W. Christmas, and James M. Christmas, heirs of Myra Clarke Gaines, for certain lands in Louisiana; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OAKEY: A bill (H. R. 10625) for the relief of John G. Barnard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLIVER: A bill (H. R. 10626) for the relief of the estate of Green T. Hill, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 10627) granting an increase of pension to William A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10628) granting an increase of pension to William R. Hefflefinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10629) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Lilley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 10630) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Ellard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10631) granting a pension to Josephine F. O'Meara; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10632) granting an increase of pension to Edward E. Crady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 10633) granting an increase of pension to Oakaley Randall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 10634) granting a pension to Charles L. McClure; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10635) granting a pension to Margaret Kelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGUE: A bill (H. R. 10636) granting a pension to Lawrence Small; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10637) granting a pension to Granville Haselton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10638) granting a pension to Joshua Marland; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10639) granting a pension to Cyrus H. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10640) granting a pension to Mary E. McGinn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 10641) for the relief of Fred Henderson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10642) for the relief of Louis Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10643) for the relief of Theodore Bagge; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 10644) to satisfy the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of Bettie L. Pankey, J. W. Longacre, and T. D. Longacre, heirs of William I. Longacre, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 10645) granting a pension to Elizabeth R. Foster; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of King County (Wash.) Democratic Club, urging the improvement of the Puget Sound Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of Sons of American Revolution of New York, urging preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of United Mine Workers of America, urging adoption of the Star-Spangled Banner as the national song; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petitions of business men of Tyrone and Ashville, Pa., favoring bill to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of George H. Gay, of New York, against increased tax on beer, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of United Spanish War Veterans of St. Louis, Mo., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE: Memorial of national commander in chief of United Spanish War Veterans of the United States, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Travelers' Protective Association of America, favoring passage of the Stephens-Ayres bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of Lutheran St. Paul's Church, of Filion, Huron County, and other citizens of Michigan, in favor of an embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Sumners Linen Co., of Port Huron, and Richmond Woolen Mills, of Richmond, Mich., in support of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of 19 members of Almont Grange, 33 members of Grove Grange, 20 members of Ray Grange, 15 members of Custer Grange, and 28 members of Bark Shanty Grange, of Michigan, against increase of appropriations for national defense; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Methodist Episcopal congregation of 100 people, for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Sharp & Dohme, favoring bill to pay the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians of Oklahoma proceeds from the sales of their land holdings in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of Commercial Club of Huron, against tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Paterson, N. J., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Tynam Throwing Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of National Indian War Veterans, Denver, Colo., favoring passage of House bill 655, relative to pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of R. S. Taylor, of Fort Wayne, Ind., against woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELSTON: Memorial of San Francisco Labor Council, relative to tuberculosis aid, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Canners' League of California, favoring House bill 651, relative to act to regulate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of San Francisco Labor Council, relative to printing reports of Commission on Industrial Relations; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Abbott Laboratories, of Chicago, Ill., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of La Salle, Ill., favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of National Indian War Veterans, favoring passage of House bill 655, relative to pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Hamilton Council, No. 35, of Brooklyn, N. Y., Sons and Daughters of Liberty, favoring the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Sharp & Dohme, New York City, relative to pay Indians in Oklahoma for holdings in land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GARNER: Petition of American Society of the New Order of Ages and Grand Army of the Prince of Peace, against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HINDS: Memorial of Society of Friends, of East Parsonfield, Me., against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Society of Friends, of East Parsonfield, Me., against use of the Quaker name on articles of trade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Penobscot and Piscataquis Rural Letter Carriers' Association, of Dover, Me., relative to improving the conditions of the Rural Delivery Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Portland (Me.) Socialist Local, favoring Government ownership of coal mines and sale, etc., of coal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of United Mine Workers of America, Columbus, and Monthly Meeting of Friends, of Damascus, Ohio, against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Bridgeport (Ohio) Liquor Co., against increase of liquor taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Bellaire Bottle Co., against bill to make District of Columbia dry; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JAMES: Petitions of officers of Lega Cittadina di Mutuo Soccorse Nol, of Laurium; Guiseppe Garibaldi Celibi, of Calumet; and Club Alpino, of Calumet, Mich., against the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Mossberg Wrench Co., of Central Falls, R. I., against legislation to restrict efficiency methods in Government arsenals, navy yards, etc.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition signed by Sidney F. Burch and 29 others, of Cedar Springs, Kent County, Mich., protesting against any plan of military or naval expansion providing for a larger expenditure annually, except in case of actual war, than has been appropriated and used for that purpose in recent years; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Vessel Owners and Captains' Association of Philadelphia, favoring purchase of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of Delaware: Petition of sundry citizens of Wilmington, Del., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Vessel Owners and Captains' Association of Philadelphia, relative to the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. NOLAN: Resolutions of the Canners' League of California, favoring improvement of inland waterways; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of the Canners' League of California, favoring the establishment of an adequate American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial and resolutions of the Los Angeles (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, urging national and Pacific coast defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Association of Pacific Fisheries, favoring increased appropriations for the Bureau of Fisheries for work on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce, Oakland, Cal., favoring increased appropriations for the work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on the Pacific Coast; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Society Sons of the American Revolution, in the State of California, in favor of a system of military training of boys in public schools; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of V. H. King, of Belmar, N. J., favoring the Stephens-Ayres bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Workmen's Circle Branch No. 429, relative to congress of neutral nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Spanish-American War Veterans, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Baptist Church and Womens' Christian Temperance Union, of Kalamazoo, Mich., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary

Also, protest of William A. Coombs Milling Co., of Coldwater, Mich., against Rainey bill (H. R. 9409); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition from secretary Kalamazoo Trades and Labor Council, Kalamazoo, Mich., favoring increased pay for janitors in District of Columbia public schools; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Eaton Rapids Woolen Mill, Eaton Rapids; and Henderson-Ames Co., Kalamazoo, Mich., favoring House bill 702, a bill for the Government to manufacture dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9648, in case of George Knapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of Clara Parrott, Ethel Parrott, Raymond Brown, Raymond Lapiere, Warren North, George Labombard, Belle Wells, Tom Brothers, Perlie Duprey, John Duprey, George Newton, Wallace Brown, Father Victor, and Joseph L. Hughes, all of Chazy, N. Y., protesting against the increasing of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of L. O. Johnson and 103 others, of Mahnomen, Minn., favoring an embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Olaf Holdahl and 31 others, of Roseau; George A. Johnson and 135 others, of Grygla, Minn., against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Charles Ross and 15 others, and Brown Duckstad and 12 others, all of Fertile, Minn., against tax on gasoline, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of German-American Alliance of New Haven, Conn., favoring bill to prevent interference with American commerce by Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *February 2, 1916.*

(Continuation of legislative day of Monday, January 31, 1916.)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock m., on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate resumes the consideration of the unfinished business, Senate bill 381.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Husting	Norris	Smoot
Bankhead	James	O'Gorman	Sterling
Beckham	Johnson, Me.	Oliver	Stone
Brandegee	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Sutherland
Bryan	Jones	Page	Swanson
Catron	Kenyon	Phelan	Thomas
Chamberlain	Kern	Pittman	Thompson
Chilton	La Follette	Poindexter	Tillman
Clapp	Lane	Pomerene	Townsend
Clarke, Ark.	Lea, Tenn.	Robinson	Vardaman
Cummins	Lewis	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Curtis	Lippitt	Shafroth	Warren
Dillingham	Lodge	Sheppard	Weeks
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Williams
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	Works
Hitchcock	Nelson	Smith, Mich.	
Hollis	Newlands	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. KERN. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY]. He is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. CHILTON. My colleague [Mr. GOFF] is detained from the Senate on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. The Senator from Iowa has requested the yeas and nays upon his amendment. Is the request for the yeas and nays seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, my attention was diverted. What is the roll being called on?

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to say just a word before the vote is taken.

I intend to vote for this amendment, because I prefer it to the Clarke amendment. As an original proposition or as a proposition standing by itself I am not in favor of the amendment; and if it should be carried, I would feel impelled to vote against it upon the final vote.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry in order that I may vote intelligently. Does the Senator from Iowa offer his amendment as a substitute for the Clarke amendment or to the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. As a substitute for the Clarke amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. As a substitute for the Clarke amendment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is as I understood it when I made my remarks on yesterday.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just one word by way of explanation.

I shall vote for the Cummins amendment, not that I am in favor of the provisions of the amendment but because I think it is far better than the Clarke amendment. I should like to vote for the bill as originally reported without the preamble, and no amendment to it. I should like to vote against the preamble and all amendments to the bill, and if I have a chance to do so I shall so vote, but otherwise my vote will be cast against the bill, because I do not believe this is a proper time for the Government of the United States to discuss the question as to when the Filipinos shall receive their independence, as all admit they are not so prepared to-day.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment without explanation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CATRON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. In his absence I shall not vote.

Mr. HARDING (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. I do not see him in the Chamber and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING], and withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the affirmative). I withdraw my vote, as I understand that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has not voted, and I am paired with him.

Mr. CHILTON. I transfer my pair as formerly announced to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and vote "nay."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I am paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] and vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I was requested to announce the absence of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY].

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—16.

Brandegee	Jones	Lodge	Sutherland
Clapp	Kenyon	Norris	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Oliver	Wadsworth
Cummins	Lane	Smoot	Weeks

NAYS—59.

Ashurst	Hollis	O'Gorman	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Husting	Overman	Smith, Mich.
Beckham	James	Page	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	Phelan	Sterling
Catron	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Stone
Chamberlain	Kern	Poindexter	Swanson
Chilton	Lea, Tenn.	Pomerene	Thompson
Clarke, Ark.	Lewis	Reed	Tillman
Colt	Lippitt	Robinson	Townsend
Curtis	McCumber	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Fall	McLean	Shafroth	Walsh
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Warren
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Williams
Gronna	Myers	Simmons	Works
Hitchcock	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	

NOT VOTING—21.

Borah	du Pont	Lee, Md.	Shively
Brady	Goff	Newlands	Smith, Md.
Broussard	Gore	Owen	Underwood
Burleigh	Harding	Penrose	
Culberson	Hardwick	Ransdell	
Dillingham	Hughes	Sherman	

So Mr. CUMMINS's substitute for the amendment of Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas was rejected.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk as a substitute for the amendment heretofore offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the words proposed to be inserted by Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas it is proposed to insert at the end of the bill the following:

That not less than four years nor more than six years from the meeting of the legislature provided for in this act the President shall withdraw the sovereignty of the United States from the Philippine Islands, except such small portions thereof as he may hereafter be authorized by Congress to hold and retain for naval bases, coaling stations, or other military or naval purposes. He shall, however, before completing the final steps of this withdrawal require of the Filipinos the establishment of a stable government, republican in form, and based upon the consent of the people duly ascertained at an election called by act of the legislature, approved by the President. At this election shall be submitted for approval the form of constitution recommended by the legislature as well as the names of all candidates for elective office in the first provisional government. If the constitution is approved and the provisional government created, the President shall then submit to it a formal treaty by which the United States shall recognize the independence of the Philippine Republic, and by which the latter shall undertake to fulfill all of the obligations of the United States in the Philippines incurred by the treaty of Paris or arising out of the occupation of the islands, including the personal and property rights of individuals and corporations of the United States and other countries, and the safeguarding of such Philippine government loans and obligations as have heretofore been authorized by act of Congress. Such treaty shall also contain for the benefit of the United States the most favored nation clause in trade relations.

Upon the exchange of ratifications of such a treaty the President shall turn over to the Philippine Government the control and sovereignty of the islands, except such naval bases and coaling stations as Congress may authorize. If, however, the President shall find at any time within the six-year period of limitation provided above that the condition of the external or internal affairs of the islands or the international relations of the United States require it, or if a satisfactory treaty can not be secured, he may by proclamation extend for the period of one year beyond the six years above provided the time for taking action under this act and thus afford to Congress an opportunity, in its discretion, to consider further the Philippine question, but any such extension of time by the President shall not otherwise suspend or nullify the operative force of this act unless Congress shall hereafter so direct.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the chief differences between the substitute which I have proposed and the original amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] are as follows: First, the President is allowed a latitude of from two to six years, instead of a latitude of from two to four years; second, the period begins after the first meeting of the Philippine Legislature set up by this bill, in the case of my amendment, and it begins from the passage of the act in the case of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

Next, my substitute provides that the government set up, which we are to recognize, shall be republican in form, such a government as Congress required the people of Cuba to set up. It is intended to guard against the danger that the Philippine people might be imposed upon by an autocratic form of government; that they might be carried away with the idea of providing a monarchy; something which I think would be abhorent to the minds of the American people after they have expended so many millions of dollars in attempting to enlighten and improve the condition of the Philippine Islands.

Next, my amendment provides that the government so set up shall be based upon the consent of the people and shall be established by peaceful means. It would never do for us to leave the Philippine Islands to the possibility that the government set up might be established by force and might be the result of a bloody revolution.

Next, my amendment provides that the rights of the people of other countries, already existing in the Philippine Islands under American protection, shall be protected and recognized by the new Philippine government. I think this is a very important matter. The Senator from Arksansas has provided for the protection of no rights except the rights of Americans in the Philippine Islands. It is true that there are six or seven thousand Americans in the islands, with a hundred million dollars of investments, and it is proper to protect their rights; but I believe that we shall almost certainly become involved in international difficulties similar to those that exist in Mexico if the new Philippine government should undertake to discriminate against the rights and property interests of the Germans, the English, the Japanese, the Chinese, the Danes, the Swedes, and all the other nationalities which exist in those islands at the present time. We can no longer protect those rights, it is true, but we should exact from the government which we are to set up and recognize a promise that they shall be observed the same as other rights.

Then, my amendment provides that the new government shall assume such obligations as the United States assumed in the treaty of Paris which the United States negotiated with Spain and by which it acquired sovereignty in the islands. That treaty guarantees the freedom of religion; it guarantees the rights of Spanish subjects in the courts; it guarantees the rights of Spanish people and their personal and business interests in the islands. When we surrender those islands to the new government which we set up, which can exist only by our grace, by our consent, it is certainly not too much to require that new government to assume the same obligations under which the Government of the United States rests at the present time; and that was one of the promises which we exacted from the Government of Cuba, and it is one which, I think, we should exact from any new government in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask not to be interrupted until I finish this category, and then I will submit to interruption.

My amendment provides for the safeguarding of the government debt and other obligations of the Philippine government which have been authorized by act of Congress. There has been issued, as I recall, $17,000,000, possibly $15,000,000, of government bonds. These bonds have been sold chiefly in the United States; they have been sold at a very low rate of interest and on very favorable terms, because they were authorized by act of Congress. In my opinion, whatever treaty is made with the new government should contain such clauses as will insure the validity and safety of these bonds. In the case of Cuba we prohibited Cuba from incurring any additional debt beyond an amount on which her revenues were sufficient to pay the interest, and I think some provision should be made for having these government bonds, which have been authorized by act of Congress, so safeguarded that their security will be absolute. It might be that the new government in the Philippine Islands might double or quadruple this debt, and if it did so it would greatly impair the obligation of these bonds which Congress has authorized.

Again, the Philippine government has incurred, by the authority of Congress, the guaranty of the interest on certain

railroad bonds in the Philippine Islands. I think that that obligation, which was authorized by Congress and which is a moral obligation of the United States, should be safeguarded in whatever arrangement is made with the new government in the Philippine Islands, and I have provided for it in my substitute.

Then, Mr. President, I think, as a matter of justice to the business interests of the United States, there should be inserted in this agreement with the new Philippine government a promise that the United States trade shall always enjoy the benefits of the most-favored nations. That is certainly none too much to exact of the new Philippine government, and here and now is the place to specify it.

Another respect in which my substitute differs from the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas is with regard to naval bases. My amendment provides that only such naval bases and coaling stations shall be reserved and maintained as may be authorized by the Congress of the United States. That, I think, is a matter which should not be left to the discretion of the President, but should only be authorized by an act of Congress.

Another respect in which my substitute differs from the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas is this: He provides that immediately upon the passage of the act the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations of the world, with a view to guaranteeing the independence of the Philippine Islands, and, failing to get any nation to agree with the United States to undertake that great burden, he places it for five years upon the United States; he obligates the United States to guarantee the independence of a nation which may be a monarchy, which may be an autocracy, which may be running into reckless governmental expenditures, and which may be threatened with revolution. Now, Mr. President, I think that that is a burden entirely too great for the United States to assume, and I have eliminated it altogether from the substitute which I have proposed to the Senator's amendment. It seems to me that an element of danger is involved in the provision which compels the United States for five years after the lapse of the next four years to guarantee practically the independence of this new government, nearly 8,000 miles from our shores. Such a guaranty will compel us to keep over there an army probably greater than that which we have now, and to maintain a naval force greater than we now provide for the purpose of holding the islands; and I have eliminated that feature from my substitute for that reason.

Mr. President, there are two other respects in which my substitute differs from the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. His amendment provides that the President may suspend the operation of this act in case the internal or external condition of affairs in the Philippine Islands requires it. He does not give the President permission to suspend the operation of this act in case the interests of the United States require it. It might happen that at the very psychological moment when the President was completing the act of retirement from the islands the United States would be involved in war or some other international complications might arise which would make it a dangerous and improper thing for us to retire from the islands, and yet the President would be required to go on with the act of vacating the islands. So I have provided that, in addition to the difficulties concerning internal or external affairs of the Philippine Islands, the President shall be permitted to submit the matter again to Congress, provided the interests of the United States at that moment seem to require it.

Mr. President, these are the chief differences between the substitute which I have offered and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas. I will be glad now to submit to any questions that the Senator from Washington may desire to propound.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I am not sure that I heard correctly the Senator's statement; but, as I understood him, he urged that his amendment be adopted because it provides that this Government in severing its relations with the Philippine Islands shall guarantee freedom of religion under the government which the Filipinos may set up in the islands, or shall make some agreement by which freedom of religion will be protected; also that we should make certain provisions for fulfilling the financial obligations which have been assumed there, such as the interest on railroad and certain other bonds. There are various other obligations which he urges shall be taken care of in the arrangement for severing the relations between this country and the Philippines. I should like to have the Senator explain his amendment in that respect, as to the means which the Government of the United States will employ to fulfill that great responsibility. After we have severed our relations with the Philippine Islands, as he proposes, how are we going to see that they pay their debts and that they do not impose religious persecution upon their people—upon the Mohammedan part of their population, for instance? As the matter stands now we are in control. Of course, we all stand for freedom of religion and for paying debts, both public and private. Now, we have the means to carry out those principles; but the Senator proposes to give up the control of the government of the islands, and then how are we going to accomplish the object which he says ought to be accomplished?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, Mr. President, I have not undertaken to go into that. All I am asking the Senate to do is to incorporate in the act which proposes to give independence to the Philippine Islands a condition that the President, in negotiating the treaty of recognition, shall require the new Philippine government to make certain promises; to make the promise to observe the treaty obligations of the United States incurred in the treaty of Paris; to safeguard and maintain the integrity of the rights of Americans and other foreigners now existing in the Philippine Islands. I assume that if the new Philippine government be republican in form and established by peaceful means, and if that government enters into an agreement with the United States to perform these things it will carry that agreement into effect. Every nation in the world would be interested, as well as the United States, in seeing that agreement carried out.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he does not believe that the Philippine people, through their representatives, would readily agree to all the guaranties which he proposes in order to obtain their independence? The probabilities are that they will so agree; but does the Senator think that that mere agreement, brought about by the hope and desire for national independence, will amount to very much?

What I am trying to ascertain as to the Senator's views is if he proposes that we shall follow up the agreement and see that it is carried out. Of course they will make the agreement, but it probably will not amount to very much. In the vicissitudes of government in the Philippine Islands after the restraining influence of the United States is withdrawn, suppose they break their agreement. Suppose they do not protect property and personal rights. Suppose they deprive the people of due process of law and of freedom of religion and repudiate their financial obligations. What are we going to do in that case?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, that will not be for this Congress to determine. This Congress is confronted with the proposition whether or not it will require the new government to promise to carry out those just matters. It will be for another Congress to determine what action shall be taken in case those promises are violated. Certainly we can do nothing less than to require them to make the promises.

I differ from the Senator in this respect: I do not think those promises will be broken. I believe that if a government of the Philippine Islands is set up under the safeguards which are proposed it will substantially keep its promises. But even if I believed that they were to be broken I nevertheless would be in favor of requiring them to make the promises.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It seems to me we ought to be looking a little further than the mere securing of the agreement. In passing a great act involving the governmental status of several million people in the Philippine Islands and the interests of this country in relation to them we ought to have some policy as to the future. The Senator is responsible for his amendment. He is in charge of the bill. It seems to me a pertinent inquiry to know whether or not the Senator intends that this Government shall establish as a policy now, when we are passing this act, that we shall back up our agreement which we make at the time of severing these relations and that we shall enforce the treaty agreements which the Filipino people make with us.

If the Senator means to say by the answer which he has already given that he thinks we ought not to guarantee the performance of the treaty, that answers the question. That states his position. It seems to me, however, that we ought to know, we ought to have a definite idea, whether we are going to be responsible for our agreements or whether we are going to set these people adrift and pay no further attention to them.

If the Senator will permit me a moment further, I think making an agreement of that kind is simply sowing the seed for controversy, it is opening a Pandora's box of trouble, if we are going to live up to the obligations which manifestly will have been imposed upon us. Of course if we are going to wash our hands of it all, we will have no further trouble about it. If we are going to do nothing but exact a promise and pay no attention to the possible breaking of the promise, we will have no trouble, except the humiliation and the loss of self-respect and

the respect of the other nations of the world for not performing our national obligations.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Nebraska. Before making it I will state that I feel that the agitation inaugurated by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] with reference to our withdrawal from these islands has been productive of excellent results in the amendment presented by the Senator from Nebraska, and it seems to me that some of the suggestions made by this amendment might well be incorporated in our legislation. I wish, however, to inquire of the Senator regarding the phrase "republican in form," on line 9 of the first page of this amendment It reads:

He shall, however, before completing the final steps of this withdrawal, require of the Filipinos the establishment of a stable government, republican in form, and based upon the consent of the people, duly ascertained at an election called by act of the legislature approved by the President.

It seems to me we might well require the establishment of a stable government; we might well require that that government should be based upon the consent of the people; but why should we require that it should be republican in form?

My view is that we are intruders in the Orient; that by taking possession of the Philippine Islands we became intruders in the Orient. We now wish to withdraw. It seems to me that those people have the right to establish such a government as they wish; and whilst I believe that they will choose a republican form of government, I question very much the propriety of our imposing it upon them by our law.

We are intruders in the Orient just as much as Japan would be an intruder were she to conquer the West Indies or Mexico; and if after such intrusion she should conclude to withdraw, I think we might well object to her imposition upon the people of the conquered territory as a condition of withdrawal that they should adopt a government monarchical in form.

There is no republican form of government in the Orient They have feebly attempted to establish a republic in China, and have failed. A Republic is the highest achievement of civilization, possible only with a people of the highest intelligence, poise, and self-control. The people of the Orient are not accustomed to a republican form of government. They hardly know what it is. The people of the Philippine Islands have not yet been democratized. They are still wedded to the old cacique system of head nien, caciques, the patrons of those dependent upon them, who are ruled both governmentally and economically; and it will take a long time for them to evolve from that system.

I have no doubt that these people will make an experiment in a republican form of government, and I have not the slightest doubt that they will fail. I expect them, however, to attempt it, and it is probably the best thing for them to do. It is the only thing for them to do. I question, however, the propriety of our proposing a republican form of government as a conditinn of their independence.

Would the Senator object to the elimination of the words "republican in form"?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I suppose I should make some reply to the statement of the Senator from Nevada, if the Senator from Washington will permit me.

The reason for inserting the expression "republican form of government" was that we are responsible for whatever government is set up there. In view of the state of public sentiment in this country and also the argument presented by the enormous sum of money which we have expended there in endeavoring ourselves to establish a republican form of government, in view, also, of the fact that every one of the 48 States of the Union exists only because it maintains a republican form of government, and in view of the fact, also, that the only time that the Philippine people undertook to establish a government of their own they created or attempted to create a Republic, I think that the moral force of the United States can very properly be used here at the very outset to indicate the kind of government that the Philippine people shall establish.

There is no objection to it, no difficulty that will arise out of it, except the added force it will give to the good influences in the Philippines to prevent something like an autocratic or monarchical form of government being forced on the people, possibly by a revolution.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want to say, furthermore, before I sit down, that "republican form of government" is not a phrase that necessarily indicates any particular form. The courts of the United States have on several occasions defined what a republican form of government was. They have indicated that that was a political expression and that there was a latitude for selecting the form of government, providing it was, in effect, the rule of the people; and the dictionaries defining "republican form of government" indicate that in its essence it is a government established by the people, with their consent, and maintained by their representatives.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question as to whether my interpretation of part of his amendment or substitute is correct. It reads:

If the constitution is approved and the provisional government created, the President shall then submit to it a formal treaty by which the United States shall recognize the independence of the Philippine republic.

The Senator has afterwards provided that—

Upon the exchange of ratifications of such a treaty the President shall turn over to the Philippine government the control and sovereignty of the islands.

What I desire to ask the Senator is whether my understanding is correct that the Philippine people can not get their independence unless that treaty is ratified by two-thirds of the Members of the Senate and whether the Senator thinks that under this bill one-third of this Senate could forever prevent the independence of the Philippine people?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not think that one-third of the Senate would ever undertake to do anything which would break the faith of the United States, solemnly enacted into law.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But is not the power vested there practically in the third to defeat Philippine independence under this amendment?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, with the Senator's permission I should like to ask him a question, in order to try to get his viewpoint.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well; I have no objection.

Mr. REED. If we are going to leave the islands and retain anything whatsoever, would it not be necessary to secure our rights by treaty?

Mr. SHAFROTH. That may be, but not of necessity; and, as a matter of fact, not under the Clarke amendment——

Mr. REED. Let us leave the Clarke amendment out for the moment. Let me ask the question in another way. The Senator recognizes the fact that under the treaty of Paris this Government solemnly bound itself to the carrying out of certain conditions with Spain and with the Spanish people resident in the islands. The Senator recognizes that fact; does he not?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, yes.

Mr. REED. Now, does the Senator think that we can turn over these islands and escape or repudiate that obligation?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no; the Clarke amendment provides for that.

Mr. REED. Very well. I am not talking about the Clarke amendment. I am asking a direct question.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, this is a substitute for the Clarke amendment.

Mr. REED. I understand, but I should like to keep to the question. Now, if it be true that we have obligations to the Spanish Government which we can never escape or repudiate, and that those obligations include the protection of Spanish subjects and the property of Spanish people, is it not incumbent upon us, when we turn over the government of the Philippines, to secure from the Philippine government a treaty guaranteeing the carrying out of those conditions?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know that a treaty is necessary, but there should be a safeguarding; and we can retain that right just as it is done in the Clarke amendment, which will cause to be respected and safeguarded all the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States. The Senator from Arkansas has indicated that he is perfectly willing to put in "and of other countries," so that will make a perfect safeguard as to the rights of Americans and foreigners.

Mr. REED. Very well. Now, then, sticking to my question, because we only want to get at what is right in this, does not the Senator recognize the fact that the only way in which we can secure these guaranties is by an agreement with the Philippine government?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; we can reserve them in this act, just as has been done in the Clarke amendment.

Mr. REED. Then the Senator wants to get out and not get out?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No.

Mr. REED. If I understand the Senator, he is arguing now that he is opposed to this clause of the Hitchcock amendment because it might be that when the Senate is asked to confirm a treaty one-third of the Members may defeat the confirmation, and thus we will keep the islands for an indefinite period. Now, on the other hand, he argues for an amendment which implies that we shall reserve in our bill of independence such rights of supervision and such powers of control as will enable us to compel the Philippine government to carry out the terms of the treaty of Paris.

Now, I put this question to the Senator: Is not the proposition to retain control over the islands more detrimental to the liberties of the islands than the one contained in the Hitchcock amendment, which proposes to leave these people free to set up a government, and then to negotiate with that government, the Senate simply retaining the right to affirm or deny the ratification of the treaty?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No, Mr. President, I do not think so. I do not think there would be any difficulty in the formation of a treaty with the Philippine people, if there should be a treaty required under the act, but my doubt is whether or not one-third of the Senate will defeat the treaty that might be agreed upon, in order to retain our present control and government of the Philippine Islands. The danger is on our part and not upon the part of the Filipinos, in my judgment.

Mr. REED. I understand that is the Senator's position, but somewhere and somehow there must be provided a protection against a repudiation of the obligation we entered into in the treaty of Paris. That protection can only be obtained in one of two ways. There may be an agreement upon the part of the Philippine Islands to carry out the terms and conditions of the treaty of Paris. That is one way. The other way is in the bill of liberation to stipulate that this Government reserves the right to compel the Philippine government to carry out the terms and conditions of the treaty of Paris.

Now, which one of the two is the more dangerous power to lodge with the Congress of the United States, for the Senator is manifestly afraid to trust Congress? Plainly any Senate that will be willing to break faith with the Philippine people after they have set up their government, any Senate that will be willing to repudiate a treaty solemnly entered into by the President in strict accordance with this bill of liberation, will find it an exceedingly easy thing to assert that we shall continue to exercise sovereignty over the islands.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. REED. Why is not that true?

Mr. SHAFROTH. The position which the Senator takes does not in my judgment comport with the conditions that I believe exist there. The President unquestionably would have the right to prescribe a constitution and that constitution would contain a guaranty upon the part of the Philippine people to respect all the obligations which we assumed with relation to those islands in our treaty with Spain and also guarantee to the American people there and all foreigners the same rights as they have themselves. That is the agreement which they will make and under those conditions we will sail away. Consequently if they break the agreement it can be a subject of controversy between this country and theirs.

Now, this Clarke amendment provides that at the end of five and a half years at the most, unless something is done to extend the time, automatically their independence is established. It does not take an act of Congress. It does not require the ratification of a treaty. It provides that their independence shall be recognized at that time.

Now, to inject into this bill a provision that before independence is recognized there shall be a treaty negotiated between these two countries, which is to be referred to the Senate of the United States, when one-third of the Members thereof can defeat it and make the independence of the islands depend entirely upon that ratification is to practically place in the hands of one-third of the Members of this body the power to determine the status between the United States and the Philippine Islands.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Colorado if he does not think that if such a contingency should arise Congress could immediately take steps to secure what they have said in this bill?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, possibly, but——

Mr. FLETCHER. There would then be time enough for such legislation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That may be, but we have been on this subject a good many years. We are likely to take five and one-half years more if we are going to pass the bill in a form where nothing will be settled, but if it is referred back to Congress as provided in the Hitchcock amendment, or where a treaty must be ratified before independence shall be given, it seems to me it puts us, at the end of six years and at the end of one year more, which would be seven years, in the same condition which exists right now. As to what may be the view upon independence in the Senate then I can not say, and it seems to me that no one else can. I want something more definite than that.

Mr. REED. The Senator certainly fails to see this question as I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think I do see it differently.

Mr. REED. The differences between us are not in matter of principle, but in failure on the part of the Senator to recognize certain things.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That may be. I——

Mr. REED. First, I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that when we propose to establish a government in the Philippine Islands we erect that territory and those people into a separate independent sovereign State, and we must then deal with them as a sovereignty. The very first thing the Senator most desires is to give them independence?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. REED. And yet the Senator proposes at the time he gives them an alleged independence to retain such control as will enable us for all time to compel them to carry out the terms of the treaty of Paris and to recognize certain property rights. In other words, he proposes to extend them not independence, not to confer upon them sovereignty, but to put them in a position of quasi dependence upon the United States.

The Hitchcock amendment is much more favorable to the Philippine Islanders. It gives them the right to set up a government stable in its form and republican in its essence. When they have done that it provides that they shall, as a sovereign power, make an agreement with us that they will carry out certain obligations we have hitherto assumed by the treaty of Paris.

The Senator agrees, I think, this far, that the Hitchcock amendment is a better proposition for the Philippine Islands than is the Clark amendment, provided the Senate of the United States does not arbitrarily refuse to confirm a treaty made in strict accordance with the law we are engaged in creating.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. REED. He fears the Senate will not ratify a treaty with those people. Is it not better to take the stand that the Senate of the United States will not repudiate the obligations which this Government has assumed by the passage of this act, and will not repudiate a treaty entered into by the President in strict conformity with the provisions of the act. Can we not safely assume that the Senate will not abuse its power, so as to nullify a law solemnly passed and accepted by the Philippine government.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like——

Mr. REED. Which of the two is the greater danger? Which of the two is most likely to keep chains upon the Filipino people and to hold out the temptation to sinister and evil interests to continue to control or to seek to gain control in those islands, the Clark amendment, which proposes to keep control, or the Hitchcock amendment, which must be carried out unless the Senate shall hereafter break faith by refusing to ratify a treaty made in consonance with a law we have enacted.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I will try to answer that question by saying to the Senator that I believe a provision contained in the constitution of the Philippine people that they will adopt, which guarantees all of the requirements which the Senator has specified, is the fairest way and the safest way. It ought not to be relegated to Congress or to this Senate for the purpose of ratification.

Mr. President, the difficulty with this very provision of the bill, requiring a treaty, does not recognize them as an independent nation at the time they are required to make the treaty. You make it a condition that a subordinate body under the United States authority shall make and present a treaty to the Senate of the United States. You have not given them their independence when you propose they shall make this treaty. You make independence contingent upon ratification, and you have the anomaly of having a coordinate branch of our own Government presenting to the United States Senate a treaty for ratification when the Philippines have not their independence at all, but are under the jurisdiction, powers, and control of the United States.

That is an anomaly which no one, it seems to me, who carefully examines the matter could ask anyone to approve. The legislature and the constitutional convention which they are to have are not to be independent until they are recognized as independent, and you are asking that a subordinate body of the

United States, holding power and position with the Government of the United States, shall have jurisdiction and control to present to the Senate of the United State a treaty, as if it were an independent nation. It is not an independent nation. Consequently that anomaly makes it inconsistent and impracticable. Treaties are made between independent Governments.

Now, it seems to me that the safe way is that which has been indicated. I admit there are some amendments which ought to be made to the Clarke amendment, and the proper way to obtain them is to make each particular provision apply not as a substitute, but as an amendment to the Clarke amendment. If you want to put in the word "may" instead of "shall" with relation to the coaling stations and naval bases, all right and good. The Senator from Arkansas is willing to make that amendment. Various other suggestions which were made by the Senator from Nebraska were acceptable to the Senator from Arkansas.

It seems to me we will get a much better provision and a much better bill if we take the Clarke amendment and amend it, and let the vote be upon each of the accepted portions of it, and then let what is left of the Clarke amendment be substituted for the preamble of the bill.

Mr. REED. Therefore the Senator makes the argument that we do not propose to make a treaty with a free people, that we propose to have this people set up a government under our supervision and then make a treaty with that people, when it is not really free to act.

But the Senator says at the same time that these people can guarantee the carrying out of the same duties through a constitution, a constitution that is also to be adopted while we are still in the islands, a constitution that is to be adopted while our power is still there.

The argument of the Senator carries him too far. If the people are not free to make a treaty, neither are they free to adopt the constitution. Applying the reasoning in one case to the other, the Senator has argued himself into the position that the Filipinos can not do anything to bind themselves in any way until and unless we first march away from the islands and leave them free to have their election in their own way and adopt such a constitution as they see fit, and that not until then can they do anything to bind themselves.

The trouble with the Senator's argument is that it strikes down an agreement by constitutional enactment as effectually as it does an agreement by treaty.

There is another trouble with it——

Mr. SHAFROTH. Now——

Mr. REED. It is that the Senator's whole argument proceeds upon the theory that the United States proposes to do something to interfere with free action on the part of the Philippine people instead of following the fact which is that we propose to leave them absolutely free to hold a fair and free election. We propose to leave them free to set up a government. We place no other restrictions save that it shall be republican in its form and stable in its character.

Now, we propose before we go out to have some kind of agreement with that people that they will respect the treaty of Paris and respect certain property rights. How are we to get that agreement? The Senator says let them write it in a constitution that is written under our supervision while we are still in the islands and that that is a sufficient guaranty to us.

I reply, first, that the constitution will be made under the same conditions as the treaty will be made, viz, while we are still in the islands. If the argument that a treaty made while we are still in the islands is invalid, then, of course, a pledge made in a constitution adopted while we are in the islands is equally invalid.

I reply, second, that no one ever heard of a nation making a contract with another nation having obligations to perform by which the first nation assumed to carry out the obligations of the second nation in any other way than by a treaty.

What is a constitution? It is an agreement by the people of a nation among themselves. It is simply their declaration of a public policy. They have the right to change it at any moment they see fit. If they are a sovereign power, they have the right to change it as they see fit. We have no right to complain. It is not a contract in any sense of the term with this Government.

The only way we can make a contract with the people of the Philippine Islands and have an obligation running from them to us which we have the right to enforce is by a treaty, for a treaty is simply a contract between two governments, and if we are not to make a treaty, if we are to have no contract, then we can have no guaranty, unless, indeed, it be the guaranty of power, the guaranty of force, the guaranty of a retention of partial sovereignty, or suzerainty over the islands. The beautiful dream the Senator holds out to the Philippine people to-day appears to be that we will retain sovereignty and control and we will enforce, by fire and sword, our mandates upon them. On the other hand, the Hitchcock amendment proposes that we shall erect them into a stable and free government and take the obligations of that government that it will carry out certain promises.

Mr. SHAFORTH. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator, I will say that the Filipino people seem to be satisfied with the Clarke amendment. They have sent to the Senate and to the Congress of the United States a specific indorsement of it. If tyranny is to be exercised over them under that amendment, you can readily see——

Mr. REED. How did the Philippine people do that?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Their legislature unanimously voted it not six days ago.

Mr. REED. The legislature, I apprehend, has not read the Clarke amendment.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It has been cabled over there, I have no doubt.

Mr. President, when the Philippine people place in their constitution the provision which will be required under the terms of this act, that the rights of Americans and the rights of foreigners shall be protected, I have not the slightest doubt there will never be a deviation from it. The Filipino people are honest; they pay their debts. They are as anxious to establish the credit of their government as we are to retain the credit of ours. Consequently, when this provision is made, I have no doubt that it will be carried out to the fullest extent; but when you again refer the question of independence to the Senate alone and make the independence of the Philippines dependent upon a treaty to be ratified by this Senate, one-third of the Members thereof can entirely defeat such independence. In my judgment, there is more danger of that than there is that the Philippine people will not carry out the obligations which they will express in their constitution.

Mr. REED. That is to say, the Senator from Colorado has more confidence in the honesty of the Filipino people than he has in one-third of the Senate of the United States?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; that is not the question. We know right now that there are in this Chamber many Senators who do not believe in giving up our sovereignty over the Filipinos at all. They are perfectly honest in that view; they believe it is to the interests of the Filipinos and that it is also to the interests of the American people. I have no criticism of their honesty, but as to the question of a governmental policy we differ. I have no doubt that there would be no difference whatever with respect to the Filipinos carrying out their obligations to the United States; you would not find a single man there but would say he would do it; it is not a policy upon which there is any dispute. For that reason it seems to me that our legislation ought to be as it is expressed in the Clarke amendment.

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado can not escape by that kind of logic. He asserts, first, that the Philippine people are all honest.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. REED. No; I have the floor, and I will yield in a moment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator will pardon me, I was not asking the Senator to yield.

Mr. REED. I thought not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] had taken his seat when I addressed the Chair, and neither the Senator from Missouri nor the Senator from Colorado had a right to the floor.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator permit me to finish this colloquy? Then, I will quit the floor.

The Senator from Colorado makes the broad assertion that all the Philippine people are honest; that they all pay their debts; that their government is going to be entirely honest. Well, I hope all that is true; but, if it is true, they are the most remarkable people on earth. The Senator from Colorado couples that assertion with the statement that one-third of the Members of this Senate will do what? Will refuse to ratify any treaty that may be made, although that treaty may be in strict conformity with the obligations of this act; although we shall pass this act to-day, and in pursuance thereof the Philippine people shall call an election; that relying upon our pledge they will set up a government, write a constitution, establish themselves in the form we have prescribed; and that, having complied in all respects with their part of the contract, one-third of the Members of the United States Sen-

ate will dishonestly, corruptly, and infamously break the faith of this Government. I do not think the people of the Philippines are so good as the Senator thinks and I do not think that one-third of the Senate will be quite so bad as the Senator anticipates.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I want to say——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me, from a hasty reading of this proposed amendment, that it contains some elements of confusion that are likely to lend to mischievous results.

I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], if he is present, to the language of the amendment. In the first place, the provision is—

> That not less than four years nor more than six years from the meeting of the legislature provided for in this act the President shall withdraw the sovereignty of the United States from the Philippine Islands—

And so on. We have there a provision absolute in its terms, that within six years in any event, no matter what else happens, the sovereignty of the United States shall be withdrawn; but, before completing the final steps of withdrawal, the amendment requires certain things of the Filipino people, which it is not now necessary to read.

Before reading the second clause of the amendment I may say that one of the things which the President is required to bring about is the submission of a formal treaty, which shall contain certain things as to the government of the Philippine Islands. Then the provision is:

> Upon the exchange of ratifications of such a treaty the President shall turn over to the Philippine government the control and sovereignty of the islands, except such naval bases—

And so on. The effect of that is that the sovereignty of the islands shall not be turned over to the people until there has been an exchange of ratifications of this proposed treaty. Suppose that near the time of the expiration of the six years specified in the first part of this amendment the President shall have succeeded in laying before the Philippine provisional government a treaty, and that that treaty has been returned and is pending before the Senate of the United States, we will assume that the Senate of the United States would be honest, as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] says it would be, but the Senate takes time to investigate the treaty; it has to go to the Committee on Foreign Relations; it is investigated there; in the meantime the six years expire, the treaty may be pending here for five or six months. I should like somebody to explain to me what in the meantime becomes of the sovereignty of the Philippine Islands. At the end of the six years, not dependent upon the ratification of the treaty, but only dependent upon the fact that the treaty has been submitted to the Philippine people, our sovereignty is to be withdrawn, but it is not to be turned over to the Philippine government until this treaty has been ratified. What has happened to it? Is it hanging in the air somewhere? There is no sovereignty anywhere. As the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] suggests, has the President got it, or is it hanging somewhere like Mohammed's coffin?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, for six weeks—practically for the whole of this session—the Philippine bill has been under discussion in the Senate, with the result, as it seems to me, that confusion is now worse confounded. There are some facts, however, which have been established during the discussion to which I propose to call attention for a moment.

In the first place, it is practically conceded that the Filipinos are not capable of self-government at this time; nor has anybody presented a serious proposition to the effect that they be given their independence now. Every proposition has assumed that it will require more time in order to fit them for governing themselves. This is the opinion of every man qualified by knowledge and experience to speak on the subject. There must be some reason for this bill.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], the chairman of the Committee on the Philippines, opened the case to the Senate with a statement that it was to be devoid of politics; that he hoped it would be discussed on the high plane of nonpartisanship; and yet almost every speaker who has contended for the measure and its amendments has maintained that it was in conformity with the Democratic national platform, and that therefore the Democrats, at least, were compelled to support a proposition which promised independence to the Filipinos. Some have been content with indefinite promises; others have been definite.

There is another fact which stands out clearly and undisputed, and that is that thus far the work of the United States in the Philippines has been most satisfactory. That is admitted by all who have addressed the Senate. That great progress has been made, therefore, I assume to be true; that we are doing a great work, such as has never been undertaken before by any country, is admitted; and yet, at this time, the proposition of changing the policy which has resulted in honor to the United States and good to the Filipinos is being seriously urged and amendment after amendment is proposed to which there are serious objections. Most of these amendments are offered either without full knowledge of conditions or regardless of their effect.

It looks to me as though there is a disposition on the part of some Senators to scuttle the ship—to haul down the Stars and Stripes from over the Philippine Islands. That has been tried once or twice on another occasion with disastrous effect to the party which was responsible for so doing. I am not insisting that our flag shall always float over the Philippines, but I do insist that it shall be lowered in honor and not in cowardice. If we haul down the flag, it must be because we propose to better the condition of the Filipinos, for another fact is admitted, namely, that we are in the Philippine Islands to-day for the good of the Filipinos. Those people themselves admit that we have done them good and are doing them good to-day. It is also admitted, or practically admitted, that the Philippine Islands are not capable of governing themselves if we leave them to their own destiny, to their own devices at the present time; and, therefore, it is proposed by some that we shall in some way release our power but retain our responsibility for the government of the islands. I emphatically object to that, Mr. President.

I favor the substitute proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] in one respect over the Clarke amendment, and that is the provision that when the time for independence does come, the United States shall relieve itself of all responsibility. I want to do that; and I am glad that there are Senators who agree with me that it is not wise for our country to form an entangling alliance with other nations, an alliance which, under the so-called Clarke amendment, might force the United States to become the ally of nations with which we might not wish to be allied and against nations that we would not like to oppose. In any event, there are infinite possibilities of trouble which may come to us if we seek to have a binding arrangement between the United States and other nations to maintain the independence of the Philippine Islands. We should keep control of the Philippines until our work is complete, and then when that time comes, it will be wise to talk of independence. It is not wise to do so before.

Mr. President, I do not believe that at this time we should meddle with this question, except possibly to extend the power of government a little further to the Filipinos, as the bill proposes, but let us not release our power and still retain responsibility to these people and to the world for conditions in the Philippines.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] has said that the people of the Philippines are favorable to the Clarke amendment. Why, sir, I believe that the intelligent Filipinos would be panic stricken if they knew that the United States was to withdraw its protection and its defense of those islands at the present time, or even within six years. If they knew what this amendment means, they would oppose it.

Senators seek to attach a condition, whereby this question may be relegated again to the Senate or to Congress at some future time, thus evidently hoping to evade responsibility and turn the problem over to the next administration and thus comply with a Democratic platform promise. To me this means confusion. It does not settle anything, but instead it complicates the problem.

Therefore, Mr. President, while I think that in some respects the Hitchcock amendment is preferable to the one introduced by the Senator from Arkansas, as it avoids some dangers which are involved in the latter, yet by voting for it I might possibly be the means of carrying it and writing it into the law, and I do not wish to do anything with the Philippine Islands along the lines suggested by any of these amendments. By voting against it, I might enable the Clarke amendment to carry, which, in my judgment, is still worse. Therefore, being confused, and yet knowing, or feeling that I know, that we are engaged in a dangerous business now, that we are playing with fire that may grow into a conflagration before it is quenched, I feel that it is my duty to vote against every proposition which has been thus far submitted.

If some arrangement could be made whereby the preamble could be stricken from the bill, I should be very glad to vote for the measure as presented by the committee, and thus give a little more power to the Filipinos in order to test their ability for self-government; but, inasmuch as this can not be made and

believing as I do believe, that they are not fitted for self-government, that they will not be fitted for self-government in that time, and that probably the experience which shall come out of the next six years will compel the Congress to annul what is being done now, I feel that it is my duty to vote against all of these propositions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE of Maryland in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] offered as a substitute for the amendment presented by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], who is not now present, asked me to see that the vote was not taken upon the matter until be might have an opportunity to be heard. I desire to make a few observations in any event with respect to the matter, and pending his return I will do so.

Mr. President, there has been a great deal of contention on the part of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and other Senators in regard to the guaranty clause of five years, and I want to call the attention of the Senate to a few facts with relation to it. We ought to take some little time to insure that the people we propose to make an independent nation shall have an opportunity to start their government properly, and that they shall have protection. We assume no more responsibility in that five years than we are assuming now; and if, as suggested by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], we should stay there a great many years, or a considerable number of years more, no greater obligation would be assumed than the obligation we now have.

It is said that there is objection by reason of the fact that we will not have any authority in the islands, but we will be responsible for the condition of those islands, and that that is radically wrong. Why, Mr. President, we have not found it so. For 93 years we have been guaranteeing the independence of 20 nations on this continent, and yet we have never had any war by reason of that fact. It has not been a matter that has made other nations attempt conquest.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There has been very frequent comparison made of the guaranteeing of the independence of the Philippine Islands with the obligations which we have assumed under the Monroe doctrine, and also with the relation we bear to Cuba. It seems to me the Senator recognizes the departure involved in going to Asia to establish such a policy of protection to weaker people as we have assumed with regard to the Americas. The Senator has instituted that comparison again; and I only rose to remark that it emphasizes and illustrates what seems to me to be the colossal mistake of the whole proposition of going across the Pacific Ocean to carry a new Monroe doctrine into that hemisphere.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The difference between the Senator and myself is that we differ fundamentally upon this question. I respect his opinion; he is entitled to it; and he is just as honest as I am; but we look at the matter from different standpoints. We have that protectorate over there now. The question is whether we shall give these people, who establish a new government five years' time in which to fix their relations with the other nations of the world.

I have no doubt that no nation would interfere during the five years. Any nation that intended to jump on to the Philippine Islands would not do so until the five years expired. There is no danger. The very fact that we limit it shows that we do not want a Monroe doctrine over there. It was the acquisition of those islands, in the first place, that violated the Monroe doctrine upon this side of the water; because, if we compel other nations to keep their hands off of our territory or territory in the Western Hemisphere, the eastern people or other people have a right to protest against our taking or seizing anything in the Orient.

Here is a provision for five years. The very fact that we limit it to five years shows that we do not want the Monroe doctrine to exist over there. For that reason, it seems to me, it is a proper provision, in order to let them have a government there with a start to it, and that it would be a good thing to let other nations negotiate with them and form treaties in that period of five years.

As I said before, we have guaranteed the independence of 20 nations for the last 93 years, and we never have had a war about it. Why should people think that in this limited period of five years we would get into trouble, so that there would be people watching for the five years to begin, and then they would get into complications with the United States?

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado if he is not putting it a little strongly when he says that we have guaranteed the independence of 20 nations?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Why, we have indicated to all of Europe, and to the most powerful nations then in the world—far more powerful than we were—that it would be an unfriendly act upon their part if they attempted to colonize upon any of the Republics of the South or Central American States.

Mr. STERLING. Is not that altogether a different proposition from guaranteeing their independence?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Why, that is a practical guaranty of their independence, because the only attack that could be made upon it would be by some powerful nation; and when you warn that powerful nation that you mean war if they attempt to do it, they will not attempt to do it. They have not done so heretofore. Here are 20 nations that have been kept independent, in many instances, I have not any doubt, by reason of that very fact. We simply want to make an arrangement here for five years and then terminate it, showing that we do not want the Monroe doctrine to extend to the Eastern Hemisphere. It seems to me that there ought to be no serious objection to it.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, on the pending question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question about his amendment.

The Senator provides in his substitute for an election to be held by the qualified voters of the Philippine Islands to pass upon the constitution and plan of government which may be submitted to them. Under what auspices would the Senator have that election held?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, it is to be held under the auspices of the existing government in the Philippine Islands, which, after the passage of this bill, will be a legislature, both branches of which have been elected by the Philippine people.

Mr. STONE. Then, the election would be held wholly under the supervision of the Philippine government or of its officers?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. STONE. My reason for asking the question is that in conditions as I think they are in the Philippines the result of an election might be determined one way or another by manipulation and might not, in fact, reflect the sentiment of the voters; and I wondered if, before we separated from them, in the plan of government that is submitted there should not be some supervision over the election by some American authority—by impartial men?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I see what the Senator means, but I think it is fairly well safeguarded. In the first place, the legislature as it exists at the present time consists of an upper and a lower house, the upper house being appointed by the President and the lower house elected by the people. After this act goes into effect, however, an election will be held for both the upper and the lower house—24 senators in the upper house and 90 representatives in the lower house. That legislature will then pass an act calling for an election to pass upon the constitution and elect a provisional government. That act, however, must receive the approval of the President of the United States before it goes into effect, which would require the Philippine Legislature to consult the views of the President of the United States. After that act has been passed, then the election would be held like any other election in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. STONE. That is all I care to ask or say in respect to that matter.

Mr. President, the last clause of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska does not meet my approval. Beginning in the twenty-third line of the second page, I read:

> If, however, the President shall find, at any time within the six-year period of limitation provided above, that the condition of the external or internal affairs of the islands or the international relations of the United States require it, or if a satisfactory treaty can not be secured, he may by proclamation extend for the period of one year beyond the six years above provided—

And so forth.

That would put the whole matter in the hands of the President, to send it back to Congress if he thought proper to do so. If, in his opinion, the internal or external affairs of the islands did not augur well for the future of the islands, he might throw the whole work of Congress in this particular overboard and send the matter back to Congress, and thus the whole question

would be opened again. I confess it is difficult for me, at least, to frame in my own mind a plan along this line that is satisfactory; and I find that the substance of what I have read from the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska is embodied in the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

I should like to strike that out of this amendment, from where I began reading to the end of the amendment. In place of it I should like to insert something like this, which I will read. That is to say, beginning after the words "may authorize," in the twenty-third line, leaving the amendment intact down to that point, I should like to insert something like this:

Provided, That prior to the exchange of ratifications of such a treaty, and before the President shall turn over to the Philippine government the control and sovereignty of the islands, the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations especially interested in the affairs of that part of the world to enter into a treaty or convention, jointly or severally, with the United States, obligating or pledging themselves—

From there on it differs from the suggestion contained in the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, which provides for a treaty with these outside nations to guarantee the sovereignty of the islands. I would have it this way, if I could:

Obligating or pledging themselves—

That is, the outside nations—

to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippine Islands and the government thereof.

I think I will leave it there. I prefer this form of expression, in a bill providing for a treaty or treaties to be made between this Government and other Governments, to the one in the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas for two reasons:

First, it does not seem at all likely or probable that outside Governments would make treaties of that kind with the United States, absolutely guaranteeing the sovereignty and independence of the Philippines against outside attack. I am not going to enlarge upon that, it has been dwelt on here so frequently by other Senators; but I am impressed with that view.

The second reason is that if we alone are to guarantee the independence of these people, as is provided in the so-called Clarke amendment, I am impressed by the objections that have been made as to that provision. I approve of that part of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska, which provides for the holding of an election for the formation of a constitution and plan of government to be submitted to the people; but after that I would give them independence absolutely—right off the bat—with only one reservation or condition, and that is that the principal nations—and who are the principal nations would be left to the judgment of the President—shall merely pledge themselves in a solemn convention with the United States that they, each for itself, will promise not for a given space of years—although that might be put in—not to assault the integrity of that sovereignty. We propose to give them their independence as a free offering; and the other nations of the world could very well afford to contract with the United States that they would keep their hands off of the islands, and always accord to them the independence which we have conferred upon them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think there is on this side of the Chamber a good deal of objection to such a condition in this legislation, for fear that it might not be possible to secure from the other nations such an agreement; and if it could not be secured, then the whole legislation would fall to the ground. I have omitted all reference to an international agreement. I have omitted all reference to a guaranty by the United States of the independence of the Philippines, partly because it seems to me that that is a matter for future Congresses to decide upon. Personally I should not be in favor of guaranteeing their independence for any length of time. I think it is too large a burden for the United States to undertake.

As far as the suggestion of the Senator is concerned that the President should be authorized and requested to undertake negotiations with other countries for a mutual or reciprocal recognition of their independence, I should be in favor of that; but I call the Senator's attention to the fact that that need not be put in the present bill. In any event, it could not take place inside of two years under the terms of either of the amendments now before the Senate, and I believe for that reason it would be better not to undertake to incorporate it in the amendment.

Mr. STONE. I do not offer what I have read as an amendment, but as a suggestion to the Senator from Nebraska, who offered the substitute. What I have said will serve at least one purpose, as far as I am personally concerned; it will again put on record my attitude with respect to this question. But I do not offer an amendment.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I should like to make a suggestion to the Senator from Nebraska covering the phraseology of his amendment on page 2, lines 6 to 11. The phraseology is this:

If the constitution is approved and the provisional government created, the President shall then submit to it a formal treaty by which the United States shall recognize the independence of the Philippine republic, and by which the latter shall undertake to fulfill all of the obligations of the United States in the Philippines incurred by the treaty of Paris or arising out of the occupation of the islands—

And so forth.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] objects to that phrase upon the ground that inasmuch as a treaty would require the consent of two-thirds of the Senate it would be in the power of one-third of the Senate to absolutely defeat hereafter the independence of the islands by refusing to ratify such a treaty. I suggest to the Senator that that might be obviated by the insertion, in the place of the sentence referred to in lines 6 to 11, of the following words:

Such constitution shall provide that the Philippine republic will fulfill all the obligations of the United States in the Philippines—

And so forth.

The Senator will observe that under this provision it would be necessary for the Philippine people to incorporate in their constitution the obligation not only to fulfill all the provisions of the treaty of Paris, but also to guarantee all personal and property rights of individuals and corporations of the United States and other countries and safeguarding such loans and obligations as have heretofore been authorized by the act of Congress.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, in reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Nevada, I will say that I considered that plan in drafting this substitute. There are, however, some objections to it.

In the first place, a constitution is a document which can be changed by the people who adopt it. It seemed to me that we should have a contract between the United States and the Philippine government to cover these questions.

In the next place, it seemed to me that it was almost unthinkable that the Senate of the United States, after Congress had finally settled this question, would be guilty of bad faith in refusing to carry out a treaty which had been entered into.

I considered, first, the possibility of an agreement to which the Senate should not be a party, but inasmuch as it was intended to be for all time and was intended that this should be an independent government, it seemed to me the proper way was to have the rights that are now guaranteed by the United States, for which the United States is responsible, enacted into a treaty which the United States would have its proper method of enforcing.

Mr. NEWLANDS. May I ask the Senator whether he recalls in what manner the stipulation between the United States and Cuba was made that the United States should have the right to intervene in case of domestic disorder, with a view to preserving a republican form of government?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. In that case the United States practically dictated certain features of the Cuban constitution, but there the situation was entirely different. There was then no government in the island of Cuba, but there is a government in the Philippines. It seems that the situation is somewhat different. Cuba is right at our door. We are carrying on a protectorate over Cuba at the present time. I think the sentiment in the United States is in favor of separating the Philippines from us absolutely and giving her recognition as an independent country, without the exercise of any of the rights of a protectorate.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Does not the Senator believe that a stipulation of this kind embraced in the constitution adopted by the Filipino people would be as binding upon them as a treaty with us?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think that the rights of the United States are quite definite and clear under a treaty, a treaty particularly which would have the moral support of all the other nations of the world, because it would be in part for the protection of their legitimate interests in the islands.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska whether he has considered the question as to the economic condition of the Philippine Islands at the time the separation takes place, and whether he has adequately guarded against such conditions as would be sure to result in disorder.

I will call his attention particularly to the tariff relations with this country. At present the Filipino people have favored tariff relations with us and we have favored relations with them. Under our legislation we have a reciprocal tariff with the Philippines under which the currents of trade were very seriously changed. The commerce of other countries with the islands was displaced and our commerce substituted, and the current of trade thus established between the Philippine Islands and the United States became the main current.

I presume that when we free them we propose not only to give them intellectual independence but economic independence. The effect of the tariff system which we have inaugurated in the Philippine Islands has been to put them partially upon a protective basis; that is to say, they get to-day in our markets 1 cent a pound, $20 a ton, more for their sugar than they can get anywhere else in the world, and they also get an increased price for their tobacco and other products. Just as soon as we sever the governmental ties that connect us and also sever that economic tie, as I presume it will be severed, the Senator must realize that there will be a drop in the price which they will receive for these products, and that drop in the price may involve very serious economic distress in the islands.

We know the price of sugar has had a great effect upon the revolutions of Cuba. The troubles in Cuba out of which governmental complications arose were largely, in the first instance, economic, arising from the distress of its people. Now, is it proposed that we shall end these favored tariff relations or that we shall continue them, and if we continue them will the oriental countries adjoining look with favor upon a system that gives us the advantage in trade with the Philippine Islands? Can we very consistently urge the open door in the Orient, particularly in China and Korea, equal opportunity to all the commercial nations of the world when we have already closed the door of the Philippines against other nations, and when, if we continue those relations after the governmental tie is severed, we will still be closing the door of the Philippines to the equal opportunity of other nations? It seems to me that all these economic questions ought to be carefully looked into and investigated before we cut the tie that binds.

Now, there is another thing, and that is with reference to a common language. The Philippine Islands have to-day about five or six hundred thousand children at school, whilst there are 2,000,000 children of school age. They expend about $2,000,000 annually, or about $4 apiece per annum upon those children in educating them.

In the United States, with a population of 100,000,000 people, we spend $523,000,000, I believe, in popular education, about $5 for every head of population and nearly $30 for every child, there being about 20,000,000 children at school. Thirty dollars, then, is spent in this country for every child as against $4 in the Philippine Islands. So I imagine the education can not be very extensive, even as to the 500,000 children who are now in school, and the other 1,500,000 children are not receiving training at all.

We must all admit if we intend to start these people upon self-government, it is essential that they should have a common language. You can, under an imperial or monarchical government such as prevails in Russia, gather together people differing in races and in language and control them; but where you have the highest form of government established, that form of government which can only be successfully conducted by people of intelligence and balance and self-control and information, it seems to me you must require a common language, so that the people can communicate their ideas and their information to each other.

Of course, we claim to be governed by altruistic motives with reference to the Philippines. I think that is true to-day. It was not true when we acquired them. The commercial instinct, the instinct of conquest, controlled us when we acquired them, and we have become very altruistic of late largely because we find the islands do not pay.

However this may be as to the past, if to-day we are bent upon altruism, upon philanthropy, why not do a good job? After having spent $600,000,000 in a war in which the Philippine Islands were conquered, and subjected ourselves to an expense of nearly $500,000,000 more in the increased military expense necessitated by the holding of those islands, why should we hesitate in spending a few millions more in fitting the Filipino people for self-government, in giving them not only the intellectual training but the industrial training that will be necessary in order to establish a well-ordered government?

Why should we not in this bill provide that during this period of six years of trial and gradual approach toward independence a sum of at least $20,000,000 should be appropriated with a view to extending the education of the Filipino people, so that at the end of six years a very much larger number will be trained in a common language? Why should we not appropriate a part of the money, or perhaps an additional sum, to industrial training, for the essential thing with the Filipinos is to teach them how to work. In that climate no one wants to work. All the white men there avoid it, if they possibly can.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. LANE. I think the Senator is quite right in saying that in that climate very few people want to work. It has been noticed that the honey bee, which is the most industrious of all insects, when transferred to that country will stop laying up honey the second year. After that no more honey comes from that bee; he goes on a strike.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I have no doubt that is the case. It is the case with most people who live in our climate and go there and remain long. I know every American there wants to avoid exposure in the sun if he can.

But, Mr. President, we have not as yet trained those people industrially. One method of training them would have been to create an agricultural bank, in order to give the small farmers an opportunity of borrowing money at a reasonable rate of interest, with a view to the development of their farms.

When I was there some 9 or 10 years ago they were plowing with forked sticks and they had the most primitive methods of cultivating and grinding sugar. The complaint then was that it was utterly impossible for the small farmers to borrow money for the purpose of getting the implements of agriculture. Then the question of an agricultural bank was being urged, and I appeared before the Senate Committee on the Philippines some eight years ago and urged that a Government agricultural bank be established there with a capital of $10,000,000 provided by the United States Government. We did provide for an agricultural bank, but capital was to be furnished by the insular government. I believe that the insular government was only able to set aside for that purpose about half a million dollars, a sum totally inadequate to meet the exigencies of the situation.

If we are going to do a good job in philanthropy and in altruism, why should we not now provide for an agricultural bank there, with a capital of at least $10,000,000, and give that bank the opportunity to establish a vivifying influence in agriculture during the next six years of our stay?

I fear, Mr. President, the experiment of a republican form of government in the Philippine Islands. I fear it will fail not because the hand of power is applied from the outside but because the Filipino people will be unable to conduct a republican form of government. I fear that changes in officials will take place, as they do in all poorly organized peoples, through revolutions instead of through elections. That is the only way they have in many of Central American and South American Republics of determining upon a change of officials. The elections are farces. They seem incapable of providing machinery under which an honest expression of popular opinion can be secured. I see no reason to believe that the Filipino people will be any wiser or more capable in this direction than the people of the Central American and many of the South American Republics.

I am for withdrawing from the Philippine Islands, because I think we ought never to have gone there. I can reconcile myself with leaving those islands now, notwithstanding the responsibilities which we assumed, because I feel that they are better off to-day because of our stay there than they would have been without our stay there.

I am unwilling to assume any obligations for the future regarding those islands. I believe that when we cut the tie that binds those islands to us and they sail off into individualized life that should be the end of our responsibility. I believe that any obligation to maintain the independence of those islands after they are severed from us will involve us in immeasurable difficulties.

I am willing to go to great expense in discharging fully the obligations which we have assumed by reason of our possession there to train those people in a common language and train them in habits of industry and to secure them the opportunity at all events of maintaining a popular form of government. Having expended over a billion dollars, I would not regard it as an act of extravagance during this period of six years now intervening before our final parting to expend a considerable sum of money, as high as $50,000,000, in really training those people for independence and self-government by securing them a common language and training them in habits of industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas demanded the yeas and nays. Is there a second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	McCumber	Shields
Beckham	Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Simmons
Borah	Harding	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Brandegee	Hardwick	Newlands	Smith, Ga.
Bryan	Hitchcock	Norris	Smith, Md.
Catron	Hollis	O'Gorman	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Husting	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Chilton	James	Overman	Smoot
Clapp	Johnson, Me.	Page	Sterling
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Phelan	Stone
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Pittman	Sutherland
Colt	Kern	Poindexter	Thompson
Cummins	La Follette	Pomerene	Tillman
Curtis	Lane	Ransdell	Vardaman
Dillingham	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Wadsworth
du Pont	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Warren
Fall	Lewis	Saulsbury	Weeks
Fletcher	Lippitt	Shafroth	Williams
Gallinger	Lodge	Sheppard	

Mr. CHILTON. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the substitute proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the amendment to the amendment I should like to say that I fear that under the Hitchcock amendment the Philippine people will not secure their independence within any time known to the mind of man; that they may be held perpetually under subjection by this Government; that it is required that they shall fulfill certain obligations which it can easily be rendered impossible for them to fulfill, thereby preventing them from securing their independence. For that reason I am opposed to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss this bill, but I think possibly it is proper that I should announce my reasons for the votes which I intend to cast.

I am in favor of the bill as it stands, without the preamble. I am opposed to the preamble and to the amendments. I would vote, sir, now to give the Filipinos immediate freedom. I wish that it were in my power to cast a vote which would render them independent within half an hour after that vote is cast. I should have voted for the original Clarke amendment because it declared for immediate freedom, simply allowing two years' time in which the United States might remove from the Philippine Islands, but declaring for immediate liberty, thereby settling once for all the question which has agitated us in every political campaign now for the last 17 or 18 years. Mr. President, I believe that in so voting, if I had the opportunity, my vote would be against the interests of the Filipino people themselves; but I believe that in so voting it would be for the best interests of the people of the United States. For that reason I would so cast my vote had I the opportunity.

I for one, Mr. President, in these times am in favor of voting and caring for the interests of the people of the United States of America. It may be true that this Nation was born to serve mankind. If so, sir, in my judgment, the best service which we could render mankind now would be to perpetuate American institutions, to clear our decks for action, to notify the world that this is going to continue to be a great, strong, self-respecting Nation and a self-respecting Government, compelling the respect of the other nations of the earth. I think, sir, we are in a critical period in our history, and I believe that the Philippine Islands constitute the weak point in the line of our defense.

I believe, as I have said, that in casting my vote for the immediate independence of the Filipinos that vote would be against their interests. By continuing to hold out to the Filipinos the hope which has been extended to them in every campaign now for years without granting them that independence which you have agreed to grant them, I believe firmly, and I now prophesy, sir, to you that you will have trouble with the Filipinos themselves withon four years' time. I believe that the only way to rid ourselves of that trouble with the Filipinos—and very possibly with other nations of the world on account of the Filipinos—is for us, selfishly and—if you will have it so—in a cowardly manner, to allow them to assume their own burdens for a while and relieve the people of the United States of the burdens which they have been carrying for 17 or 18 years.

Mr. President, the last declaration in a political platform was only a repetition, not possibly in such strong terms, of prior declarations contained in the platform of the same political party. When this Government undertook to inaugurate a government for the Philippine Islands, when our soldiers were engaged in defending the laws of this country in the Philippines in time of war, our actions and the attempt to establish a government for the Filipinos was denounced, not only by platform declarations but in political speeches throughout the entire length and breadth of this country. That agitation has been kept up until to-day. Pledges have been made by one of the great political parties. It has been the understanding of the Filipinos that so soon as that party should have an opportunity, so soon as it should control this Government, it would immediately grant to them independence. You are now failing to do that, Senators. You are again holding out a hope, by these various propositions which you are offering in the shape of amendments to the bill itself, you are again saying to them that, "Although we have solemnly pledged ourselves in various campaigns, although every prominent man in our party has pledged himself to independence for the Filipinos, although we have reiterated those pledges, not only in times of political peace but in the stress of political campaigns, we again refer you to another administration; and not only are we leaving you to the tender care of another administration to carry out our pledges, but, as is set forth in the amendments, we are providing now that in the discretion of the President of the United States, in the event that the time is thought propitious, within four years or within six years, unless something shall have arisen, the Filipinos shall be granted independence, but the President of the United States shall judge." Inevitably, sir, something will have occurred in that time, in my judgment, which will cause the President of the United States to exercise his discretion; and inevitably the exercise of such discretion against the immediate independence in the Philippines would cause trouble and almost inevitably revolution in the Philippines. Then would the people of the United States undertake to put such revolution down and restore order? If so, would they again be denounced throughout the length and breadth of this country, in every congressional district and on the lecture platforms throughout the Chautauqua circuit, for oppressing the Philippine people? I say yes; they would; and I do not propose by my vote to assume that burden.

I do not believe that the present administration will have the final passing upon this proposition. I believe that the party in opposition now to the party in power will be called upon to carry out the provisions of this bill, and I believe, with due respect to my friends on the other side, that that is very largely the purpose of the proposed amendment, that they may shift from themselves the responsibility that they should be compelled to take upon themselves to carry out their pledges. They now have the opportunity to do what they have promised the people of the United States to do and what they have promised the Filipinos themselves that they would do as soon as they achieved that power. They are now shirking that responsibility and leaving it to another administration or to a second administration, possibly not with the hope, but I think rather firm in the belief, that that responsibility will not rest during either of those administrations upon the party now in power.

Believing that, sir, I, for one, refuse to accept the burden which they desire to shirk, and therefore if I had the opportunity I should vote for immediate independence for the Philippines, and I shall refuse to vote for any proposition deferring such action to another administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] for the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES], I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], who is detained from the Senate on account of illness.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent, but is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY].

Mr. CHILTON. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. CATRON. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. OLIVER (after having voted in the negative). I observe that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has not voted. I therefore withdraw my vote, being paired with that Senator.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—24.

Beckham	Hollis	McLean	Pittman
Brandegee	Kenyon	Martin, Va.	Pomerene
Clapp	Kern	Myers	Ransdell
Cummins	Lea, Tenn.	Norris	Reed
Fletcher	Lee, Md.	O'Gorman	Smith, Md.
Hitchcock	Lewis	Phelan	Walsh

NAYS—58.

Ashurst	Gronna	Overman	Stone
Bankhead	Harding	Page	Sutherland
Borah	Hardwick	Poindexter	Swanson
Broussard	Husting	Robinson	Thomas
Bryan	James	Saulsbury	Thompson
Catron	Johnson, Me.	Shafroth	Tillman
Chilton	Jones	Sheppard	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Shields	Underwood
Clarke, Ark.	Lane	Simmons	Vardaman
Colt	Lippitt	Smith, Ariz.	Wadsworth
Curtis	Lodge	Smith, Ga.	Weeks
Dillingham	McCumber	Smith, Mich.	Williams
du Pont	Martine, N. J.	Smith, S. C.	Works
Fall	Nelson	Smoot	
Gallinger	Newlands	Sterling	

NOT VOTING—14.

Brady	Goff	Oliver	Shively
Burleigh	Gore	Owen	Warren
Chamberlain	Hughes	Penrose	
Culberson	Johnson, S. D.	Sherman	

So the amendment of Mr. HITCHCOCK to the amendment of Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. REED. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has pending a group of amendments to the original amendment offered by myself, to some of which I have no objection; in fact, I think one or two of them would be an improvement, although I do not think that many of them would be. For instance, in line 11, on page 3, the provision is:

Immediately upon the passage of the act the President shall invite the the cooperation of the principal nations.

There is no objection to striking out the words "immediately upon" and inserting the word "after," so as to read "after the passage of this act," thus permitting the President to have such time as in his judgment may be necessary. I propose that amendment myself, if the Senator from Nebraska does not intend to present his amendments. I ask unanimous consent that that amendment may be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has the right to perfect his amendment.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Not after another proposition to amend has been presented. The Senator from Nebraska has one pending, but he does not seem to urge it.

While I am on my feet I believe I will say just a word or two. The delegation of power to the President is quite broad, and must necessarily be so. There is not a man occupying official station in the civilized world upon whom more powers have been conferred than upon the President of the United States, and the instances where it has been abused in dealing with international matters are so few in number that it is not a sane fear to assume that anything will be done intentionally that will not be for the benefit of the American people. Therefore, the amendment submitted by me delegates to him the power to—

fully recognize the independence of the said Philippines as a separate and self-governing nation and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the government instituted by the people thereof.

There is nothing in that amendment that requires the President to recognize a government that is not republican in form. Notwithstanding that phrase is not a very exact one, it does recognize the rule of the people and the recognition by the President of such government as the people have instituted. That is the test of freedom; that is the test of independence; and it is one that is included in this amendment.

Now, when we come to deal with the character of the obligations the President of the United States is required to safeguard, we authorize him—

to enter into such negotiations with the authorities of said Philippines or others as may be necessary—

Not only with the Philippines, but with others—

as may be necessary to finally settle and adjust—

What?

all property rights and other relations as between the United States and the said Philippines.

If it is a fact that the United States Government, in the ratification of the treaty of Paris, has assumed certain obligations that it will require the people of the Philippines while under their jurisdiction to recoguize, that provision may be well transferred to that people if it is one continuing in character. That is exactly what was done in the case of Cuba. We assumed the same burden in connection with the Cuban territory and people that we did in connection with the Philippines, the difference being that we paid for the Philippines and did not pay for Cuba. The Cuban territory and the Cuban people were released from American control by a joint resolution, which stipulated certain things that should be incorporated in the constitution of Cuba. That was deemed an adequate provision for those matters, and has proven adequate up to the present time.

Now, concerning the extension of a protectorate over the Philippines during the remaining five years after the expiration of the four years, plus an additional period if, in the opinion of the President, the same may become necessary, I have no particular view about that. I think it ought to be submitted to the Senate as an independent proposition. My own opinion is that the four years provided for on the face of the amendment, with that elastic extension of another year or a little more than a year, is an adequate period of preparation; and if the Senate see proper to say that that is adequate and will undertake to strike out the language of the last provision of the amendment, I am not prepared to say that they have done what they should not have done. My own opinion is that that is a separable and distinct provision.

So far as the great Governments of the world interested in the affairs of that part of the world are concerned, they will assume just such obligations as may respectively suit them. They are not going to engage in any wholesale guaranty of sovereignty of that comparatively small people. Just now as far as they would be willing to go would perhaps be to say, "We will not evade it and we will not violate it." Those that have no intimate relations may build up some intimate trade connections that may justify the assumption of a wider power.

Negotiations between independent peoples must be determined by agreement, consultation, and consideration of the advantages that are to flow from one to the other, and no one party to a negotiation can indicate what the other one shall do. For that reason we have left it somewhat elastic, as I think it ought to be. Some may decline to go in at all; some may be willing to take a wider responsibility than others; some may desire to go no further than to say, "We will do no more than to say that, so far as we are concerned, we will not violate the neutrality nor invade the independence of those people." That is quite as far as it is necessary to go.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question right there?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I will be very glad to answer the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. Suppose that one of the nations should say to the President, "We are willing to recognize the neutrality and the independence of the Philippine Islands, but we are not willing to guarantee that independence," under the provisions of the Senator's amendment, could the President accept such an agreement?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Unquestionably he could. The power to refuse to join at all implies the power to go in on such terms as are mutually satisfactory.

Mr. McCUMBER. But that is not what the amendment says. It says:

Immediately upon the passage of the act, the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located, in the form of a treaty or other character of binding agreement, whereby the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines, and also—

Now, there are two things that he must obtain under the terms of this bill. There are two things that the President must obtain in that treaty—not only an agreement that these nations will respect the independence of the Philippine Islands, but also that they shall guarantee their independence. Under it I can not see the power of the President to say that he will accept one provision, but under this amendment he can release the other nations from entering into the other obligation.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That would apply to those who are willing to assume that form of obligation. Those who are not willing to assume it, of course, would assume a less one. I take it for granted that there will be some nations that will be willing to assume the broader obligation; but if any considerable number of the Senate seem to think that that is a limitation upon the power of the President, it is a matter of but a moment's time to strike it out.

Mr. McCUMBER. Or the Senator could strike out "and also" and insert "or to mutually obligate themselves."

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The amendment suggested by the Senator from North Dakota is a very good one, and I will

accept it, if I have the permission of the Senate. It is to strike out the words "and also," in line 18, page 3, and insert the word "or."

With that statement I do not believe it is necessary for me to add anything.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Arkansas has omitted some of the suggestions which were made by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I wish the Senator would bring them to the attention of the Senate. He discussed the matter with the Senator from Nebraska, and some of them really improve the text of the amendment.

Mr. SHAFROTH. There is one on page 2, at line 5, where the following language appears:

Provided, That if the President, at the expiration of the said period of four years—

It was suggested by the Senator from Nebraska that the word "prior" or "before the expiration" should be inserted.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. "Prior to."

Mr. SHAFROTH. "Prior to." I ask unanimous consent that those words may be inserted instead of the word "at."

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the amendment to the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. SHAFROTH. There is another one which was suggested by the Senator from Nebraska and which I think is a very good amendment, and to which, it seems to me, all ought to agree. It is on page 3, line 3, after the words "United States," to insert the words "and of other countries."

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That is not objectionable.

Mr. SHAFROTH. So that it would read:

Between the United States and the said Philippines, and to cause to be acknowledged, respected, and safeguarded all of the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States and of other countries.

I ask unanimous consent that that amendment may be inserted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the amendment to the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Another suggestion which the Senator from Nebraska made was to strike out, in line 7, page 3, the word "shall" and insert the word "may."

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Yes; that ought to be done.

Mr. SHAFROTH. So that it will read in this way:

In any such settlement or adjustment so made in respect to the rights and property of the United States as against the said Philippines the President may reserve or acquire such lands and rights and privileges appurtenant thereto as may, in his judgment, be required by the United States for naval bases and coaling stations within the territory of said Philippines.

I ask unanimous consent that the word "shall" may be stricken out and the word "may" inserted in lieu thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the amendment to the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will inquire whether the word "immediately" was stricken out, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas, and the word "after" inserted, in line 11, page 3?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The words "immediately upon" were stricken out and the word "after" inserted.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think that is all.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether an amendment proposing to strike out certain portions of the Clarke amendment would be in order at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in order.

Mr. KENYON. I therefore move as an amendment that all of that part of the Clarke amendment commencing on page 3 with the word "immediately" be stricken from the amendment.

I want to say, Mr. President, that I think there are some who would be glad to vote for the Clarke amendment were it not for the guaranty that is made as to our country and the period of time that is specified. I should myself. If that amendment can be made, I shall be glad to support the Clarke amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. KENYON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FLETCHER. May we have the amendment stated again?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is to strike out all of the Clarke amendment after the word "After" on line 11, page 3. Beginning at line 11, on page 3, it is proposed to strike out all thereafter. The words proposed to be struck out will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the following words:

After the passage of the act, the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located, in the form of a treaty or other character of binding agreement, whereby the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines, and also to mutually obligate themselves, equally and not one primarily nor to any greater extent than another, to maintain as against external force the sovereignty of said Philippines. If any of the nations so invited to join the United States in such undertaking shall decline to do so, then the President shall include as parties to such convention or agreement such nations as may be willing to join therein and to assume such obligations; and if none are willing to so unite therein, then the President is authorized to give such guaranty on behalf of the United States alone for the period of five years from and after the expiration of said period of four years, or any extension thereof, and pending the existence of such separate guaranty by the United States, the United States shall be entitled to retain and exercise such control and supervision in the said Philippines as may be necessary to enforce order therein and to avoid external complications.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CATRON. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH. I am requested by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] to announce that his colleague [Mr. GOFF] is detained by reason of illness. He is paired with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY].

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—53.

Ashurst	Harding	Norris	Smoot
Beckham	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Sterling
Borah	Hollis	Oliver	Sutherland
Brandegee	Jones	Page	Thomas
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Phelan	Townsend
Clapp	La Follette	Pittman	Wadsworth
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Poindexter	Walsh
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Pomerene	Warren
Cummins	Lewis	Ransdell	Weeks
Curtis	Lippitt	Reed	Williams
Dillingham	Lodge	Shafroth	Works
du Pont	Martine, N. J.	Shields	
Fall	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	
Gallinger	Newlands	Smith, Mich.	

NAYS—31.

Bankhead	Hardwick	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Broussard	Husting	Overman	Stone
Bryan	James	Robinson	Swanson
Catron	Johnson, Me.	Saulsbury	Thompson
Chilton	Kern	Sheppard	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Lee, Md.	Simmons	Underwood
Fletcher	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	Vardaman
Gronna	Martin, Va.	Smith, Md.	

NOT VOTING—12.

Brady	Goff	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose
Burleigh	Gore	McLean	Sherman
Culberson	Hughes	Owen	Shively

So Mr. KENYON's amendment to the amendment of Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CATRON (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. THOMAS. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent and is paired with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY].

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). May I inquire whether the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I withdraw my vote, having a pair with him.

The roll call resulted—yeas 41, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—41.

Ashurst	Hollis	Overman	Swanson
Bankhead	Husting	Pittman	Thomas
Borah	James	Robinson	Thompson
Broussard	Johnson, Me.	Shafroth	Tillman
Bryan	Kenyon	Sheppard	Underwood
Chamberlain	Kern	Shields	Vardaman
Chilton	La Follette	Simmons	Williams
Clapp	Lane	Smith, Ariz.	Works
Clarke, Ark.	Lee, Md.	Smith, Ga.	
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Smith, S. C.	
Hardwick	Newlands	Stone	

NAYS—41.

Beckham	Harding	Norris	Smoot
Brandegee	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Sterling
Catron	Jones	Oliver	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	Lea, Tenn.	Page	Townsend
Colt	Lewis	Phelan	Wadsworth
Cummins	Lippitt	Poindexter	Walsh
Curtis	Lodge	Pomerene	Warren
du Pont	McCumber	Ransdell	Weeks
Fall	McLean	Reed	
Gallinger	Myers	Saulsbury	
Gronna	Nelson	Smith, Mich.	

NOT VOTING—14.

Brady	Goff	Martin, Va.	Shively
Burleigh	Gore	Owen	Smith, Md.
Culberson	Hughes	Penrose	
Dillingham	Johnson, S. Dak.	Sherman	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] the yeas are 41 and the nays are 41. The Chair votes "yea," and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, line 20, after the word "land" and the comma, it is proposed to insert the word "water" and a comma.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, this bill as presented by the committee provides that all concessions in respect to land, timber, and mining rights which are a part of the public domain shall be subject to the approval of the President. It seems to me that the same reason which would make these rights subject to the approval of the President would apply with equal force to the granting of water rights; and it is for that reason that I offer the amendment.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I move that the Philippine bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Philippines.

In explanation of that motion I wish to say that the Philippine bill as it was written was a consistent piece of legislation according to the theory on which it was proposed. I do not agree with the execution of that theory in all its parts, although I recognize that as a general proposition it was carrying out the policy which has heretofore prevailed in the Philippine Islands. The Philippine bill as it now stands, with the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas upon it, is not only an inconsistent piece of legislation, but a very dangerous piece of legislation.

As the Philippine bill now stands, it provides that there shall be an enormous increase in the electorate of the Philippine Islands. It provides that an electorate which now consists of only some 275,000 qualified voters shall be increased to between——

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I call for order in the Chamber. The Senator from Rhode Island is making a very interesting statement, and it ought to be listened to.

The VICE PRESIDENT rapped with his gavel.

Mr. LIPPITT. I was saying, Mr. President, that this bill increases the electorate from some 275,000 qualified voters to an estimated electorate of between eight and nine hundred thousand qualified voters. The new amendment which has been put upon the bill provides for the independence of the Philippine Islands within a period of from two to four years from now. At just the time that goes into effect the new electorate will for the first time undertake to cast a vote in the Philippine Islands. The Philippine authorities who will be compelled to take up the burden of organizing those islands and carrying out the great responsibilities of the government of those islands under the bill as it now stands will have a government that is elected, not by the 275,000 trained and partially trained Philippine electors, but by an electorate composed of citizens more than two-thirds of whom never have cast a vote in their lives, many of whom will not understand the meaning of a vote, and a large number of whom have no common language of communication and do not understand any language in which a literature of any size is available to them.

I say to the Senators from the South, who have had some experience of that sort, that it will be more or less reproducing in the Philippine Islands the same situation which occurred in the Southern States during the reconstruction period, when they had an enormous ignorant colored vote thrust into their affairs.

It is impossible to suppose that an electorate composed as this electorate will be in the Philippine Islands will be of a character and ability equal even to running a government that has already been established, much less to undertaking the great responsibilities of establishing a new form and character of government.

For us to undertake under these new conditions to pass this bill, to carry out these various changes in the Philippine situation as has been proposed under the original bill, would seem to me in its possibilities for trouble and chances for insurrection almost as—I do not want to use any extreme expression—but it would seem to me to be almost a criminal proceeding in the light of the great responsibility that we have assumed in regard to those people.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LIPPITT. I yield.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In view of the fact that we have now adopted an amendment by which we are to run away from the Philippine Islands, finally and irrevocably, within the next four years, what advantage does the Senator from Rhode Island see in our trying to perfect this proposed legislation or to pass it in any form whatever? In other words, in view of the adoption of that amendment, why is not the wise thing to do to reject every part of the bill except the amendment? Is it not sufficient, in view of that fact, to permit the organic act as it now is found upon the statute books to remain in force? Will not that take care of the situation for four years? Why should we waste our time in undertaking to perfect a piece of legislation which is to be temporary, and which, in all probability, can not even be put in working operation for the next two or three years?

Mr. LIPPITT. Not only in all probability can it not be put in operation, but it is almost an absolute certainty that it can not be put into operation.

If, Mr. President, the theory of the gentlemen who are responsible for Philippine legislation is going to be the theory that is in the amendment which has been proposed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], that is one situation. If our attitude on the Philippine Islands is to be one of continuing protection, then the theory in the bill that was reported by the committee has its justification. But to attempt to mix up those two things, to undertake to project into those islands—which will have difficulties enough in establishing an independent system of government without any complications—an utterly new and untried system of government, it seems to me is objectionable from every viewpoint. It is in a sense impertinent. If we are going to pass over to those people their country, to be governed by themselves, let us pass it over to them without complications and let them arrange for themselves how they will govern it. There is no necessity for the American Congress to undertake under these changed conditions to prescribe all the details of governmental operations. If we are going to make them independent, by all means let us make them independent. Certainly we do not want to undertake to compel those people to organize their new and independent government under what are practically the same conditions that prevailed in the States of the South after the War of the Rebellion.

Mr. President, there are, I think, no doubt, very inconsistent provisions in this bill under the present theory upon which it is being written. I do not believe it is possible that a bill of this kind can be perfected on the floor of the Senate. No committee has ever undertaken to write this bill under the theory which is now the basis of the bill. It seems to me, for the purpose of wise legislation, of reasonable care in this question, the bill should be recommitted.

Gentlemen here must not forget, and I do not forget, that we are not dealing now with a commercial question; we are not dealing with a question that simply involves more or less dollars and cents to the country or to individuals; we are dealing with a question that involves the existence of human life. We

are dealing with one of the most dangerous questions that has ever come before this body.

There is plenty of evidence in the testimony which has been given before the committee of men competent to express an opinion to the effect that the result of the action which has been taken here to-day will inevitably result in insurrection. It is a very common opinion held by both Americans and Filipinos who are familiar with the Philippine Islands. Under those circumstances I say to you gentlemen who are responsible for this legislation at least let the Filipinos establish their independent government under the most favorable circumstances that we can devise.

I hope the bill will be returned to the committee. You can instruct them as you wish as to some time to report, but let it be returned there that the members of the committee, in the quiet of their committee room, undisturbed as they are here by conflicting opinions, may prepare something that is consistent with the new conditions that have been put in the bill by the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. It is not a simple matter you are doing; it is a very serious one. I hope the motion will prevail.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I think the matter has been discussed about as fully as it would be if it were referred. I move to lay the motion on the table.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CLAPP. I hope the Senator from Arkansas will withdraw his motion. I think those Senators who have supported his amendment and who are interested in it ought to be permitted to express their views.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I have no objection to that. I will withdraw it for the purpose of permitting the Senator from Minnesota or anyone else to discuss it.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I desire to say for myself that there is great force in this position. I am a member of the committee. We framed the bill along one line of thought and purpose, and now that the Senate has definitely settled that some provision of independence shall be associated with the bill, I think it very appropriate that the bill should go back to the committee for consideration by the committee in the light of the determination of the Senate that fundamentally and basically the Senate is for a declaration providing for the independence of the islands.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I voted against the Clarke amendment. There is one thing, however, that the Clarke amendment does. It does provide for the independence of the Philippine Islands. That amendment must also pass the House. I feel that if the bill goes back to the committee the chances will be against ever securing during this session any final adjudication of the question. Certainly the length of time it has taken on the floor of the Senate so far would indicate that it would probably be laid aside before being finally acted upon.

I am willing to trust to the good judgment of the House upon the bill as it stands in the Senate, and I for one, while I voted against the Clarke amendment, shall vote against the recommittal of the bill.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, unless some other Senator desires to discuss it, I move to lay the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island on the table.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not want to make any remarks further than a simple statement. I am a member of the Philippines Committee and have given this bill some attention.

I want to say to the Senate that it is my opinion that the bill with this amendment upon it will be a sort of an absurdity, and that since the amendment has been adopted the bill ought to be redrafted in order to make it consistent with the theory of the amendment.

I simply wanted to make that statement, and that is all.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I only desire to say in explanation of my vote on the motion to recommit that the amendment which was adopted is entirely a distinct piece of legislation from the bill to which it has been attached. It is as important, perhaps, as any piece of legislation that will come before this body, and it has never been considered in committee. The confusion that existed here in the debate this morning as to the effect of the various amendments and the policy of the government under them indicates to me the need of some sort of executive consideration of this proposition.

I have no right to prophesy in this matter, but I am very much inclined to think that if the bill passes as it is now with this amendment, within a month the United States will be involved in serious trouble in the Philippine Islands in maintaining order and peace.

I think that the same rules which provide for committees of the Senate and which require proposed legislation to be referred to committees apply with full force in this instance, and that the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island ought to be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island be laid on the table? The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], and vote on this question "yea."

Mr. KERN (when Mr. SHIVELY's name was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY]. He is paired with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH].

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] as heretofore to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES], and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JAMES (after having voted in the affirmative). I observe that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] did not vote. I have a general pair with that Senator. I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I withdraw my vote, as I understand my pair, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], has been called from the Chamber.

Mr. CATRON. Transferring my pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] I vote "nay."

Mr. POMERENE. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. CHILTON. I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. GOFF] on account of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—50.

Ashurst	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Kenyon	Overman	Stone
Broussard	Kern	Pittman	Swanson
Bryan	La Follette	Pomerene	Thomas
Chamberlain	Lane	Ransdell	Thompson
Chilton	Lea, Tenn.	Robinson	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Underwood
Fall	Lewis	Shafroth	Vardaman
Fletcher	McCumber	Sheppard	Walsh
Hardwick	Martin, Va.	Shields	Williams
Hollis	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	Works
Husting	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	
Johnson, Me.	Newlands	Smith, Ga.	

NAYS—29.

Brandegee	Gallinger	O'Gorman	Sterling
Catron	Gronna	Oliver	Sutherland
Clapp	Harding	Page	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Phelan	Wadsworth
Colt	Lippitt	Poindexter	Warren
Cummins	Lodge	Reed	
Curtis	McLean	Smith, Mich.	
du Pont	Nelson	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—17.

Beckham	Dillingham	James	Smith, Md.
Borah	Goff	Owen	Weeks
Brady	Gore	Penrose	
Burleigh	Hitchcock	Sherman	
Culberson	Hughes	Shively	

So Mr. LIPPITT's motion was laid on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is one offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE]. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, line 20, after the word "land" and the comma, insert the word "water" and a comma, so as to read:

Providing for the disposition or concessions in respect of land, water, timber, and mining rights.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be agreed to, without objection.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I offer the following as an additional section to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Add, at the end of the bill, a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. The sum of $20,000,000 is hereby appropriated to be expended under the direction of the President, through the Philippine Commission, in aid of the instruction of the Filipinos in a common language, in the principles of free government, and in industrial pursuits; and also in aid of an agricultural bank in the Philippines.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I have voted for the so-called Clarke amendment because I believe that we should never have been in the Philippines, and I believe that it is to the interest of this country that we should get out of the Philippines as soon as possible. But I want the United States to get out of those islands with honor. We have thus far been training the Filipino people through their own taxation in a common language. They have been able to apply from their own income $2,000,000 annually for the education of 500,000 children, although there are 2,000,000 children there of school age, thus expending only about $4 per annum upon each child in school. We expend in this country $30 per annum upon each child in school, nearly $600,000,000 annually in the aggregate, and we have 20,000,000 children at school out of a total population of 100,000,000. They have made good progress in the Philippine Islands in securing a common language with so limited a fund.

We ought 15 years ago to have commenced an appropriation in aid of giving those people a common language, because, in my judgment, that is absolutely essential for the establishment of free government in the islands. We will now have five years probably of possession of those islands. During that time a great advance can be made in training those people in a common language and in industrial pursuits and in the principles of free government. The question is whether we will leave them to their own limited funds or whether we will help them.

The insular revenue amounts to about $11,000,000 annually. The insular and municipal revenues combined amount to about $17,000,000 annually. They have therefore available for the government and the education of 7,000,000 people a sum about equal to the amount that is expended in the District of Columbia for the government and education of 350,000 people.

The situation therefore appeals to us. If we really wish to train them in a common language, if we wish to train them in the principles of free government, if we wish to train them in industrial pursuits, we have an opportunity now for five years. Are we going, by reason of a mistaken economy, to fail to do, as fully and completely as possible, the work which we inaugurated? We spent in the war which involved the conquest of the Philippines $600,000,000. We have expended since in fortifications, in increased military and naval expense connected with the retention of the Philippines about $500,000,000 more—over a billion dollars in all. Are we going to refuse now to furnish $20,000,000 more with a view to perfecting, as far as possible, the job which we inaugurated?

I observed that a smile spread over the faces of Senators when this subject was introduced. The idea of largess to the people of whom we are about to rid ourselves was apparently ridiculous. I take no humorous view of the situation, I care not what the condition of the Federal Treasury is. We have a sacred obligation resting upon us so long as we hold those islands, and we intend to hold them for five years longer. It is the most objectionable parsimony that bids us halt now and refuse to give the few millions that are necessary to the successful accomplishment of what we have in view.

Mr. President, I have little faith in the success of republican government among savage or semicivilized people. Devoted as we are to democratic government, it seems to me that experience must teach us that democratic government is only suited to people of the highest intelligence and the greatest self-control. A savage, a barbarous, or a semicivilized people have not such intelligence and such self-control.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. NEWLANDS. The Senator will permit me to go on with my thought.

I fear that republican government will rail in the Philippines. We will have there after a time revolutions in the place of elections. The revolutions will determine the officials of the Philippine Islands, not the elections. So far as I am concerned I want to do everything that I can in the way of training those people in such a way that the governing officials of the islands will be determined by the voluntary choice of the people and not by force, as is the case with almost all our Central American and South American Republics.

Now, Mr. President, we have lost the opportunity of 15 years. We have been parsimonious when we should have been liberal. We have allowed the governmental, educational, and training system of those islands to be conducted upon insufficient funds secured by local taxation only $17,000,000 annually, a sum hardly sufficient for the 350,000 people of the District of Columbia. We have an opportunity now to correct our mistakes, and we have only five years in which to do it. Are we going to cut the tie that binds those islands to us without making proper provision in the matter of training them for self-government?

When I was in the Philippine Islands the Filipinos were still plowing with a stick. There has been some improvement since, but I am told there has not been very much. There have been some improved methods of sugar cultivation introduced, which were of the crudest order when I was there. We are now about to turn those islands loose without the benefits of the reciprocal tariff which they now have with us, under which they get 50 per cent more for their sugar than they would otherwise get, and a very considerable percentage more for their tobacco than they would otherwise get.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask not to be interrupted. They will be thrown into the world's markets unsustained by this joint protective system, which they now have with us. Will they be prepared for the industrial competition, and is it not our duty to prepare them for that industrial competition, and how can we better accomplish it than by training those people in improved methods of agriculture? That involves the creation of an agricultural bank, which can make loans to the small farmers, with a view of enabling them to get the implements that are necessary for improved methods. That need has been apparent for 15 years. Every Governor General of the Philippine Islands has commented upon the absolute necessity of an agricultural bank. The matter was broached in legislation years ago, and the proposal was practically defeated by the substitution of a measure which gave the Philippine Government itself the power to establish an agricultural bank out of its limited funds. It has been unable to furnish to that bank, I believe, any more than a half million dollars in capital. That has been utterly inadequate to meet the requirements of those people. When I was in the islands extreme cases of usury existed. Interest was charged at the rate of 50 and 100 per cent. These interest charges kept the producers always under the control of the money lenders and practically absorbed the profits of production.

Mr. President, the chief danger to the Philippine Islands will come not from the outside but from within. The chief danger of the Philippine Islands is revolution. Revolution always comes as the result of economic distress. Look over the history of all the revolutions in Cuba, in Central America, and in the South American Republics and you will find that their source is almost always economic distress. We thus throw these islands into the ocean, depriving them of the supports which they have thus far had by reason of their reciprocal tariff with us; depriving them of all their aids in getting large and favored prices in this country; remitting them to the fierce competition of the world without taking any steps to arm them against the new conditions.

I do not believe that we should maintain favored relations with them even by treaty. I do not believe in reciprocal tariffs between nations. I believe that our whole fiscal system should be an independent one, unconnected with that of any other country, and that the rule should be, so far as all other countries are concerned, the rigid rule of impartiality. Partiality to any country involves favors which arouse the hostility of other countries.

We have no right, in my judgment, by a favored relation with the Philippine Islands, to absolutely insure the importation of their products into this country and the importation of our products into theirs, thus cutting off the trade of other nations with the Philippine Islands. I think the entire Orient has the right to complain of our inconsistency in demanding an "open door"—equality of opportunity—in China and in Korea and at the same time closing the door to equal opportunity among the nations in the Philippine Islands. We must, therefore, end the favored relations between those islands and this country; and, unless we provide for that crisis, it will surely result in economic distress that will breed revolution within six months after we withdraw.

After expending a billion dollars in the military aspects of imperialism and colonialism, can we not spend $20,000,000 more in the peaceful work of preparing the people of the Philippines for self-dependence and self-help in the difficult undertaking before them of substituting independence for dependence? What better method can we take than to put $20,000,000 unreservedly in the hands of the President of the United States and instruct him, with the aid of the Philippine Commission, to expend it in aid of training those people in a common language, training them in the principles of free government,

training them in industrial pursuits, and in aid of an agricultural bank, which will mean the advancement of intelligent industry throughout the islands?

I trust this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I desire to tender an amendment, to be a separate section of this bill, and I ask to have it read and that it lie over and be printed, and not to be considered until to-morrow, as I understand the chairman of the Committee on the Philippines desires to have the bill reprinted; in other words, I waive discussion at this time.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask that the amendment I have offered be taken up to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] will be printed and lie upon the table. The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS].

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator from Nevada made a similar request as to the amendment offered by him. If that request is granted, of course it will delay the passage of the bill for to-day. I will ask the Senator from Nebraska what is his purpose to do from this time forward?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I was on the point of asking unanimous consent that the bill be temporarily laid aside, and that a print of the bill as amended be laid before the Senate to-morrow.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Together with the amendment just offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and one offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I should like to have my amendment read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add as a new section the following:

SEC. —. That before the independence and sovereignty of the Philippine Islands shall be proclaimed by the President of the United States the government of the Philippine Islands as constituted shall make and execute a perpetual treaty with the United States guaranteeing freedom of trade to the United States and exemption from all import tariff duties upon any goods, merchandise, or trade from the United States.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Does the Senator from Nebraska make a request that the bill be temporarily laid aside at this point?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; that is my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And for the printing of the bill as amended.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] desires first to offer an amendment.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Nebraska refers to an amendment which I suggested on yesterday. It was merely a verbal amendment to change the place in the bill of the words "sectarian institutions." I think the Secretary has the amendment at the desk. All I desire is that the bill shall be so printed as to show the amendment which I offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the bill being temporarily laid aside until to-morrow?

Mr. GALLINGER. Before that is done, Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry of the Senator from Nebraska. I will ask the Senator to read lines 20, 21, and 22, on page 6 of the bill, and see if they are not at least badly punctuated, and if there is not the omission of a word.

Mr. HITCHCOCK (after examining the bill). I think there is no error, except as to punctuation, and that can be corrected by the Secretary.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, the language should be correctly punctuated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to temporarily laying the bill aside?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the bill, but I am not sure whether or not it has been formally offered, and I should like to have the amendment printed in connection with the bill, if there is to be a reprint.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, has the request of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] been agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not yet been agreed to. The Chair is unable to ascertain what the Senate desires to do. Is there objection to temporarily laying the bill aside? The Chair hears none, and the bill is temporarily laid aside.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a reprint of the bill as amended up to this time be laid before the Senate to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. With all proposed amendments?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. With all amendments which have so far been adopted by the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Other Senators have asked that amendments which have been offered should also be printed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have no objection to that, but that is a separate request. My request is for a reprint of the bill as amended up to this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I ask, in addition, that the reprint shall also show in brackets the pending amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 646).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, stating that balance sheets and other information required by the Public Utilities Commission of the various utilities under its jurisdiction received on or before February 1, 1916, had been submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes:

W. J. Major *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 274);
F. M. King *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 278);
C. L. Jones *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 275);
John H. King *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 280);
Martin Cooper *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 276);
Michael Fitzgerald *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 279);
Edwin H. Tillson *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 281);
Anna Ahrens, widow of Otto Ahrens, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 277);
Michael Ryan *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 282);
M. F. Quinn *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 284);
Edward Cronan *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 285);
Darly Sneed, widow of Page Sneed, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 283);
Floyd Thornhill *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 286);
Henry McD. Jackson *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 287);
John Scott *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 288);
Thelwin Jones *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 289);
Joseph H. Mason *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 290);
David Moore *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 291);
William L. Johnson *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 292); and
Macedonia J. Garcia *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 293).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan presented petitions of Hannah McIntosh Cady Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Allegan; of the Michigan Society, Sons of the Revolution, of Holland; of the Chamber of Commerce of Grand Haven; of Lucy Wolcott Barnum Chapter, Daughters of the Revolution, of Adrian; and of the Commercial Club of Marquette, all in the State of Michigan, praying for an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented memorials of Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Hillsdale County; of Local Lodge No. 170, International Association of Machinists, of Muskegon; of Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Cheboygan County; of Lenawee County Pomona Grange, of Adrian; and of sundry citizens of Wolverine, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Retail Liquor Dealers' Association, of Menominee, Mich., remonstrating against an increase in the tax on intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 205, Cigarmakers' International Union, of Battle Creek, Mich., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Kalamazoo, Mich., remonstrating against an increase in the tax on cigars, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Guy V. Henry Camp, No. 3, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Michigan, of Grand Rapids; of Camp J. C. Brown, No. 31, Department of Michigan, United Spanish War Veterans, of Big Rapids; of Major John C. Durst Camp, No. 40, United Spanish War Vet-

erans, of Lansing; and of Richard Westnedge Camp, No. 16, United Spanish War Veterans, of Kalamazoo, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish War, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Muskegon and Grand Rapids, in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against prohibition in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of Club Alpino, Pont E Locana, of Calumet, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Retail Clothiers' Association, of Muskegon, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide 1-cent letter postage, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Federation of Labor of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called seamen's law, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Charlevoix, Mich., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Women's Christian Union of Charlevoix, Mich., and a petition of sundry citizens of Dow and Carp Lake, Mich., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Grand Rapids and Harbor Springs, in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Battle Creek, Mich., and a petition of sundry citizens of Bay City, Mich., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of E. C. Paige, of Antrim, N. H., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of S. H. Dana, of Exeter, N. H., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a new immigration station at Boston, Mass., which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also (for Mr. BURLEIGH) presented a petition of the Penobscot and Piscataquis Rural Letter Carriers' Association, of Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the Rural Mail Service, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Maine State Board of Trade, praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Santa Cruz, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to relieve the congested condition of freight on the eastern seaboard, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce and the Commercial Club of Oakland, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation granting certain aid to the oil producers in that State, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Reedley, Cal., remonstrating against the seizure of California fruits destined for neutral countries, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A bill (S. 4104) granting an increase of pension to Albert L. Pickett (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4105) granting an increase of pension to Stephen M. Teachout; and

A bill (S. 4106) granting a pension to Franz G. Schmelsser (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 4107) granting an increase of pension to Anstress L. Hendricks (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4108) granting an increase of pension to Martha Gardner (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. BURLEIGH):

A bill (S. 4109) granting an increase of pension to Julia Churchill;

A bill (S. 4110) granting a pension to Clarence A. Hunt;

A bill (S. 4111) granting an increase of pension to Fitz W. Patterson;

A bill (S. 4112) granting a pension to Adaline F. Washburn;

A bill (S. 4113) granting an increase of pension to Herbert Wadsworth; and

A bill (S. 4114) granting a pension to Sopronia N. Pierce; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 4115) granting a pension to Newton H. Reed; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 4116) granting an increase of pension to Frances J. Sutton;

A bill (S. 4117) granting an increase of pension to Nancy R. Brady;

A bill (S. 4118) granting a pension to Sarah A. Shinkle;

A bill (S. 4119) granting a pension to Anna W. Sapp;

A bill (S. 4120) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Swander;

A bill (S. 4121) granting an increase of pension to Alice A. Richey;

A bill (S. 4122) granting an increase of pension to Marget E. Schrieber (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4123) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Harrison (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4124) granting an increase of pension to Nannie P. Brown (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 4125) to create a tariff reference board with powers to investigate all necessary subjects and make recommendations to Congress, and to suspend or decrease or increase any rate of import duties subject to approval of the President of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 4126) for the relief of the trustees of Hobson Methodist Church, of Davidson County, Tenn. (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4127) granting a pension to Edward B. Earl (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 4128) granting an increase of pension to Julius Nix;

A bill (S. 4129) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Sexton;

A bill (S. 4130) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. White;

A bill (S. 4131) granting an increase of pension to Addison W. Wilson;

A bill (S. 4132) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Hyde;

A bill (S. 4133) granting a pension to Charles H. Storms;

A bill (S. 4134) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Phares;

A bill (S. 4135) granting a pension to Gus Gurtz;

A bill (S. 4136) granting a pension to Mary E. Dismore;

A bill (S. 4137) granting a pension to William Hulshart;

A bill (S. 4138) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Pool;

A bill (S. 4139) granting an increase of pension to William H. Osborn (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4140) granting an increase of pension to Isabelle Dean (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4141) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Campbell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4142) granting an increase of pension to James Winford, alias Lewis H. Robinson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4143) granting an increase of pension to Permelia E. Wilson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEWLANDS:

A bill (S. 4144) for the relief of Fannie E. Turner (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 4145) for the relief of Charles W. Howard (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4146) for the relief of John W. Moore (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 4147) vesting jurisdiction in the Court of Claims, to entertain the claim of Charles A. Morrison, as administrator

de bonis non of the estate of William Morrison, deceased, against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4148) granting a pension to James Hanners (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4149) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Woodworth (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4150) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cleland (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4151) granting an increase of pension to John Stone (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4152) granting an increase of pension to Robert Wright (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4153) granting an increase of pension to William H. Grafton (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4154) granting a pension to William N. Griffing (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 4156) granting a pension to Tabitha Rask; and

A bill (S. 4157) granting an increase of pensions to Albert W. Kelley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) to prohibit the employment of enlisted men in competition with local civilians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

TENTS FOR FLOOD-STRICKEN DISTRICTS.

Mr. ROBINSON. I introduce a bill calling upon the Secretary of War to supply for temporary use tents for destitute persons in flood-stricken districts, which I ask may be received and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The bill (S. 4155) to authorize the Secretary of War to supply tents for temporary use of destitute persons in flood-stricken districts, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROBINSON. In connection with the bill, I desire to have printed in the RECORD certain telegrams which I have received, one being from the mayor of Arkansas City.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARKANSAS CITY, ARK., *January 31, 1916.*

Hon. JOSEPH T. ROBINSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Send me at Arkansas City 100 Government tents; 500 families in destitute condition. Need supplies at once. Whole country under water here. Have wired Col. TAYLOR. Answer.

C. C. HEMINGWAY, *Mayor.*

—

DOUGLAS, ARK., *February 1, 1916.*

Senator JOSEPH T. ROBINSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Levees broken in three places on both ends of State farm and at Douglas. Send provisions for 300 families, and hay for stock. Thousands of acres flooded.

C. W. DIXON.
W. W. DOUGLASS.
R. E. LAKE.

—

HELENA, ARK., *February 2, 1916.*

Senator JOSEPH T. ROBINSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

You no doubt are familiar with the misfortune which has befallen our locality. I think it will be a question of a short time until we will have to appeal to the Government for relief. In fact, our board of trade has already made this appeal. If the Government should send officers in here to take charge of this situation, will ask you to use your influence in securing Lieut. Hanna and Quartermaster Clerk Dulin, if available. Both have been here and are familiar with conditions. We will appreciate any help you may give us.

AMOS JARMAN.

CENTRAL HEATING, LIGHTING, AND POWER PLANT.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask that joint resolution No. 92, relative to the construction on the site selected of the central heating, lighting, and power plant authorized by the provisions of the sundry civil appropriation act approved June 23, 1913, introduced by me on the 29th ultimo, be taken from the table and referred to the Committee on the Library.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. NEWLANDS. In connection with the joint resolution I ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the American Federation of Arts, which I ask may be referred with the resolution to the Committee on the Library.

There being no objection, the communication was referred to the Committee on the Library and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF ARTS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1916.

Hon. FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS,
United States Senate,
United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The American Federation of Arts, the national art organization of America, representing 210 of the leading art museums, art societies, and associations throughout the United States, desires to respectfully make protest against the proposed erection of a power plant at Fourteenth and Water Streets in the city of Washington in accordance with plans recently designed under the supervision of the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury and disapproved by the Federal Commission of Fine Arts.

The erection of such a building, 80 or 90 feet in height, surmounted by four smokestacks 16 feet in diameter and 195 feet above the water line, would be seriously detrimental to the beauty of our National Capital, becoming a dominant note in almost every vista, and perpetually marring the beautiful park system which is being developed with so much skill and such excellent effect under the direction of Congress.

The American Federation of Arts therefore earnestly asks your cooperation in preventing the erection of such a building on such a site, which would not only permanently disfigure the city of Washington, but would stand as a monumental witness to the ill-judgment of those under whose direction and by whose order it was erected.

It is earnestly hoped that through the intervention of yourself and others such misfortune may be avoided.

I am, sir,

Very respectfully, yours, LEILA MECHLIN, *Secretary.*

THE MILITIA.

Mr. GORE. I introduce a joint resolution and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 95) to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to calling out the militia, was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That in lieu of the fifteenth paragraph of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:

"ART. XVIII. The Congress shall have power to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, repel invasions, and carry on war."

AMENDMENT TO INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PITTMAN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $3,600 for the payment of rental of private land occupied by nonreservation homeless Indians in the vicinity of Sparks, Nev., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill (H. R. 10385), which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

THE JUDICIAL CODE.

Mr. SHIELDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1412) further to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution No. 87 to print the manuscript entitled "Electric Power Development in the United States and Concentration in its Ownership and Control." There was objection a few days ago to unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution, but it ought to be acted upon promptly, if at all, and it ought to be favorably acted upon at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there are one or two Senators, not now in the Chamber, who desire to speak upon the resolution; and if the Senator from Florida now asks for its consideration, I shall object at this time.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have moved that the resolution be taken up.

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to say to the Senator that, if he insists upon having the resolution considered to-night, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum, so that the Senators to whom I have referred may be present.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the first place, there is no order in the Senate Chamber; in the second place, the Chair is unable to hear one word that is being said. The Chair did not hear a single word which the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] said, but thinks it was a request of some kind.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska rose to make some inquiry, I think.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Florida had asked unanimous consent to consider Senate resolution 87, providing for the printing of certain material for use in connection with the proposed water-power bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; that is the situation.

Mr. NORRIS. And I understood the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] was inclined to object to that. I do not believe any Senator is absolutely opposed to the printing of the material referred to. I should like to say to the Senator from Utah that some Senators may be opposed to the printing of the diagrams or illustrations or something of that kind, but I have not heard anyone object to the printing of the text. I have abundant evidence, I will say to the Senator from Utah, direct from the office of the Secretary of Agriculture that the state-

ment made when this resolution was previously under consideration that the material could all be found somewhere else is really without foundation when the subject is investigated. A very great deal of it is absolutely new, and that portion of it which can be found in the records of the various departments is scattered so that it would require a year's time, perhaps, for any one man to get it together.

We have spent already over $20,000 in gathering this information in response to a resolution of the Senate instructing the Secretary to gather it. We have two water-power bills on the calendar now, with a notice on the calendar that a motion is to be made to take one of them up when we get through with the Philippine bill. We ought to have this information, and we ought to have it soon, if it is to do any good in connection with the bills which are coming up for consideration, and I hope the Senator will not delay the matter by calling for a quorum.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will be compelled to call for a quorum if the resolution is to be considered now, but I do not intend to object to its consideration. I am perfectly willing that it shall be considered, but the Senators who spoke to me in relation to this matter, who wanted to submit some remarks upon it, are not present, and it is for that reason that I will suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FLETCHER. If the Senator wishes to suggest the absence of a quorum, that is his privilege, of course. We will have to secure a quorum. If he objects to the consideration of the resolution by unanimous consent, I will move to take it up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to taking up the resolution, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolution 87, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 87) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the report entitled "Electric Power Development in the United States and Concentration in its Ownership and Control," transmitted to the Senate by the Secretary of Agriculture on January 20, 1916, in response to Senate resolution No. 544, Sixty-third Congress, be printed as a Senate document, together with accompanying tables and illustrations.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harding	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Hollis	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Borah	Husting	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	James	Norris	Smoot
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	O'Gorman	Sterling
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Oliver	Stone
Chilton	Jones	Overman	Sutherland
Clapp	Kenyon	Page	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	Kern	Pittman	Townsend
Colt	Lane	Poindexter	Underwood
Cummins	Lea, Tenn.	Pomerene	Vardaman
Curtis	Lee, Md.	Reed	Wadsworth
du Pont	Lewis	Robinson	Walsh
Fall	Lippitt	Saulsbury	Williams
Fletcher	Lodge	Shafroth	
Gallinger	McCumber	Sheppard	
Gronna	McLean	Simmons	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

The resolution is before the Senate by unanimous consent. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who seems particularly interested in this resolution, whether it is his purpose to object to the consideration of the water-power bills until the report referred to in the pending resolution is printed?

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Nebraska knows very well that in a general way our ideas are quite in accord in reference to the proposed legislation, and I should feel that it would be exceedingly regrettable if, when we seek to get these measures before the Senate, some Senator should object to their consideration because this material is not here for use.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator, I will say that I do not intend to object; in fact, for some time I have been industriously trying to get this matter printed and in usable shape. I realize that, if the Philippine bill should be disposed of within the next day or two and the Senate should decide to take up one of the water-power bills, we would not have this information before us for some time at least; but if the first water-power bill shall be before the Senate anywhere near so long a time as we have given to the bill now before the Senate, we will probably have the information before we are through with that bill, and if not then, before we take up the next bill. In any event, it will be available to the Members of the House when the bill we pass, if we do pass a bill before the information is available here, shall be taken up in the House. In other words, it seems to me that, after we have spent the Government funds to gather this information, a large part of which has never before been gathered together, and such portions as have been given at various times before various committees are scattered through hundreds of reports, we should have it printed and put in shape, so that it would be readily usable in case we should desire it. It seems to me we ought to have it available at the very first possible moment, certainly before we get through with this question.

So far as I am concerned, I would not object to the bill, even if my objection would succeed in delaying it—and it would not, as it could be taken up in any event on motion, and I understand it will be taken up in that way—but it seems to me that every day, every moment that we delay the printing of this material, which has been gathered by the office of the Secretary of Agriculture in pursuance to a resolution of this body, we are making it more difficult for Members of this body intelligently to pass upon the various questions that will arise in the course of the discussion and consideration of proposed water-power legislation.

I have in my hand a copy of a letter from Mr. Graves, Chief of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, in which he outlines to some considerable extent the information contained in this report. For instance, he says:

The work of preparation of the report began about the 1st of March, and was prosecuted continuously until the middle of December, by the full office force of the Chief Engineer, aided by certain details from the field, by the several district engineers, and by a force of clerks, stenographers, and draftsmen.

He says in another place:

In order that the data on concentration in the ownership and control of power development might be correct and might be of sufficiently recent date to be of value, a special census of electric power was made for the United States. This involved the time of one man with clerical and stenographic assistance for 10 months. This material is entirely new, is not available anywhere except in the report, and has never been presented before. On the basis of the special power census the tabulations showing the concentration in the control and ownership of power were prepared. These tabulations are therefore entirely new. While information upon concentration was presented for water powers alone by the Commissioner of Corporations in 1912 and for electric power in 1913 for several of the Western States at hearings before the Public Lands Committees of the House and Senate, the information as contained in the report has never been presented before in any form for the majority of the States or been brought up to date for any of the States. The material in section 2 of the report is therefore entirely new.

There are other parts of it that are entirely new. He says in another place in this letter:

In hearings before the Public Lands Committees of the House and Senate certain material has been presented by representatives of this department along the lines of part 3 of the report; but such material as was presented in the hearings involved only a few corporations and amounted to less than one-tenth of the data presented in the report, while the data concerning the relations of public utility electric companies to banking institutions has never been presented before.

They have worked, as I understand, diligently and have done everything they could to expedite the gathering of the data in order that we might have this information for the purpose of intelligently legislating on the proposed water-power legislation. Although, in my judgment, it would be wise if the consideration of the water-power bills were delayed for a week or so in order to get this information, I am not going to ask that even that delay take place.

I agree with the Senator from Montana. I think that this is a subject that we ought to legislate upon in some manner, in some form, at this session of Congress, and I am just as anxious that we legislate as soon as possible as is the Senator from Montana or as is any other Senator, but we ought to get all the information we possibly can.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question, if he will permit, with the consent of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. NORRIS. I am occupying the floor by the courtesy of the Senator from Montana, for the purpose of answering his question.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator has expressed his views upon this subject. Would it not be better to adopt the suggestion which was made the other day by the Senator from Washington, and print the printed part, which will cost very little? Then, after that is delivered to the Senate, we can look through it and see whether it is necessary to print the other; and if so, do it. I understand that the printed part, which is in a separate volume, could be printed in four or five days.

Mr. NORRIS. I am very glad the Senator made that suggestion, because I intended to say something along that line. If we adopt the resolution as the committee has brought it in here, my understanding is that the first thing that will be done under

the resolution will be to print the material suggested by the Senator from Colorado. We can use that while they are getting out the other part.

I am informed by those who know more about the material than I do—I have not had any opportunity to examine it—that it would materially affect the value of this document if these diagrams were not printed. But if we adopt the resolution, I understand—and I believe the Senator from Florida, who is the chairman of the Committee on Printing, will bear me out; if I am wrong, of course I want to be corrected—that we can get the printed part mentioned by the Senator from Colorado printed first, and we can be using that while they are finishing up the complete work. That would be worth a good deal, even though we did not get any more of it than that.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, the only objection I would have to printing it all now would be the fact that it might not be worth the sum of $13,500 simply for the illustrations. These illustrations, as I understand, make a bird's-eye view of just what is said in the report; and the very fact that the report is printed in a separate volume shows that people can understand it without that object lesson being right before them.

Mr. NORRIS. I will say that I think they could understand it; at least, my understanding is that they could; but it would very materially aid them if these diagrams were printed in connection with the text.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It might; but if we get the report here in three or four days and then look through it and decide that we want the report in full, I say we should get it, even if it does cost a good deal.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida, who has examined the material and who is chairman of the committee bringing in this resolution, what he thinks about it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will permit me, I will state that the report is in this shape: It is presented in three parts. Part 1 contains the text of the report, which is this which I hold in my hand. Part 2 contains—

> The plates and tables concerning primary power, power generated, and financial statistics; the detailed data of power development in 1915; the summary tables showing the concentration in control of this power; and maps of 14 of the public-land States showing the location of all power plants, main transmission systems, and national forest areas.

Part 3 contains—

> The data concerning the interrelations between public service holding companies and the relation of these companies to certain banking corporations, diagrams showing the successive steps by which certain holding companies have established their control over operating companies, and charts indicating the relation through directors or principal officers of certain public-utility holding companies with each other.

These three parts, it seems to me, can be printed separately. Part 1, which is the text, could be printed without delay in a very few days.

I will say to the Senator from Montana that I have not any idea at all of causing the slightest delay in reference to the pending measures. I am in thorough sympathy with the bill which has been noted as the next measure to be taken up, and I do not believe that any delay would be occasioned by agreeing to the resolution in favor of printing this report. The parts that contain the diagrams and maps could follow along as quickly as possible, but the whole resolution ought to be adopted and the full report turned out as rapidly as it can be done. I do not believe a month's time will be required to print all the diagrams and all the maps and charts in connection with the report, but the text can be gotten out within a very few days—three or four days, I should think.

The matter is a very important one, and I do not believe there would be the slightest reason for causing delay in the consideration of the bills, because if we do not have this report printed the same contention could be made that we need further information on it. If we do have it printed, and it is out in time for use, so much the better. If it is not all out before we finish the bills, some of it surely will be, but portions of it might be delayed beyond that, and still it is a very valuable contribution to this great question concerning one of the most important natural resources in the whole country.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, does the statement the Senator has just made include all of the printing that is involved and which the resolution covers, and which I think the Senator stated the other day would cost somewhere in the neighborhood of $22,000?

Mr. FLETCHER. Nearly $21,000; twenty thousand nine hundred and some dollars.

Mr. THOMAS. Are there any illustrations or pictures of any sort except the diagrams and charts of which the Senator speaks?

Mr. FLETCHER. There are no pictures, no photographic illustrations, except these. Here is one of the books which the Senator can examine and see for himself.

Mr. THOMAS. I saw that when the Senator had it the other morning. I noted that.

Mr. FLETCHER. As I read from the report the locations, the plans, the maps of these public-land States are here; and as they are colored, time is required to put them in shape and get them printed.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me ask if it is intended to duplicate the size of the charts and diagrams in the volume the Senator has before him?

Mr. FLETCHER. Oh, no; no, indeed. They will be about the size of this smaller volume.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am not to be understood as voicing any opposition whatever to the printing of this interesting, and doubtless valuable, information for the use of the Senate. I entertain no doubt that it will be serviceable, not only here but elsewhere throughout the country, without any reference to the bearing it may have upon the water-power bills now pending in this body.

But, Mr. President, we must bear in mind the fact that, unfortunately, this has been a subject of heated controversy now for a period of 10 years. The measures that are to be presented to this body for consideration are very stoutly resisted, both in matters of principle and in matters of detail. It is scarcely to be expected but that those gentlemen who do not want to see those measures passed will be urging before this body, and urging with much force and much emphasis, that having gone to the expense of $15,000 or $20,000 for the purpose of having printed material bearing upon the question, it would be quite improper, or at least inadvisable, to enter upon the consideration of those measures until that matter is laid before the Senate. If that course is unfortunately taken, other measures—the naval and military appropriation bills, the shipping bill, and various other bills—will have arrived at such condition as that they will be in shape for consideration by the body, and, as a matter of course, they will displace everything else.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH. I will ask the Senator to pardon me for just a moment.

On the other hand, there are extremists who view this matter as of the very essence of the questions involved in the two measures to which I have adverted. Now, if I may be at liberty to express my own opinion about the matter, I undertake to say that the question of whether the water powers of this country have, as a matter of fact, passed into monopolistic control or have not passed into monopolistic control, is only in the most incidental way relevant to the discussion of the merits of those two measures. To a very large extent probably no one will dispute that that is the condition of things, and the legislation will go on in the light of what will probably be conceded in that respect. So I trust that this does not mean that we are going to have consideration of those measures.

Mr. President, since the river-regulation and dam bill was vetoed, in the year 1906, my recollection is—some 10 years ago—this matter has been a subject of agitation and discussion, not only in both Houses of Congress but in the journals throughout the country; and time and again all of those great interests of this country that have been interested in establishing that conclusion—and they have been patriotic and energetic—have furnished the country with a world of information about it. I have no doubt in the world that this report adds much, and much that is valuable, to that, and for that reason I do not desire to be understood as in any manner objecting to the printing of it; but I trust that neither the antagonists of the measure nor those who favor it as it will be presented to the Senate will be urging that further consideration of it be postponed until this information is brought before the Senate.

I therefore hope that the solution suggested may be reached, namely, that it be given to us in installments, as fast as possible; and that we proceed, in the light of such information as comes to us, with the consideration of those measures in the passage of which, to my mind, there is involved so much of the future of this country.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the printing clerk of the Senate informs me that the text of the report, exclusive of illustrations, which is comprised within the covers of the black book on the desk of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], comprises practically all the information in the report, and that it could be printed in 24 hours, at a cost not to exceed $700. I understand that the Senator from Florida has just made that statement in my absence. It seems to me that that would be

the better course to pursue, and I will ask the Senator from Florida if he does not think it would be.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have just said, Mr. President, that the report is in three parts; that one part can be gotten out immediately and the next can follow shortly after and the next as quickly as possible after that. I think that is entirely practicable; I think that is the way it could be done; but the resolution——

Mr. MYERS. If it is printed in its entirety, I hope the chairman of the Committee on Printing will have the part contained in the black leather covers on his desk printed and given to us first, without any delay. I apprehend that the furnishing of the illustrations and designs does not make so much difference, and the printer may have them for any length of time.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana, as he seems to be somewhat of the same opinion as I, if the printed part of this report can not be printed, and if we can not then determine whether the great expenditure involved in printing the illustrations should be made?

Mr. MYERS. I suppose that could be done.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Do I understand that the printed part of the report would cost only $700?

Mr. MYERS. That is my recollection. I was told that that is the case.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If it will cost $700 and the other will cost $20,000, and everything that is in the report is in the printed part, it does seem to me that we will be extravagant if we provide that all of it shall be done without each Senator examining the matter to see whether or not he thinks it is of that value.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if he knows the cost of that work?

Mr. FLETCHER. About twenty thousand nine hundred dollars and something.

Mr. VARDAMAN. For what number of copies?

Mr. FLETCHER. The regular number—1,345 copies. Five hundred copies go to the public libraries, so many to the Senate, and so many to the House.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Twenty thousand dollars.

Mr. FLETCHER. That would be the total cost of the whole report.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, all this matter was debated for quite a while the other day. I wish the Senator could get a vote on the matter.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am willing to vote. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that it probably would cost $700 to print the typewritten portion of this report, but there are some illustrations in connection with this portion, outside of the plans and maps, and so forth, which would cost about $7,000. I gave the figures the other day.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It seems to me, then, that we could print the typewritten part, together with what illustrations are in the typewritten part. Evidently they are referred to directly on the pages of the report; but when you turn to another volume, or two other volumes, it is not necessary that they should be there to confirm what is stated in the printed part. It seems to me that if we authorize the printing of the printed part at a small cost we could determine afterwards whether or not the enlarged and illustrated parts should be printed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move to strike out the words "together with accompanying tables and illustrations."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I desire to join very heartily in the wish expressed by my colleague that whatever may be done, whether the report be printed in whole or in part, it will not operate to delay the consideration of the water-power legislation now pending before the Senate.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, would the Senator consent to letting this matter go over until to-morrow morning? We should like to have a short executive session.

Mr. THOMAS. I think we can get through very soon, in view of the motion made by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think we can finish in a very few minutes.

Mr. STONE. In a very few minutes it will be 5 o'clock and we will have to adjourn.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana a question regarding his proposed amendment. If it is as I understand it to be, I shall not oppose a vote at once. I desire to ask the Senator whether his amendment is designed to exclude from the resolution the printing of the large mass of matter found in this book here?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Then, I shall vote for it.

Mr. WALSH. I will withdraw that amendment, with the permission of the Senate, and substitute in lieu thereof the following: I move to strike out the words "together with accompanying tables and illustrations" and to insert in lieu thereof "without accompanying illustrations."

Mr. FLETCHER. I think that would destroy the value of the report. That is the only objection I have.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I do not mean to prevent the publication of this matter, but I think the wise thing to do is to submit another resolution to provide for the printing of the illustrations.

Mr. FLETCHER. If the Senator desires to accomplish that, his amendment was in proper shape before. That can be accomplished by striking out the words just as he had them before and not using the word "without," because unless the resolution provides for printing the illustrations they will not be printed.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Florida. How long would it take to print the reports that the Senator has there in that big book?

Mr. FLETCHER. The whole thing could be done in a month.

Mr. OVERMAN. By that time would not the water-power bills have passed?

Mr. FLETCHER. I was just saying that the report is submitted in three parts. If Senators come in after we get through with the discussion, we have to go all over it again. The report is in three parts—1, 2, and 3. Part 1 comprises the text, part 2 some other data and illustrations, and part 3 plans and maps. The text can be printed in 24 hours.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand. Then if the printing is deferred until those other reports can be printed, the report will be of no advantage to us, because we will have discussed the bill and passed it, probably; and then of what value to the Senate would be the expenditure of $13,000 to print these things?

Mr. VARDAMAN. It will cost $20,000 to print thirteen hundred of them.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand it would cost $13,000—$7,000 for the text.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senate of the United States has passed a resolution calling for this report.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand that.

Mr. FLETCHER. Some forty or fifty thousand dollars have been expended in collecting this data and making this report, and probably more. Now it is here. What is the use of having it if we are not going to print it?

Mr. OVERMAN. Why spend $13,000 to print those documents when they will be of no advantage to the Senate?

Mr. FLETCHER. They will be of everlasting advantage to the Senate. The Senator will never see the day come when it will not be of advantage to have this information before the American people and before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to correct statements that have been made by Senators in this debate. They say that there was $50,000 spent in collecting the information in response to the resolution of the Senate.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course I have no data on that point. It is merely an estimate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I know that that is not the case. I know that the greater part of the information was collected before ever the resolution was offered in the Senate. I have seen the tables. I have seen the illustrations. Most of them have been before the Public Lands Committee, not once, but twice that I know of. When the statement is made that the Government of the United States has spent $50,000 for the purpose of collecting information based upon the resolution under consideration, it is not true.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not quite like to have that sort of language used in reference to a statement that I have made in this Chamber. I never said that it was paid after this resolution was passed. I said that a resolution was passed that called for this report. I said that the collection of these data and material and the making of these surveys had cost something like forty or fifty thousand dollars. It may not have been all expended since the resolution was passed. The material may have been gathered years before; but however it was gathered, no matter when it was done, it cost something to do it; and it has cost the Government somehow, some time, in some way, an immense amount of money to get this material together. I have not the figures on it; but the Senator from Utah can not say to the Senate that this material has not cost the Government anything of any consequence——

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah did not so state.

Mr. FLETCHER. Because it is utterly unreasonable to take that position.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Florida that I did not so state. Further than that, as to the statement the Senator now makes, that this information was collected before the resolution was introduced, and that it cost $50,000 to collect it, I have not a word to say against that. I believe that is true.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is just exactly my statement.

Mr. SMOOT. I believe that the information that was collected by the department may have cost $50,000. That I do not know.

Mr. FLETCHER. Well, that is my statement. That is all I did say.

Mr. SMOOT. If the department says it cost $50,000, well and good, let it be that way. But it has been stated and restated, Mr. President, that because of a resolution of the Senate the Government went to the expense of $50,000 to collect the information, which of course is not the fact, as I have stated.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say, Mr. President, that I do not know anybody who has ever stated that. This is what the letter transmitting the report says:

> This report has been made up from data which has been accumulating for several years in the office of the Chief of Engineers, supplemented by investigations made in the field by district engineers of the Forest Service, and by correspondence with officials of power companies, to whom have been submitted for verification the greater part of the data on power development in 1915 as contained in this report.

The resolution was passed in 1915.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the resolution was passed at this session of Congress.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no.

Mr. SMOOT. I should say at the last session of Congress.

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. Before the close of the last session of Congress.

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. It was passed after the hearings on the water-power bill and the leasing bill were had before the Public Lands Committee. The Senator from Idaho introduced the resolution, and Mr. Merrill had the information and testified before the Public Lands Committee.

Mr. President, I do not want it understood that I object to printing any information that has not already been printed over and over again. I am perfectly willing to spend the money of the Government in printing everything that may be used in the consideration of the bills that are now upon the calendar or may be upon the calendar at this session of Congress. I may be wrong, and perhaps I am, in trying to save to the Treasury of the United States money that should not be wastefully spent. The great bulk of this, the great percentage of the report, can be found in Government documents to-day.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Utah a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will ask the Senator from Utah whether he does not regard this question of water power as one of the most important questions in the country, involving a resource that is of immense value in development, and whether he does not regard the diagrams of engineers explanatory of the legends in these reports as an aid, particularly to laymen, in reading these reports, and whether this expenditure is not trifling compared with the importance of the subject which is under consideration to-day, and probably will be under consideration for 20 years?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator's question is a fair one, and I will say to the Senator that if it had not already been printed in——

Mr. NEWLANDS. I understand it has been printed in detached ways, a part here and a part there. A part of it has been presented to committes, but it never has been collated in any definite and comprehensive form, such as the form presented here.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know in how much more comprehensive form it could be printed than in three volumes recording the hearings before the Public Lands Committee, Sixty-third Congress, third session, on House bill 16673. The hearings began December 9, 1914.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator mean to say that there is not anything in this report that is not already available in some other report?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I did not say that. I said the great bulk of the information is available. But the Senator will say this: There is not one principle in the power bill or the leasing bill that will be discussed in this body that there have not been hearings upon, and they have been printed. The Senator will say another thing——

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator what that has to do with this resolution?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator will say another thing. If this material is printed, and the full expense of $21,000 incurred, it will not change one word in the bill as it will be ultimately passed by Congress. Another thing I want to say to the Senator——

Mr. NORRIS. How sure is the Senator of that? Does the Senator think there is not anyone here open to conviction? Have we all formed opinions that can not be changed by evidence, as the Senator evidently has done?

Mr. SMOOT. I say there is no information in the report that has not already been printed that would affect the mind of Senators in any way as to the wisdom of the legislation.

Mr. NORRIS. How does the Senator know that? It would not change his mind, probably; but I venture to say that this information, which has been gathered according to our orders—and I should like to say that my information is that it has cost over $20,000—after the passage of the resolution——

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 5 o'clock). The Senate stands adjourned until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Thereupon the Senate (at 5 o'clock p. m., Wednesday, February 2, 1916) adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 3, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *February 2, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we realize profoundly the duality of our being, that deep in the secrets of the heart is the conflict twixt the evil and the good, the false and the true, the animal and the spiritual; each seeking supremacy. Deliver us, we beseech Thee, from the one and help us to make dominant the other, putting under our feet the evil, emphasizing the good, crushing the false, exalting the true, holding back the malevolent, putting forward the benevolent, eliminating selfish ambitions, rising ever to the spirit of altruism, that we may be worthy of the trust reposed in us and grow in favor with Thee, our fellow men, and feel the thrill of an approving conscience; and Thine be the praise forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY—CHILD-LABOR BILL.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the unfinished business is the bill (H. R. 8234) to prevent interstate commerce in the product of child labor, and for other purposes. The House will automatically resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] will take the Chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8234, the child-labor bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment which was under consideration when the bill was last before the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amend, on page 2, by striking out section 3, being from lines 17 to 23, inclusive, as follows:
> "SEC. 3. That the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor shall constitute a board to make and publish from time to time uniform rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 3. That for the purpose of securing proper enforcement of this act the Secretary of Labor, or any person duly authorized by him, shall have authority to enter and inspect at any time mines, quarries, mills, canneries, workshops, factories, and manufacturing establishments and other places in which goods are produced or held for interstate commerce, and the Secretary of Labor shall have authority to employ such assistance for the purposes of this act as may from time to time be authorized by law.

With the following committee amendments:

> Page 2, line 21, strike out the figure "3" and insert the figure "4."
> Line 25, page 2, after the word "factories," strike out the word "and."
> Page 3, line 3, after the word "by," strike out the words "appropriation or other."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 22, after the word "or," strike out the words "any person duly authorized by him" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Any United States marshal or deputy United States marshal."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, in this connection I desire simply to state that I have listened to able arguments on both sides of the House in respect to economy. With those arguments I heartily agree, and I offer this amendment, believing that the United States marshals and deputy United States marshals throughout the country, without the employment of additional help, can see that this bill is fully enforced if it should be enacted into law. I seek to place this in the hands of the Attorney General, without any reflection upon the Secretary of Labor, because under the Attorney General's department, it strikes me, would come the enforcement of this law more than under the hands of the Secretary of Labor. I am satisfied that the Attorney General of this great country of ours will see that this law is fully enforced by the United States marshals and deputy United States marshals. I do not believe it is necessary to place upon the people the additional burden of employing additional men to travel from one end of this country to the other for the purpose of enforcing this bill should it become a law.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not prevail. If this law is to be effective, experience has demonstrated that it is necessary to employ men specially to search out violations in order to have the law properly enforced.

Unfortunately, because of other duties, I was not present last Wednesday when the bill was under consideration. I am fully in sympathy with its purpose, and I hope it will be enacted. If it is to be enacted, it should contain such provisions as will enable the Government to make it effective. The only department of the Government that will have any keen interest in having this law effectively carried out is the Department of Labor. Under its organic act that department is charged with the enforcement of laws and for the ascertainment of the violation of laws similar to this proposed one. That department has special employees to enforce the naturalization laws and the immigration laws, and this particular act, which is designed to prevent young children, because of particular employment, being so affected that their after lives will be materially impaired, can only be effectively enforced by having employed under the Department of Labor persons selected particularly to enforce it. For these reasons I hope the amendment will not prevail, but that the department will be clothed with sufficient authority to make the law of some avail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line —, after the word "the," strike out all down to and including the word "act" and insert the following: "Attorney General shall pay said United States marshal or deputy United States marshal for services rendered for the purpose of enforcing this act such sum or sums as he may deem reasonable and as may from time to time be authorized by appropriation or other law."

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I believed when I introduced this amendment that the law would be more effectively enforced than it would otherwise be, and at the same time save hundreds of thousands of dollars to the taxpayers of this country. The first amendment having been voted down, I can not see there is any need of passing this amendment; but I still believe marshals should be paid an additional sum in addition to the very small sum they are now paid, and we would get better service, and that this law would be more effectively enforced if this amendment were passed than otherwise.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to oppose this amendment which would take from the Department of Labor the enforcement of the law and place it in the Department of Justice. Let me say to the gentleman from Florida and other gentlemen here that in my State of Rhode Island the United States marshal's office could not very properly enforce this proposed law for the reason that the force is now overworked and underpaid. The Department of Labor is peculiarly well fitted to enforce the law, and I think the committee has done well in naming that department of the Government for the work. I am glad I am here to-day to support this measure because I have nothing but the heartiest commendation for the people who are behind this kind of legislation, whether they are in this House or outside of it. It is legislation worth while, and as I listened to the debate last week I could not help but think it was a struggle between humanitarians and lawyers, and I am with the humanitarians and against the lawyers. That impression was somewhat enforced by looking at the table where the minority of the committee were entrenched behind a small law library, and it is further enforced by the consideration of the committee's report. The minority report looks like a brief addressed to a court to preserve and take care of some special interest.

The report of the majority looks like a combined effort of uplifters, humanitarians, and legislators to make the world better and bring a little sunshine into the lives of the children. Now, there is no question in the world that child labor is a national evil and a blot upon the fair name of our Republic. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the sentiment expressed in that sentence, and I want to say here that while I believe in industry, and I believe that every community should make every legitimate effort for the upbuilding of industry, I will say unreservedly I would rather see an industry wither and die than see it built up upon the child labor of this country. [Applause.] We have a very decent child-labor law in Rhode Island, and, of course, Rhode Island is a beehive of industry. I remember well when that law was up for consideration in the Rhode Island Legislature that I happened to be upon the committee on special legislation, and we had the usual objections interposed. There were men there representing different concerns, notably the department stores, saying that it would disorganize their business.

If I remember rightly, I said, "I hope it will if it will bring about social justice, and if it will bring about better conditions not only for the children but for the women employees." I remember distinctly, when I asked them how much of a wage they paid these children, they said about 50 cents a day. And when they kept them at night there was nothing provided in the way of food or comfort for the children.

Those department stores are still doing business; no disorganization has taken place, and the law is being enforced. And let me ask why uniform legislation should not govern the subject of child labor, whose work is transported from State to State? I believe that we should equalize conditions and put other States on an equal footing with Rhode Island. Let us be just to the manufacturers. Congress has the undoubted power to regulate interstate commerce, and no more beneficent exercise of that power could be indulged in than the helping in a generous way the children of our land, who will be our future citizens.

This bill is in line with the enlightened progress of the age; in line with advanced thought. I dislike to see and hear men falling back upon the Constitution of the United States when progressive legislation is urged in this body. I have more respect for the men who framed the Constitution of the United States than to take refuge in that instrument whenever we attempt progressive legislation. [Applause.] While it may be a fact that the property interests were better represented than the poor interests by the men who made the Constitution, still I do not believe that it was ever their thought to prohibit Congress from enacting legislation that would be of benefit to mankind in the suppression of child labor. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word or rise in opposition to the amendment, I do not care which. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Rhode Island that it is very unkind if he feels that he ought to deprive the opponents of this bill of the only possible objection that they can urge against its passage. There certainly would be nothing else that could be suggested that would give power to any man who desired to secure such desirable legislation. But, Mr. Chairman, I think that it may be said fairly that the lawyers are not by any means arrayed in opposition to this bill. Upon that proposition I desire to submit a few words in the consideration of this bill.

Each of the departments of government may have occasion to pass upon the constitutionality of a law. The legislative body which enacts the law must first determine whether or not the proposed measure conforms to the fundamental law. The Executive may be called upon to consider its constitutionality, and if he believes it unconstitutional veto it. The courts may be required to pass upon it when its constitutionality is challenged in a legal proceeding.

While the power of the courts to declare a law unconstitutional rests upon incontrovertible authority and is founded upon reason and necessity, it is evident that to declare the invalidity of a legislative act is the exercise of a very delicate and extraor-

dinary power, and not to be exercised or justified except in cases requiring it. In determining the question every presumption should be in favor of the validity of the statute, and it should be declared invalid only when clearly and necessarily in contravention of the fundamental law. This is the announced and approved rule of all the Federal and State courts. It has been followed in an unbroken line of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States for more than a century. Thus in Fletcher against Peck it was held that the presumption is always in favor of the validity of a statute if the contrary is not clearly demonstrated; in the Dartmouth College case that in no doubtful case will a statute be pronounced unconstitutional; in the Sinking Fund cases that the presumption that an act of Congress is valid continues until the contrary is established beyond a reasonable doubt; and in Pine Grove Township against Talcott that a statute is not to be pronounced void upon the ground of repugnancy to the Constitution, unless such repugnancy be clear and the conclusion that it exists inevitable.

It is the duty of a court or a judge never to declare a statute unconstitutional unless it is so clearly, inevitably beyond any reasonable doubt. That is the rule not only because of the comity which should exist between coordinate branches of the Government, but also because constitutions are not intended as restraints or impediments to progress. Rather are they designed to aid the growth and development of the people. As new conditions arise new legislation is required, which is intended to benefit the people, to aid their progress, and lighten their burdens. It is to be presumed that legislative acts will help and not harm, will be beneficial and not injurious. Nothing should interfere with the exercise of that purpose except a clear violation of the people's will as expressed in their fundamental law. In the consideration of this bill the constitutionality of the proposed measure has been vigorously challenged, and Members have been told that if they have any doubt of the constitutionality of the contemplated legislation they should resolve that doubt against the measure and vote against it; that while it is the duty of courts to give every presumption in favor of the constitutionality of a law, Members of the House considering a bill should, if in doubt, resolve that doubt against the bill and vote against it. The reason given for this singular rule is that the courts considering the validity of legislative acts must assume that the legislative body has properly acted and only set aside its action on the clearest and most cogent reasons, while a legislature acting at first hand should never act when there is any doubt of its right to do so.

This course of reasoning is based upon what I consider an entirely false premise. No contemplated legislation which in the mind of the legislator is desirable should be prevented unless there is want of power to act or a restriction of the power to act contained in the fundamental law. Having determined the need of the legislation the legislator then considers whether there is any constitutional impediment. To refuse to enact a law which he has decided is necessary in the interest of the people because a doubt arises as to whether the Constitution might not interfere would bar the path of progress completely. Upon every ground of reason and sound sense the legislation ought to be enacted unless the constitutional bar to action is clearly shown. It could not be argued that reckless latitude should govern the legislative judgment.

Mr. BRITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. TOWNER. I do.

Mr. BRITT. I desire to ask the gentleman if it be true that the Supreme Court of the United States has held recently, as reported in Two hundred and thirty-eighth, that the digger of coal is not engaged in interstate commerce, coal being an innocent thing of itself and therefore not subject to control under the interstate provisions of the Constitution, how would the maker of a yard of cloth, which is an innocent thing of itself, be engaged in interstate commerce so as to let that product become a subject of interstate-commerce control?

Mr. TOWNER. I will be glad to answer that if I have the time.

The constitutional objection if urged should be fairly considered. But the legislator should be able to say, "I believe the legislation desirable, but the Constitution plainly forbids," before he opposes it on that ground. The constitutional obstacle should be definite and fairly certain in order to obstruct the course of legislation. To hold otherwise would be to block the path of progress. Constitutions were not made for that purpose. They are charters of liberty, rather than shackles of slavery. They are guideposts on the pathway of progress, rather than impediments and obstacles. Because that progress is orderly does not mean that it should be obstructed.

Mr. BRITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. TOWNER. I can not take the time now, but I will yield if I can get the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. KEATING. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. MANN. Do not object.

Mr. KEATING. I am not going to object, but I am going to endeavor to get an agreement as to the time on this section.

Mr. MANN. Will not the gentleman wait a little while? It is early in the afternoon. Give the gentlemen a chance to discuss the bill a little while, under the five-minute rule.

Mr. KEATING. I do not want to unnecessarily limit debate, but I would like to get on with the bill.

Mr. MANN. I do not think there is any difficulty about that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TOWNER. Constitutional restrictions are designed to prevent interference and injustice, not to impede the onward march of civilization. As the minds of men are widened by the years, as the spirit of humanity is strengthened by enlarged vision, new means of helping the weak, protecting the dependent, uplifting the lowly, lightening the burdens of the poor will come into view. It would be a strange perversion of constitutional government if the very instruments under which these blessings should be obtained most easily should be made insurmountable walls, forever barring progress.

I hope no Member of this House, convinced of the desirability of this legislation, will be deterred from supporting it merely because its ingenious and energetic opponents have suggested doubts as to its constitutionality. They certainly have fallen far short of any convincing showing that it is unconstitutional.

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution gives Congress power to regulate commerce among the States. If this bill regulates commerce among the States, all questions as to its constitutionality must disappear. It provides that the products of child labor shall not be transported in interstate commerce; that is, in commerce among the States. It is argued that the object of the bill is not to regulate commerce among the States, but to prevent child labor within the States. But upon what grounds is that assumption based? It does not in terms provide that child labor shall not be used by any mill or factory within the State. It does not provide that goods made by child labor shall not be sold or transported within the State. It does not attempt in any way to regulate commerce within the State. All that is left absolutely, without restriction, to the State. But if products made by child labor are offered for commerce among the States, that portion of commerce, the regulation of which is expressly committed to Congress, such traffic is prohibited. How, then, can it be argued that Congress exceeds its powers? It does not attempt to interfere with manufacture within the State; it does not attempt to regulate or prohibit commerce within the State. It is only when the makers of products produced by child labor seek to embark in commerce among the States that congressional regulation becomes operative. It is only within that field of operation which the Constitution expressly commits to Congress that this bill takes effect.

But it is argued that the ulterior purpose of the bill is to interfere with the police power of the States. Many times the Supreme Court has held that the ulterior effects of the operation of an act will not defeat its purpose if that purpose is within the constitutional power of Congress.

In a decision handed down January 10, 1916, interpreting the food and drugs act, Mr. Justice Hughes, delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court, considered the objection that the measure, although relating to articles transported in interstate commerce, was an encroachment on the reserved rights of the States. He said that the objection was not to be distinguished in substance from that which was overruled in sustaining the white-slave act. There it was stated that—

> if the facility of interstate transportation can be denied in lotteries, obscene literature, diseased cattle and persons, and impure food and drugs, the like facility could be taken away from the systematic enticement of and enslavement in the prostitution and debauchery of women.

Justice Hughes then adds:

> The court concluded with the reassertion of the simple principle that Congress is not to be denied the exercise of its constitutional authority over interstate commerce and its power to adopt not only means necessary but convenient to its exercise, because those means may have the quality of police regulations.

Applying that reasoning to the present case, may it not fairly be said that Congress shall not be denied the exercise of its constitutional authority over interstate commerce because it may result in the exclusion of the products of a State which are produced by child labor? Neither will it be defeated in its endeavor to regulate commerce among the States in the interest of all the people of all the States merely because that regulation may run counter to the police laws of individual States. [Applause.]

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad, indeed, of the opportunity of saying a word in favor of this bill.

I was very much impressed the other day with the address of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] wherein he stated that in the arts of peace the time had come for this Government to put its house in order, that it might be sufficient unto itself if the evil days should come. I have been pleased at the opportunity of supporting measures that looked to the conservation of water power, of oil, and minerals; but, Mr. Chairman, the greatest asset possessed by this Nation is not water power, nor oil, nor minerals—the greatest asset possessed by this or any other nation is the youth of the land. [Applause.]

I was delighted at the statement made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] that he was going to resolve all of his constitutional doubts in favor of the childhood of his State. I want to say, in fairness to him and the State that he represents, that the conditions disclosed by him with reference to children being forced into the factories by "drunken daddies" is not peculiar to the State of Georgia, but obtains in every State of this Union to a greater or less degree. And if the time is now here when the natural guardians of children will not protect them from labor of this character, then the time has come for this great Government to interfere in behalf of those children and supersede, in some measure, the authority that is being abused by their natural guardians.

Mr. BRITT. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. REAVIS. I must decline to yield; I have only five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. REAVIS. In conversation the other day I heard the statement made that in the environment in which many of these children live, with the limitation of their horizon, with the blood that was in them, there was not much hope for their future. Mr. Chairman, you and I, who judge superficially, have no right to pass judgment upon the future of a child. You and I, who see only externals, have no right to place limits on the souls of children. Down deep in the subconsciousness of the childhood of America lies embryonic greatness that requires only just legislation on the part of the Government to give it a chance to develop. If you and I had been walking the streets of St. Louis in the early fifties and had seen a short, heavy-set, silent man standing in the drizzle of an early fall evening by the side of his load of wood seeking a possible purchaser, as I have seen them in my home city times without number, we might have pitied him that he had no chance; and yet within the course of a very few years the crowned heads of Europe were doing homage to Ulysses S. Grant, the wood hauler of St. Louis. [Applause.] If you and I had been in the wilderness of Kentucky a hundred years ago and had seen a plain-faced, unkempt little lad studying his book by the brushwood fire, we would have pitied him because of his limited opportunity; and yet the time came when not only the people of the United States, but the people of the civilized world created of Abraham Lincoln their patron saint—the plain-faced, unkempt little boy who read by the brushwood fire. [Applause.]

Why, Mr. Chairman, if you and I had walked the streets of Bethlehem some 2,000 years ago and had seen a brown-eyed, brown-haired little Lad following His father, the carpenter, we would have pitied Him. But the time came when the earth trembled, when the sun hid its face from the tragedy on the mountain, and to-day, after the passing of 2,000 years, the civilized world bows in adoration at the feet of the Christ, the brown-eyed, brown-haired little Lad who followed His father, the carpenter. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GARNER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. REAVIS. The great need in America to-day is the development of individual character, and you can not develop character in the childhood of America by making them beasts of burden.

If I may be permitted the relation of an intimate incident that occurred in my district late last fall, I will say that by reason of being caught in a storm on the public highway and because my automobile insisted on parking itself in a ditch I was compelled to throw myself on the hospitality of a farmer for the night. And after supper was over—for we call it supper out there—and the supper dishes had been done away we repaired to the sitting room in that farm home. On one side of the stove the father was reading his paper, and on the other side the mother was doing her sewing as she talked to me. As we sat there three white-clad little figures came quietly into that room and knelt by their mother's knee and recited the prayer that has been the litany of this race for more than a hundred years:

Now I lay me down to sleep.

In the eyes of the mother was a holy look. The father, through half-closed lids, seemed to be seeing in the distant future a vision of his little boys and girls, grown to be men and women, doing their part in the work of the world, performing the duties of citizenship. I walked to the window and looked out on the quiet country night and saw the stars swing out through the broken clouds of a dying storm. I heard the patter of baby feet up the stairway, with the mother following in their wake, and the thought came to me, Mr. Chairman, and the thought is with me now, that the strength of this Nation lies not in the vulgar noise and turmoil of your great cities; the strength of this Nation is not in the lights and music and fair faces of State receptions; the trength of this Nation is not in a mighty Navy nor a far-flung battle line. The strength of this Nation, its promise of to-day, its fulfillment of to-morrow, lies in the teachings that are being given to the youth of the land in the Christian homes of America. [Applause.]

I would take the children from the factories and the mines and put them in the schools where they belong that they may be equipped for the future. I would take these children from the mines and the factories and place them upon the playgrounds where bent and wasted bodies may be restored to health and strength. I would have this Government, through this Congress, say to the man of greed and avarice, whoever he may be, wherever he may be, "No more, no more, except you choose to become a criminal under the laws of your Nation, shall you be permitted to coin dollars from the fair white body of a child." [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my approval of the purpose of this bill. I have listened with marked attention to the discussion of the Members here upon the floor of the House; and I have failed yet to find a single Member who has risen and said that he was not in favor of prohibiting child labor under certain restrictions. This being true, now is the time to vote as you speak.

It seems to me that the purpose of this bill is best for the child, it is best for the Nation, and it is best for the State, for in the welfare of our children do we find the welfare of our Nation. And it occurs to me this bill is based not only upon the health of the children, but as well I can not see how a little child of immature years can stay in a cotton mill, with the windows closed, breathing the atmosphere that is filled with lint, and such labor not be derogatory to the child's health.

We are confronted here with the idea on the part of some Members that this is an attack against an industry of their States. A great majority of the States of our country have legislation similar to the legislation contained in this bill; and may I say that under this bill any State can manufacture goods with child labor or female labor if they wish, but if they do manufacture goods with such labor they should keep that product in their own State and out of a State that forbids the employment of child labor in the manufacture of goods produced therein. I herewith incorporate in my remarks the provision of the bill referring to child labor:

Be it enacted, etc., That no producer, manufacturer, or dealer shall ship or deliver for shipment in interstate commerce the product of any mine or quarry situated in the United States which has been produced, in whole or in part, by the labor of children under the age of 16 years, or the product of any mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment situated in the United States which has been produced, in whole or in part, by the labor of children under the age of 14 years or by the labor of children between the ages of 14 years and 16 years who work more than eight hours in any one day or more than six days in any one week, or after the hour of 7 o'clock p. m. or before the hour of 7 o'clock a. m.

This legislation is opposed on account of contravening the Constitution, but I think, Mr. Chairman, that the court, when it comes to that question, will decide in favor of the welfare of the child under the clause to provide for the general welfare of the people. But the Constitution specifically provides that Congress shall have power to regulate commerce between the States. The right of Congress to make this legislation is full

and ample. The bill will not affect my State, as we have similar laws.

Some seem to think it is an attack on the rights and prerogatives of their States. I am inclined to think they are wrong. Twenty-seven States have laws prohibiting children under 14 years to work in factories or mines, and it is not plain to me why any outside State should ship goods into a State that prohibits the manufacture of goods by such labor within the State itself. Michigan is one of the States that prohibits a child under 14 years from working in its mines or factories. Why should it prohibit such children from working in its mines or factories if it permitted goods made in other States by children within such age to come in and be sold in its markets? I think the uniform law provided in this bill will tend to make better relations between all the States—North, South, East, and West. And, Mr. Chairman, during immature years, when the child should be fitting itself for the great work of citizenship of this Republic, there is a place far superior to the mine and the factory for those of tender years. For those reasons and others I am in favor of this legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, this bill makes it unlawful for the producer or dealer to make interstate shipment of products produced in whole or in part by child labor. Under its terms, first, children under the age of 16 years are prohibited from working in mines and quarries; second, children under 14 years of age are prohibited from working in mills, canneries, workshops, factories, or manufacturing establishments; third, children between 14 and 16 years of age can not be employed more than eight hours per day; fourth, children under 16 years of age can not be employed at night.

The bill seeks to outlaw products made in violation of the act from interstate shipment. The Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor constitute a board to provide uniform rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of the act. Authority is granted to the Secretary of Labor, or any person duly authorized by him, to enter and inspect, at any time, mines, quarries, mills, workshops, factories, manufacturing establishments, and other places where goods intended for interstate shipment are being manufactured by child labor. It further provides that no dealer shall be subject to a conviction who shall establish a guaranty, issued by the manufacturing establishment, to the effect that the act had not been violated by the employment of child labor.

Fifteen years ago the policy of most of the States permitted children over 11 years of age to be employed in the factories. There was then scarcely any system of inspection in any of the States. Night work was everywhere permitted. Many States had no laws at all protecting the child in the factory.

The 1900 census contained the startling data that 30 per cent of those that labored in the cotton mills of the South were under 16 years of age. Also, that many children were working in the factories at the age of 6 years. Great changes have taken place for the betterment of conditions of children working in factories since that date. Nearly every State has now some kind of child-labor law.

Public sentiment exists everywhere favoring better conditions for children working in the factories. Only a few years ago one State refused to pass a law for the protection of the children. The law being placed before the electorate on the initiative was passed by a vote of 75,000 to 25,000.

Even where commendable laws were passed it is shown in the hearings that such laws were generally violated, and in some instances the legislatures have lowered the age limit from 14 to 12 years.

It was also developed that many of the factories had lobbyists working against such measures; that 86 per cent of the population of the United States by States has now adopted a 14-year age limit; that 85 per cent of the population of the States have legislation that prohibits children under 16 years of age from doing night work, while 50.6 per cent of the population of the States are committed to the standard of eight hours per day for children who work in the factories. It also appears that eight-hour-per-day laws are but feebly and poorly enforced.

The Census Bureau in 1900, at a time when South Carolina had no child-labor law, gave the following figures for two counties having factories in that State, showing the number of children employed in factories and the number attending school, viz:

Age.	In school.	Employed.
9 to 9 years	251	147
10 years	79	351
11 years	50	391

After the 12-year age limit went upon the statutes the majority of the children under 12 years were found in school; but when the age limit was reached the children graduated from the school to the factory, there to labor under the most unfavorable conditions, affecting health and physical and moral development.

It is estimated that in this State about 1,500 children under the age of 12 years were employed in the cotton mills. It is also said that 50 per cent of the factory children were illiterate, and that the death rate of the operatives and the nonoperatives was greatly in favor of the latter.

On March 28, 1914, a canning factory in Maryland had in its employ 37 children ranging from 4 to 14 years of age. Who can doubt the fact that these children would be wonderfully benefited by the passage of this act.

It must be remembered that the children who are forced into the factories have no chance for education, no opportunity to equip themselves for the struggles of life. The system brings down the wages of the men. The adult wage is largely measured by the child's wage.

This widespread evil should be wiped out and every child should be given an education and fitted for the duties of citizenship. It becomes the duty of a great nation to protect the children from exploitation, that they may have a fair and equal opportunity for development. If the child must be placed under stress and crushing conditions that cause physical, mental, and moral decay, so must the nation to that extent be injured. The Government must ultimately rest upon the shoulders, hearts, and consciences of the coming generation.

CONSTITUTIONALITY.

Much has been said against the constitutionality of the proposed bill. Under the early decisions of the United States Supreme Court this bill probably would have been declared unconstitutional. Our court in recent years has been giving a broad meaning to the interstate-commerce clause of our Constitution in so far as public health, public morals, and the welfare of the people are concerned.

Many cases are cited to show that production is complete before commerce begins; that there is no connection between production of merchandise and commerce of the same; and that the article is not a part of interstate commerce until it is on its journey to another State.

Section 8, Article I, of the Constitution provides:

> The Congress shall have power * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.

The power granted is direct, without limitations or exceptions. Congress may regulate commerce among the States for the purpose of promoting public health, public morals, and general welfare of the people.

The Congress may adopt any means to put into force and effect the power granted them by the States, even if such legislation may to some extent constitute a police regulation within the State in so far as it may affect commerce. The very object of vesting this power in Congress was to create uniformity in the regulation of commerce between States so that one State could not adopt and maintain a policy offensive to the morals of the people of another State.

Under the provision Congress can deny to the citizens of one State the right to use the channels of commerce into other States when their methods in competition or in the production of the article of commerce are unfair and unjust to the people of the other States.

Many States have passed humane laws affecting child labor. Some have passed laws in a limited way while others have no laws at all. Certainly Congress should have the power to deny the citizens of one State the right to traffic in interstate commerce goods when they have adopted false and inhuman policies inimical to the health, morals, or welfare of the people.

The right exists to protect the people from unfair discrimination, from unlawful combination in restraint of trade; and in order to reach the evil Congress denies the offending operator the right to interstate transportation.

Child labor in the factories is offensive because articles are produced under conditions that shock the conscience, under conditions that are crushing the lives and injuring the health of the children.

No one should be permitted to pursue evil practices as a matter of right. Because of such fact Congress has the undoubted right to overthrow a bad system that is crushing out the health and lives of the children.

The Lottery Ticket case fully sustained the provisions of this bill. In that case it was said, in effect, that the State may for

the purpose of guarding the morals of its people forbid all sales of lottery tickets within its limits. So Congress, for the purpose of guarding all the people of the United States against this widespread pestilence and for the purpose of protecting its commerce, may prohibit the carrying of tickets from one State to another.

This decision was not made on the ground that the Government should protect the buyer of the ticket, but on the broad ground that it violated the morals and public welfare, not the individual morals, but the public morals.

If the State may take knowledge of the widespread evil of child labor, then why may not Congress as to interstate-commerce matters do so? If it is wrong in the States, why is it not wrong in the commerce between States? If it is right to prohibit child labor in one State, why should it not be prohibited in all the States? If the wrong should be driven out by the legislative power of a State, why should it be permitted to take refuge in another State?

The interstate-commerce clause allows Congress to strike at the evil in all the States by denying the product of this system the right to be sent in interstate commerce. The court sustained the lottery act because the institution was offending the morals of the people. It sustained the Mann White-Slave Act, which took away the facilities of interstate transportation from those engaged in prostituting and debauching women and girls.

Obscene literature offends the morals. The fear of contagion from diseased cattle offends public health. Impure foods and drugs are injurious to health. Misbranding of goods perpetrates a fraud. Antitrust laws have been sustained on the ground that the offending combinations should not be allowed to use interstate-commerce channels because they were engaged in a wrong. All of these have been declared to be offensive to commerce between States, and Congress has entered upon the duty of keeping the channels of transportation pure and free from these evils which affect health, morals, and public welfare.

Why, then, should goods manufactured under conditions that deprive children of health and education, under conditions that shocks the conscience of the Nation, be allowed to pollute the free channels of interstate commerce? [Applause.]

Mr. WEBB rose.

Mr. BRITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that he has agreed to recognize the gentleman's colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB].

Mr. WEBB. I am perfectly willing, Mr. Chairman, that the Chair should recognize my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. BRITT].

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. BRITT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no gentleman on this floor in my earnest and sincere advocacy of all just and proper laws for the protection of tender childhood. But, gentlemen, I ask that that authority be exercised by the powers to which it is delegated under the Constitution of our country.

Can it be that gentlemen here believe that this Congress has the power to pass a law which will permit what is provided for in section 2 of this bill? Under its provisions if a negro boy, a water carrier, carries water to the employees who make the products of the factory one time and one time only, he being under the age of 14 years and within the provisions of this bill, then the entire product of that factory for 60 days, although it may be $1,000,000 worth of its products, can be boycotted and obstructed and its removal prevented under the provisions of this act.

Is there anybody here who believes that the Congress of the United States, under the Constitution, has the power thus to invade the reserved powers of the States and control the production and removal of an article absolutely innocent in itself? Why, my distinguished friend from South Dakota [Mr. DILLON] says that we have the power to prevent immoral women from being transported from one State into another State. Of course we have, because they are injurious to the morals of that State. He says also that we have the power to prevent impure drugs and food from being transported from one State to another. Certainly we have, because they offend the health and decency of that State. But I ask any gentleman on this floor to name in all the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States a single case where it has been held that an article, absolutely innocent in itself, not offending in the place where it is proposed to ship it, not hurting its morals, not hurting its people, has ever been held by the Supreme Court of the United States to be subject to control by this Congress under the interstate provision of the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITT. Certainly.

Mr. DILLON. I would like to ask the gentleman how does he distinguish the cases where the courts hold that they have a right to prohibit combinations from exercising the right to transport their goods in interstate commerce?

Mr. BRITT. I shall be glad to answer that. It comes under and applies to an entirely different provision of law, under an entirely different principle of public policy, where there are combinations against the public interest, and is not in line with the making of an innocent article. But in this case your bill is directed against the production of a clean, harmless, healthy, and moral article, and you propose to go into the heart of a State and take the power of that State and transfer it to this Congress. Republican as I am, Hamiltonian as I am, I can not approve it. It would make Alexander Hamilton turn over in his grave to think of the exercise of such power by the Federal authority. I favor all just, necessary, and proper laws for the regulation of child labor. I do not want the innocent child worked too long; I want him in school; I want his little limbs, body, mind, and soul conserved and protected; but I want it done by the only authority that knows how to do it.

Take my State, for instance. In one place it is wood manufactures; in another it is cotton goods; in another it is wooden novelties; in others it is pottery; in others it is the thousand and one little things that we make; all of them perfectly innocent and harmless in themselves. You make no distinction; you abolish child labor of any sort, even where it would be a pleasure for the child to get to work. You propose one blanket law for North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, and every other State, and you do not attempt a defense of its constitutionality; you virtually admit that you have no authority to do it; but you want to make those States that have not yet made laws in harmony with your views enact them anyway, whether they meet local conditions or not. True, we have not yet done all we should do. We have not yet done all we should do in North Carolina, but we are advancing. This movement is an evolution. We are rising to the situation. Our vision is being clarified. Leave us to ourselves. It is our problem. We are equal to it. To protect our children is our right; it is our duty. This Congress has neither the power nor the duty. We have both. Leave us to our appointed task.

Gentlemen, I am in favor of protecting the child. All my life long I have been his friend, and I shall always be; but I also respect those rights that have been reserved by the Constitution to the several States of this Union, and so long as I am a Member of this Congress I shall, under my oath, give my vote for the protection of those rights. [Applause.]

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I noticed the enthusiasm of my friend from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] for this bill. I fear there is a good deal of false sentiment that has been created by a well organized and financed child-labor committee, and I fear that many Members are going to vote according to that sentiment. I do not like to have a man attempt to pluck the beam out of my eye until he gets the mote out of his own. I do not like to have the gentleman from New York commend the provisions of this unusual revolutionary measure, because he thinks probably that it will hit somebody else, until he cleans around his own door. I want to read just a few extracts from a recent report by Mrs. Nathan, head of the Consumers' League in New York, and I want to say that these things which she relates are taking place right under the very noses of the National Child-labor committee, backers of this bill, with its head offices at 105 East Twenty-second Street, New York. And I want to say before I read this that I defy any man, North, South, East, or West, to find anything remotely approaching such horrible conditions in North Carolina or in any one of the four States that seem to be under attack.

MRS. NATHAN FINDS BABIES WAGE SLAVES—CONSUMERS' LEAGUE HEAD TELLS OF ABUSES IN ARTIFICIAL-FLOWER INDUSTRY FOUND IN YEAR OF INQUIRY—CHILD OF 4 WORKS 14 HOURS A DAY IN TENEMENT—WOMAN TOILS FROM 6 A. M. UNTIL MIDNIGHT.

Shocking details of child slavery in this city were unfolded yesterday by Mrs. Frederick Nathan, president of the Consumers' League.

Her story, the result of a year's investigation by the league, was told in the Harris Theater before a large audience. She related instances of long hours in dingy tenement rooms for a few cents, which lead in every case to the sanitarium and then the grave.

Mrs. Nathan's report follows:

"The most important investigation made by the Consumers' League in the last year was a comprehensive study of the artificial-flower trade in tenement homes.

"The labor law of New York State says: 'No child under the age of 14 years shall be employed, permitted, or suffered to work in or in connection with any factory in this State.' Yet in many families everyone, even down to the tiniest children, was found at work.

"In one home on a Saturday morning, four children of 10, 9, 6, and 4 years were found sitting by a table near the one window, making cherries. They had been there since 6 o'clock, and worked each day until 8 o'clock.

"No child above 4 or 5 is considered too young to work. Six-year-old boys and girls were found separating petals or pasting leaves on stems. One baby of 2½ years was found seated in a high chair, by his mother's side, pulling apart the petals which had been sent from the factory packed between gauze which must be separated from the petals.

"Another woman worked from early in the morning until 10, 11, and 12, and sometimes 1 and 2 o'clock at night. She had no children, and her husband, who was out of employment, did her housework in order that she might devote all her time to the work."

Now, there are a great many of these idle-rich, sentimental, good-hearted women who help out the child-labor committee agitation who want to press this bill through Congress, who next Sunday will probably wear upon their beautiful hats flowers made by the children slaves there in New York City.

To work long hours in a factory—

Says Mrs. Nathan in her report—

To work long hours in a factory surrounded by the whir of machines and the confusion of many workers has its decided disadvantages, but when long hours are combined with work in these crowded, cluttered, often ill-smelling and dirty homes, almost any factory would be preferable.

Family after family was found where one or more of the members had "a cough and was going away to get well," where children had died of "a bad cold," or the father had been in bed for six weeks with "throat trouble." The toll of tuberculosis in these dark and unhealthy tenements is very great.

One woman was found whose three oldest children had died of the dread disease within nine years in the same house where she and her 11-year-old girl were then at work on flowers. One of her daughters was even then at the State sanitarium, and the little girl was soon to be sent away to "get over her cold."

CONTAGION INEVITABLE RESULT.

In one tenement a scarlet-fever sign adorned an open door and children from other homes were running in and out.

If goods are made in homes where dirt and filth are prevalent, or, worse still, where disease is so often found, contagion is the inevitable result. Case after case has been found where disease germs have been carried from the filthy tenements to the homes of the buyers of these tenement-made goods.

The danger to the consumer is great, to society perhaps even greater. The stunted, anaemic children whom we see in almost every tenement home can not but grow up into stunted, anaemic adults.

The price paid for the work is so excessively low that the possibility of living on it is out of the question. Prices vary from 2 cents a gross for pasting leaves on stems to $1.40 a gross for making flower wreaths.

FAMILIES GET 60 CENTS A DAY.

One family was found in which three women working on flowers made together $4.30 every 15 days. They made forget-me-not wreaths and received 7 cents for one dozen wreaths. Families were found whose combined earnings were only 60 cents a day.

If, therefore, we wish to prevent child labor, to conserve the health of the dwellers in tenements, to protect the consumer from the danger of contagion, and to safeguard society, we must stand for the absolute prohibition of tenment-home manufacturing.

I commend that severe arraignment of the conditions in the tenement houses to my friend from New York and to the National Child Labor Committee, and I defy him and them to point to a factory in the entire South where such horrible conditions have ever prevailed or ever can prevail.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. I will.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does not the gentleman think the passage of this bill would help to cure the conditions he has just recited?

Mr. WEBB. Not a particle. Tenement-house work is not included in this bill. If I offered an amendment to strike at these tenement hell holes, this House would vote it down, as they did some similar amendments. I offered an amendment touching the white-slave traffic in Chicago, and the House voted it down without even giving it consideration. You can not put an amendment on this bill that would strike the horrible tenement holes where men, women, and little children are dying of tuberculosis and scarlet fever. If you can, why do you not strike them? There is a very fertile field in New York City, and there are others in Boston and other big cities where the evils are far more terrible than in the sanitary and well-conducted cotton mills throughout the South. [Applause.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I was much impressed by the splendid tribute of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] to the boys whom he named here, who performed such great services as boys and as men for their homes and for this Nation; but it seemed to me, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has overlooked one little feature that should have had his attention in paying that tribute to these boys, and that was the fact that these boys, raised by poor mothers, were taught as boys the necessity for contributing to the support of the family. [Applause.] He has picked out boys who have made their names illustrious in the history of this country, but he has overlooked the fact that he has not named a single boy who did not have to work as a boy. It does not detract from their greatness that these poor boys made their own way; why does not the gentleman devote himself to the proposition that it has not retarded the development of these boys in any way, but has made them men sooner, in that they learned as boys to take care of themselves. And, Mr. Chairman, he has overlooked absolutely the call of the mother in this instance. When he pays his tribute to childhood, I say to him that if he would go through all the world and take all the languages he can find, and pick out the one word that stands higher than any other in the estimation of American manhood, it is the name of mother; and where you find a widowed mother in want, unable to support herself, I ask the gentleman is he doing right and justice to take these boys and these young women who are capable of earning their living, working in warm climates where the windows are open and where they can toil in safety to themselves, is he doing right to throw them out of honest employment and offer them all the temptations of vice without offering them any other honest livelihood? What positions do you offer them? What opportunities for education do you give them? What advantages do you propose to offer them? Absolutely nothing. You throw the restrictive arm of this Government between them and opportunity. You leave wide open the ports of entry from all the world, and you bring to this country the products of child labor from every country in the world and sell them in my home State and in all the States of this Union without any restriction whatever. The fact that these products are made in hell holes, that they are made by children under 10 years of age—all of these conditions are known to you, but not one single thing do you do to protect American labor against child labor abroad. You take your sweatshops located in New York and Massachusetts, and other States, and produce articles there by child labor, and send them where you will. You also take the raw products from every State in the Union, grown, raised, and produced by child labor, and you bring them from one State to another and put them in your factories and manufacture them as you will, and do you try to keep them out? No, you do not. Arrogating great virtues to yourselves, you lay an inhibition on commerce, you restrict us and injure us for your own selfish purposes, being unwilling to go far enough to do anything for a result that injures you to any degree.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, in the recent discussion of the child-labor bill the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] made some remarks which, it seems to me, deserve attention, especially his brief summary relative to the production of cotton and knit goods at home and abroad. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, he pointed to the fact that 525,000 women and girls and 66,000 men and boys were engaged in the manufacture of these textiles in Japan alone. He also showed that these workers were paid from 8 to 15 cents per day, and viewed with much alarm the competition the Far East is building up against American manufacturers.

While I can, in the main, corroborate by personal observation his statement as to these conditions in Japan and China, I can see no immediate cause for distress as to direct competition from that source in this country, unless the European war reaches an early termination. None of these articles are being exported to America to-day, and in 1917 I am certain a Republican President and a Republican Congress will see to it that all danger of unfair competition in foreign, cheap-labor-made textiles is promptly subdued. [Applause on the Republican side.]

No, Mr. Chairman; the competition of Japan and China in the cotton and knit goods industries does not so much concern the northern manufacturer at this time as do the conditions in our own country, which this bill will seek to terminate, if enacted.

In my mind, I might say in passing that I might not agree with all the provisions of this bill. I might be willing to agree that children in States without compulsory educational law were in less danger at early ages if engaged in some light employment rather than to become exposed to the dangers and temptations of idleness and perfect freedom of their desires and fancies. Suitable employment is not always a dangerous element in the life of a boy or girl, and brings sometimes experiences which are valuable in their after years; but to conserve their abilities by education and enlightening surroundings and environment is far better, in the last analysis, if this element of improvement and good citizenship is at hand and properly employed.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman told us that in his district there are 2 cotton plants and 15 knitting mills, in which the wages range from 50 to 60 cents per day for beginners and from $1 to $1.50 per day for skilled workers. In my own district there are more than 100 of these industries. There the lowest wage is $1 per day, and the highest for skilled labor is upward of $3.50 per day, with an average wage of about $1.75 per day. We have a child-labor law which provides for a minimum age of 14 to 16 years; we have compulsory education laws; we have workmen's compensation laws, which not only guard and protect the family of every worker, but which have inculcated and emphasized that wonderful principle of "safety first" among both employers and employees. All of these enactments have made gratifying changes in working conditions and have assisted potently in cementing a friendship between the workers and their employers which was not dreamed of when the laws cited were placed in operation.

Here, then, is the competition which is feared and must be met. The argument of the gentleman from Tennessee relative to the situation in Japan returns with far more force to the situation at home. His own statement proves that by reason of freedom in the matter of child labor his mills are turning out their product at about 100 per cent lower labor costs than are we of New York. He is located in the center of the production of the raw material, while we pay liberally for its transportation to our far-away industries.

Therefore, is it a source of wonderment that we of New York favor the enactment of this law? Is it a source of wonderment why some of our southern friends and neighbors oppose it? Their business interests will not suffer so greatly as they appear to fear should this measure become law, and they will enjoy the benefit of their enviable location.

The northern manufacturers, too, will be better contented to know that the present so-called unfair competition in their own country has been largely done away with, and that the southern manufacturers, on the plane of labor cost at least, have no advantage over them. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I think it is an unfair assumption on the part of one of the advocates of this bill that those who are opposed to it favor child labor. I know that, so far as I am concerned, I am opposed to this bill, but in the only speech I ever made on the subject in my own State I advocated the enactment by the Legislature of South Carolina of a law prohibiting absolutely the employment of children under the age of 14 years. According to the majority report there are but four States in the Union in which this standard provision does not prevail, so that it is boiled down to a question here whether the Congress will force those four States now to adopt the 14-year provision or whether it will allow those States to progress gradually toward the adoption of that 14-year age limit.

Now, I know that in the majority report they have quoted with approval of the committee the statement of Miss Florence Kelley that in South Carolina after the enactment of the 60-hour-a-week law the legislature evidently decided that it was too liberal, and increased the period of work from 60 to 66 hours a week. I have no doubt that that good lady was sincere in that statement; but the fact is it is untrue, for the age limit has not been increased; and the history of this legislation in all the States of the Union will show that there has been a gradual progress toward the adoption of stricter laws for the protection of children.

In the State of South Carolina that has been true. It was but a few years ago when there was no labor law for the protection of children, but gradually they have adopted laws prohibiting night work, prohibiting the work of children under 12, and allowing the work of children between 12 and 14 years of age only where permit is secured from the State for their employment. Under that provision, according to the report of the secretary of labor of South Carolina, which I hold in my hand and which with permission I will put in the RECORD, there has been a gradual tendency away from the employment of children. Every year there has been a reduction in the number of children employed in the textile industries in South Carolina. So I contend that, if left to the States, the States themselves will correct what you believe to be a national evil.

My good friend from Georgia, Mr. HOWARD, referred to the fact that Georgia has adopted a child-labor law. It was only a few years ago that I heard on this floor Members criticizing the State of Georgia for not adopting a child-labor law. Now they have one, and he tells us that progress is being made. In South Carolina that is true also. Now, why should Congress attempt to enforce its ideas of what a standard provision should be, without having knowledge of the local conditions, instead of allowing these people to pursue their progress toward a standard law? You may say, "If what you say is true, what objection have you to this bill?" I have this objection: My people believe in local self-government; they believe that that legislation is best which is founded upon accurate information, and that accurate information can be secured only by those who are familiar with the local conditions. I may say that the Legislature of South Carolina is now in session, and a bill has been introduced to raise the limit to 14 years, and there is a good chance of its being adopted; but even if it is not adopted, I contend that it is better to leave the matter of regulation to the several States rather than have Congress force them to adopt the provisions of this bill whether they want to or not.

The report of the commissioner of agriculture and industries for the State of South Carolina for the year 1915 contains the following reference to the child-labor situation:

> The child-labor situation in June was still continuing to lead away from the employment of the young child, even though those between the ages of 12 and 14 years of age are allowed under the law to work. At that time, as compared to last year, there were 219 more white boys and 263 more white girls between the ages of 14 and 16 years in the mills than there were the year before. Between the same ages the negro males decreased by 23 and the negro girls by 6. There were 223 less white boys between the ages of 12 and 14 in the mills this year than last year and 116 less white girls between the same ages than last year, and there were 20 less negro boys and 5 less negro girls between the ages of 12 to 14 than at the same time last year.
>
> Summarizing the child-labor situation, the increase in children were all white children between the ages of 14 to 16, totaling 482 in number. The decreases were in children between the ages of 12 to 14. Of these, 339 were white children and 25 colored children, and then there were 29 colored children less between the ages of 14 to 16. The total decrease, therefore, in child labor amounted to 393, of which 339 were white children between the ages of 12 and 14. There were in June, therefore, only 7,425 children under the age of 16 employed in the textiles of the State of South Carolina, and of these 4,582 were above the age of 14 years, leaving only 2,843 between 12 and 14 working under permits granted by the State under the law. Most of these latter number were rapidly approaching the age of 14. Just one year before there were 4,100 white children between the age of 14 to 16 and 3,182 between 12 to 14.
>
> It is easy to see from the figures given above that there was during the first six months of 1915 a rapid drift away from the employment of the child that is under the age of 14 years. Considering the industrial situation in the State as a whole, nothing could be more gratifying than this very fact.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for eight minutes in stead of five.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for eight minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, having read the opinion of our Supreme Court in the Lottery case, in One hundred and eighty-eighth United States, I have no doubt whatever about the constitutionality of this measure. The question of constitutionality, then, being out of the way, the only other question is whether this Congress shall exercise its power for the protection of innocent children by passing this act. I believe it should, and I believe that if we pass this bill the power of Congress will have never been used for a higher, nobler, or better purpose. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that any child under 14 years of age, or even under 16 years of age, should be permitted to work in mines, quarries, workshops, or factories, and I believe that it is the imperative duty of Congress to use all its powers to prevent this inhuman system of child labor in whatever parts of our country it may now be permitted.

There are but two reasons for child labor. One is that children can be employed cheaper than adults and thereby their employers can make more profits out of the particular business in which they are employed. The other reason is that inhuman parents are willing to put their little, innocent, helpless children into slavery in order to avoid working themselves. This fight, therefore, is a fight of helplessness and innocence on the one side against inhumanity and greed on the other. We have long since made the slaves free. We are fast freeing the women from conditions that are degrading to sex and motherhood and womanly development. Surely, it is time that we were breaking the shackles of slavery from the young children of our land. The very life of the Nation is dependent upon the mental and physical vigor and the unhampered development of the children of the Nation. This physical and mental vigor can not be had if they are permitted or forced to work long hours in mines, quarries, factories, or workshops. I am told that there are more than 2,000,000 of children in this country under 14 years of age slaving and toiling their young lives away in these institutions in order to bring greater ease and comfort to inhuman parents and in order to satisfy the greed of inhuman masters. In my view life is more important than property, and surely

innocent, young life, just budding, blooming, and quickening life, is the most important of all life, and, in my judgment, it is our solemn duty, and it ought to be our highest privilege, to protect and defend this kind of life with all the power of our great Government. [Applause.]

Again, Mr. Chairman, the greatest adornment of life is education. The one main chance to get an education is in youth. If it is not well under way by the time the child is 14 years old it is rarely ever obtained. Oh, my colleagues, what right have we to permit others to take away from these young children that one chance to lift themselves to higher and better things?

You gentlemen who are fighting this bill, whether on constitutional grounds or whatever grounds, think well before you cast your votes against the little children. I know you are high-minded men. I know you are strong men. I know you are patriotic men. I know you are sincere and honest men. But do not let your well-trained minds dry up the generous impulses of your hearts, and I urge you to think long and soberly before you vote to shut the door of hope to these 2,000,000 young children and to the countless millions more who are to come after them. I doubt if there is a man among you whose sweetest memory is not that of standing at your mother's knee in the long ago, looking at the picture of Christ blessing the little children and hearing your sweet mother read from the great Book of Books, "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven."

When you vote against this bill you vote against the teachings of that blessed book; you vote against the teachings of that Divine Saviour; you vote against the highest aspirations and the tenderest love of every true mother; you vote to make the children old before their time; you vote to prevent them from learning to read at their mothers' knee; you vote to make them too tired to stand and listen to the teachings of Holy Writ; you vote to take away from them their God-given right of mental and physical development; you vote to force them to lay their sweet, innocent young lives as a helpless sacrifice upon the cruel altar of inhumanity and greed. I beg you not to do it.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] a few moments ago alluded to his friends from New York who are going to vote for this bill without taking either the beam or the mote from their eyes, I forget which, or both. The gentleman from North Carolina always tries to be accurate, and this time is no exception. This time he fell into error, and that is unusual. The language that he cited was, as I recall it, absolutely accurate. That report was made by the distinguished, charitable, generous, and useful lady whose name he mentioned. Twenty-five years ago, about, the State of New York passed a statute to regulate the very evil to which that report alludes, and our court of appeals, in the case of In re Jacobs, declared that statute unconstitutional by a vote of four to three. Thereafter the Consumers' League was formed. To do what? To supplement the statute and to stamp out the evils of home work in the homes in the metropolis, and it has been meeting each year with a greater and greater measure of success. More than that—and I say all this for the information of my friend from North Carolina, who would himself have stated it had he known it—within the last year, as any lawyer from New York could have told him, had he inquired, the highest court has modified the case of In re Jacobs so that now for the first time in a quarter of a century we are permitted to regulate that evil. The language that the gentleman read from the report of Mrs. Nathan was correct, but the report was submitted some time since. Since that report the legal conditions have changed so that we can fight that evil, and to-day in the city of New York if children such as he describes should attempt to do the work to which he referred in a tenement house in the city of New York the persons responsible for the work would be arrested and convicted. Knowing my friend's generous disposition and his fairness in argument, I thought that he would like to know that the citation that he made to the House was already a condition which fortunately has passed, and that now, at least, in the city of New York we can and are rooting out the very evils to which he so graphically called the attention of this House.

Most of us from New York City are going to vote for this child-labor bill because we think it is right. We have a similar law, somewhat more drastic, on the statute books of New York, and we are for this; and further than that, there are men who are Members of this House who are owners and operators of factories in the city of New York that have for themselves in their own factories established, and are maintaining, requirements that are higher not only than those required under this statute but higher than those under the statute of the State of New York, based on the higher law of all, the law of equality and justice and common humanity. I shall not name those men, although they are Members of this House and sitting on this floor. I want my friend from North Carolina to know these things about the great city which in part I have the honor to represent. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, on last Wednesday, a few moments before the adjournment of the House, I was very unjustly criticized by my good friend from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE], and also my good friend from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], for what they claimed to be an intended reflection on the State of South Carolina. I merely alluded to the Carolinas by way of comparison, as the record of what I said will show. I did not intend to say anything harsh, I did not intend to point out any specific instance, but my friend from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] saw fit to hold my great State up in ridicule without the least justification in comparison with his own State of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, old Georgia would compare most favorably with South Carolina, but I have long since learned to hold my temper and try to be fair and just; in other words, to use a practical illustration, if I belonged to the bird family I would much prefer to be a humming bird, attracted by the fragrance of the flower, than to be that bird attracted by the stench of a putrid substance; so I shall proceed to show that there was at least some justification for what I had to say.

On the 27th of January I received this letter, and I have a telegram from the gentleman who sent it authorizing me to use it. The letter is as follows:

Hon. WILLIAM S. HOWARD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I congratulate you on your speech in advocacy of the child-labor bill. Spartanburg is the center of the largest cotton manufacturing district in the South, ranking second only to Lowell, Mass. Until last September conditions here were just as you describe, and not all due to the cotton mills either.

I have been superintendent of the city schools of Spartanburg 21 years. I have been teaching 33 years, and have been advocating compulsory attendance for 31 years. Last year I prepared a bill for State-wide compulsory school attendance for the entire term, age limit 8 to 14 years. The legislature enacted an optional law and I succeeded in getting it in operation in this city. If the law had applied to the whole State, there would now be no necessity for the proposed Keating law.

I inclose herewith a copy of the report which I made to the South Carolina State Teachers' Association at its annual meeting last year. Please read on page 6, of the statement made before the joint meeting of the committees on education concerning the Palmer-Owen bill.

You need not return the report, as it has been published in the minutes of the association.

Wishing you great success in your important work for the children of the South, I am,

Very truly, yours, FRANK EVANS.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to read an extract or two from this report made by the joint committees on education of the House and Senate of South Carolina:

> Your weak legislator is an animal who holds his head to the ground to see what he can hear, and he does not always head aright. He has not yet learned that wireless telephony passes through the air and that men of intelligence do not have to crawl on the ground. One fellow said, "I reckon we'll have to fix you up some sort of a law." Another admitted that "the people seem to want some sort of a law." He evidently had no notion of what was needed and took no pains to find out. Nor were the representatives of this type more progressive in their ideas on the subject of election reform—
>
> And so forth.
>
> I read again:
>
> I called attention to the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill, then pending in Congress. Some of them had never heard of it before. When I explained to them that it was a very brief bill, a very simple bill, providing that the carriers of interstate commerce, the railroads and steamboat lines, shall not transport the products of any factory or mine that employs or permits the labor of children under 14 years of age, providing also for any officer of the factory or mine who violates that act the punishment of a money fine and a sentence in the penitentiary, they said such a law could never pass Congress; that the interstate commerce had nothing to do with our children. The Palmer bill did pass the National House, however, by an extraordinary and nonpartisan majority. The vote was 232 to 44. It would undoubtedly have passed the Senate by a decisive nonpartisan majority had it been brought to a vote before adjournment.

Now, gentlemen, I am not going to say on this floor that South Carolina is any more backward than Georgia in educational advantages. If I did, I would be misrepresenting the fact. Neither would I say that North Carolina is any worse off than Georgia, because we are all about on an equality; but I do not want you gentlemen from the North Atlantic States to have any comfort from this, because you are just about as bad off as we are. I have got a report of the States, by school districts, from 1904 to 1914——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. I desire to ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOWARD. I do not want all the blame to be put on the South. I find the percentage of attendance of school population enrolled in the North Atlantic division is 69.96; in the North Central division, 76.75; the South Atlantic division, which embraces the States of Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and practically all the Southern States, our general average of attendance is 72.39. The South Central division is 72.5 and the Western division is 81.84. So that we are all about on a parity. But I want to say to you, gentlemen, some practical things that come from folks who know. Here is a letter from a poor fellow who is a weaver in a mill in Anderson, S. C., and he asked me not to give his name, and I am going to keep faith with him. He says:

Representative HOWARD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I write you to-day to say I am glad to see in the papers the fight you are making for Keating child-labor law, you and Mr. SHERLEY, while the rest of our southern crowd—

He said "crowd," but he meant "Congressmen"—

are trying to defeat it. Them petitions they got up there from S. C. was gotton up by the mill presidents and are nothing but forgeries, Mr. HOWARD, and you know it is true a grate many signed them but they done it for feare of being fired out of job or else did not know what they was doing. What you told them about no account drunken dadys is every word the truth. I know 500 at the mills at Anderson that dont do nothin but tote dinner to thayre little children, some of them not 10 years old to work all day some as low 20 cents a day. It is a burning shame and I and thousands of others are glad to see you on our side and for right. I do hope you will get through and enacted into law an enforced, not no sham thing like our State law. Thes are fact, Mr. HOWARD, as sure as you live. I will a little later on write you again and tell you my name, would do so now but it might get into print etc.

Yours truly, ——— ———.

And he says he is a weaver.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is not any sentimental question. I have always been like I am now. I have been fighting the employment of child labor in my State for 16 years. Anybody who tries to fool this House into the belief that ignorance in a State participating in the elections of that State is not the greatest liability of that State are simply fools for the want of sense. [Applause.] Take the great State of Wisconsin, from which Mr. LENROOT hails, and other gentlemen here on the floor; take their average attendance, take the statistics of the progress of that great State, and it shows you that the greatest asset that any State can have is an intelligent, educated people within its borders. You can not keep down intelligence, but you can always enslave ignorance. And from an economical standpoint, what do I care about the opinion of a fly-specking technical lawyer about the constitutionality of a question when it liberates from ignorance a certain class in my State. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that right under general permission already granted.

Mr. HOWARD. The statistics referred to above are as follows:

State common-school statistics, 1914.

States.	School population, 5 to 18 years.	School enrollment.	Per cent of school population enrolled.	Average daily attendance.	Per cent of enrollment in average daily attendance.
United States	26,002,153	19,153,786	73.66	14,216,459	74.2
North Atlantic Division	6,544,063	4,578,126	69.96	3,677,735	80.3
North Central Division	8,009,822	6,139,220	76.65	4,814,682	78.4
South Atlantic Division	3,916,630	2,835,357	72.39	1,906,317	67.2
South Central Division	5,749,744	4,142,849	72.05	2,696,622	65.1
Western Division	1,781,894	1,458,234	81.84	1,121,103	76.9
North Atlantic Division:					
Maine	163,602	144,620	88.40	113,056	78.2
New Hampshire	97,339	63,004	64.73	50,000	79.4
Vermont	84,089	65,137	77.46	51,324	78.8
Massachusetts	804,752	576,510	71.64	486,869	84.5
Rhode Island	136,807	86,505	63.23	68,183	78.8
Connecticut	275,897	211,975	76.83	168,060	79.3
New York	2,251,206	1,532,151	68.06	1,233,074	80.5
New Jersey	675,477	496,899	73.56	382,218	76.9
Pennsylvania	2,054,894	1,401,325	68.19	1,124,951	80.3
North Central Division:					
Ohio	1,188,359	895,167	75.33	720,442	80.5
Indiana	694,311	548,497	79.00	441,168	80.4
Illinois	1,473,347	1,043,227	70.81	908,906	87.1
Michigan	732,103	572,201	78.16	440,595	77.0
Wisconsin	671,634	440,103	65.53	323,476	73.5
Minnesota	599,529	457,041	76.23	354,339	77.5
Iowa	583,655	517,559	88.68	384,000	74.2
Missouri	880,323	706,364	80.24	515,233	72.9
North Dakota	193,312	148,021	76.57	102,490	69.2
South Dakota	183,192	130,812	71.41	99,078	75.7
Nebraska	338,130	287,566	85.05	214,152	74.5
Kansas	471,927	392,662	83.20	310,803	79.2
South Atlantic Division:					
Delaware	51,888	35,950	69.28	22,560	62.8
Maryland	351,760	245,258	69.72	160,281	65.4
District of Columbia	70,322	56,563	80.43	46,591	82.4
Virginia	652,958	427,937	65.54	281,976	65.9
West Virginia	385,744	299,135	77.55	208,004	69.5
North Carolina	761,900	599,647	78.70	408,464	68.1
South Carolina	520,747	378,669	72.72	250,163	66.1
Georgia	886,818	615,044	69.35	401,713	65.3
Florida	234,493	177,154	75.55	126,565	71.4
South Central Division:					
Kentucky	690,880	532,196	77.03	294,550	55.3
Tennessee	677,102	593,437	87.64	431,053	72.6
Alabama	720,707	473,150	65.65	292,540	61.8
Mississippi	619,062	492,756	79.60	301,922	61.3
Louisiana	555,455	284,136	51.15	195,670	68.9
Texas	1,334,411	830,642	62.25	560,173	67.4
Arkansas	529,386	439,624	83.04	298,597	67.9
Oklahoma	622,741	496,908	79.79	322,117	64.8
Western Division:					
Montana	99,099	85,782	86.56	63,686	74.2
Wyoming	34,827	29,301	84.13	24,000	81.9
Colorado	212,842	178,392	83.81	118,972	66.7
New Mexico	111,191	67,147	60.39	49,823	74.2
Arizona	57,491	44,303	77.06	29,912	67.5
Utah	120,376	96,678	80.31	79,173	81.9
Nevada	16,201	11,710	72.28	8,552	73.0
Idaho	113,348	92,437	81.55	69,398	75.1
Washington	308,463	238,663	77.37	180,225	75.5
Oregon	171,921	133,819	77.84	122,869	91.8
California	536,135	480,002	89.53	374,493	78.0

State common-school statistics of the South, 1914.

State.	School population 5 to 18 years of age.		Per cent of school population.		Enrollment in State common schools.		Per cent of school population enrolled.		Average daily attendance.		Per cent of enrollment in average daily attendance.	
	White.	Negro.	White.	Negro.	White.	Negro.	White.	Negro.	White.	Negro.	White.	Negro.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Alabama	388,401	332,246	53.90	46.10	325,338	147,812	83.75	44.49	200,462	92,078	64.66	62.29
Arkansas (estimated)	382,111	147,275	72.18	27.82	322,025	117,599	84.28	79.85	222,216	76,381	64.01	64.95
Delaware (estimated)	42,470	9,418	81.85	18.15	30,018	5,932	70.68	62.99	19,176	3,384	63.88	57.05
District of Columbia	47,488	22,834	67.53	32.47	38,808	17,755	81.72	77.76	31,946	14,645	82.32	82.48
Florida	133,004	101,489	56.72	43.28	117,384	59,770	88.26	58.89	82,556	44,009	70.33	73.63
Georgia	459,017	427,801	51.76	48.24	375,261	239,783	81.75	56.05	257,314	144,399	68.57	60.22
Kentucky (estimated)	602,378	88,502	87.19	12.81	478,338	53,858	79.41	60.86	283,858	30,692	55.16	56.99
Louisiana	286,115	269,340	51.51	48.49	201,243	82,893	70.34	30.78	138,568	57,102	68.86	68.89
Maryland	278,383	73,377	79.14	20.86	200,783	44,475	72.12	60.61	134,256	26,025	66.87	58.52
Mississippi	247,996	371,066	40.06	59.94	231,490	261,266	93.34	70.41	149,470	152,452	64.57	58.35
Missouri (estimated)	837,363	42,960	95.12	4.88	674,455	31,909	80.55	74.28	491,959	23,274	72.94	72.94
North Carolina	497,368	264,532	65.28	34.72	409,728	189,919	82.38	71.79	288,834	119,630	70.49	62.99
Oklahoma	560,467	62,274	90.00	10.00	459,194	37,714	81.93	60.56	298,200	23,917	64.94	63.41
South Carolina	202,987	317,760	38.98	61.02	175,297	203,372	86.36	64.00	114,919	135,244	65.56	66.50
Tennessee	513,582	163,520	75.85	24.15	478,056	115,381	93.08	70.56	347,976	83,077	72.79	72.00
Texas (estimated)	1,049,915	284,496	78.68	21.32	679,465	151,177	64.72	53.14	464,931	95,242	68.43	63.00
Virginia (estimated)	403,066	249,952	61.72	38.28	305,761	122,176	75.87	48.88	206,463	75,513	67.52	61.81
West Virginia	371,086	14,658	96.20	3.80	286,727	12,408	77.27	84.65	199,449	8,555	69.56	68.95
Total, 1914	7,303,197	3,243,500	69.25	30.75	5,789,371	1,895,199	79.27	58.43	3,912,553	1,205,619	67.58	63.61
Total, 1910	6,874,772	3,019,834	69.48	30.52	5,345,553	1,748,853	77.75	57.91	3,540,683	1,105,629	66.23	63.22
Total, 1900	5,892,392	2,705,142	68.55	31.45	4,261,309	1,560,070	72.32	57.67	2,775,059	981,026	65.12	62.88
Total, 1893	5,132,948	2,510,847	67.15	32.85	3,402,420	1,296,959	66.28	51.65	2,165,249	813,710	63.64	62.74

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, the saddest thing about this controversy to my mind is not that certain owners of cotton mills in the South are fighting for the right to continue the employment of child labor, but that those who are upon this floor fighting this bill represent a substantial percentage of fathers and mothers of those States who desire the right to continue to coin into dollars the lives of their own children. The next saddest thing is that any Member can be found to rise on his feet upon this floor and defend the employment of little children in the factories of our country—and most of those who are opposed to this bill do defend that very thing—even the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB], one of the ablest Members of this House, and one who commands the respect of us all, in his speech made one week ago to-day defended this very thing.

I quote just a paragraph:

Our mill employees are against this bill because it prescribes an unreasonable restriction upon their inherent right to labor, and because it would deprive them of the right to teach their children and have them help in a reasonable way to contribute toward the family expense.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it did not seem to me possible that these gentlemen would rise here and take the attitude that they do with reference to the right to employ child labor unless there was a considerable sentiment among their own constitutents that they do so. I read the hearings before the committee upon this bill, and I made some amazing discoveries, not only relating to the employment of child labor, but in reference to other great questions. One of the men who appeared before that committee was Mr. David Clark, of Charlotte, N. C., the editor of the Southern Textile Bulletin, and in his testimony the question of compulsory education arose, and this is what he said:

When these people come from the mountains they do not believe in education. That is the reason we do not have compulsory education in North Carolina, because the isolated mountain districts—

Mark the words—

would go Republican if we forced compulsory education on them.

A little later in the same hearing he said:

Well, the State is Democratic—most of it—and our western counties are largely isolated communities. Those people are on the balance of power, and if we put on a State-wide system of compulsory education it would swing the balance the other way, because people of the isolated rural sections do not want compulsory education.

Mr. NOLAN, a member of the committee, said:

Do you not think you are giving a mighty lot of consideration to the minority down there?

Mr. CLARK. If it will make them the majority; yes, sir. They have been in the majority in our tenth district. We often elect a Republican Congressman from there. We have one in this Congress.

Mr. COOPER. You people in North Carolina blame your condition on the Republicans?

Mr. CLARK. Oh, no; they blame it on a certain class of people who live in the mountains.

Mr. NOLAN. They do not want to educate the Democrats, because they are afraid they might vote the Republican ticket if they were educated.

That was said in a spirit of pleasantry, but Mr. CLARK took it seriously and said.

They vote the Democratic ticket now. If you force on them compulsory education they might change around and vote the other way for spite.

Mr. Chairman, would anyone believe that any political party in any section of the Union or in any State of the Union would refuse to provide for the education of little children for merely political reasons? Why, Mr. Chairman, I should think that any man who would get up and defend these conditions in these States would blush with shame. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I suggest we proceed now with the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending which is offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS].

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we close debate on this section in five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Can you not give us 10 minutes over here?

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all further debate on this section and amendments pending thereto be closed within 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in 10 minutes.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. FINLEY. I make the point that there is no quorum present, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seven gentlemen are present, a quorum.

So the motion to limit debate to 10 minutes is agreed to.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the——

Mr. LEWIS. I believe the gentleman from South Carolina did not have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is chairman of the committee and is entitled to the floor if he desires.

Mr. FINLEY. For how long?

The CHAIRMAN. Ten minutes. If the gentleman from Maryland does not care for the floor, he can recognize some one else.

Mr. LEWIS. Go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] is recognized.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate here, and I want to say to the committee that there is a total misconception of the people from the mill section of the South as to this bill. I stand for education. I stand for an intelligent and an enlightened American citizenship; and the man who stands here or elsewhere and says I do not, does not speak the truth. I have advocated for many years such legislation as would give to the laboring people of this country what they were entitled to in order to make them competent, fit American citizens, and to discharge their duties. I want to say to the gentleman—I do not know what State he is from—that South Carolina has a modified compulsory-education law. This bill, in my judgment, will not affect South Carolina at all, but I say to the gentleman this, that what we do oppose is that everything that can be thought of is brought to the Congress of the United States, and the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution is invoked in order to do it, and for what? I say to the gentleman this, that if you would put down socialism, you must leave to the States the right to enact such legislation. We are taking care of our factory people, taking care of the people who work in the mills and the mines, and it does not lie in the mouth of any man to say that we do not. And I repudiate the statements as false.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate somewhat to rise for the first time on these floors, but I do desire to say a word in behalf of this bill. I am now and always have been opposed to child labor. I have listened very attentively to the men on the other side of the Chamber who have opposed this measure, and it seems to me that they would have us believe that if this bill becomes a law it would entirely destroy the manufacturing industries, or the cotton mills and the silk mills of the South.

Now, what does the bill provide? It provides that when any State in the Union permits little children of tender age—between the ages of 14 and 16—to work over eight hours a day, then they shall not ship those child-made products into other States of the Union that already have laws upon the statute books protecting the children in that State. They failed to tell the Members of this House that this bill provides that their children can work between the ages of 14 and 16, providing they do not work over eight hours a day. Is there any man on the floor of this House that would oppose eight hours a day for little children? Why, the Government sees to it that its big, strong men shall not work over eight hours a day.

Hundreds of labor organizations all over this country have been granted the eight-hour day, and at this time there is a concerted movement all over the United States of America amongst the railroad employees for an eight-hour day. And yet we have men who stand on the floor of this House and say that if we prohibit them from working the innocent children over eight hours we will destroy their cotton mills and their silk mills in the South.

For many years you have heard much on the floor of these Halls in regard to conservation—the conservation of our public lands, our mineral fields, and our water-power sites. We have just passed a measure for the conservation of our public resources, which is all very well and good. I would that we could have more conservation of our natural resources than we have to-day. But, oh, how I would to God that this Congress would get interested in the conservation of its manhood and its womanhood, in the conservation of its little boys and girls. [Applause.] For, after all, what is it that makes a nation great? It is not our large cities with paved streets and avenues over which we drive our high-powered automobiles. It is not our large manufacturing industries. It is not our banking institutions. It is not a large Army or a great Navy. No. Each country is measured up by its standard of citizenship and by the efficiency of its citizens. But it seems to me that whenever any measure is presented to this body which has for its ultimate purpose the uplifting of humanity or trying to make this a better, cleaner, and a purer place to live in; whenever a measure like this comes before this House, we always have some one stand here and bring forward

the question of State rights, personal liberty, or the constitutionality of such a measure.

Now, I am not a lawyer. I come from the ranks of labor. I know what it is to have had callouses on my hands since I was 13 years old. I am not a lawyer, and therefore I am not qualified to pass on the constitutionality of this measure. But I do believe that this body ought to have the right to pass any measure that would have for its ultimate purpose the conservation of the human race. [Applause.] For, after all, that is the greatest asset that we have in our country to-day. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENISON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] is recognized.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] stated just a little while ago that this bill was unusual and revolutionary. Now, Mr. Chairman, that statement coming from the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of this House seems to me a little strange, in view of the fact that about 40 States of the Union have enacted legislation similar in terms to those of this bill. And I predict, Mr. Chairman, that after this bill shall have become a law and we come to look upon it as one of the beneficent measures that have been passed by this House, the gentleman from North Carolina will wish that that statement, as well as a great many of those which he made here last Wednesday and the amendments that he then offered in his endeavor to defeat this bill by leading a filibuster, were stricken from the RECORD.

And, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] has occupied some time this morning in arguing against this bill because it deals with child labor in this country and does not also deal with child labor in Europe and other foreign countries by prohibiting the importation into this country of child-made products from abroad. Now, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the gentleman from South Carolina can not see any difference between the duty which this Government owes to the children of our own country and that which it owes to the children of foreign countries, but those of us who are in favor of this bill recognize the difference. This bill is intended to benefit those who produce the objects transported in interstate commerce, rather than the products that are transported. And this Government has no right and is under no duty to legislate for the benefit of the laborers of other countries.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to be a member of the committee which reported this bill to the House. I attended every meeting of the committee during the hearings on the bill, and desire to say here that every question connected with this subject was given the most careful consideration by the committee. Those who were opposed to the bill appeared before the committee and testified to the favorable conditions under which children are employed in the cotton mills of North and South Carolina and other Southern States. Representatives of a number of these great industries presented to the committee what, to my mind, was convincing proof that the cotton mills of the South have in recent years responded in a marked degree to an aroused public sentiment, and have greatly improved the conditions under which their employees work. It was shown that most of these great industries are carrying on a system of welfare work that is commendable and is contributing to the educational, moral, and physical improvement of those working in the mills; and, Mr. Chairman, I think the people of these great cotton-raising States of the South, that struggled so long under adverse economic conditions, should be proud of the wonderful growth of their cotton-manufacturing industries, which have given profitable employment to their white labor and a home market for their own cotton.

But it seems there are certain kinds of work connected with the cotton mills which can be easily done by children, and the operators of the mills, who no doubt have found it profitable to use the cheaper labor of children, as well as the parents of the children, who either want or need the wages they earn, have in some few of these States prevented the enactment of child-labor legislation, which the great majority of the American people have concluded is necessary for the proper protection and well-being of the children.

Mr. Chairman, it was shown to the committee that there are now 27 States which have child-labor laws preventing the employment of children under 14 years of age in factories, and 18 other States which have the 14-year limit with certain exceptions, as by special permit, or during vacations in certain specified industries.

I find that there are 20 States which have laws preventing children under 16 years old from working in mines or quarries, or both, and 3 others which have the 16-year limit with certain exceptions.

I find that there are 19 States which have laws providing for an eight-hour day for children under 16 years who work in factories, and 4 others which have the eight-hour day with certain exceptions.

I find that there are 34 States which have laws which prevent the employment of children under 16 years old at night work in factories, and 5 other States which prohibit night work under 16 years, with certain exceptions.

The fact that so many of the different States, with their varied classes of population, differing climatic conditions, and diversified industries, have enacted laws for the prevention or protection of child labor, which are almost identical, ought to be sufficient to convince us that there has come to be almost a common conscience, a consensus of opinion in this country on the subject of child labor in mines, quarries, mills, canneries, and in manufacturing and other industries.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the provisions of this bill harmonize, in the main, with the laws of most of the States that have legislated on this subject. The committee, after a most careful consideration of the labor laws of all these different States, have reported this bill, which in their opinion conforms to and is in harmony with the consensus of public sentiment of the whole country, in so far as the public sentiment has found expression in the child-labor laws to which I have just referred.

It was well stated on last Wednesday by the chairman of the Labor Committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS], that there are two questions to be considered by Congress in connection with this proposed legislation—its desirability and its validity.

I do not see how there can be any serious difference of opinion as to the desirability of this law. It is not claimed by anyone that it will injure or disturb the cotton-mill industries themselves. Mr. Chairman, I would be slow to support any measure which I thought would seriously interfere with this splendid development and successful operation of the cotton mills of the Southern States. But the representatives of these mills who testified at the hearings, all said this proposed legislation would not in any manner injure the industries; children 14 years old can be employed for the same wages as children under 14 years. They base their opposition to the bill on the ground that it would be a hardship upon the children themselves, many of whom have to work to support themselves or, in some instances, their widowed mothers.

Mr. Chairman, while I am convinced that the owners of many of these cotton mills are doing commendable welfare work in the interest of their employees, I can not help looking with some suspicion upon the fact that the owners and the managers of the mills came to Washington with their witnesses and attorneys to oppose the enactment of a reasonable child-labor law, under the pretense that they are doing so in the sole interest of the children whom they work. Unfortunately, labor in the cotton-mill communities of the South is not organized. These employees have no organization to which they can look to safeguard their interests, and through which they can speak. Under these unusual circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I prefer to disregard the testimony of their employers who pretend to be speaking in their interests, when I know that their claims and their recommendations are out of harmony with the legislation of at least 40 other great States of our country. Mr. Chairman, I do not need the testimony of physicians upon the injurious results of long hours of work for children, although I think evidence of this character was submitted to the Labor Committee of the last Congress and resubmitted to the present committee. Nor am I willing to follow the views of those who employ the children and profit by their labors.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that any child, boy or girl, under 14 years of age ever voluntarily sought and continued employment that confined him or her to a continuing task for from 8 to 11 hours a day. It is contrary to human nature to expect such a thing. Children of that age need fresh air and sunshine; they need play and recreation; and common sense tells us that they will not work at a continuing task where they are confined indoors unless under compulsion. And, Mr. Chairman, when the parents of children under 14 years of age, through ignorance or selfishness, or even for a more commendable motive, if you please, insist on driving them into the mills or canneries or factories, and keeping them there for 8 or 10 hours a day, I say that it is time for the Government to step in and say to the parents, "You shall not do it."

This duty rests, of course, upon the State government in the first instance. But when the State fails to do its duty, I believe the National Government should extend its strong arm and, as far as it can do so within its constitutional limitations, protect little children from the selfishness of employers and the ignorance or indifference of their parents by prohibiting the

products of their enforced labors from the privileges of interstate commerce. There is always found to be some local opposition to legislation of this kind. But those who oppose it are often the first to praise it after it has been tried. And I fancy that the able chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. WEBB] and the other gentlemen who have been trying to defeat this bill by conducting a filibuster against it will some day wish the story of their futile efforts were stricken from the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to represent one of the great industrial districts of the country. There are almost 10,000 coal miners living in my district. Formerly boys under 14 years of age were allowed to work in the mines. Many boys of that age went down into the darkness of the earth to engage in that hazardous work in a commendable effort to support themselves or dependent parents. But more often did the fathers themselves take their boys into the mines to get the wages of their labors. Finally the law was changed so that none under 16 years old could work in the mines. This may have worked a hardship in some instances, but I know that it was a good law. I know that it protected the lives and health of the boys of Illinois and gave them opportunities they would not have had, and no one would now question for a moment the wisdom and the justice of that law.

The voice of labor has spoken so forcibly all over this country against child labor in mines, mills, and factories and in favor of the eight-hour law that I believe that Congress should hear the appeal and go as far as it can in the interest of the children. And so I do not believe there can be any serious difference of opinion as to the wisdom and justice of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is one of the most wonderful things about our Constitution, in my judgment, that by it there is given to the Federal Government all the powers necessary to guarantee its own perpetuity. One of its wisest and most far-reaching provisions is that clause wherein the Congress is given power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and between the States. It is the duty of any Government to provide by appropriate legislation for the general welfare of its citizens. In protecting its children from the greed of those who would exploit their labors, or from the ignorance or selfishness of parents who would force or permit them to work, the Government is but humanely providing for the welfare of its future citizens. While the duty clearly rests upon the several States to provide for the welfare of their citizens by appropriate legislation on the subject of child labor, I believe that when the States fail to act the Federal Government should do its part by prohibiting those who would profit through the State's neglect from the privileges of interstate commerce.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the constitutionality of this bill presents a more difficult question. I confess I was at first of the opinion that the bill, if it should become a law, would be held unconstitutional. I feared that it might be held that this legislation was but an attempt to do indirectly what Congress could not do directly; that is, legislate upon questions of purely local employment and production. But the more I have considered the question, in view of the later decisions of the Supreme Court, the further I have gotten from my first opinion. It is still a doubtful question in my mind whether the bill, if it passes, will be held valid should its validity be tested.

But, Mr. Chairman, this legislation is of such importance to the country, its desirability is so clear, I am willing to give the bill the benefit of any doubt I may have as to its validity. This suggests, I know, a question upon which there is some difference of opinion. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] stated in his discussion of the bill on last Wednesday, if I remember correctly, that when we have doubts of the constitutionality of a measure we should vote against it. Those who share this view usually quote Judge Cooley, who says in his General Principles of Constitutional Law that "to pass an act when they (legislators) are in doubt whether it is not violating the Constitution is to treat as of no force the most imperative obligations any person can assume."

I have always had the highest respect for Judge Cooley; but he lived and wrote years ago. Constitutional law has developed wonderfully in late years. The attitude of the courts toward the Constitution has changed. And, moreover, Judge Cooley was a judge and jurist. He was not a legislator, I believe; and while I am willing to accept his statement as to the duty and proper attitude of a lawyer or judge toward the law, I am not willing to accept his statement as to the duty of a legislator when in doubt as to the constitutionality of a proposed law.

Unlike the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], I think if we have only a doubt of the constitutionality of a bill which does not amount to a positive conviction it is our duty to vote for it.

On the question of the desirability of a proposed law our decision must be final. The courts will not review it. If we have doubts on that subject, we should vote against it.

But upon its constitutionality our decision is not final. After we act the Supreme Court still passes upon its validity. The final responsibility on that question rests with the courts and not with us. Should we adopt the other view and never pass a law when we have any doubts as to its constitutionality there would be little or no progress in our constitutional law; the tendency of the courts would be to adopt an interpretation of the Constitution that would be rigid rather than elastic; and this elasticity of interpretation under which the Supreme Court has repeatedly extended the commerce clause of the Constitution beyond commonly accepted notions of its limitations has, I think, resulted in great good to the country.

Mr. Chairman, if we have doubts as to the desirability of a proposed law, I think we should not pass it. But if we have doubts as to its validity only, I think we should pass it and let the courts, who are better able to judge than we, determine whether or not it is constitutional.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I confess I have some doubt as to the constitutionality of this bill. But I am so strongly impressed with its desirability I think we should pass it and let the courts say whether or not it is valid.

The Supreme Court has been so liberal in construing the commerce clause of the Constitution, has gone so far in sustaining other laws under that clause, that no one can tell with any reasonable certainty what the court would do in passing upon this bill if it becomes a law. We can only reason about it from what has been done in other cases. The precise question involved has not been presented in any of the reported cases, so far as I have learned.

Mr. Chairman, very able and learned arguments both for and against the constitutionality of the bill were made before the committee. The pivotal question involved is a nice one. Able lawyers would differ about it, and I doubt not it will present perplexities to the courts that pass upon it. But I have found that the Supreme Court is not entirely immune to the influence of public sentiment. That there is a very decided public sentiment upon the question of child labor must be admitted, because so many States have legislated upon it. And in view of other cases where the Supreme Court has construed the commerce clause there is good reason for the hope, if not for the belief, that the court would sustain this bill if it passes.

Mr. Chairman, I would not attempt here to make a technical argument on the constitutionality of this bill. I would only give a few reasons that have led me to the opinion that it will be held constitutional. Section 8 of the first article of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States. The grant of power to regulate commerce among the States is in the same language, and until the adoption of the fifth amendment was as plenary as the grant of power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. It has been decided by the Supreme Court in a number of cases that the power to regulate foreign commerce was absolute and included the power to prohibit.

Now, when the fifth amendment was adopted, which provides that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, a limitation was thereby imposed upon the power of Congress over interstate commerce which was until then absolute. This limitation does not apply to the power to regulate foreign commerce, because, I think, it is fundamental that the citizens of the different States have a vested right to transport their property from one State to another in the course of commerce, whereas they have no such vested right with foreign nations. I think the Supreme Court has held that the power of Congress over foreign commerce is absolute; and that it is just as absolute over interstate commerce, subject to the limitation that no person shall be deprived of his property without due process of law.

Mr. Chairman, in studying the decisions of the Supreme Court, where the court held the Louisiana lottery law, the pure food and drugs act, and the Mann white slave act valid, I am impressed with the views of Dr. Parkinson, expressed in the committee report, that the power conferred upon Congress under the commerce clause of the Constitution is not confined to the regulation of interstate commerce in the interests of the commerce itself or of its instrumentalities, but it includes also the right to regulate interstate commerce in the interests of the public health, safety, morals, and welfare. I think there is much force in the argument that the Supreme Court sustained the lottery legislation and the Mann white slave act on the ground that the power to regulate interstate commerce included the power to regulate it in the interests of the public morals and public welfare; and the pure food and drugs act was upheld be-

cause the power to regulate interstate commerce included the power to regulate it in the interests of the public health and welfare by preventing fraud and imposition upon those persons who received the articles of commerce in the States into which they are shipped.

And, Mr. Chairman, if it be conceded, as it must be, that Congress has the power, under the commerce clause of the Constitution, to regulate interstate commerce in the interests of the safety, health, morals, and welfare of those who are to receive the things transported at the end of their journey, why does not Congress have the same right to regulate commerce in the interests of the safety, health, morals, and welfare of those who produce the things transported at the beginning of their journey. For my part I can see no logical distinction.

If this conclusion is correct, the only question that remains is whether this bill, which would prohibit interstate commerce in those things that are produced by children under the prohibited ages or by children working more than the legal hours, can be said to be in the interests of the safety, health, morals, or welfare of those producing the objects transported.

Upon this question, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the Supreme Court would disregard or set aside the judgment of the Congress unless it should appear that the action of Congress was unreasonable or arbitrary. And in determining that question the Supreme Court would not fail to take into consideration the fact that the provisions of this bill are, generally speaking, in harmony with the provisions of State laws in about 40 of the different States of the Union. A bill which thus represents the concensus of of public opinion can not, I think, be held unreasonable or arbitrary. Mr. Chairman, I find that laws similar to this that have been passed by the State legislatures have been uniformly sustained not only by the supreme courts of the States, but by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Now, the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution provides that no State shall pass any law which shall deprive any citizen of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. In other words, the fourteenth amendment imposes exactly the same limitation on State legislation that the fifth amendment imposes on legislation by Congress. Yet the Supreme Court has held that State laws regulating child labor similar in every respect to this bill are within the police powers of the State, which means the power to legislate for the public good, notwithstanding the limitation imposed upon the States by the fourteenth amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if the several States can properly legislate upon the subject of child labor under their general police powers without violating the limitation imposed upon them by the fourteenth amendment, I can not see why Congress may not legislate upon the same subject under a similar police power without violating the limitation imposed upon it by the fifth amendment. The States may legislate on questions of commerce within their borders, but can not control interstate commerce. Congress can legislate on questions of interstate commerce alone. The power of each to legislate within its proper field is the same, and the limitations upon that power in the fifth and fourteenth amendments are the same. And since the Supreme Court has held that the child-labor laws of the States are not unconstitutional, I think it is not an unreasonable conclusion that the same court will hold that this bill governing interstate commerce is not unconstitutional.

At least, Mr. Chairman, these considerations have been sufficient to change the opinion which I formerly had upon this question, and to lead me to the belief that this bill is within the constitutional power of Congress; and while I still have some doubts upon this question, I hope that this bill will become a law and that its validity will be tested. If it is sustained, there are many laws which Congress could pass under the interstate commerce clause that would, in my judgment, be of great benefit to the people of this country. And while I would not be willing to amend the Constitution for this purpose, I would like to see the power of Congress under the interstate commerce clause extended just as far as it reasonably can be.

Mr. Chairman, this is no partisan measure. There ought not to be any politics in it. Yet, I am proud to say that the gentlemen on this side of the House are almost unanimously in favor of this bill, and that the fight against it is being made by the Democrats. And while they tried to defeat the bill on last Wednesday by offering a flood of amendments to the bill and otherwise trying to filibuster against it, I hope that notwithstanding this opposition among the Democrats enough of them will stand with the Republicans to pass this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman already has that privilege. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment in the form of a new section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DALLINGER, of Massachusetts, moves to amend by adding the following new section after section 4:

"That it shall be unlawful for any carrier of interstate commerce to transport or accept for transportation in interstate commerce the product of any mine, quarry, mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment offered to it for such transportation by any person, firm, or corporation which owns or operates such mine, quarry, mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment, or by any officer, agent, or servant of said person, firm, or corporation, until the president, secretary, or general manager of such corporation, or a member of such firm, or the person owning or operating such mine, quarry, mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment, shall file with said carrier an affidavit setting forth that none of the products so offered have been produced, in whole or in part, by the labor of children under the age of 14 years, or by the labor of children between the ages of 14 and 16 years, who work more than eight hours in any one day, or more than six days in any one week, or after the hour of 7 o'clock postmeridian, or before the hour of 7 o'clock antemeridian: *Provided, however,* That in lieu of the affidavit hereinbefore provided, the president, secretary, or general manager of any corporation, or the member of any firm, or any person owning or operating any mine, quarry, mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment, as aforesaid, may file with the Secretary of Labor a general affidavit setting forth that for the six months preceding the filing thereof, in said mine, quarry, mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment, no children under the age of 14 years have been employed in any capacity, and that no children between the ages of 14 years and 16 years have worked more than eight hours in any one day, or more than six days in any one week, or after the hour of 7 o'clock postmeridian, or before the hour of 7 o'clock antemeridian, which general affidavit shall be renewed each six months thereafter. The form of said affidavits shall be prescribed by the board composed of the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor, as hereinafter provided."

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment. The gentleman offered substantially the same amendment when this bill was last under consideration. It is not therefore in order to offer it again.

Mr. MANN. It is not offered in the same place.

Mr. FOSTER. But this amendment was offered in the consideration of this bill before. The gentleman surely does not contend that it can be offered again?

Mr. MANN. But, Mr. Chairman, the fact that an amendment offered to one place in the bill is voted down is no reason why the same amendment can not be offered in another place in the bill, because the committee and the House may not wish to put such a provision in one place in the bill and might want to put it in another place. That question constantly arises.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the House has voted on this amendment.

Mr. MANN. Not on this amendment. It has voted against inserting this matter in another place in the bill. If the Chair should so rule, the easiest way in the world to defeat a proposition would be for somebody to offer it as an amendment in the wrong place in the bill, and then the committee, refusing to insert it in the wrong place in the bill, under the gentleman's contention would refuse to insert it afterwards in the right place.

Mr. FOSTER. I insist that you can offer an amendment at each paragraph of the bill if it should be germane, but you can not keep on doing it over and over again.

Mr. MANN. You could offer a thousand amendments to this bill. We met that situation the other day, and disposed of it, I think, in a way very satisfactory to the majority.

Mr. FOSTER. I suggest that it is the offering of the same amendment twice.

Mr. MANN. The Chair would not be justified in holding that because the committee decided that an amendment was not appropriate in one place in the bill, therefore it was not appropriate in another place in the bill.

Mr. FOSTER. However, I think I will withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn, and the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not worded exactly the same as the one that was offered by me as an amendment to section 1 a week ago to-day. There are certain perfecting words that have been inserted.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I have offered this amendment at this place, where it more properly belongs, as a new

section, not for the purpose of delay but simply because I have been asked by several Members of this House to offer it again, Members who believe as I do, that the bill in its present form can not be enforced and that it will be practically impossible to get a conviction under it. Now, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] in his very interesting speech to-day read a letter from a weaver who expressed the hope that we would not pass any sham bill like the South Carolina law, and that is why I have ventured to take up the time of this House this afternoon to try to persuade the House not to pass a bill that may prove to be a sham bill; not simply to pass a bill so that we can go back to our constituents and say we put a child-labor law on the statute book, a law that never can be enforced, but that we have put something on the statute book that can be effectively enforced. Now, I have not seen or heard any reason advanced by the committee why the carrier should not be made liable under this bill. In the Federal statutes governing the transportation of explosives from State to State and in the statutes prohibiting the transportation of obscene and immoral literature from State to State you hold the carrier, as well as the shipper, and even the receiver, liable. Why do you make an exception in this bill, which is proposed to be enacted under the same interstate commerce clause of the Constitution? There is no real hardship imposed upon the railroads by the provisions of this amendment. This amendment simply provides that no carrier shall accept for transportation in interstate commerce any goods unless an affidavit accompanies them that the provisions of this act have been complied with in their production. And then, in order to do away with the burden of having to file a separate affidavit with each shipment, it is provided that a general affidavit may be filed semiannually with the Secretary of Labor here in Washington stating that no children under 14 years of age have been employed in any capacity in any particular establishment and that the other provisions of the act have been complied with. This general affidavit will be filed by shippers, manufacturers, and producers in every State in this Union that has an up-to-date child-labor law, and no burden will be occasioned either to the carrier or to the shipper in those States.

In those States, on the other hand, where they have failed or refused to enact decent child-labor legislation the temptation will be strong to file a general affidavit in order to get rid of the bother and trouble and burden of filing separate affidavits, and once the general affidavit is filed you can always get a conviction under this act. All you have got to prove is the fact that a child under 14 years of age has been found by the Government inspector working in that particular establishment and you are sure to obtain your conviction. On the other hand, under this bill as drawn, the burden of proof is ultimately placed on the Government to show that the labor of any particular child has actually entered into the production of a commodity that has been or is going to be transported beyond the boundaries of a particular State. After the manufacturer has put on evidence to contradict your prima facie case the Government must prove by evidence that the goods on which that child was working had been or were going to be carried into another State. And how is the Government going to do that? In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred it can not do it. The judge will charge the jury to that effect and you will not get any conviction.

Mr. Chairman, if you want to put upon the statute book a child-labor act that has got teeth in it and that can be enforced, you will adopt my amendment. If you simply want to put on the statute book a child-labor law, the enforcement of which will be difficult, if not impossible, you will vote against the amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] was considered by the House last Wednesday and quite properly rejected, and I trust the House will vote down the amendment at this time.

This bill has been carefully drafted after consultation with men and women who have devoted their lives to the task of enforcing legislation of this kind. It is their judgment that this bill has "teeth." And I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Massachusetts is presuming a great deal when he sets up his judgment against the judgment of those men and women, sweeping aside this entire bill, and branding it as a sham bill. One of the very best evidences that this bill has "teeth," that it can be enforced and will be enforced, is the determined opposition with which it has been met.

Now, I trust that the Members of this House will not adopt amendments which will unnecessarily weigh down the bill.

Mr. DALLINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DALLINGER. Will the gentleman who introduced this bill please explain to the House what reason there is for not holding the carrier as well as the shipper liable?

Mr. KEATING. There is one very good reason—it is unnecessary. It is unnecessary to burden every shipper in this country with the task of making an affidavit such as is provided in the gentleman's amendment. The great mass of our interstate commerce is produced by adult labor, and child labor has nothing to do with it. The great majority of the interstate shippers have nothing to do with child labor, and under the gentleman's amendment it will be necessary for them—every six months, under the amendment which the gentleman offered last Wednesday—to file an affidavit with the Secretary of Labor. It would also be a burden upon the common carriers of the country. If it were necessary to impose that burden upon producers, shippers, and carriers, I would not hesitate to impose it; but why place that unnecessary burden upon them when the mass of evidence submitted by the men and women who have had experience, and who advocate this bill, is that it is unnecessary, and that the bill as it stands can and will be enforced.

Mr. KENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. KENT. I should like to ask the gentleman whether in the phosphorus-match law there is any similar clause?

Mr. KEATING. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. HOWARD. That was a taxation bill.

Mr. KEATING. I am not familiar with the bill that the gentleman mentions; but so far as this bill is concerned, the committee objects to the amendment because it is unnecessary.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] is worthy of consideration, but it seems to me that it ought not to be agreed to. It proposes to penalize the innocent, not to punish the guilty. I think in laws of this kind it is usually a little better to put the punishment upon those who violate the proprieties of the law instead of penalizing those who obey the law.

Under the gentleman's amendment there would be punishment against the carrier, who is absolutely innocent as far as he is concerned. The carrier does not produce by child labor; the carrier has nothing to do except to transport the goods which are presented to him, and he ought not to be obliged to ascertain where the goods are produced regardless of whether they were produced under the law or in violation of the law. That question has been repeatedly before Congress.

Nor are those who obey the law entitled to be penalized. It is those who violate the provisions in reference to child labor—those who employ child labor—that we are desiring to reach. The amendment of my friend from Massachusetts would reach every manufacturer in the United States, although the great majority of them obey the law in reference to child labor. They would be subjected to the annoyance and trouble just the same as if they violated the law. I do not think that is desirable. If we provide, as is provided in the bill, a penalty against those who ship the goods produced by child labor and then give to the agents of the Government an opportunity of ascertaining whether child labor is employed in the manufacturing establishments, we provide a complete law and an organization to enforce it, and we can prevent the shipment of goods in interstate commerce made by those who use child labor, directing our attention to them, and not endeavoring to inconvenience the whole mass of manufacturing industry and carrier industry of the United States who are entirely innocent.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to make any remarks concerning the bill now before the House, but there have been so many reflections and false statements uttered against the State which I have the honor in part to represent, I feel that I would be unworthy of my position as a Representative on the floor of this House if I did not say something in rebuttal of those false and misleading statements.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], speaking about educational conditions in my State, said that Mr. Clark had testified before the committee that the reason we did not have compulsory education in North Carolina was that if we did enact such a law it would cause the State to go Republican. It is unfortunate, indeed, that a measure of this kind can not be considered apart from party politics. However, I notice in the papers that Mr. Clark has repudiated a portion of the remarks attributed to him along this line.

Western North Carolina has a modified system of compulsory education, and the people there are just as zealous for the welfare of their children, educationally and otherwise, as are the people of any other section of the country. My home is among the mountains of western North Carolina, of which section I am proud, and I claim to know something of the real

conditions there; and I want to say that those people need no help from the outside world, and especially do they not need advice from those who know nothing at all about their real conditions or domestic affairs. No State in this Union has made more rapid progress along educational and industrial lines for the past 10 years than has North Carolina. We have in our State an educational qualification or requirement in order to exercise the right of the franchise. This has done more to promote the cause of education within our borders than will all the child-labor laws you can pass between now and doomsday.

Those who are so strenuously advocating this legislation have had a cordial invitation to go to our State and get information at first hand and see the actual conditions that prevail there. But they preferred to listen to sensation mongers and muckrakers. The committee was invited to go there and make examination of mill conditions and labor conditions in those mills, but they also declined. But if they had accepted the invitation, I have no doubt it would have been very illuminating to their minds, as they appear to be so benighted on the subject.

As an example I would like to have these alarmists make a visit to an ideal mill town in my district. This beautiful little city is situated on the main line of the Southern Railway between Washington and Charlotte, 7 miles north of Concord. You will recognize it by a beautiful artificial lake by the side of the railroad about 15 miles south of Salisbury. It is called "The Magic City" down there, but its real nome is Kannapolis, and it was named for its founder, Mr. J. W. Cannon, who is president of the Cannon Manufacturing Co. This company operates a chain of about 20 cotton mills in North Carolina and South Carolina, several of which are in my district, a number of them being located in the town to which I refer. At this particular town which has grown to a population of several thousand since the company built some of its mills there five or six years ago, you will observe the new order that prevails in the South with reference to the conditions and surroundings of mill people since the day when sensational welfare workers found some cause for criticism and complaint. Here you will find neat, sanitary homes for the mill workers, safe and sanitary conditions under which to work; a Young Men's Christian Association especially for the men and boys who are employed in the mills; wholesome amusements for children, a library and reading room and a swimming pool; and a good graded school open for eight or nine months of the year. You will also see a home for girls who work in the mills, but whose parents do not live nearby. This home is in charge of competent matrons, and the girls who live there are as well protected as in the best home.

When you go to this town you will be greeted by a genial, elderly gentleman, a typical executive and man of affairs. This is Mr. Cannon, who has done much to disprove the charges that have been made against southern mill men. However, you may be greeted by one of his several sons, who are associated with him in the management of the great chain of the Cannon mills. They will courteously tell you that you are welcome to observe all the conditions and influences for which the management is in any way responsible in any of their mills. But you will not see any evidences of degeneracy, first, because they are not there, and, second, because you will be so impressed with the ideal conditions that prevail there you will forget all you have heard about bad conditions in the cotton mills of the South. Instead of immoral, depraved young men you will see gentlemanly, robust, and healthy young men, with a purpose written in their faces, and that purpose is to earn the promotion and confidence that is sure to come to them for efficiency and trustworthiness. Instead of wretched, slovenly girls, you will see young women who go about with the bearing of a school mistress and who are not ashamed of their work. The children, too, are just as healthy and as beautiful as other children elsewhere. This is but an example of many mills elsewhere in North Carolina and the South, though they may be on a smaller scale.

It has been stated on this floor that the fathers in North Carolina are coining money out of the labor of their children who work in the mills. I hurl this statement back into the teeth of those who make it as untrue and unworthy to come from the source it does. Of course many children, either at their own instance or by request of their parents, work in the mills of our State, but few of them are under 14 years of age. The conditions under which they work are not harmful, and their hours are not unreasonable. The mill owners of our State, in the main, are among our very best citizens, and they have a humane interest in the welfare of those who work in their mills. They provide for them neat, sanitary homes; good schoolhouses, in which schools are maintained for a good portion of each year at the expense of the mill owners. The fact is the people who work in these mills are far better off than they were before they moved to the mill districts.

The trouble with some of the advocates of this bill is that they "strain at a gnat" in our State, but "swallow a camel" in their own. [Laughter.] Take, for instance, the State of Colorado, from which comes one of the Members having this bill in charge [Mr. KEATING]. If he will compare conditions in our State with those in the State of Colorado, he will not find the comparison favorable to his own State. If those advocating this bill can demonstrate that the children who work in the mills of the South are inferior, either morally or physically, to those of a similar class who are engaged in other occupations or do not work at all, then they will have established their contention; but they can do no such thing because exactly the reverse is true, which has been stated again and again by those familiar with conditions.

I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that reasonable labor under proper conditions and regulations is not only helpful to children, but is absolutely essential to their well-being. The criminals of our land to-day do not come from the class of people who are brought up to work from childhood, but they come from those who idle and toil not. Idleness produces more vice and crime than any other cause and, since children must be engaged in something, they would much better be employed in some reasonable, honorable work than to be loafing in idleness on the streets, exposed to the evil influences and surroundings with which they must necessarily come in contact.

If you can pass this law, saying that goods which are manufactured in whole or in part by child labor shall not be shipped into another State, then you had just as well pass a law saying that farm products which are produced in whole or in part by child labor shall be denied the privilege of interstate transportation. The principle is the same, and the agitators and "hired mourners" will not cease their activities and lamentations when this law is enacted, but they will still find occasion for interference with every other line of honest endeavor in which children are employed.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I disagree somewhat with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], though I think the principle he states is absolutely correct—that punishment ought to fall on the guilty—but we do find sometimes in the execution of a law that we have to have the assistance of the innocent. If we are really going to pass a child-labor law that will be enforced, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] will make it an enforceable law. We enforce laws against those who are helpless and against whom there can be no accusation brought. Under section 15 of the immigration law every steamer that sails out of any port of the United States—and there can be no accusation made against them as to bringing in improper immigrants—has to file a voluminous report in relation to everyone on board of foreign birth, so as to help our own authorities to enforce the laws in relation to foreign-born people. This does not impose any great burden on the manufacturer—to file twice a year a short affidavit that during the six months he has not empolyed anyone who comes within the prohibition of the statute. That is a very light thing to be placed on the manufacturer. Gentlemen who come from large cities, who are familiar with what manufacturers have to do under the State law——

Mr. MANN. I come from a large city.

Mr. BENNET. Oh, I admit Chicago is a large city. The gentleman can deny it all he pleases, but I affirm that it is and defy him to disprove it—gentlemen who come from large places like Chicago or New York, and I admit that that is a large place, who are familiar, as the gentleman from Illinois is, with what manufacturers have to do under local regulations, would not regard an affidavit every six months as any burden at all in addition to what they are under now.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Suppose that provision were inserted in the law and the manufacturer was not following the child-labor law, would it not be a very simple thing to have a selling agent who would not be obliged to make this affidavit?

Mr. BENNET. I do not quite get the drift of the gentleman's question.

Mr. MANN. Turn over the sale of his product to a selling agent. The selling agent is not required to make an affidavit.

Mr. BENNET. Yes; the gentleman from Massachusetts so says.

Mr. MANN. Then every wholesaler would have to make the same affidavit.

Mr. BENNET. Every selling agent of the manufacturer.

Mr. MANN. Every wholesaler would have to make an affidavit, every jobber would have to make an affidavit, and, perchance, every retailer. How ridiculous that is.

Mr. BENNET. Let us assume that is so.

Mr. MANN. Of all goods made in the United States?

Mr. BENNET. Oh, no. Let us assume that is so. The act would be enforced, and that, I assume, is the purpose of the gentlemen who are bringing this bill in.

Mr. MANN. I dare say it would not be enforced a year before it would be repealed, if that were the case.

Mr. BENNET. No; if this were put in as the gentleman from Massachusetts desires, within that time the four States of the Union that have not child-labor laws up to what is called the standard would have child-labor laws, and we could get back to what is better enforcement in the long run, and that is enforcement of State laws within the States on their own citizens. That would bring it about, if we once passed a provision that would really compel the law to be observed. You will never convict under section 2. I am going to vote for the bill. I would be for it if there was not anything in it except the title and the perfectly satisfactory enacting clause, in the belief that it would be perfected in another place, because I am in favor of the principle of the law.

Mr. MANN. It will not be perfected in any other place. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. LEWIS. I object.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I was called out a half hour ago to meet an engagement in connection with the business of the House and have not had the opportunity to be informed of what has been said during my absence. There is some excuse and perhaps justification for this legislation, largely from the material standpoint, that has not been much spoken of. In a few States of the Union child labor is employed. It is prohibited in other States. I apprehend if it were not for that reason this bill would not be pending here, because, as I understand it, the States that permit child labor, which would be prohibited by this bill if enacted into law, already are moving along that line. And I presume, in the light, perhaps, of interested selfishness, from one standpoint and another, they will continue to so move. You will notice that this bill does not interfere with foreign commerce. It prohibits the transportation of products of the mine and quarry produced by labor in whole or in part by children under 16 years of age from one State to another State. It also covers the product of any mill, cannery, workshop, or manufacturing establishment in the United States produced in whole or part by labor of children under 14 years of age. The largest cannery in the United States is at Hoopston, Ill., in my district. I think children do work there during the sweet-corn season, the pea season, the tomato season, and that those children are employed between the ages of 14 and 16, and perhaps some under 14. They are anxious for employment, the canning season is during the school vacation, the ventilation where the work is done is good, and the hours of labor are not oppressive.

The farmers and truckers raise the raw material. I do not know, I am just wondering, but I expect I may vote for this bill, and yet there is a good deal of talk about the children. Now, we are going to have some more talk about the people who are not covered in this bill when we come to farm-loan credits, and then it is going to be the "poor, oppressed farmer," and the "ignorant farmer" who has to be protected, and all that kind of thing. I grew up on a farm, and very largely my district is an agricultural district, with something of manufacturing and something of mining in one or two counties. But it is largely an agricultural district. I know about the farmer. One-third of the people in the United States are farmers. I have no hesitancy in saying that from every standpoint they are quite equal to the other two-thirds of our population.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague may proceed for 10 minutes. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. The most eloquent speech I ever read, I think, upon this question of child labor was from a distinguished Senator who spoke with an eloquent tongue. He is no longer in the public service, but he was wonderful; and as I read his speech the tears came to my eyes when he related how on the farm he had been oppressed, how he had been compelled to get up early, and this, that, and the other. I thought when I read his speech that if he had been under different conditions, if he had not been permitted to work upon a farm, with his father and mother living in a farming country, that possibly he might never have looked inside the boundaries of the Senate. Why, take it in my little city of 40,000 people, take it in your city, take your lawyers and your doctors and your merchants—you will find, if your experience is like mine, that three-fourths of the men who are doing things to-day are men who were boys on the farm or in the mine or in the factory. Their successors 50 years from now will be the boys who learn to hustle when they are young. [Applause.]

There is much talk about social justice. Great heavens, I sometimes wonder what it means! I have sent for the dictionary and I have tried to find out what social justice is. Can any man define it? Is it to make all men equal? Is it to make all men and women equal? Is it to make all boys of equal capacity? Well, so far as I know, as a rule the man and the woman who talk most about social justice are the man and the woman who never earned a dollar but are living on the production that they inherited. [Applause.] They talk about social justice. Then there is another class that talks about it. They are good people, and I am not abusing any of them, but if you will go to work and investigate you will find that two thirds of them never earned a dollar in their lives and that the other third are being subsisted by their contributions. [Applause.]

We are making great progress in this country.

May I say a word about the amendment? I was told what my colleague had said about it. I shall vote against it. It seems to me that it is unduly oppressive, and if the law can be administered at all it can be administered without further vexing the common carriers of the country. Well, you may ask if I am a plutocrat and if I own common carriers? No. I never have been either, so far as that is concerned. And I say to you that if railways in this country, nearly half of the mileage of the whole world, would fail from the standpoint of efficiency for 10 days, half of the population of the United States would be starving. Therefore I do not care to burden them unduly. They come under the rod; yes. They are regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission and various public-utilities commissions, but I would give them, as I would give everybody else, a fair chance under the law, because, after all, we are compelled, this hundred millions of people, to cooperate. No one lives to himself alone. True prosperity comes from liberty and cooperation on the part of the hundred millions, whether they toil in the mine or the quarry or in the textile industry or on the farm or anywhere else.

I thank the committee. [Loud applause.]

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from California [Mr. KENT] is recognized.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am very sorry for the men who, whether it be owing to their political situation or to the part of the country from which they come, believe it to be incumbent upon them to fight this kind of legislation. This more than any other legislation that we can consider represents the future welfare of our country. Mr. Chairman, I have little sympathy with the remarks of a gentleman opposed to this bill when I recall the fact that he stated in private conversation, when asked where he stood on this matter, "that the children of his State should not grow up in idleness," and that therefore he believed that they should work in the cotton mills. I do not believe that his own children work in the cotton mills and I do not believe that his children will grow up to habits of idleness.

I know in my own case that I was given abundant opportunity to play, abundant opportunity for outdoor life, as the result of which I am still alive. I have been able to give to a large family of my own children opportunity for outdoor life, for recreation, and, so far as I have been able to watch the growth and tendencies of those children I find in them no suspicion of idleness. I ask for all children of the Nation the reasonable opportunities that I and mine have enjoyed. I have been working for many years on a problem intimately connected with this legislation, which is to furnish playgrounds and recreation centers for children, and at this time I take the opportunity to mention in this House a measure introduced by Mr.

GARDNER, of Massachusetts, providing for the incorporation of the National Playground Association, to the end of recognizing the children's right to outdoor exercise and playtime.

I feel almost guilty in standing up here and seemingly throwing bricks at those unfortunate Members of this House who feel it necessary to defend child labor. I am sorry for them. I apologize for them if they do not apologize for themselves. But when this vote is taken we shall show them that, whatever the conditions are in their own districts, however backward their own people may be, that the Nation stands for the conservation of child life and for the inherent right of children to grow strong and sturdy and hardy under conditions of play, instead of being wrecked by absorbing, driving, ruinous toil.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That it shall be the duty of each district attorney to whom the Secretary of Labor shall report any violation of this act, or to whom any State factory or mining or quarry inspector, commissioner of labor, State medical inspector, or school-attendance officer, or any other person shall present satisfactory evidence of any such violation to cause appropriate proceedings to be commenced and prosecuted in the proper courts of the United States without delay for the enforcement of the penalties as in such cases herein provided.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 3, line 4, strike out the figure "4" and insert the figure "5."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, after the word "provided," add the following words: "*Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be held to refer to or include orphans dependent on their own labor for their support, or children whose mother is a widow and who is in part dependent upon their labor for their support, or children whose parents on account of sickness or other providential cause are unable to provide for their support."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust this amendment will be passed by this House and made a part of this bill if the same is to become a law. I can not believe the distinguished gentlemen sitting around this Hall to-day realize the full import of the arguments they have made for the purpose of getting some to vote for this proposition.

As I look over this magnificent body of American manhood and brilliant minds and men of brilliant thought; as I look around these galleries, Mr. Chairman, at the people who to-day occupy those seats, I wonder how it is that we have ever been permitted to survive and to be here for the purpose of enacting laws and listening to the magnificent speeches of gentlemen without such a law as this to protect us when we were growing up. We go out before the people in our districts during a campaign and tell them about the hard struggles we had during childhood's happy days. Each congressional candidate tells the people with some degree of pride that he stands before them a self-made man; that he began to work at an early age, and how he wants to come here because he realizes their needs, and how he hopes to continue to come here in order that he may better represent the people. And now you want to rob the children of to-day, the politicians of to-morrow, of this valuable asset which you have used so well. And yet I am told to-day, Mr. Chairman, that the very heart blood of the boy who works is sapped away, and that the child who labors will never amount to anything when he becomes a man, all of his energy having been exhausted. I am told by distinguished gentlemen who, I believe, frankly, have not investigated this matter, that in the far Southland, which in part I have the honor to represent, they are weaving by some infernal machine the very bodies and souls of children into the cloth that women are wearing on the streets to-day. This I can not believe, as I have never heard of the invention of any such machine.

I will not make any assertion nor will I make any charge as to any other section of the country, for with conditions there I am not familiar; but I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that such is the case in the South; and I want to warn the distinguished gentlemen who are sitting here, and I trust they are paying close attention to this bill, that if this bill becomes a law without the amendment which I have offered, I fear you will make a loafer, yea, a beggar and a thief, of every child under the age of 14 who does not have the necessary means to procure the absolute necessities of life; for a child will beg, yes steal, before he will starve.

Talk about philanthropy. If the gentlemen on this floor will join hands with me and pass a section with the proviso that thousands of dollars, if necessary, be appropriated by the Government for the purpose of educating, clothing, and feeding those children who can not make their own living and have no visible means of support——

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. SEARS. No; I fear to yield to the distinguished and learned gentleman, because I realize that I am just breaking into the Halls of Congress, and by his wit and wisdom he might flustrate me. [Laughter.] And, as I was about to say, make the conditions which I have suggested impossible, then they will have accomplished something.

Mr. Chairman, I want to appeal to those men who, like myself, equally as well love their mothers and love children. I thank my God that I had the strength—and I am not appealing to the galleries—when I was under the age of 14 to go out and work and make an honest dollar, for I believe I was benefited rather than injured by so doing. And I am trying in my humble way to instill into my little boy of 11 years of age the lesson that it is no disgrace at any age to do an honest day's toil. And yet if this bill becomes a law you tell him if he works before he is 14 years of age somebody is committing a crime, and you not only tell him this, but you say to him he can not work before he is 14, even though he should be starving.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the South, at my hands, needs no defense. In my own State, Florida, which I have the honor in part to represent, we have a law that prevents boys under the age of 10 years from selling papers, and which prevents boys and girls under the age of 12 from working even in stores unless they can come under a proviso somewhat similar to the amendment that I have introduced here to-day. And yet it is the South, you affirm, you are striking at; yet it is my people that by the strong arm of the law must be forced to protect their children. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I do not doff my hat to any man when it comes to love and respect and admiration for a child. For 10 years it has been my pleasure to give of my time to the education and the uplift of the young men of my county, and I believe I know what is best for them; and I therefore appeal to you, during the four months when there are no schools in our section, not to make of them loafers, and if they have no means of support not to make of them beggars. Do not force those who have been so unfortunate as to lose their father to gain their living and their support by the toil and the sweat of the brow of their poor widowed mother. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the section, after the word "*Provided*," in line 13, page 3, insert the following: "This act shall not apply to healthy sons of dependent mothers if such sons are over 12 years of age and possess a third-grade school education."

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, that amendment was not born south of Mason and Dixon's line. It came to me from the assistant prosecuting attorney of Schuylkill County, at Pottsville, Pa., to wit, Edward J. Maginnis. It appealed to me so strongly and its argument is so convincing that we should have some exception in this bill along that line that I have offered my amendment in perfect good faith.

If it will not burden you, I want this House to hear what the gentleman says. He deals with boys and criminals. He has prosecuted cases for years up there in Schuylkill County, Pa. Here is what he says:

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY,
SCHUYLKILL COUNTY,
Pottsville, Pa., January 27, 1916.

DEAR SIR: I address you as one who, I perceive, is working to have Congress pass a just child-labor bill. As one who has given the subject deep study for many years, and as one who has lived his whole life among the class of people who are directly affected by such legislation, let me state that the child-idleness legislation adopted in Pennsylvania has caused awful distress among the following classes of large families among the poor:

1. Fathers incapacitated for labor by sickness or disease.
2. Fathers incapacitated for labor by accident outside of his regular employment.
3. Fathers unable, because of industrial conditions, to obtain employment.

4. Fathers in prison.
5. Mothers and children deserted by faithless fathers.
6. Families large and fathers' wages meager.

And so on.

Under our legislation no help whatever is provided for families in any of the foregoing classes. The distress among them is terrible. I could relate instances indefinitely. The law has taken from these families the right of self-preservation—the right of healthy children to labor when the exigencies of the home demand them to labor—and has given them nothing instead. Candidly, isn't it more in keeping with Christian doctrine to let children labor (under proper conditions) than to send whole families to pauper institutions? I began to labor about the mines when I was 10 years of age, and never afterwards ceased to be a wage earner, because my parents needed my help. I am proud of what I did; why not then leave the same privilege open to the children of the future?

I would respectfully suggest an amendment to the act which would exempt child labor which is performed in order to prevent a family (1) from starving or (2) in order to keep a poor family intact. Believe me that the men and women who advocate these child-labor laws know nothing of the actual conditions that prevail among the poor industrial classes. You must actually live among them to know—for their voices never reach the upper stratas.

I urge you in the name of the millions of Lincolns yet unborn to continue your noble efforts to obtain such amendment to the Keating bill as will leave a vestige of hope for the poor who must labor.

Sincerely, your well-wisher,

E. J. MAGINNIS.

I also wish to submit the following:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE LEGISLATORS OF PENNSYLVANIA.

(By Edward J. Maginnis.)

[Reprinted from the Pottsville (Pa.) Republican, Apr. 1, 1915.]

EVILS OF CHILD-LABOR BILLS.

The chief danger lurking in the majority of the child-labor bills under consideration at Harrisburg arises from the fact that one class of citizens composed principally of cultured men and women of small or no families at all, living in comfort, albeit with good intentions, are attempting to force legislation on the industrial class, composed mostly of humble, stalwart men and women of large families living in contentment, but depending for existence upon their daily wages.

The distinguishing mark of a free government has been that the laws for the people are made by the people. Whenever the opulent and more intellectual element in society succeed in establishing laws that will operate exclusively upon the proletarian class, free government, as Lincoln understood it, ceases and aristocracy rules. Unless we can show that a considerable portion of the people to be affected by this legislation favors its adoption we should, as true members of a free country, defer action until the wishes of the common people are better ascertained.

The writer at much personal expense of time and labor, and because of a natural sympathy for every soul struggling against adversity, has made careful inquiry among the families of the industrial classes and he has been unable to find a single mother of five or more children depending upon the daily wages of the father for sustenance, who approves of any of the proposed measures.

In short, the rich and childless, the old bachelors and maiden ladies, are striving to impose regulations upon the family of the poor man, which the latter does not want.

If thinking, reasonable men of the influential and patriotic class can be got to realize this truth, a powerful protest will assuredly arise against the enactment of such pernicious legislation. No effective protest is yet being heard simply because the ones who will be hurt are not able to make public protest. And even if those good mothers are thus visited with heavier burdens they will suffer on in silence, and the gay world shall little know their agony. Signs of a happy awakening, however, are evident. Here and there great men are beginning to think and speak upon the subject.

On March 23 Supreme Court Justice John P. Elkin, a man possessing the broad vision and soft heart of a real statesman, declared in a public address: "The question of child labor is now being very generally considered. This is a court problem and desires the best thought of thinking people. But in considering this question let us not forget that work is the common lot of mankind. The best men and the best women of the Nation to-day are those who were taught in the school of adversity and were reared to labor with their hands."

Prof. Nearing, of the University of Pennsylvania, has compiled some statistics which are interesting. He says: "Statistics compiled by colleges of America show that the average size of the family of a college graduate is 1.9 children."

As the average family must include at least four children simply to perpetuate the race it requires small argument to show what would happen to this world if all children were constrained to become college graduates. Within a few centuries the earth would become as barren of human life as the moon. Yet we are told in beautiful language that education is the great moral force of the world.

We have a glimmering recollection that the Good Book somewhere says that man was born to labor. Prof. Nearing further states: "The birth rate in Chestnut Hill and Germantown is two and one-half children to the average family (less than in decadent France); in Kensington it is three children to the average family; and in the second ward of Philadelphia it is seven children to the family."

The lesson is startling; the more mankind is inclined to labor the more he begets respect for and obedience to the prime laws of nature. Is it not time for the brilliant ones among the industrial class to become social uplifters and urge the adoption of civil laws that will insure the perpetuation of the families of the educated and wealthy classes? Or, since the poor must assume the major burden of perpetuating the race, would it not be a just regulation to tax every adult man and woman in élite society, say, $1,000 a year for each legitimate child he or she lacks of a normal family of four, and let the proceeds be distributed by the State among the good fathers and mothers of the industrial class who are rearing large families.

At the hearing in the hall of the house at Harrisburg on Wednesday, March 17, a host of club women from various sections of the State appeared and made pathetic pleas in behalf of the child laborer. They spoke as though they believed that the average child is sort of a non-refillable bottle, containing so much energy which when depleted leaves the child a physical wreck. And yet they all, without exception, went on record as being opposed to an eight-hour day for servant girls or domestics.

These good, noble women, upon whom rest the solemn obligation of attending to social affairs of select society, might be obliged to do some of their own housework if perchance their child servants were limited to an eight-hour workday. Are we to understand that working girls are to be forced out of the stores and factories and given the alternative of working unlimited hours as domestics? Does not this circumstance again illustrate the misguided agitation back of the child-labor reform?

And, lest the writer be charged with taking a stand against liberal education of the mind for any person who can possibly afford it, be it noted emphatically that he has an abiding faith in the good men and women of our industrial class that they will never deprive a child of the opportunity to acquire such intellectual training as the child needs or desires. Let the State provide every facility for education; provide board as well as tuition at the State college; offer premiums to the children of the poor who seek higher education; and establish free professional schools for the poor; but then leave it to the wise judgment of our good fathers and mothers to determine whether their children need manual labor as well as education in order to develop their characters.

History, which, by the way, is becoming an obsolete study, teaches that labor and sacrifice in virile youth molded the characters of most of the lovable men and women of fame. "But," the zealous social reformer retorts, "many fathers and mothers exploit their children." True, but why should that fact be a justification for laying harsh restrictions on the parental hand generally. It is a principle of common law that it is better that ninety-nine guilty escape than that one innocent person be punished. Are not our God-loving fathers and mothers of the industrial class deserving of as much consideration as the criminal? Why reverse the principle as to them, and punish the ninety-nine devoted parents in order to catch the one who exploits his or her children. Herod, it is said, put ninety-nine thousand innocent children to death in order to prevent the rearing of One who was to come to teach the dignity of labor; but Herod was a rich man without a large family of his own.

The records show and our police authorities attest that just in the same degree that we have encumbered our law books with unwise child-labor legislation have we increased the work of our juvenile courts and crowded our reform schools. An authority on such matters wrote recently in one of our large dailies: "The breaking up of the social unit—the family—is responsible for the fact that the city of Philadelphia has an army of 10,000 little ones in homes and institutions." Certainly, homes will be broken up when we deny to poor families the God-given right to sustain themselves by labor. Many boys from 12 to 14 years of age are daily brought into our juvenile courts charged with incipient crimes. Invariably it is found that such boys have formed a dislike for school training, but they are willing to work for wages.

Under our present system there is nothing left for the trial judge to do except to send them to reform schools. There they are associated with hundreds of boys all affected with different forms of vice or moral delinquency. The result is, as the writer has often verified, that they return to society a little better educated in books—and crime. How much better for society if these boys could be paroled and put to manual labor under the care of their parents.

None of the proposed child-labor bills contains an exception in favor of this large class of boys. They will not go to school, the social reformer ordains that they shall not work, hence they must become criminals, for idleness leads ever to crime. Why not first call a convention of all the probation officers of the State and get their opinion as to what ought to be done with our incorrigible, truant, and delinquent boys?

Finally, let us present the case of the mothers in such clear light that only the hardened of heart can longer advocate measures that would rob them of the last vestige of hope. When the soldier in war shoots down his brother we decorate him for valor; when the mothers of men sustain the race we strip them of their natural right to the child's help, we put no trust in their sense of honor. Instead of argument let us exhibit the living examples of the cruel consideration which the social reformer grants to our Spartan mothers.

Here are a few pages taken from the book of life; examples which have come under the eye of the writer; examples which are multiplied the country over in all our industrial centers. And be it remembered that the proposed measures, by restricting further the right of the child to labor, will immeasurably increase the miseries here depicted.

And first we take the case of Mrs. O'Brien. Mrs. O'Brien was a religious woman; she read her Bible and learned that it is God's eternal decree that man shall increase and multiply. She had six children, and her husband worked in the mines. The whole family ate well, slept well, sympathized with their less-fortunate neighbors, and obeyed the law. The earnings of the father barely provided for their current needs. One day Mr. O'Brien was stricken down with an incurable malady. The eldest boys were respectively 11 and 13 years of age. They were willing, anxious, and able to work to make up for the loss of their father's wages. But no; it was economically wrong for boys of their tender age to labor in a free country. Hence the family was divided up, one child was sent here, another there, and poor Mrs. O'Brien died of a broken heart.

And there was Mrs. Bolinski. She had eight children, the eldest a girl of 14 and the next a husky boy of 11. Her husband, in a drunken frenzy, committed an aggravated assault on a neighbor and he got two years. Mrs. Bolinski came into court with her brood and bade her husband an affectionate farewell as he was being led to prison. There was much weeping among them, and the older children strove to console the disconsolate mother with assurances that they would go to work and try to fill dad's place. But no; there was no right for them to do heroic things in a great free country erected upon the sacrifices of the hardy pioneers; hence Mrs. Bolinski and her flock were sent to the county almshouse—where there is no education for children. To date no social uplifter has offered her any help.

And Mrs. Davis, too. She had but four children, just enough to entitle her to a place among the families of the elect. She had an unfaithful spouse, and he deserted her and her little ones and fled the jurisdiction. She was able to take in washing, and Johnnie, her eldest boy, could do a man's job. But Johnnie, so an employer told him, was not old enough to be permitted to soil his manly hands in ugly toil; hence Mrs. Davis, in addition to taking in washing, had to do a little begging on the side to preserve the family unity. It went hard on the proud little woman to beg.

And there was noble Mrs. Schmidt. Because of hard times her husband, a tradesman, was unable to get employment. There was plenty of work about that her boys could do, but they could not get employment certificates unless their parents took false oaths. Mrs. Schmidt,

fortunately for her, came of a hardy race. She did not go to the poorhouse, but instead took in two washings a day with ironing, and thus kept the table provided while her husband searched the country for a job. It might be added as a detail that the awful strain broke her down in body.

But less the foregoing seem but commonplace recitals of human experience, we will relate the story of Mrs. Haas for the delectation of our pseudo-social reformers. And to avoid all play on the sympathies we will not color any of the details. Last fall her husband became ill and was unable to work. She is the mother of six children, the eldest physically able to work, but prohibited by law. The family income being shut off they were actually starving when a fellow laborer happened in one day. Moved by compassion, the fellow laborer went out and soon returned with three chickens. Within an hour thereafter the chickens were devoured. It was the first substantial food they had eaten in many days. It turned out that the chickens were stolen. As soon as Haas got up from his sick bed he was arrested for receiving stolen goods. He admitted to the court that he and his family had eaten the chickens, knowing them to have been stolen. He was sentenced to serve a year and three months. The family became destitute. The distressed mother was tempted to put her virtue on the block, but she was brave. Kind friends brought the matter to the attention of the court, and after some months her husband was paroled.

Thus hundreds of faithful women are forced by legislation conceived in absolute ignorance of conditions prevailing among the industrial class to sacrifice their bodies, to beg, to retreat to pauper institutions, to sacrifice their lives, to sell their honor, in order to preserve their families.

"Oh," the college professor, the club woman, and the childless philanthropist will exclaim in unison, "the widows' pension and the compensation act will take care of those unfortunate women." The writer challenges anyone to point to a single provision in the statute books of Pennsylvania, or in any of the proposed reform bills, which provides any adequate relief for a mother in any of the circumstances above noted. And yet, if we were humanely inclined, how easy it would be to incorporate a proviso to permit the healthy sons of distressed mothers, say over the age of 12 years, and having a third-grade school education, to work at such manual labor as his home physician would certify that he is able to perform.

Down deep in the hearts of these faithful mothers of large families there is a growing conviction that the world is unconsciously uniting in a giant conspiracy to crush them because of their unbending fidelity to the primary laws of God and nature. In time, slowly it may be, American manhood will awaken to the evils of fanatical legislation, and then we can hope for a return to first principles.

I submit, gentlemen of the House, that we ought not to prevent a mother whose husband has deserted her or is in jail, or a destitute mother who is a widow, from receiving the fruits of the labor of her boys of 12, 13, and 14 years of age. She ought not to be compelled to go to the poorhouse or see her boys go to a reformatory and have the family scattered instead of the boys working in honest toil to help support her. She toiled for them in infancy, and when she becomes worn out from such toil and has no other support, it is noble and just to let her able children labor sufficiently to keep her from suffering.

I appeal to you in behalf of the tired, saddened, dependent mothers.

Now, when the mother is old and helpless, saddened and pauperized, are you going to require that her little family be scattered to other homes; are you going to let them roam the streets and finally land in a house of correction, or are you going to let an able-bodied boy, 12 years old or older, under these circumstances, who has already acquired a third-grade certificate, work for his mother?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WEBB. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBB. I say, there is much more Christian spirit, as my friend says, and there is much more common sense in letting the boy work under these circumstances; and I predict that the boy who is permitted to feel the honorable duty of helping a poor mother with his honest toil will be among the boys who will in the future sit in the Halls of Congress and run your industrial institutions, and such boys will be among your leading men. It will not be the little tramp who goes around the streets in idleness until he is 16 and says, "My mammy and daddy can keep me up, and I don't have to work." The boy who feels the responsibility of working for a widowed mother, who in his infancy protected his life, will make the better man of the two in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WEBB. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand the gentleman thinks the son of a widowed mother is benefited by having lost his father?

Mr. WEBB. No; I said no such thing as that.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman said he was in a much better attitude to succeed.

Mr. WEBB. No; I said the boy who felt the responsibility of honest toil to protect a widowed and helpless mother would become a better man than one who, when a boy, was tramping around the streets doing nothing until he was 16 years of age, and experience will prove the truth of what I say.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman ought to modify his statement, because as he made it it plainly was that it would benefit a child to lose his father.

Mr. WEBB. I appeal to the House that I did not say any such thing.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman modifies his remarks, it will be all right.

Mr. WEBB. Listen to this letter from Rev. A. E. Brown, superintendent of the Department of Mountain Missions and Schools of North Carolina, a godly man, who keeps close to our people, knows their habits and their needs:

HOME MISSION BOARD OF THE
SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION,
Asheville, N. C., January 31, 1916.

Hon. E. Y. WEBB, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BROTHER WEBB: I note the position which Congressmen from this State are taking on the child-labor bill before Congress, and I am inclined to give my heartiest approval of this course. I think the employment of children in manufactories should be regulated and supervised by a suitable person. I do not know just how much injury has been done to children by their work in the factories, but I have noticed this, that the children who work in factories are not before our police court to be sentenced to the reformatory. I believe that labor in a measure is a preventive of crime. I think it is a greater problem to know what to do with the boys growing up in our cities and towns without employment than what to do with those who are employed in the factories.

Yours, fraternally, A. E. BROWN, *Superintendent.*

[Mr. LEWIS addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, can we not arrange by unanimous consent to limit the debate on this section? I suggest that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and 5 minutes by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to offer an amendment to the section.

Mr. KEATING. Then let us say in 15 minutes, 5 minutes for the gentleman from Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this bill, as I did for a similar bill when it passed the last Congress. I do this knowing that many children have worked and will continue to work below the age of the limit fixed by this bill. There is a difference between child work on the farm and work in mines and factories.

I saw a number of children from the Lawrence (Mass.) district when the strike conditions were being investigated by the Committee on Rules of the House. Some of them were there with their parents. In nine cases out of ten the children had violated, either through their guardians or parents, the laws of the State of Massachusetts in order to get into the mills. Their parents admitted in some instances that they had stated to the employers that their children were over 14 years of age so they could get them into the mills. That condition exists throughout the country. I have seen men take their own boys, under 14 years old, into the coal mines and have them work by their side in the mines.

While parents will consent to or permit their children to work in mills or mines, the State—and the Nation, where the State fails—must step in and take care of the child life that is wasted in employments that are ruinous to young life. If this bill was so broad in its scope that it included farm as well as factory and mine work, it would raise a serious question. But as it refers solely to the industries in which it is so ruinous to the child, and while the same parents refuse to exercise that care over their own children that they ought to, the State or the Nation must step in and do it.

Mr. WEBB. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. WEBB. This bill applies to every manufacturing plant in the United States.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; it does not refer to the cotton mills only.

Mr. WEBB. It refers to mills, factories, and manufacturing establishments.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Certainly where children are placed on machines and compelled to work along with the machines, it saps the life out of the children, and it properly applies to all industries of that kind. There may be a small chance for a child in a coal mine where it is not under machine control. There is none in a mill on a machine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day I spoke in opposition to an amendment prohibiting the Department of Labor from appointing employees to enforce this law. Later, during my absence in the Committee on Appropriations on committee work, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] commented upon my enthusiasm for the bill, and suggested that I should attempt to remedy conditions in the State of New York before I attempted to interfere with conditions in his State.

I did not refer to conditions in any State, Mr. Chairman. I favor this bill because of its great fundamental underlying principle and the benevolent purpose sought to be accomplished. If conditions in the State which I represent, in part, were as vicious and as bad as they are in the State of the gentleman from North Carolina, and the Congress of the United States should feel impelled to take up a bill like this one in order to eliminate those conditions, I should be so ashamed of my own State that, rather than attempt to defeat the legislation, I should retire from this House to private life.

It unfortunately is true that evil conditions exist in all communities. Wherever greed is exalted over humanity men will be found indifferent to the proper development of the child so long as pecuniary benefit results from the abuse of children by enforced labor.

Much talk is indulged in about the man from the farm, of the boy of 12 and 14 who, struggling up through youth to manhood, overcomes many obstacles and accumulates wealth and attains high position. Have you ever talked with any of them? Find one who will not regret that conditions had been such and that his life had been cast in environments so unfortunate that he had been deprived of the opportunities he was entitled to as a youth and who does not devote every energy and make every sacrifice to give his own children the privileges and benefits denied to him in his youth. [Applause.]

I have a boy 14 years of age and I have one 12 years of age. God forbid that any legislation would be enacted here which would permit them to go into the quarry or the factory or the mill to support their mother if their natural support were taken away.

Mr. Chairman, we live in a new age and under different conditions than those prevailing 20 or 30 years ago. Conditions in factories and quarries and mines are entirely different from what they were then. Society owes something to the innocent and helpless children. [Applause.] They can no longer in this country be condemned to a life of disease and helplessness and ignorance because through misfortune or accident their natural support is taken away and they are compelled to depend on the efforts and labor of an honorable and honest mother. The State owes something to dependent children, and it is one of the glories of our civilization that legislation is being enacted in recognition of that fact and for the welfare of the young. My State has taken a foremost position in such legislation and has enacted a widow's pension law in order to meet one phase of the problem.

This legislation should not be discussed because of the conditions existing in any one State. I did not intend, in advocating this bill, to refer to conditions in any particular State. Wherever the conditions aimed at exist they should be eliminated. The Federal Government can not completely control the situation; but it can aid in bettering conditions, and this bill will help materially. What chance in the future has the child placed in a mine or quarry under the age of 16 years? Put the child under 14 years of age in a mill for more than eight hours a day, or before 7 o'clock in the morning and after 7 o'clock in the evening, with the speeding-up conditions that exist in such establishments and indicate what chance has he for that physical, mental, and moral development essential to fit him to be a good citizen and a contented human being? Such children are doomed to lives of disease, in most instances to lives of crime, and if, perchance, some one of them, because of unusual conditions, peculiar capacity, and exceptional ability, manages to break through the barrier which surrounds him and climbs successfully the ladder of life it should not be held up as an example for children to emulate, but, rather, we should consider the fate of the great majority, who fail and sink to a lower plane, with the resulting misery, disease, and unhappiness. [Applause.]

This bill deserves to pass. It will help the widespread movement to conserve human life; it will give thousands of children opportunities to contribute to the betterment of mankind who otherwise will be a menace to their fellows.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there is an amendment pending offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB].

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Very well; I will withhold my amendment for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WEBB) there were—ayes 8, noes 104.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of line 13, page 3, the following:
"*Provided*, Nothing herein contained shall apply to goods made or prepared by any boys' or girls' canning club existing in any State."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to call the attention of the House to the fact, well known, I think, to all of the membership, that the Department of Agriculture for a number of years has been encouraging the building up of boys' and girls' canning clubs in the different States of the Union. These canning clubs can vegetables, fruits, and other things of that character, and they ship them into other States for sale. I have offered this amendment solely to protect those canning clubs. If this House thinks that that spirit of enterprise and industry among the boys and girls of the country ought not to be encouraged, of course they will vote down the amendment. I do not care at this time to go into any argument of the merits of the bill, but I think if it is to become a law this exception ought to be made, and I have offered the amendment for that purpose.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Will not this amendment open up the door for the organization of these clubs in every community where they desire to violate the law?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not suppose it would create them in communities that want to violate the law. I think they exist in nearly all of the agricultural communities in this country to-day. They are existing now all over the West and all over the South and, I think, in the East and in almost every agricultural community they have their boys' canning clubs and their girls' canning clubs.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Might we not be able to add some word to the amendment of the gentleman which would clearly show that if the amendment should be adopted it would be impossible for a corporation to call itself a boys' canning club or a girls' canning club?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am willing to have such an amendment adopted.

Mr. MANN. These boys' clubs are voluntary organizations, not incorporated.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Absolutely; but the products which they make do at times ship into other States. I am quite willing to add any word that will protect it from any intentional violation of the law.

Mr. MANN. After the word "club," if you would add the words "not incorporated," I think it might make it safe, so that it could not be used by any company engaged in canning.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Then I will ask that the words "not incorporated" shall be inserted at the proper place. I make that request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to amend his amendment in the manner stated. Is there objection?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I will say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], as I did a moment ago in private conversation, that it is not the intention of those who drafted the bill that it should affect the canning clubs operating under the encouragement of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. But it does affect them.

Mr. KEATING. And the gentleman's amendment as he has drafted it, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] suggests, is entirely too broad. It seems to me that it should be left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture or the three Cabinet officers mentioned in section 3 of this bill, who are to draft rules and regulations.

Mr. MANN. But they could not draft rules and regulations in violation of the act. It looks as though section 1 would cover anything that could be called a cannery.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Let me read from the bill a moment:

The product of any mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment.

These boys and girls have what they call a cannery, and this language would certainly exclude the products of their cannery.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, would not the words "bona fide canning clubs recognized by the Department of Agriculture of the United States" clear up the meaning of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am perfectly willing to accept any amendment which will make it perfectly clear. All I desire to do is to protect these very commendable canning clubs of boys and girls in the agricultural sections of the country.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. I sympathize with the gentleman's proposition. The fact is you will now kill the bill with my vote if the proposition is not accepted. In my county we are not operating under the United States Department of Agriculture, but we are operating under the State department of agriculture in our own State, and we have, I think, some twenty-odd voluntary canning clubs, where they can all kinds of farm products.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired on this paragraph and amendments thereto.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. MANN. Was there an agreement? I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois that the gentleman from Florida have five minutes?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the gentleman from Colorado have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois amends the request of his colleague by asking that the gentleman from Florida have five minutes and the gentleman from Colorado have five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOPWOOD. I would like to ask unanimous consent to have five minutes on this matter.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can get it on the next paragraph.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have asked unanimous consent—and I believe it was granted—to make this proposed amendment read "unincorporated boys' and girls' canning clubs." Now, I want to say, as I have already, to make it plain, that if this legislation is to pass at all—and I assume it will—I am not in favor of it, and I want to be perfectly frank with the House and therefore make that statement. We have upon the statutes in Florida a much better, a more full and complete child-labor law than this; and, in addition, I am one of those who believe that we have not the jurisdiction to engage in this character of legislation. I understand it is labeled a bill to deal with interstate commerce, but that is a mere subterfuge. It is, in fact, a bill to deal with child labor throughout the United States, with which the Congress has nothing to do. And I want right here, Mr. Chairman, as long as I have gotten the time, to relate a statement made to me by a Member of Congress who has passed to his reward—a gentleman whom all the older Members knew and whom, I think, we all loved—an old gentleman about 70 years of age, of magnificent physical proportions. He stated to a number of Members on a certain occasion that he was once a member of the State senate of his State, and he said there was a little doctor, also a member of the senate, who got up a child-labor bill; and he said one day that little doctor made a powerful speech in favor of his child-labor bill, and in the course of his speech, among other things, said "this way of working young children had to stop; it would stunt them, and that they would grow up to be little runts and never would be of any account." Our friend said when the doctor got through he himself took the floor and he said, "Gentlemen, I want you to look at me." He was over 6 feet and weighed about 260 pounds. He said, "I think I am a pretty good specimen of a man, and I do not remember the day when I was not working." He said he then sat down, and the little doctor came again. "Well," said the little doctor, "if it did not tell on you it will tell on your children, and they will be little runts and dwarfs and never amount to anything." My friend said, "I knew they did not know anything about my family, and when the doctor got through I took the floor again and I said, 'Gentlemen, I haint got but two children in the world, and they are both boys. One of them weighs 260 pounds and the other weighs 340; and if I had not been stunted by work when I was young the Lord only knows what they would have been.'" [Laughter and applause.]

I look upon all this talk as being sickeningly sentimental, with nothing else to it; but if you are going to adopt it, if you are going to say that the boys of this country shall not grow up strong, rugged, fully capable of making their way in the world, as they have in the past, then I ask you to put this amendment in the bill, and at least protect the little boys and girls who are engaged in gardening and in canning the fruits of their labor and trying to learn something which will be useful to them in after life. Tell me that a boy ought not to work, that it is ruinous to him? Look at the men on this floor; look at the men at the other end of the Capitol; a great majority of them came not from the lap of luxury; and I want to say if I had my right to-day to will to my two boys when I die $100,000 or a million dollars apiece, I do not know of anything worse on earth that could happen to them. They ought to work. The scripture says, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, the Southern States have been quite severely criticized in the course of discussion upon this bill because, forsooth, some of us from that section are still loyal to the Constitution of the land in both letter and spirit. We have been painted as inhumane and with no kindly interest in the children of this country. I do not care to criticize others, but if I lived in New York, Boston, or other large cities in the North where I have seen small boys—much below 14 years of age—thinly clad, ragged, and almost barefooted, trudging through the snow and ice and shivering in the winter winds as they cried their newspapers in an effort to earn a few pennies with which to buy bread, I hardly think I should have the supreme nerve to set myself up as a teacher of the most humane method of rearing children.

What do the advocates of this bill propose to do with children under 14 years of age after they have denied them the privilege of earning a dollar by honest toil? Who will care for and support those whose parents are unable to care for and support them? What will become of those who have no parents and no property? Will the law which denies to them the privilege to earn an honest living by light toil make provision for their support? What will become of them? Perhaps these very humane gentlemen, who seem to delight in lecturing us on our cruel treatment of children, prefer that they shall be brought up in poverty, indolence, and idleness, which invariably leads to crime, rather than have them taught to be industrious in youth, which invariably leads to independence in maturer years. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe a case can be found in all the world where moderate labor ever proved either mentally or physically injurious to a child. "Idleness is the devil's storehouse," with the boy as well as with the man. "As the twig is bent so is the tree inclined," and if you bring up a boy, rich or poor, in idleness, ninety-nine times out of a hundred he will not be worth a "tinker's damn" to himself or the community when he becomes a man. If employers of child labor are oppressive and inhuman, punish such employers and regulate child labor along humane lines; but do not deny to the poor boy, perhaps alone in the world, the chance to carve out his own fortune by honest labor and write his name high on the scroll of fame, as so many before him have done. Give him a chance in the race of life, and do not hamper him with misfit legislation born of a sickening sentimentality which has no place in a Government like ours.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, as I stated a few moments ago it was not the intention of the men who drafted this bill that it should apply to the so-called boys' and girls' canning clubs, and yet if you begin to place exemptions in this bill I think you will very seriously weaken it. This particular amendment is offered by a gentleman who avows his opposition to the bill, his anxiety to defeat the bill. I believe under the circumstances that the House will act wisely if it rejects his amendment. I do not believe that any proper interpretation of the law will interfere with the operation of any legitimate boys' and girls' canning club.

Mr. CLARK or Florida. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does not the gentleman think a cannery would include a boys' and girls' club?

Mr. KEATING. No; not a boys' and girls' canning club. A cannery has a very definite meaning.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman permit a further question?

Mr. KEATING. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. What possible harm would it do?

Mr. KEATING. As the gentleman has drafted his amendment any club called a boys' and girls' canning club may get its out-

put into interstate commerce. It would be the simplest thing in the world to crawl through that particular loophole and violate the law.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. KEATING. Certainly.

Mr. BLACK. We have in my district community canneries, where the farmers in the vicinity come together and can their products, and in that way use the labor of their children, no doubt some of them under 14 years of age. They carry these to the wholesale grocery houses and in that way get a market for canned goods of that kind. Of course, some goes into interstate commerce in Oklahoma and New Mexico. Does the gentleman think that the bill would cover cases of that kind?

Mr. KEATING. I do not believe that children should be worked in canneries. That is the provision of this bill, and I believe that provision should be retained, and that we should not put into the bill weakening exemptions. I trust the House will vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment by striking out all after the word "club" and inserting in parentheses the word "unincorporated."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will pardon me, I got consent to include the word "unincorporated" just before the word "boys," to read "unincorporated boys' and girls' clubs."

Mr. MANN. I did not know that consent had been granted.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes. I would like to ask the Clerk to read the amendment as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MANN moves to amend by striking out——

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I made the request some time ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Florida that the gentleman did make that request, but in the confusion the Chair did not put it; but, if the gentleman from Florida desires, the Chair will put the request now. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out, after the word "club," the words "existing in any State," and insert the word "unincorporated."

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] a question.

The CHAIRMAN. There are two minutes remaining.

Mr. KEATING. I will yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Children can not manufacture products and sell them. If these children's canneries are to be unincorporated, who will make the contracts with purchasers and with carriers, and who will receive and pay out the money? If these canneries are not incorporated, they must be partnerships or something of that kind. Who is to do the business for the children if they are to ship goods in interstate commerce?

Mr. MANN. They not only can a great many goods but sell them.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. They can not make a legal contract.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. They can not make a legal contract, but the man who wants to work children can make such a contract. In my judgment the pending amendment ought to be defeated.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute for the amendment as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia offers a substitute for the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after line 4——

The CHAIRMAN. Page 2 is not now under consideration.

Mr. HOWARD. Wherever the gentleman's amendment came in. I did not hear the page.

The CHAIRMAN. Page 3, line 13.

Mr. HOWARD. After page 3, line 13.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk will read the substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 13, insert "*Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to bona fide boys' and girls' canning clubs recognized by the agricultural departments of the several States and of the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia for the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HOWARD. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 89, noes 9.

So the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as a substitute.

The amendment as a substitue was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That any person who violates any of the provisions of section 1 of this act, or who refuses or obstructs entry or inspection authorized by section 3 of this act, shall for the first offense be punished by a fine of not more than $200 and for each subsequent offense shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 nor less than $100, or by imprisonment for not more than three months, or by both fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court: *Provided*, That no dealer shall be subject to conviction under the provisions of this act who shall establish a guaranty issued by the person by whom such goods were manufactured or produced, resident in the United States, to the effect that in the manufacture and production of such goods, neither in whole nor in part, had children been employed or permitted to work in any mine or quarry under the age of 16 years, or in any mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment under the age of 14 years, or between the ages of 14 years and 16 years who worked more than eight hours in any one day or more than six days in any one week or after the hour of 7 o'clock p. m. or before the hour of 7 o'clock a. m., and in such event the guarantor shall be amenable to any prosecution, fine, or penalty to which the person seeking the protection of such guaranty would otherwise have been subject under the provisions of this act. Said guaranty, to afford the protection above provided, shall contain the name and address of the person giving the same.

Also, the following committee amendments were read:

Page 3, line 14, strike out the figure "5" and insert "6."

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 3, line 16, strike out the word "three" and insert the word "four."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOPWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

In answer to an argument on the other side of the House against this bill, founded upon a letter received from Pennsylvania, I am brought to my feet as a Member from Pennsylvania to say a few words in favor of the bill, and in answer to that argument.

Pennsylvania has the most advanced laws, I think, or as advanced, as any State in the Union on all questions pertaining to children. In the first place, our educational laws are among the best in the United States. We have erected the finest school buildings and we have the largest percentage of attendants, and we have the best care of our children in an educational sense that any State can have.

Our mining laws in Pennsylvania are among the most advanced of any State in the Union. I happen to live in a mining section. I represent a mining district in the coke and coal regions in southwestern Pennsylvania. In the past 25 years the mining laws of that State have added to the welfare of those people, so that you would not recognize their homes if you had seen them 25 years ago and would see them now, by reason of the advanced legislation that has allowed them to have these fine homes, surrounded by green fields, fine gardens, and flowers, and everything that makes life comfortable and pleasant.

The child-labor law of Pennsylvania is one of the most advanced in the Union, and that that child-labor law has in any way prevented the people of Pennsylvania, the widows of Pennsylvania, as was said here, from the best to which they are entitled, the best things in this land for usefulness and happiness, is not correct. We have the best laws or as good laws as are in the United States in regard to the care of the indigent poor. We have poor-farms on which they are cared for.

We have a system of outdoor relief, where a family that wants to live together and does not want to be sent to the poor farm, whereby the widow and her children are cared for in their own homes. So that the lady who wrote the letter referred to is entirely misinformed in regard to Pennsylvania.

I just wanted to answer that stricture on Pennsylvania, and to say that Pennsylvania is in favor of every advancement that can be had for the protection of the children. I am in favor of the enactment of this law as an additional law to make the States that are not coming up and marching with the other States of the Union—only a few of them are lagging behind—toe the mark, and march along with equal step. It will keep the products of the child labor of such States out of Pennsyl-

vania and other States which are willing to take care of their children as they should be cared for, and will give them the opportunity which they ought to have without being compelled to compete with the child labor of such States as still insist on the employment of such labor. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. Chairman, in the report of the committee on this bill, on page 7, this statement appears:

It was evident through this testimony that the only opposition from manufacturers personally appearing before the committee has been from the cotton-manufacturing sections of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Alabama, and that the manufacturing associations of these States have been in the past opponents before their own State legislatures of the raising of the age limit or shortening of the hours for the working children.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to read a copy of the resolutions which were adopted by the Cotton Manufacturers' Association of South Carolina on January 22, 1909. I read:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE COTTON MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

Resolved, That the association renews its recommendation to the legislature that there be passed a general compulsory education law requiring the compulsory education of children under 14 years of age.

Resolved, That provided there be passed such compulsory education law this association feels that there is no objection to advancing under proper limitations and restrictions the age limit of children working in textile mills and other industries to an age to comply with the general compulsory education law as passed.

Resolved, That this association also renews its strong and urgent recommendation to the legislature that a law be passed in this State requiring registration of births and marriage licenses.

Now, Mr. Chairman, those resolutions were presented and read before the committee of the South Carolina Legislature and repeatedly presented to that body. They were sent to me by one of the leading cotton manufacturers in the South, Capt. E. A. Smyth, of the Pelzer Mills. I believe he is the largest manufacturer in the South to-day of cotton goods. I believe if the report of the committee throughout is no more reliable than the statement which I have quoted from it, it must be taken with a good deal of salt.

I know that the Manufacturers' Association of our State has been in favor since 1909 of a child-labor law, but the legislature has not passed it. I wish to have these resolutions printed as part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

There was no objection.

Mr. AIKEN. Now, Mr. Chairman, while I am not a lawyer, I claim to have a reasonable amount of common sense, and some one has said that law is, or should be, based on common sense.

I can conceive of the National Government prohibiting the use of the mails for the conduct of a lottery between States, for gambling in itself is an evil subject to police regulation. I can conceive of the National Government forbidding the carrying of girls or immoral women from one State to another, affording the States some protection against the immoral practices of citizens of other States. I can conceive of the ever-ready interstate commerce act being called into play to suppress the illicit sale of whisky. These all come within the scope of police regulations and find justification in the right of the National Government to protect one State against those immoral or illegal practices that the citizens of another State would inflict upon it. But that the National Government should prohibit the shipping of a bolt of cloth, or a sewing machine, or a box of shoes, or a suit of clothes from one State to another or to an alien country because children under the age of 16 years may have aided in their manufacture is stretching the inhibitions of interstate commerce beyond the limit.

I am opposed to the pending bill because it undertakes to usurp a duty that belongs exclusively to the States and that the States can perform more satisfactorily than the National Government can.

North and South Carolina, New Mexico, and Wyoming have been cited as the only States in the Union where a child under 14 years of age can be legally admitted to factory work. The State legislature, through the efficient service of its department of commerce and labor, is handling this question more intelligently and satisfactorily to employer and employee alike than the National Government could possibly handle it.

I can not lose sight of the fact that any interference with the right of a parent to put his child to work at such age as he may deem wise, if that labor is necessary for the support of the family, is in a measure subversive of the individual rights of the citizen. The parent is the natural guardian of the child, and it is reasonable to suppose that, except in rare instances, he is not going to impose labor on his child unless poverty or stern necessity impels it. But if there are some abuses, and I admit there are, the State is nearer to its own citizens and is better qualified to take on itself paternal obligations than the Nation. We want no Federal agents going through our mills and mill villages telling our people when their children shall go to work and when they shall not, and telling our men and women how many hours they may work per day and how many not.

And why apply the provisions of a Federal act to children of mill operatives? Why not the children of lawyers, farmers, merchants, or other professions or callings? I can readily conceive of the employees in manufacturing plants feeling righteous indignation at this effort of the Federal Government to supervise their private affairs.

With the State the feeling is different. We are a homogeneous people, of one blood and of a common interest. Our people have accepted such laws as the State legislature has passed as being for the common good, and employer and employee are working hand in hand through the State legislature, slowly but surely, for the permanent betterment of labor. Any effort to standardize labor and wages through a Federal act, even if it were constitutional, which it can not be, must fail. What might suit New York, for instance, might not suit South Carolina at all. A large per cent of the labor of the North is of foreign lineage, if not actually foreign. In the South we are of one blood, one interest, and whatever may be the necessity for Federal supervision of labor in the North, there is no such necessity in the South. The Southern States are not going to lay unreasonable demands on any of its citizens, and such demands as it does make for the good of society will be administered humanely and with every consideration for the rights of the individual.

This Federal child-labor bill, grafted, as it were, on an entirely foreign and irrelevant act of Congress, is inconsistent in its very title, to wit, "A bill to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor." If it should pass, it could be made operative only by putting a Federal agent in every mill village in the South, for who could tell by inspection whether a bolt of cloth was manufactured wholly or in part by child labor?

Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with those little ones, even of the age of 14 years, who must rise early in the morning and stand at the post of duty until day has faded into night. But I realize that all of our people are comparatively poor, and there are few southern families, without as well as within our mills, in which children do not work some. I realize that beyond 14 years the child can take on labor without materially impairing his growth, and I know that the southern parent, except in the rarest instance, is not going to impose work on his or her children, except as necessity or duty prompts. We are solving this problem satisfactorily. We are solving it in the light of conditions that this National Government can not adapt itself to. We are solving it with the interests of all of our people at heart. I feel sure, then, that it would be a mistake for the National Government to interfere, if it had the right, and I feel even more sure that it has absolutely no right in the premises.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] moves to strike out the last three words.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether it has been stated or not, but it should be said that the cotton manufacturers of North Carolina were the first great body of business men to advocate compulsory education in North Carolina.

I desire, Mr. Chairman, to sum up briefly my arguments against this bill. What I have done I have done from conscience. I believe I am trying to save the great distinguishing feature of this Republic. Other republics have risen and fallen, because no republic in the past had that splendid balance that we have of State sovereignty on the one side and national sovereignty on the other.

The regulation of the morals and the health of the people for 125 years has been left wisely to the States, as was intended by the framers of the Constitution. This is one of the cases covered in this bill that should be likewise left to the States and constitutionally belongs to them, and where it has always been heretofore. Whenever you unbalance our splendid system of government and let the National Government absorb all these multifarious things that have been heretofore done by the people themselves in their States and localities then you will have a vast government that will ultimately fall of its own weight.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. WEBB. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. I am a new Member. Do I understand that the gentleman introduced the national prohibition resolution or bill?

Mr. WEBB. I did. I will say to my friend that there is no analogy between that and this bill. That bill leaves to the States themselves the amendment of their constitution in an orderly and a constitutional way, but this bill is a proposition to take charge, by mere congressional act, of the rules and regulation of labor connected with manufacturing in 48 States, in 299,000 manufacturing plants.

My chief objection to this bill, Mr. Chairman, is that, in my opinion, it is flagrantly and obviously unconstitutional. I would not be bold enough to say that if I were the only man who had said it, but the great lawyers who composed and headed the Committee on the Judiciary in times past, including Judge Jenkins, of Wisconsin, and Judge Birdsall, of Iowa, and Judge Parker, of New Jersey, and Mr. Littlefield, of Maine, and Judge De Armond, of Missouri, all members of the great Judiciary Committee seven years ago, had this same matter before them and unanimously reported that it was unconstitutional. The Senate Committee on the Judiciary at the same time, containing, as I recall, as members Senator Root and Senator Knox, of Pennsylvania, made the same report—that the bill was unconstitutional because the Congress of the United States had no power to regulate the hours of labor of women and children wholly within a State, which this bill undertakes to regulate.

Again, I am opposed to this bill, because I do not believe a Federal bureau here in Washington to supervise and look after the administration of this law can be as well trusted to administer properly the labor laws of 299,000 manufacturing plants that are scattered all over the 48 different States of the Union as the people of those 48 States.

I am opposed to the bill also because under it you have two sets of morals. You say it is immoral or wrong to circulate in interstate commerce goods made by child labor in the United States, but you do not exclude the products of the labor of children in Panama, or in Hawaii, or in other parts of the world. They can come in and circulate at liberty in our interstate-commerce channels. In addition, this bill will not affect the products of child labor to be shipped into foreign countries. It will not affect the industries of Massachusetts or New Jersey or North Carolina or South Carolina or any other seaboard State engaged in manufacturing goods to be shipped to foreign countries. We have here two or three standards of morals. If it is wrong for one State to receive child-labor goods made in another State, it is wrong to use goods made anywhere by child labor. Why not exclude all child-made goods from interstate-commerce channels in the United States? I offered a proposition to that effect, but you voted it down; and your Republican floor leader, Mr. MANN, voted against my amendment. I do not know if you will be able, when you go back to your constituents, to satisfactorily tell them why you made such a discrimination in favor of foreign-made child-labor products as against manufacturers of this country who use the labor of children only 14 to 16 years of age.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes more.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—although I do not intend to object—I think we might be able to agree upon a time when the debate on this section should close—say, in 25 minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I would like to have some time. I will not take more than six minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Make it 26 minutes, Mr. Chairman. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 26 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 26 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. WEBB. I shall probably not consume the five minutes allotted to me, because I have about finished what I wanted to say.

There is still another objection to the bill, and that is that in order to punish the four States which have been under such constant discussion here you gentlemen are willing to penalize the 275,000 manufacturing plants of the United States. This bill does not apply alone to cotton mills, canneries, and quarries, but it applies to all the manufacturing establishments in the country, and you are willing to require those 275,000 manufacturing plants to put upon every rake, pitchfork, digger, wheelbarrow, package of canned goods, bolt of cloth, and every other one of the million different things that are manufactured in the United States a pure "child-labor" certificate, certifying that they are not made with the child labor denounced in this bill, before any dealer will be willing to handle those articles. Now, gentlemen, we have heard much talk about the odiousness of putting stamps on checks. Stamping checks will not be a marker, it will be only a mild zephyr compared to a Kansas cyclone, to the labor and expense to which the innocent manufacturers of this country, if you please to call them that, will be subjected in putting upon the articles which they manufacture the millions upon millions of stamps which will be required before those articles can be moved in interstate commerce. The average manufacturer does not understand that he has got to do that in order to make two or three States, that are rapidly coming up to the standard, come up to it at once.

I object to the bill again and lastly because there is no provision in it which will permit a big, strapping 12-year-old, or 13, 14, or 15-year-old boy to work for a destitute or pauperized mother. You may talk all you please about sentimentality. I have a boy 11 years old, and I want him to work. I would be willing to have him work in a cotton mill rather than to run about the streets and learn bad habits and hear the vulgar stuff that is often dished out in his presence by older men. The president of one of the best cotton mills in this country, a man whom I know, put his boy in the mill, when school was not going on, when the boy was just 12 years old, to keep him out of the bad company that he would encounter running around town doing nothing. I tell you, gentlemen, we are letting a false sentimentality work upon us and force us into doing an impracticable and improper thing, in my opinion.

In this connection I want to put in the RECORD the labor laws of North Carolina:

No child under 12 to work in any factory or manufacturing establishment within this State. No child between 12 and 13 to work in a factory except as apprentice, and then only after having attended school four months in preceding 12 months.

Sixty hours shall constitute a week's work in all factories and manufacturing establishments, and no minor or woman shall be worked in such factory or establishment more than that length of time, and no adult male to be worked therein longer than that time per week, unless a written contract entered into between him and employer, under terms of which he shall receive extra compensation for extra hours. No employee in any factory or establishment to work exceeding 11 hours a day. This section not to apply to engineers, firemen, superintendents, overseers, section and yard hands, office men, watchmen, or repairers of breakdowns.

Parents of children hiring them to factory or manufacturing establishment to furnish written statement of age of child and certificate of school attendance.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that it has been stated by the gentleman who has just taken his seat [Mr. WEBB] that this bill is flagrantly and boldly unconstitutional, I want to call attention to the fact that no lawyer upon the floor of this House has attempted to prove its unconstitutionality, except those who come from States affected by its provisions. I have the highest respect for the learning, ability, and conscientiousness of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina and the equally distinguished gentleman from Virginia, who have contended against the constitutionality of this bill; but in view of the fact I have just stated, I hope I may be pardoned in saying I am convinced that their judgment is somewhat warped by their surroundings.

In such time as has been permitted to me I have made a careful study with reference to the constitutional questions involved in this bill. I have also at various times given much study to the general principles which involve control by the Government under such circumstances as this bill will cover, and I have come to the abiding conclusion that this bill is constitutional. The objections that have been made to its constitutionality have been for the most part, as it seems to me, disposed of, but there are one or two remaining of which no particular mention has been made, and they have been insisted upon so vociferously by gentlemen who are opposed to the bill that I wish to devote just a few moments to them.

One was mentioned by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] who has just spoken. He has insisted that it is not the business of the Government, and that the Government has no right to take into consideration questions which relate purely to the morals and health of the citizens of some particular State. Yet those questions, as it seems to me, are entirely and completely disposed of by the lottery cases, which relate to the morals of the State, and by the pure-food laws, which pertain to the health of the State.

It remains possibly to be determined as to whether the Government may go one step further and, through its power over interstate commerce, undertake to regulate transportation which is in aid of anything that injuriously affects the public welfare or the public morals. This is the gist of the principle which controls and makes constitutional the provisions of this act.

That principle, in my opinion, has been affirmed recently in the white-slave cases.

Inasmuch as it has been so positively asserted here on this floor that no act has been held constitutional when the transportation inhibited by its provisions did not injuriously affect the people of the State into which such transportation came, I wish to say that if that principle was carried to its logical conclusion the white-slave act would be shorn of most of its power. It is true that the principal object of the white-slave act, or at least one important object which was probably in the mind of the author of that act, was to prevent injury to the morals of the community into which some person was taken for purposes of prostitution or lewdness; but the white-slave act has been applied over and over again to cases where the persons transported and the parties who engaged in the inhibited transportation had no intention to affect, and never would in the least degree have affected, either the morals, the conscience, or the feelings of the community into which they came, because they carried on their proceedings in perfect secrecy, so far as that community was concerned. The only harm was to the morals and the welfare of the community where the transportation originated, just as in this case the general welfare of the community where the transportation originates will be injured if this particular traffic is permitted to be carried on. In both cases the act of transportation was not injurious in itself, but only because it was used as an instrument in aid of the injurious act. And I conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying that this act is justified because it refuses longer to permit interstate commerce to be used as an instrument for carrying on, aiding, and affecting business operations which are inimical to the welfare and health of the producers.

Mr. Chairman, it would not seem necessary to say anything in support of the merits of the bill. With a few exceptions, those who have opposed it have admitted that its purpose was useful and the results of its enactment would be of great aid in social unlift. Being unable to attack the bill upon its merits, some have sought refuge in its alleged unconstitutionality, and some have even gone so far as to assert that if a Member had had any doubt as to the constitutionality of the bill he ought, as a matter of duty, vote against it. This, Mr. Chairman, is an extreme position and states a principle which, I trust, will never be followed by this House in voting upon any bill. The logical effect of such a rule would be to transform those provisions of our Constitution, whose doctrines we find somewhat difficult to define or whose application somewhat in doubt, into absolute prohibition wherever such doubt arises. Such questions, to my mind, should be decided with the broader view. I concede that the States have certain rights upon which we ought not to infringe, but in determining what those rights are we ought to hold the scales in equal balance and only let them fall upon that side which has the weight of the better reasoning. In so weighing these questions we ought also to take into consideration the purpose and object of our Government, the needs of society, and the axiomatic rule that power and control must vest somewhere, and if it be not found in the States must necessarily belong to the General Government. That there is a crying need for such legislation is doubted by few and affirmed by all of the best thinkers upon the subject. No more important legislation can come before this body than that which aims to protect, improve, and build up the mind and the health of the youth of this Nation, and moved by such considerations I unhesitatingly urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the discussions of this question as to the constitutionality of this bill. We find that there are a number of men of eminence in the law who have been quoted as saying this bill is unconstitutional. I find there is another large number who say it is not unconstitutional. I am not a lawyer. I am willing to take the advice of lawyers on the subject, but as there seems to be a division of opinion as to its constitutionality, then, if we are going to err, for God's sake, let us err on the side of humanity. [Applause.] Let us pass the bill. And if some court declares it unconstitutional, let it do so, but let us not stand here in an attitude of fear as to what the court will do and refuse to do the thing that ought to be done.

I was not in at the time a gentleman read a letter from some one up in Pennsylvania protesting against this bill. I want to say here, being a Representative from Pennsylvania, that this is not the feeling of the employers over there. For 40 years I have been active in labor matters, for years almost constantly on conferences over in Pennsylvania and other States in the iron industry where we met each year, with millions of capital represented on one side of the table and hundreds of thousands of men with families directly and indirectly represented on the other side. We talked our matters over, talked over the conditions of employment, talked over the conditions of labor, and I never found along the employers a desire to enslave child labor. Their contention has always been, and rightfully, too, that they ought to be protected against States making the same material using child labor; they expected that protection. It is up to the United States Government through its Congress to give that protection to the States that have already passed laws protecting the children. We do not care anything about what they do in their own State, if they do not come over the line, but when they come over the line where we are trying to give the children better conditions, we say it is time to cry "Halt."

I have heard a lot of talk about men coming up from the bottom. I am not a good example for pity, not any better than the gentleman from Florida referred to when speaking of the people who are ill treated in youth. I started early—I am sorry I had to do so, for I have felt the loss of a chance to go to school all my life—and it has been my endeavor in all the time I have been in labor circles, and the endeavor of all men who are interested in the labor movement, to try and get a better condition for the children who are to grow up than we had ourselves. [Applause.] That is what we are talking for now and that is what this bill intends to do. The bill is going to pass. I want to say, in reply to the gentleman who spoke about letting in things from abroad made by child labor, that that is true, because his side of the House will not agree to protect us against child-made merchandise coming from abroad. But let us pass this bill, so that we can protect ourselves and our children against the Southern States, where they have no restrictions on child labor, and the next Congress, the Sixty-fifth Congress, will see to it, by a tariff bill that will protect, that there will not be any child-made labor goods coming in from abroad. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It has been said on this floor that a large number of prominent men have come from poor families and had to work at an early age, but that does not prove that useful and prominent men are not coming forward now and will be in the future with a higher age limit and a better labor condition. But it is true, to my mind, that more boys who were given the chance of an education before being compelled to become wage earners will be of prominence and of value to their country than where the reverse has been the condition. There is this to be said in favor of child-labor legislation since it has been enacted, that with each succeeding census the stature of man seems to be increasing and their longevity extended.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word in reply to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB]. He seemed to be fearful that the enactment of this bill into law would result in undue centralization of power in the National Government; and yet if this bill shall become a law, practically all the powers of government that touch the family and social life and the ordinary business relations of the people will still remain with the States. The States will continue to make the laws which govern the purchase and sale of property, the forms of conveyance, the descent of property, marriage and divorce, the protection of personal liberty, the distribution of estates, the making of wills—in other words, all which affects the people in their intimate personal relations will abide with the State even if the pending bill should become a law.

The gentleman from North Carolina cited the fact, which he seemed to think important, that some years ago the Judiciary Committee of the House declared a bill similar to this to be unconstitutional. But this fact is not decisive of our duty respecting the pending measure; for it has happened more than once that the Supreme Court of the United States has reversed decisions of distinguished judges as to the true interpretation of the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution. And before permitting that committee opinion to cause us to surrender our own convictions that the pending bill is constitutional and ought to pass it will be well to recall an interesting and instructive fact respecting the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in Gibbons against Ogden, the leading case touching the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution and the power which it grants to Congress. Members will recall that the Legislature of the State of New York had by law granted to Livingston and Fulton the exclusive right, for a term of years, to navigate steamboats on the navigable waters within the jurisdiction of that State, and that the power of the State to grant this exclusive right was sustained by the very eminent Chancellor Kent, author of Kent's Commentaries, in an elaborate decision declaring the unanimous judgment of the highest court of that State. But when the case reached the Supreme Court of the United States, Chief Justice Marshall, in an immortal opinion, ground the Livingston-Fulton contention and the logic of Chancellor Kent's opinion into dust.

But what would have happened to the United States of America if the men of that day had merely pointed to the decision of Chancellor Kent and his associates, surrendered their own convictions, and insisted that the case should go no further? And here I pause to say what this bit of history powerfully suggests—that the Supreme Court of the United States demands not men who are mere worshipers of the dusty precedents of the books but men who combine with great knowledge of the law the forethought, the soul, the imagination of the statesman. [Applause.]

Several of the opponents of the bill have said that if we enact it into law it would afford a precedent for Congress to do many foolish things. For example, they ask, what would prevent Congress from declaring that no goods manufactured by one-armed men could go through the channels of interstate commerce? Now, it is a sufficient answer to this sort of argument to say that the fact that Congress might do a foolish thing is not at all an argument to show that Congress has not the constitutional power to do it. This afternoon the two Houses of Congress could, under the power granted by the Constitution, declare war against every other nation on the globe. It has such power but will not exercise it. The fact that in exercising a power Congress might do a very foolish thing does not prove that the power does not exist.

The gentleman from North Carolina says that this bill, if enacted into law, would not obstruct the coming in of goods manufactured by child labor in Europe. But as a Democrat he has no business to rise on this floor or elsewhere and contend for the enactment of a law for the specific purpose of preventing child-made European goods coming in here, because his party platform declares that Congress has no constitutional power to pass a law for the purpose of protecting an American industry. The Republican Party is the party of protection.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption there?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The Democratic Party maintains that laws to restrict the importation of foreign goods must be for the purpose of obtaining revenue only, with an accent on "only."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, in listening to the arguments of these gentlemen who have so eloquently pleaded that this law is unconstitutional I am reminded of the remark which I think Madam Roland made during the French Revolution: "O Liberty! Liberty! how many crimes are committed in thy name!" So far as the constitutionality of this bill is concerned, nobody could discuss it in five minutes, but the other day during the very eloquent remarks of my friend from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] I interrupted him to ask him if this bill were not similar to the pure food and drugs act. He said then that the difference between that act and this bill, so far as its bearing upon the decision of the Supreme Court as to the constitutionality of the food and drugs act was concerned, was that the Supreme Court decided that act to be constitutional because the things prohibited by that act were deleterious to the human family. Mr. Chairman, if it is deleterious to the human family, it is deleterious at the place where it is ultimately consumed. It it not deleterious at the place of manufacture, it is not deleterious in its transportation, and if it is constitutional because it happens to be deleterious at its destination, I can not conceive of any difference between a product deleterious at its destination and one deleterious at its source. In other words, if Congress has the right to prevent the shipment of an article in interstate commerce because it may endanger some one's anatomy when it gets to its destination, it has the same right to regulate and prevent interstate commerce of an article if it endangers some one in its manufacture and production.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] again said that he was against this bill because it infringed upon the rights of the States. Mr. Chairman, I believe in State rights, but I do not believe in State wrongs, and I will not vote here to protect any State wrong any more than I would vote to infringe upon the right of any State; but I am getting a little tired, a little impatient, every time some legislation comes up in this House, which is for the benefit of humanity and the progress and enlightenment of our Nation, of hearing the standpats on both sides of the Chamber hide behind an antiquated interpretation of the doctrine of State rights. [Applause.] I am not—and I am glad that I am not—one of those Democrats who believes that this great Nation of ours is a monster. If I believed that the Federal Government, of which I am a part, and that the flag to which I owe allegiance was the flag of a cruel, monstrous Government, I would leave it. I would go to Germany and join Von Hindenberg's army or go to England and become a baron. [Laughter.] I would not stay here.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt in my mind of the constitutionality of this law nor of its desirability as a matter of public policy. Congress a few years ago passed a bill known as the insecticide law to protect bugs and ants and grasshoppers from having their rights infringed upon with insecticide. Was there anything in that law that involved its constitutionalty because it might kill a bug or a grasshopper or a lizard or a worm of some kind in an unconstitutional manner? I have greater regard for the boys and girls of this Nation than I have for the grasshoppers and June bugs, and as my good friend from Georgia the other day said, if there is any doubt at all about the constitutionality of the law upon which we are about to vote, and which I am glad to say we are about to pass, I am willing so to vote that the boys and girls of this Nation may receive the benefit of that vote, because there is nothing in all this world that is sadder than a girl without a girlhood or a boy without a boyhood. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That the word "dealer" or the word "person" as used in this act shall be construed to include any individual or corporation or the members of any partnership or other unincorporated association. The term "ship or deliver for shipment in interstate commerce" as used in this act means to ship or deliver for shipment from any State or Territory or the District of Columbia to or through any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 4, line 17, strike out the figure "6" and insert the figure "7."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 24, on page 4, add the following:

"*Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall apply to any State of the Union whose legislature has already enacted legislation relating to child labor."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, can we make an agreement in reference to limiting debate?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I only want two or three minutes.

Mr. KEATING. I ask unanimous consent that debate close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair did not know as to the division of debate, and he recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I only want three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to state that I have offered this amendment, as I did the other amendments that I offered, in the utmost of good faith. I want to repeat what I said a while ago, that the State of Florida, which I have the honor in part to represent on this floor, has a more complete child-labor law than this proposed enactment. We feel, Mr. Chairman, that under our peculiar form of government we have the absolute right to deal with the question for ourselves. We have dealt with it, and there is not a State in this Union—North, South, East, or West—that has dealt with it in a more enlightened manner than we have in the State of Florida. Our children are protected there as well as they are protected in any State within the broad confines of this Republic, and I do not care in what section of the Union you find it.

Mr. Chairman, our educational laws will compare favorably with the educational laws of any State of this Union. We have spent as much money per capita for education as any of them, and we go as far as any of them in the matter of conserving the childhood of the State. We regard it as a matter peculiarly within the State jurisdiction; and if it is not within the province of the State to legislate upon it, why do these gentlemen name this child an "interstate-commerce" regulation? It is not an interstate-commerce regulation. It is not intended for that. It was intended to regulate child labor in this Republic, and why do not these gentlemen give it the proper name? In my judgment it is simply because they know that the Congress has no jurisdiction to handle the question of child labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I have seen the Constitution of the United States cuffed about so much on this floor during the past eight years that, not being a lawyer, I have

about reached the conclusion that there is some doubt about the constitutionality of the Constitution of the United States. [Laughter.] Whenever a matter of great moment comes on the floor of this House, those who oppose it are very much given to hiding behind the fear of its unconstitutionality. Possibly it may be; but in that event there is always a court of last resort, and they have their recourse there. But really, it seems to me that such a question as that ought not to figure largely in a matter of so much concern to humanity's welfare as that of child labor. Some statistician has figured out that it costs an average of $3,000 to bring a boy from babyhood to manhood, to clothe him, to educate him, to doctor him, to make a man of him; and it costs a whole lot more than that. It costs the average father many short meals and long hours, and it costs the mother many sleepless nights, pain and anguish, heartaches, and all of that in order to bring up that boy to be a man. And yet under the conditions which prevail in this country in many places, despite the sacrifices which are made by the parents, we bring children up to manhood defective in physical organism and mentally unprepared to meet the battle of life. I believe as firmly as that I stand here that the innocent child's blood that bespatters so many windowpanes in the factories of this country is a stain upon the character of every legislative authority in this country which tolerates it, and it ought to be abolished. I do not know what the Constitution may do about it; but as for me, Constitution or no Constitution, I am in favor of providing for the childhood of this country the largest possibility for growing up into a vigorous, sturdy, and responsible citizenship, and this bill will help to that triumph. [Applause.]

Mr. BLACKMON. Mr. Chairman, during the past year I have noticed a great deal of criticism by eastern magazines relative to the child-labor proposition in the Southern States, and I have listened to-day with much interest to the debate about taking care of children. While I have always been a staunch advocate of proper legislation to safeguard the interests of children who of necessity are compelled to labor in manufacturing plants, yet as a Democrat I am a firm believer in the broad principle of our Government that the States are amply capable of taking care of their own affairs, without the interference of the Federal Government. Many years ago while in the senate of Alabama I introduced the first child-labor bill ever introduced in that State. The State of Alabama has always been watchful of the interests of her people, and we have always felt, and still feel, that we are thoroughly capable of doing so without legislation by Congress. We have a splendid child-labor law and are protecting our children and propose to continue to do so, regardless of what action Congress may take on the measure.

It strikes me that some of these gentlemen on the floor are unduly alarmed about the State not being able to take care of its own affairs. It appears to me that these gentlemen need about as much protection as do the children in the different States.

If the States of the Union are not able to safeguard their children, we must confess that our system of government has been more or less a failure. No one is more deeply interested in the welfare of the children of my State or the welfare of the children of any State of the Union than I am, and no one within the State of Alabama will go further in the matter of legislation to protect their lives and future happiness; but what I want you to do is to recognize the independence of my State and of your sovereign States. Of course in the minds of some of the distinguished gentlemen Alabama can not take care of her children, though they feel that their own particular State can; but by thorough investigation they would learn that Alabama has and is taking care of the laboring element of her citizenship and will continue to do so.

Gentlemen, we should view this matter in an honest, common-sense way, and not in a demagogic fashion, with appeals about the "poor children." That is the trouble with the country to-day. Some Members of the House, when they think that a matter is popular in their district, flock to it without giving the matter any study and without using any reasoning.

Let us allow the State of Alabama and the other States of the Union to take care of their own children and other affairs affecting the internal welfare of their State. We understand local conditions in Alabama better than the man from the far East or the far West, and the man in Pennsylvania understands his home conditions better than we in Alabama could possibly understand them.

I am in favor of all legislation tending to protect the children, but I believe that this is a matter that should be dealt with by the States individually, without Federal interference.

My opposition to this bill is not based on the idea of my not caring for the women and children of the country. My objection to it is that it is another step in an effort to centralize all power at Washington. Centralization of power at Washington will necessarily be harmful to the great masses of our people. Do you think that the people of the different States are willing to admit that they are not capable of local self-government? For myself, I shall never admit nor by my vote indorse the proposition that my people in my State must call on other States to aid them in the regulation of their affairs which are purely domestic. We are a growing State and are from time to time passing laws that deal with all questions that are purely local to our people. Why, then, should we transfer to the Federal Government the right to dictate to Alabama what she should do in the matter of regulating child labor or any other question? All my people in Alabama favor proper legislation with reference to working the children in factories and elsewhere, and I am of the opinion that we are capable of handling this question without the aid of other States. [Applause.]

The American people must sooner or later wake up to a realization of the fact that we have in Congress and elsewhere people who desire the centralization of all power at Washington. Centralization of power here means the destruction of local self-government. The Federal Government conducts its business on the most expensive plan of any government in the world. It has been my effort on more than one occasion to cut down expenses in the different departments of our National Government. This, as the thoughtful citizen knows, is difficult to do.

Mr. Chairman, are not the people of your State better prepared to pass on local questions than are the people from other States? Why, then, should we undertake to pass a law taking away from the different States the right to regulate this great question? The section from which I come is rapidly assuming ascendency in manufactures. Why is it that the Federal Government, through the proponents of this bill, are attempting to take from the State her individual rights which this bill will clearly do.

I will not say that this is done for the purpose of injuring the section from which I come. I can not understand, if this legislation for which a number of the Members of this body are so strenuously contending is meritorious now, why was it not presented and adopted long ago? [Applause.]

Are we, as citizens of Alabama, willing to admit that we are incapable of operating our cotton mills and of manufacturing that great product of the South, wherein we have shown such wonderful skill, without asking the aid and supervision of the Federal Government? I feel that I voice the sentiment of the people of my State and all of the cotton-growing States when I answer no. I am not unmindful of the fact, as the records of this body will show, that when the cotton-growing States, apparently crushed by the war in Europe, sought aid of the National Government to tide over what threatened to be the darkest financial period in their history, most of the gentlemen who now propose to dictate to the South the terms and conditions under which it shall manufacture its cotton and other products were unwilling to have the Federal Government extend a helping hand. Whither are our lawmakers drifting when they are not willing to trust the people of the different States to pass on all questions that vitally affect them?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That in prosecutions under this act each shipment or delivery for shipment shall constitute a separate offense.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Strike out the figure "7" and insert the figure "8."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of inserting in the RECORD a telegram which I have just received from a Member of this House, Hon. H. GARLAND DUPRÉ, Representative from the second district of Louisiana. It is as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, *February 2, 1916.*

Congressman EDWARD KEATING,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

If child-labor bill comes to a vote to-morrow, please see that I am paired affirmatively for it. I voted for the measure in the Sixty-third Congress and would again vote for it but for my enforced absence, which I greatly regret.

H. GARLAND DUPRÉ,
Representative Second Louisiana District.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. That this act shall take effect from and after one year from the date of its passage.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Strike out the figure "8" and insert the figure "9."

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8234) to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes, and had instructed him to report the same to the House with certain amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? [After a pause.] If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill, with the following instructions: To strike out the word "cannery," in line 7, page 1, and report the same forthwith to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS. May I ask whether the gentleman is in favor of the bill or not?

Mr. CANNON. I intend to vote for the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves to recommit the bill with instructions to strike out the word "cannery," on line 7, page 1.

Mr. CANNON. On which I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The motion is on the previous question on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 35, noes 137.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. LEWIS. Now, I ask for the passage of the bill, and on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] demands the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the bill will, when their names are called, answer "yea," and those opposed will answer "nay," and those present and not voting will answer "present," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 337, nays 46, answered "present" 3, not voting 48, as follows:

YEAS—337.

Abercrombie	Cantrill	Dallinger	Ferris
Alexander	Capstick	Danforth	Fess
Allen	Caraway	Darrow	Fields
Anderson	Carew	Davenport	Fitzgerald
Anthony	Carlin	Davis, Minn.	Flood
Ashbrook	Carter, Mass.	Davis, Tex.	Flynn
Aswell	Carter, Okla.	Decker	Fordney
Austin	Cary	Dempsey	Foss
Ayres	Casey	Denison	Foster
Bacharach	Chandler, N. Y.	Dewalt	Frear
Bailey	Charles	Dickinson	Freeman
Barchfeld	Chiperfield	Dill	Fuller
Barkley	Church	Dillon	Gallagher
Barnhart	Cline	Dixon	Gallivan
Beakes	Coady	Doolittle	Gandy
Beales	Coleman	Doremus	Gard
Bennet	Collier	Dowell	Garland
Booher	Connelly	Drukker	Garner
Borland	Conry	Dunn	Gillett
Britten	Cooper, Ohio	Dyer	Glass
Browne, Wis.	Cooper, W. Va.	Eagan	Glynn
Browning	Cooper, Wis.	Edmonds	Good
Bruckner	Copley	Edwards	Goodwin, Ark.
Brumbaugh	Costello	Ellsworth	Gordon
Buchanan, Ill.	Cox	Elston	Gould
Buchanan, Tex.	Crago	Emerson	Gray, Ind.
Burke	Cramton	Esch	Green, Iowa
Butler	Crosser	Estopinal	Greene, Mass.
Byrns, Tenn.	Curry	Evans	Greene, Vt.
Campbell	Dale, N. Y.	Fairchild	Griest
Cannon	Dale, Vt.	Farr	Griffin
Guernsey	Kinkaid	Neely	Smith, Tex.
Hadley	Konop	Nelson	Snell
Hamill	Lafean	Nichols, Mich.	Snyder
Hamilton, Mich.	La Follette	Nolan	Steagall
Hamilton, N. Y.	Lazaro	Norton	Steele, Iowa
Hamlin	Lehlbach	Oakey	Steenerson
Hart	Lenroot	Oglesby	Stephens, Cal.
Haskell	Lesher	Oldfield	Stephens, Nebr.
Hastings	Lewis	Oliver	Sterling
Hawley	Lieb	Olney	Stiness
Hayden	Liebel	O'Shaunessy	Stone
Hayes	Lindbergh	Overmyer	Stout
Heaton	Linthicum	Padgett	Sulloway
Helgesen	Littlepage	Paige, Mass.	Sumners
Helm	Lloyd	Parker, N. Y.	Sweet
Helvering	Lobeck	Peters	Swift
Henry	Loft	Phelan	Switzer
Hensley	London	Platt	Taggart
Hernandez	Longworth	Price	Tague
Hicks	Loud	Quin	Talbott
Hill	McAndrews	Rainey	Tavenner
Hilliard	McArthur	Raker	Taylor, Ark.
Hinds	McClintic	Ramseyer	Taylor, Colo.
Holland	McCracken	Randall	Temple
Hollingsworth	McDermott	Rauch	Thomas
Hopwood	McFadden	Reavis	Thompson
Howard	McGillicuddy	Ricketts	Tillman
Howell	McKellar	Riordan	Tilson
Huddleston	McKenzie	Roberts, Mass.	Timberlake
Hulbert	McKinley	Rouse	Tinkham
Hull, Iowa	McLaughlin	Rowe	Towner
Hull, Tenn.	McLemore	Rubey	Treadway
Humphrey, Wash.	Madden	Rucker	Vare
Husted	Magee	Russell, Mo.	Volstead
Hutchinson	Maher	Russell, Ohio	Walsh
Igoe	Mann	Sanford	Ward
Jacoway	Mapes	Schall	Wason
James	Martin	Scott, Mich.	Watkins
Johnson, Ky.	Matthews	Scott, Pa.	Watson, Pa.
Johnson, S. Dak.	Mays	Scully	Wheeler
Johnson, Wash.	Meeker	Sells	Williams, Ohio
Kahn	Miller, Del.	Shackleford	Williams, T. S.
Kearns	Miller, Minn.	Shallenberger	Williams, W. E.
Keating	Mondell	Sherley	Wilson, Ill.
Keister	Montague	Sherwood	Wilson, La.
Kelley	Moon	Shouse	Wingo
Kennedy, Iowa	Moore, Pa.	Slegel	Winslow
Kennedy, R. I.	Moores, Ind.	Sims	Wood, Ind.
Kent	Morgan, La.	Sinnott	Woods, Iowa
Kettner	Morgan, Okla.	Slemp	Young, N. Dak.
Key, Ohio	Moss, Ind.	Sloan	Young, Tex.
Kiess, Pa.	Mott	Smith, Idaho	
Kincheloe	Mudd	Smith, Mich.	
King	Murray	Smith, Minn.	

NAYS—46.

Adamson	Dent	Lee	Small
Aiken	Dies	Lever	Stedman
Bell	Doughton	Nicholls, S. C.	Stephens, Miss.
Black	Finley	Page, N. C.	Tribble
Blackmon	Garrett	Park	Venable
Britt	Godwin, N. C.	Parker, N. J.	Vinson
Burgess	Hardy	Pou	Walker
Byrnes, S. C.	Hood	Ragsdale	Watson, Va.
Callaway	Houston	Rayburn	Webb
Candler, Miss.	Hughes	Saunders	Whaley
Clark, Fla.	Humphreys, Miss.	Sears	
Crisp	Kitchin	Sisson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Harrison	Sparkman	Wise

NOT VOTING—48.

Adair	Gardner	Miller, Pa.	Rodenberg
Almon	Graham	Mooney	Rogers
Brown, W. Va.	Gray, Ala.	Morin	Rowland
Burnett	Gray, N. J.	Morrison	Sabath
Caldwell	Gregg	Moss, W. Va.	Slayden
Cullop	Haugen	North	Smith, N. Y.
Dooling	Hay	Patten	Stafford
Driscoll	Heflin	Porter	Steele, Pa.
Dupré	Jones	Powers	Stephens, Tex.
Eagle	Kreider	Pratt	Sutherland
Farley	Langley	Reilly	Van Dyke
Focht	McCulloch	Roberts, Nev.	Wilson, Fla.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. CALDWELL (for) with Mr. WISE (against).

Mr. ROGERS (for) with Mr. HARRISON (against).

Mr. HAUGEN (for) with Mr. LEVER (against).

Mr. BURNETT (for) with Mr. SLAYDEN (against).

Mr. PATTEN (for) with Mr. WILSON of Florida (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. Moss of West Virginia.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. PRATT.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. ADAIR with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. ALMON with Mr. LANGLEY.

Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania with Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DUPRÉ with Mr. NORTH.

Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. POWERS.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. REILLY with Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. MORRISON with Mr. RODENBERG.

Mr. HEFLIN with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. HAY with Mr. MORIN.
Mr. GREGG with Mr. MOONEY.
Mr. EAGLE with Mr. MCCULLOCH.
Mr. DUPRÉ with Mr. KREIDER.
Mr. CULLOP with Mr. FOCHT.
Mr. BROWN of West Virginia with Mr. GRAY of New Jersey.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to change my vote from "no" to "present," as I am paired with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. ROGERS, who is not here.

Mr. WISE. I wish to inquire whether the gentleman from New York, Mr. CALDWELL, voted?

The SPEAKER. He is not recorded.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from New York, and I desire to change my vote from "no" to "present."

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague Mr. RODENBERG is ill and unable to be present. He has requested me to state that if he had been present he would have voted for the bill.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. KEATING, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the approval of the Journal to-morrow my colleague, Mr. CARAWAY, and myself be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes each on the suffering, destitution, and distress caused by the great flood on the Arkansas and Mississippi Rivers in the State of Arkansas.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR] asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal and the transaction of the business on the Speaker's table, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR] and his colleague [Mr. CARAWAY] shall each be allowed to address the House for 10 minutes on the subject of the destruction of life and property by the floods on the Arkansas and Mississippi Rivers in the State of Arkansas. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think it likely that there will be a matter before the House the first thing to-morrow which will give the two gentlemen from Arkansas an opportunity to be heard, and when it will be quite appropriate that they should be heard, and therefore I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects for the reasons stated.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Saturday, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the transaction of other business on the Speaker's table, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the Mexican problem and the national defense.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS] asks unanimous consent that on Saturday, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, he be allowed to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of Mexico and the national defense. Of course, this request and all similar requests are subject to privileged matters, appropriation bills, and such things.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—and I shall object—I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS] and other gentlemen of the House will have very fair opportunity to address the House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union during the consideration of these various appropriation bills; and it has been the invariable custom of the House to refuse permission to gentlemen to address the House on such matters in the House itself when there were appropriation bills coming along.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. I withdraw the application, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his application.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS—CORONADO BEACH CO.

By unanimous consent, Mr. KETTNER was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of the Coronado Beach Co. (H. R. 22901, 62d Cong., 2d sess.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LANGLEY, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, February 3, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination for waterway from small-boat harbor, Newport News, Va., to York River, with a view to connecting by canals New Market Creek, Back River, and Poquoson River with York River, in order to provide a safe inland passage for small boats between Newport News and York River (H. Doc. No. 644); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of the Mississippi River Commission (H. Doc. No. 645); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

3. A letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting report of the City & Suburban Railway of Washington for the year ending December 31, 1915 (S. Doc. 273); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting report of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. for the year ending December 31, 1915 (S. Doc. 272); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting report of the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the year ending December 31, 1915 (S. Doc. 269); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting report of the Georgetown & Tennallytown Railway Co. for the year ending December 31, 1915 (S. Doc. 271); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the chairman of the Public Utilities Commission, transmitting balance sheets and other information required by the public utilities commission of the various utilities under its jurisdiction for the year ended December 31, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 646); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, recommending that certain changes be made in the estimates of appropriations required for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1917, as they appear in the House Naval Committee's draft of the naval appropriation bill (H. Doc. No. 647); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SHERWOOD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4701) to establish in the War Department and in the Navy Department, respectively, a roll, designated as "the Army and Navy medal-of-honor honor roll," and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 113), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GARRETT, from the Committee on Rules, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 122) to amend the standing rules of the House of Representatives, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 114), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. FOSTER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1684) for the relief of Cyrus F. Goddard, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 111), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4885) for the relief of Bolognesi, Hartfield & Co., reported the same adversely, accom-

panied by a report (No. 112), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2978) for the relief of Dennis J. Neagle, and the same was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCRACKEN: A bill (H. R. 10646) directing the Secretary of the Interior to make a survey of the Black Canyon irrigation project, in southern Idaho, to ascertain its cost and feasibility; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10647) providing for the purchase by the United States of the Kings Hill irrigation system in southern Idaho, and providing for the completion of said system by the Reclamation Service under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 10648) to authorize the provision of accommodations for the United States courts in the Federal building at Sunbury, Pa., and to increase the limit of cost for said building accordingly; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 10649) for the erection of a public building at Madisonville, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DOOLING: A bill (H. R. 10650) to develop and promote the industry of utilizing the natural resources of the United States which are useful for chemical products; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 10651) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Eminence, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 10652) to authorize a survey of the Forked Deer River from Dyersburg, Tenn., to the point at which it empties into the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 10653) providing for a survey of Newton Creek from the Delaware River to Mount Ephraim Turnpike, on the north and south branches, respectively, and to Cuthbert Avenue, Collingswood, on the main branch; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 10654) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Whitewater, Walworth County, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10655) for the relief of the city of Racine; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10656) to amend H. R. 1339, Sixty-second Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10657) to pension widow and minor children of any officer or enlisted man who served in the War with Spain or Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10658) for the retirement of employees of the Government who served in the War with Mexico or the Civil War; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 10659) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lake Geneva, Walworth County, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 10660) regulating the street improvements in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 10661) to provide capital for agricultural and urban home development; to create standard forms of investment, one based upon farm mortgages and another upon urban home mortgages; to equalize rates of interest; to provide for deposits and personal credits; to furnish a market for United States bonds; to create Government depositaries and financial agents for the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OLNEY: A bill (H. R. 10662) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Holbrook Memorial Association, of Holbrook, in the county of Norfolk, and Commonwealth of Massachusetts, two bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10663) to make classifications for military and naval service, to promote preparedness, to provide for adequate and efficient national defense, to require that in all naval and military service of the United States, whether in time of peace or war, wealth shall bear and perform its proportional part of the service, and that money shall be made to fight for its country the same as men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 10664) authorizing the Secretary of War to investigate, examine, and report upon sites near Los Angeles, Cal., for the establishment of a brigade mobile army post for the better defense of the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 10665) making an appropriation for rebuilding, improving, and strengthening the levee on the Mississippi River at Hickman, Ky.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 10666) authorizing improvement of the site and plant of the Cushman Indian Trades School, at Tacoma, Wash., and appropriating $100,000 therefor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BEALES: A bill (H. R. 10667) to provide a suitable memorial to the memory of Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg, Pa.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 10668) to repeal section 4 of the act of Congress approved June 11, 1906, known as the forest homestead act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10669) to prohibit the traffic in peyote, including its sale to Indians, introduction into the Indian country, importation and transportation, and providing penalties therefor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARAWAY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 131) making appropriations for the relief of sufferers from floods in the Mississippi Valley and St. Francis Valley; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 132) providing for the Board of Indian Commissioners to consider and report upon the Rodman Wanamaker expedition of citizenship to the North American Indian, and for a report upon the information secured by Dr. Joseph K. Dixon, leader of the expedition, and empowering the said commissioners to report a bill upon the entire reorganization of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 10670) granting a pension to George V. McAllister; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10671) granting a pension to Mark Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10672) to satisfy the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of William Moseley, administrator of Temperance Moseley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 10673) granting a pension to James H. Hunt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10674) granting an increase of pension to Sophia F. Twist; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10675) granting a pension to William Sommers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 10676) granting a pension to Jasper Robinett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10677) granting a pension to Joseph Hemming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10678) granting a pension to Abraham Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10679) granting a pension to William Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10680) granting an increase of pension to Albert Saunders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 10681) granting a pension to Hannah C. Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: A bill (H. R. 10682) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Edward I. Gallagher, administrator of Charles Gallagher, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURGESS: A bill (H. R. 10683) for the relief of Charles W. Hosman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10684) for the relief of the legal representatives of Rebecca J. Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 10685) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Linn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10686) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Neal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10687) granting an increase of pension to John P. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 10688) for the relief of William A. Persons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10689) for the relief of William Kinney, alias William Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10690) for the relief of James U. Quinn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10691) for the relief of Rev. Oscar Samuel, alias August Meier; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10692) for the relief of S. O. Onsgard; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10693) for the relief of William G. Keats; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10694) for the relief of the heirs of Patrick Sullivan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10695) to remove bar of the statute of limitations and pay to Napoleon Van de Bogert a sum of money as pension because of disabilities incurred in service; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10696) for the relief of Milton S. Harrington; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10697) for the relief of S. Spencer Carr; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: A bill (H. R. 10698) granting a pension to Agnes Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLING: A bill (H. R. 10699) granting a pension to Richard H. Bermingham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 10700) granting an increase of pension to James Giddy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 10701) granting a pension to Niles D. Crites; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 10702) granting a pension to Jennie Holloway Gibbons; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 10703) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Harrison; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 10704) granting a pension to Thomas L. C. McAchran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 10705) granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 10706) granting a pension to James J. Huff; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10707) granting an increase of pension to William H. K. Southard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 10708) granting an increase of pension to Hugh J. Gallagher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 10709) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Case; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10710) granting an increase of pension to Myron H. Isabell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 10711) granting an increase of pension to Ione D. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10712) granting an increase of pension to Columbus L. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10713) granting an increase of pension to Stephen S. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10714) granting a pension to Daniel F. French; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 10715) granting an increase of pension to John Malehorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10716) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan M. Glatfelter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 10717) granting an increase of pension to Adaline L. Power; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 10718) for the relief of the Commonwealth Building & Loan Association; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 10719) granting an increase of pension to George Shults; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCRACKEN: A bill (H. R. 10720) for the relief of John J. McCue; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 10721) granting a pension to Georgianna H. Peabody; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURRAY: A bill (H. R. 10722) granting a pension to Rachel F. Burdg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 10723) granting a pension to Martha J. Meloy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10724) granting a pension to Shelby L. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 10725) granting a pension to Elizabeth Boetticher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10726) granting an increase of pension to Philson Hutchinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 10727) for the relief of Edgar W. Preble; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 10728) granting a pension to Margaret Mallery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 10729) granting a pension to Samuel N. Munro; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10730) granting a pension to Elizabeth White Orr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 10731) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Noyes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 10732) granting a pension to Mary C. Ryan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10733) granting a pension to Sarah H. Matheny; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10734) granting an increase of pension to James Hickman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10735) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10736) granting an increase of pension to Chalmers Canan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 10737) for the relief of Eli Pettijohn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 10738) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Newman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10739) granting an increase of pension to William S. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 10740) granting an increase of pension to John Branson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10741) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Maples; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10742) for the relief of Elizabeth Fisher Snorgrass; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 10743) granting a pension to J. A. Bunn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10744) granting a pension to John J. Brogan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 10745) granting a pension to Tirzah Maria Willson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 10746) granting a pension to Mary Hamilton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 10747) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Baughman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 10748) granting an increase of pension to William M. Noel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: Resolution (H. Res. 125) authorizing the appointment of William F. Cody upon the Capitol police force; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Palmetto Harbor No. 74, urging that House bill 9678 be not passed; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petitions of W. H. Newby and others, of Tonganoxie; John W. Spickelmier and others, of Willis; H. L. Wikoff and others, of Oneida; R. M. Petherbridge and others, of Basehor; First National Bank of Holton; O. J. Potter, for officers, stockholders, and patrons of Easton State Bank, all of Kansas, against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution adopted by the Christian Church, representing 300 members, of Highland, Kans., and bearing the indorse-

ment of G. W. Cohouer, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution adopted by the German Methodist Church of Wathena, Kans., representing 200 members, and bearing the indorsement of E. Crepin, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition signed by C. E. Smith and other citizens of Huron, Kans., protesting against stamp tax on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by J. H. Wilhelm and other citizens of Winchester, Kans., protesting against stamp tax on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by George A. Magill and other citizens of Kelly, Kans., protesting against stamp tax on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution adopted by Methodist Episcopal Church of Wathena, Kans., and bearing the indorsement of Rev. E. L. Geyer and other members of the church and congregation, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Christian Church of Troy, Kans., representing 600 members and bearing the indorsement of J. Tilden Sapp, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Robert Rorson and other citizens of Valeda, Kans., protesting against stamp tax on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by Charles G. Royer and other citizens of Winchester, Kans., protesting against stamp tax on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by L. C. Burns and other citizens of Hoyt, Kans., protesting against stamp tax on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by A. J. Smith and other citizens of Lancaster, Kans., protesting against stamp tax on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by Scott Hopkins and other citizens of Topeka, Kans., protesting against stamp tax on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by J. E. Blevins and other citizens of Linwood, Kans., protesting against stamp tax on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by Albert Neese and other citizens of Richland, Kans., protesting against stamp tax on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by C. D. Lamme and other citizens of Hiawatha, Kans., protesting against stamp tax on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by J. M. Everts and other citizens of Baileyville, Kans., protesting against stamp tax on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by E. J. Kelly and other citizens of Effingham, Kans., protesting against stamp tax on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of citizens of Maize, Kans., against the proposed law requiring revenue stamps to be placed on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Andale, Kans., against proposed law requiring revenue stamps to be placed on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of business men of Bellwood, Pa., favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEALES: Memorial of Travelers' Protective Association of America, favoring the passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of United Spanish War Veterans, favoring national preparedness and advocating national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 10248, to correct military record of Charles P. Kibler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., favoring submitting the question of railway mail pay to the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of McFarland Lumber Co., Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of the Small bill regulating compulsory pilotage on barges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Howard L. Neff, Thomas E. Coule Lumber Co., and Smedley Bros. Co., of Frankford, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of the Small bill regulating compulsory pilotage on barges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorials of Pennsylvania Lumberman's Association and the Lumberman's Exchange of the city of Philadelphia, favoring the passage of the Small bill regulating compulsory pilotage on barges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Dubuque County Retail Druggists' Association, Dubuque, Iowa, urging the amendment of section 6 of the Harrison antinarcotic law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE (by request): Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Poynette, Wis., and 115 other people of Poynette, Wis., in favor of the passage of a constitutional amendment for nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions adopted by the New York Zoological Society, of New York, asking for the passage of legislation to convert the national forest reserves of the United States into game reserves for the protection of wild life; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petitions of depositors in banks of Arma and Winfield, Kans., against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of New York Zoological Society, favoring game sanctuaries in national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of members of the International Brewery Workers' Union, of Schenectady, N. Y., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMTON: Petitions of Summers Linen Co., of Port Huron, and the Richmond Woolen Mills, of Richmond, Mich., in support of House bill 702, the dyestuffs bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Lutheran St. Paul's Church, of Filion, Huron County, Mich.; Gustav Moeller and Anton Etzter, of Kinde, Mich.; and Wendel Block, Charles Heiliz, Theodore Hunsanger, C. F. Block, and Raymond Heilig, of Minden City, Mich., in support of embargo on shipment of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, protests of 10 members of Almont Grange, 33 members of Grove Grange, 20 members of Ray Grange, 15 members of Custer Grange, and 28 members of Bark Shanty Grange, of Michigan, against increase in appropriations for national defense; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Methodist Episcopal Congregation of Memphis, Mich., for submission of constitutional amendment providing national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memoral of Pittsburgh Hungarian Political Club, relative to bill to prevent belligerent powers from interfering with mails; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Harry P. Knight, against the use of "Quaker" by certain business interests; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of New York Zoological Society, favoring plan for game sanctuaries in national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the J. L. Mott Iron Works, New York, against the curtailment of mail deliveries in New York City; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Hilton-Dodge Sales Co., of New York, relative to removing compulsory pilotage from barges; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of H. E. Aitken, of New York, against censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of M. L. Hornaday, of New York, favoring House bill 6881, to increase productiveness of national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of business men of the State of New York, favoring river and harbor improvements in State of New York; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petitions of Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., of Hartford, and Provident Life & Trust Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring House bill 9320, to compel insurance companies to file bills of interpleader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Charles H. Clarke, of New York, favoring passage of House bill 9814, relative to purchase of land from Oregon & California Railroad Co.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petition of business men of the State of New York, favoring river and harbor improvements in New York State; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of New York Zoological Society, of New York, favoring game sanctuaries in national forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DARROW: Petition of Perkasie Council No. 127, Junior Order United American Mechanics, in favor of Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration.

Also, petition of Evangelical Lutheran Labor Church of Olney, Philadelphia, in favor of an embargo on arms and ammunition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of Richard H. Benninghem, for increase of pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of the John Deere Plow Co., St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of House bill 6883, relative to payment to Indians of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of Conrad Lilick, St. Louis, Mo., relative to restrictions in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Thomas Phelan, St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of St. Louis Cotton Exchange, against cotton-futures act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of St. Louis Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Travelers' Protective Association, favoring the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of Edward P. Buffet, for Federal censorship of moving pictures and constitutional amendment prohibiting liquor selling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELSTON: Memorial of Central Labor Council of Oakland, Cal., favoring Federal aid to indigent tuberculous persons, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of grape growers of the twenty-second congressional district of Ohio, against the Overmyer bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Papers in support of House bill 10511, granting an increase of pension to Ida E. Hazen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of New York Zoological Society, favoring game sanctuaries in national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, papers in support of House bill 7802, granting an increase of pension to Edgar Abbott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of Pittsburgh Hungarian Political Club, favoring bill to prevent belligerents from interfering with mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of New York Zoological Society, favoring game sanctuaries in national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of H. E. Aitkin, against censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of business men of State of New York, relative to various river and harbor improvements; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Post No. 68, Grand Army of the Republic, and No. 116, Woman's Relief Corps, of Streator, Ill., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Illinois Chapter, American Institute of Architects, against passage of House bill 743, relative to building for Department of Justice; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of retail merchants of Sheridan, Verona, and Kinsman, all in the State of Illinois, favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Massachusetts State Board of Trade, favoring nonpartisan tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Frank T. Menzson, of Rox, and George Schroth, of Boston, both in the State of Massachusetts, favoring embargo on arms, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Arbuckle Bros., relative to duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of retail liquor dealers against tax on beer, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Memorial of the Traffic Club, of Erie, Pa., favoring the submission of the question of railway mail pay to the Interstate Commerce Commission for investigation and report; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of H. B. Workman Co., of Lititz, Pa., favoring protection for manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HADLEY: Petitions of 1,000 people of Washington State, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS: Papers to accompany House bill 9840, for relief of Nancy Proctor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of 70 people of Alpine, Oreg., for national constiutional amendment; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 75 people, of Clatskanie; United Brethren Church public meeting, 350 people, of Philomath; and United Brethren Church, 30 people, of Ashland, all in the State of Oregon, in favor of national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Petitions of First Baptist Church, 1,500 people; First Methodist Episcopal Church, 750 people; Central Methodist Episcopal Church, 600 people; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 85 people; and Christian Church, 350 people, all of Phoenix, Ariz., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of William C. Rogers, jr., and others, of New York and New Jersey; Lloyd Knitting Mills, of Salt Lake City, Utah; and the Reed Manufacturing Co., of Springfield; Philadelphia Axminster Carpet Co. and Ford Silk Hosiery & Dyeing Co., Universal Hosiery Co., and Lehigh Silk Hosiery Mills, all of Philadelphia, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: Memorial of John T. Taylor and 10 other business firms of Providence, Utah, favoring passage of Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Gottfried Bentler and eight others, of Providence, Utah, favoring an embargo on arms, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES: Petition of officers of Italio-American Federation of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, against the literacy test in immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rhode Island, favoring passage of child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Rhode Island Protective Textile Alliance, of Pawtucket, favoring printing of report of commission on Industrial Relations; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Lycoming County, Pa., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of citizens of Appleton, Wis., in favor of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition against repeal of mixed-flour law; protest against enactment of House bill 9409; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of A. Duchateau and others, of Wisconsin, against prohibition in District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Peshtigo, Wis., in favor of woman suffrage; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of Pittsburgh Hungarian Club, adopted January 30, 1916, objecting to suspension of parcel-post service to Hungary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Schmidt, Ault Paper Co. and other manufacturers of York, Pa., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of New York Zoological Society, indorsing game sanctuaries in national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOBECK: Memorial of Harry I. Brown Camp, No. 11, United Spanish War Veterans, in favor of the Key bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of M. V. Anthony and 23 other members of Pleasant Valley Grange, of Michigan, against increase of national expenditures for Army and Navy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McLEMORE: Petition of sundry citizens of Yoakum, Tex., favoring embargo on arms, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McKENZIE: Petition of Evangelical Lutheran Church, 387 people, of Polo, Ill., and Independent Presbyterian Church, 200 people, of Polo, Ill., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Why Bros. & Co., of Philadelphia, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Universal Winding Co., of Providence, R. I., protesting against the Dietrick amendment; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of F. J. McGovern, of Providence, R. I., in favor of making Columbus Day a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OAKEY: Petitions of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Warehouse Point and Plantsville, Conn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Papers in support of House bill 10190, for pension for Carl O. Nelson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Walter B. Hall and others, of West Warren, Mass., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE: Petition of citizens of Maryland and others, favoring repeal of the seamen's law; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of sundry citizens of Sigourney, Iowa, against press-muzzle bills of every description; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROWE: Petition of proprietors of Ritz-Carlton Hotel, of New York City, against curtailing mail deliveries in business section of New York; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Central Labor Union of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 6871, relative to convict labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of United Textile Workers of America, favoring passage of House bill 6871, for regulation of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Cigarmakers' Progressive International Union, No. 149, relative to congress of neutral nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Men's Class of Central Presbyterian Church, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of the Smith-Hughes motion-picture commission bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petitions of sundry citizens of Albany, N. Y., favoring censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 10372, to remove the charge of cowardice against John McNeil; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of Hunter Jones, of Asbury Park, N. J., in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, letter from Isaac Stern, favoring embargo on shipment of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Travelers' Protective Association of America, in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of New York Zoological Society, of New York City, indorsing the plan for game sanctuaries in national forests; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Petition of Public Interests League, Women's Antisuffrage Association, Massachusetts, favoring new immigration station at Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolution of the New York Zoological Society, of New York, favoring national bird preserves; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of Albion City Federation of Women's Clubs, of Albion; and Michigan State Federation of Women's Clubs, of Adrian; and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Albion, in favor of Keating child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, protest of Triangle-Film Corporation, New York City, against Hughes-Smith Federal motion-picture censorship bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions of Evans & Gishling, Rome, N. Y., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Utica-Willowvale Bleaching Co., the Sauquoit Spinning Co., and the Fort Schuyler Knitting Co., and Foster Bros., of Utica, N. Y., for a tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of First Congregational Church, 300 people; Methodist Episcopal Church, 600 people; and Baptist Church, all of Fruita, Colo.; to the Com-

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Meriden Young Men's Christian Association, favoring legislation to prohibit the sale and mittee on the Judiciary.
manufacture of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of 1,710 people of Boulder, Colo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARD: Petitions of sundry citizens of Hudson, N. Y., favoring censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petitions of International Union and United Brewery Workmen of America and the Central Labor Union, Hudson, N. Y., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry retail liquor dealers of the State of New York, against increase of tax on beer, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry merchants of Des Moines, Iowa, favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *February 3, 1916.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pray Thee to keep us this day from sin. Thou art the God of all power. Thou art the God of grace as well. In the great conflict of life, the stage upon which Thou dost enable us to develop our mental and moral power, we pray that we may have regard for the development of our spiritual life as well, that we may not sin against God. Give to us victory over ourselves that our lives may be open in Thy sight and may be approved of Thee. Guide us this day in the discharge of the duties that are upon us. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, January 31, 1916, when, on request of Mr. VARDAMAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION OF GASOLINE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair presents a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting, in response to Senate resolution No. 40, certain information as to the production, consumption, and price of gasoline. It is in response to a resolution submitted by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER]. The Chair does not know to what committee the communication should be referred.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Unless there is some other suggestion made, I suggest that the communication lie on the table temporarily until the Senator from North Dakota arrives.

Mr. GALLINGER. And that it be printed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Let it be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair finds that the communication is accompanied by illustrations, and it will be referred to the Committee on Printing for action.

ARMY DREDGES "ATLANTIC" AND "RARITAN."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, referring to his letter of December 21, 1915, inviting attention to the lack of sufficient water in the ship canals leading to the navy yard, Brooklyn, and conveying the information that the large Army dredges *Atlantic* and *Raritan* are now laid up at the navy yard, New York, on account of lack of funds to proceed with further work, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes:

John F. Fee *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 306);
Thomas Woods *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 305);
Chris C. Lennet *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 304);
Charles H. Rankins *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 303);
William T. Dwyer *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 302);
Edward G. Grossman *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 301);
James S. Page *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 300);
Wallace N. Evans *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 299);
Walter P. Noonan *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 298);
William Edwards *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 297);
Alfred J. Leigh *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 296);
Henry W. Sims *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 295); and
Henry C. Brock *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 294).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of the German American Alliance, of New Haven, Conn., remonstrating against the seizures of American mail and the suppression of American trade by the British Government, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. THOMPSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Sabetha, Arcadia, Longton, and Morrill, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against a stamp tax on bank checks, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Buffville, Kans., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Natoma, Kans., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine (for Mr. BURLEIGH) presented a petition of sundry citizens of Houlton, Me., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented petitions of sundry citizens of Texas, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the labor council of Houston, Tex., praying for the printing of the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations, which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. SAULSBURY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lewes, Del., praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the Lighthouse Service, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Jamestown, Irwin, Newtown, Warren, Waynesboro, and New Oxford, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of the local unions of the Internation Union of the United Brewery Workmen of America, in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Farrell and New Castle, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of American Council, No. 47, Daughters of Liberty, of Chester, Pa., and a petition of Council No. 37, Daughters of Liberty, of Marshallton, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the Society of Friends, of Concordville, Pa., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hampton, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide shorter rural-delivery mail routes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. HARDING presented memorials of sundry citizens of Ohio, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PHELAN presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Fresno, Cal., remonstrating against the seizure of California fruits destined for delivery to neutral countries, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Medical Association of Oakland, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the Medical Corps of the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Granite Falls, Lake Crystal, Preston, and Blackduck, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Brainerd, Minn., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Crookston, Minn., remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota presented a memorial of the Commercial Club of Huron, S. Dak., remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution of the Dakota Conference of the German Baptist Churches of North America, held at Emery, S. Dak., favoring the placing of an embargo on munitions of war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the memorial of Levi McGee, of Rapid City, S. Dak., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Huron, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to relieve the congested condition of freight on the eastern seaboard, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. KERN presented a petition of the Columbia Enameling & Stamping Co., of Terre Haute, Ind., praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Muncie, Indianapolis, and Westfield, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Elkhart, Ind., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 209, International Union of United Brewery Workers, of Richmond, Ind., remonstrating against national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DU PONT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Georgetown, Del., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LIPPITT presented a petition of the Rhode Island Citizens' Historical Association, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CURTIS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the inspection, grading, and weighing of interstate shipments of grain and hay, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Anderson County, Thomas County, and Sherman County, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Franklin County, Kans., remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kansas, praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the German-American Alliance, of Leavenworth, Kans., praying for the placing of an embargo on munitions of war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club, of Topeka, Kans., praying for a readjustment of the compensation allowed railroads for carrying the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a petition of 2,000 citizens of Kokomo, Ind., and a petition of 240 citizens of Elkhart, Ind., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Afton, N. Y., and a petition of sundry citizens of Hudson, N. Y., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Standard Furniture Co., of Herkimer, N. Y., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maryland, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Cumberland, Md., praying for the creation of a system of rural credits, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the District of Columbia, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SAULSBURY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 4014) to supplement existing legislation relative to the United States Court for China and to

increase the serviceability thereof, reported it without amendments and submitted a report (No. 101) thereon.

Mr. O'GORMAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3606) for the relief of the contributors of the Ellen M. Stone ransom fund, asked to be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, which was agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 649) making appropriation for expenses incurred under the treaty of Washington, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 102) thereon.

Mr. HITCHCOCK, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 3680) to authorize the payment of indemnities to the Governments of Austria-Hungary, Greece, and Turkey for injuries inflicted on their nationals during riots occurring in South Omaha, Nebr., February 21, 1909, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 103) thereon.

Mr. CLAPP, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 138) for the relief of the Ottawa Indian Tribe of Blanchard Fork and Rouch de Boeuf, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 104) thereon.

ADJOURNMENT OF DAILY SESSIONS.

Mr. OVERMAN. I report back from the Committee on Rules Senate resolution 88 with a substitute therefor, and recommend that the substitute be passed. I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the substitute was read and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That so much of the order of December 6, 1915, as fixes the hour of 5 o'clock p. m. as the time of adjournment be, and the same is hereby, abrogated.

COL. JAMES JACKSON.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Military Affairs the bill (S. 1162) to place certain officers of the Army on the retired list, and I submit a report (No. 100) thereon. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon asks for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. JONES. I suggest that the bill be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and place him on the retired list of the Army with the rank and retired pay of brigadier general, any colonel now on the retired list of the Army who served with credit as an enlisted man and officer of the Regular Army of the United States during the Civil War, who has been brevetted captain, major, and lieutenant colonel, respectively, for gallant services in battles in the Civil War and in actions against Indians, who has been awarded the congressional medal of honor for most distinguished gallantry in action against Indians, and who is now and has been since early in 1904 on active duty.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I state in reference to the bill that it applies only to one officer in the United States Army. He is now past 82 years of age, and from the date of his retirement until now he has been doing and is still doing active service in connection wth the Oregon National Guard. He has rendered most efficient service in that respect, as his record discloses he rendered in the Civil War. I have a letter from the War Department reciting the record that this officer has made. In addition to that, Mr. President, I desire to say that he lost an only son about a year ago, a captain in the Army, who was killed in the line of his duty. It has been a great shock to him, and in the very nature of things he can not be with us very long. He is past 82 years old and is still, as I said, engaged in the active service of his country.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator object to giving the name of the officer to whom the bill refers?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Col. James Jackson, now detailed with the Oregon National Guard.

Mr. SMOOT. I think when we pass such legislation the name of the particular officer should be given rather than to state that a certain officer should be retired, as is done in the bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a letter from the Secretary of War which is made a part of the report, and I will ask that it go into the RECORD to show that Col. Jackson is the only officer to whom the bill can apply.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 5, 1916.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
United States Senate.

SIR: I am in receipt of request that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs be furnished with any information relative to Senate bill 1162 in possession of the War Department.

It is believed that Col. James Jackson, United States Army, retired, is the only officer who has the qualifications necessary to comply with the requirements of the bill. Col. Jackson's military history is as follows:

He served as an enlisted man in the Twelfth Infantry from November 8, 1861, to April 28, 1863, when appointed second lieutenant in the same regiment. He was promoted to be first lieutenant, August 3, 1863; captain, February 17, 1868; major, January 23, 1889; and lieutenant colonel, June 19, 1897. He was retired from active service as lieutenant colonel November 21, 1897, by operation of law, having reached the age of 64 years. He was advanced to the rank of colonel on the retired list under the act of April 23, 1904, by reason of Civil War service. He was breveted captain August 1, 1864, and major August 18, 1964, for gallant services in the battles of North Anna River and Weldon Railroad, Virginia, respectively, and lieutenant colonel February 27, 1890, for gallant and meritorious services in actions against Indians. He was awarded a medal of honor on April 17, 1896, for most distinguished gallantry in action against hostile Nez Perce Indians at Camas Meadows, Idaho, August 20, 1877.

He was detailed for duty with the Oregon Militia in May, 1904, as a retired officer, and has since then remained on this duty.

Very respectfully,

LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. BRYAN. May I ask the Senator from Oregon to substitute for the bill reported a bill to authorize the President to place this officer on the retired list and to give him this rank? In that form I shall not object to the present consideration of the bill at this time nor to the bill whenever it shall come up, but I do object to the present consideration of a bill using a lot of general language when designed only for the benefit of one officer.

I do this for the reason that it will set a bad precedent. There may be some officers entitled to this unusual distinction; but every officer, whether he comes within the terms of the act or not, will apply for general legislation that would be beneficial to him in a manner similar to this, if not the same that is covered by the general language of the bill as reported by the committee.

I shall therefore object to the consideration of the bill unless the Senator will submit a substitute for the bill as reported providing that this officer shall be given the benefit of this legislation. If that is done, I shall not object.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator will notice the bill, it really does limit the promotion, because it mentions particularly the service of this officer. The letter from the Secretary of War, which is a part of this report, will show that to be the case.

Mr. BRYAN. The evil of this kind of legislation was illustrated by a provision in the naval appropriation act last year. There was language covering two or three pages so drawn as to care for one particular individual. It could not apply to anyone else. I can not see the sense in using a lot of words to accomplish a purpose in a bill that appears to be general, instead of saying directly and specifically and positively and definitely exactly what we mean to do.

In addition to that, as is suggested to me by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], if we desire to give special honor to this officer, it comes with better grace to name him and say he is the man we mean rather than to have general legislation, which will be used as a precedent because obviously, according to its language, it is meant to apply generally.

If I had the name of the officer and knew the exact language to use in order to carry out the purpose, I would move a substitute, giving his name and making him a brigadier general on the retired list.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I withdraw the request and ask that the bill go to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES—COUNTING A QUORUM.

Mr. NELSON. For the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] I report favorably with an amendment, from the Committee on Rules, Senate resolution No. 7, providing that any Senator upon his own request may be recorded and counted as present in order to constitute a quorum.

Mr. O'GORMAN subsequently said: A moment since the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] reported a resolution from the Committee on Rules. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolutjon submitted by Mr. WILLIAMS December 7, 1915, and referred to the Committee on Rules, as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of the Senate be amended as follows: In Rule XII, clause 1, after the words "by the Senate," there shall be inserted the following: "and any Senator may arise and declare that he is paired and how he would vote if not paired, and may add that being present he desires to be so recorded, in order to constitute a quo-

rum; whereupon he shall be so recorded and his presence as a part of the quorum announced by the Chair."

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go to the calendar.

REPORTS OF ALASKAN ENGINEERING COMMISSION.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred House concurrent resolution No. 11, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, in two volumes, for the period from March 12, 1914, to December 31, 1915, inclusive, together with accompanying maps, charts, and profiles, be printed as a House document, and that 6,000 additional copies be printed, of which 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 1,500 copies for the use of the Senate, and 1,500 copies for the use of the commission.

SPECIAL REPORT ON DISEASES OF THE HORSE.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred House concurrent resolution No. 13, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse, the same to be first revised and brought to date under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture; 70,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 30,000 for the use of the Senate.

SPECIAL REPORT ON DISEASES OF CATTLE.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred House concurrent resolution No. 14, reported it favorably without amendment and it was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle, the same to be first revised and brought to date under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, 70,000 copies for use of the House of Representatives and 30,000 copies for use of the Senate.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I notice that reports were made from the Committee on Printing just a moment ago authorizing the printing of 100,000 copies of various worthy publications, and I want to address a question to the chairman of the Committee on Printing [Mr. FLETCHER]. On the 7th of December I introduced a resolution proposing to print 100,000 copies of the final report of the Commission on Industrial Relations. I receive every day requests for copies of that report. I have only one copy. I am certain that every other Senator has received requests for copies, and I should like to ask the Senator from Florida, the chairman of the Committee on Printing, what progress is being made in reference thereto?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will state, Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's inquiry, that the resolution submitted by the Senator called for the printing of the report to which he has referred. A resolution has passed the House, has come to the Senate, and has been referred to the Committee on Printing, calling for the printing of this report. Other resolutions have been submitted calling for the printing of the testimony. We have been considering all these resolutions, but upon investigation we find that the report as submitted by the commission is in the shape of three dry-goods boxes full of material. It has been very difficult to separate the real testimony from certain exhibits, which are regarded perhaps by the commission itself as not a part of the testimony. The committee has been laboring somewhat under the disadvantage of not knowing precisely what was desired to have printed, either by the commission or by the various Members who have submitted resolutions here and in the other body. We shall, however, hold a meeting of the committee on Saturday night. We shall probably then determine the matter and be able to report either in favor of printing the report itself or of printing the report with the testimony, or of printing the report with the testimony confined to certain matter which would not include the exhibits, in the nature of books and publications which have already been printed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to say to the chairman of the Committee on Printing that I have received a great many requests for the report, but have received no request for the testimony. The requests which have come to me have indicated that what is desired is a large number of copies of the report. That would be much less expensive than to undertake to print the testimony; and as that seems to be what is desired, I urge the printing of a large number of copies of the report itself.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think there is no disposition at all, I may say, on the part of any member of the committee not to have the report printed; there is, on the contrary, a desire to have printed all that may be wanted, including the testimony, or such portions of it as would not include books already published.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator from Florida that I have had requests similar to those received by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST]. I do not think anybody wants the testimony, but there is almost a universal demand throughout the United States, if I may take the requests that I have received from Mississippi as an index, for this report. I should like very much if the committee would have the report printed in sufficient numbers to meet the demand.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think beyond any doubt the resolution covering the printing of the report will be favorably acted on; but there are other resolutions calling for the printing of the testimony, which, of course, the committee has been obliged to consider.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. Can the Senator state approximately the amount of matter that would be comprised in the publication if it embraced the entire testimony, together with the exhibits?

Mr. FLETCHER. If it embraced the entire testimony with the exhibits there would be 12 or 14 volumes, and perhaps more.

Mr. ROBINSON. Is the committee making the investigation for the purpose of determining whether or not it is necessary or advisable to print all of that testimony?

Mr. FLETCHER. The committee has been looking into that question with the assistance of the secretary of the commission.

Mr. ROBINSON. I myself have received a great many requests for copies of this report. I do not know whether the requests contemplated copies of the testimony taken by the commission.

Mr. FLETCHER. The commission itself has asked for the printing of a portion of the testimony, but omitting certain exhibits. The committee does not desire to be put in the position of editing the commission's report or excluding any portion of it. At the same time, certain of the exhibits are published books, whole volumes, and it seems to us they can be referred to as, say, "See Exhibit No. so and so," or "See book of such and such a title, published at such and such time," and so forth, without reprinting the book.

Mr. ROBINSON. Does the commission insist upon the reprinting of those books which have been incorporated as exhibits?

Mr. FLETCHER. Apparently that is one difficulty we are having, as to whether the matter reported is an exhibit which has to be reprinted or can be simply referred to. In that case the whole thing would have to be edited.

Mr. ROBINSON. Has an estimate been made as to the cost of printing?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; we have had estimates made. I have not the figures with me right now, but I will say that to print the entire report, including the testimony and all these exhibits, would run into a tremendous sum, exceeding $100,000, I think.

Mr. ROBINSON. What would it cost to print the report proper without the testimony?

Mr. FLETCHER. To print the report itself, without the testimony, would cost $7,847.75, embracing 320 pages and furnishing 100,000 copies.

Mr. ROBINSON. The committee has not yet reached the conclusion, then, as to whether or not the whole matter is to be published and printed?

Mr. FLETCHER. Not precisely. We shall determine that at our next meeting, and I think will be able to report by Monday.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. May I ask the Senator from Florida a question?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Did the Senator from Florida say that the Committee on Printing was considering the advisability of printing a part of the testimony?

Mr. FLETCHER. That involves a question of determining what is the testimony. For instance, the testimony may be held, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, as including exhibits.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Assuming that the testimony means what the witnesses said before the Industrial Commission, irre-

spective of the exhibits to which they referred, is the Committee on Printing proposing to print the testimony that was taken before the Industrial Commission?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is one thing the committee is considering; yes. The committee desires to print the testimony without any elimination. The only point is as to printing the testimony instead of printing the exhibits. There are certain volumes, certain published books, which are called exhibits, which the committee feels need not be printed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understand that. Of course, if I may express an opinion, I should say that it would be absurd to print the exhibits to which witnesses may have referred, and which consist of books, documents, and so forth, that are already in print. I wanted to know whether the committee was really considering the printing of the testimony of the witnesses before the Industrial Commission.

Mr. FLETCHER. The committee is considering that, and one of the resolutions involves that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. But the committee has not yet been able to decide what constitutes the testimony, as I understand the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the case.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Therefore, of course, no estimate has been made as to what would be the cost of printing the testimony?

Mr. FLETCHER. We have estimates as to that also, but the estimates are based upon the printing of the exhibits as well as the testimony; so that the matter is in a rather indefinite shape on that account at present.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Could the Senator, without violating any confidence or committee secrets, advise the Senate what the estimate was as to the printing of the testimony and of the exhibits?

Mr. SMOOT. Two hundred and twenty thousand dollars.

Mr. FLETCHER. One estimate we had, taking in all the data that was submitted, called for an expenditure of about $220,000.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Only $220,000?

Mr. FLETCHER. I believe that was the figure.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Is that the lowest estimate?

Mr. FLETCHER. That would include the exhibits as well.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is one estimate?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Was there any lower estimate than that?

Mr. FLETCHER. If we eliminate the exhibits that are already in print, as the Senator has suggested, that amount will be very materially reduced, of course.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee, perhaps, has not stated as explicitly as he might have done that the members of the late Industrial Relations Commission, or whatever the title of the commission was, have not asked the committee to print the exhibits. On the contrary, they have suggested to the committee that, in their judgment, it was not necessary to print them. There are two or three great dry goods boxes full of books which have been put in as exhibits, and, as the Senator from Connecticut has said, it would look rather absurd to undertake to print those books at the expense of the Government, they being already in print. As I understood, the contention of the members of the commission who appeared before the Printing Committee was that they wanted the final report printed and the actual testimony, the words spoken by the witnesses, but that they would not insist upon the printing of the exhibits. I will ask the Senator if that was not their position?

Mr. FLETCHER. That was their position, I think. As I understand, the Senator states that quite correctly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. This is all out of order, Mr. President, but I will not make the point.

Mr. BORAH. In view of the suggestion made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], I ask has there been any estimate made as to the cost of printing the testimony and the report after the elimination of the matter to which he has referred?

Mr. FLETCHER. That estimate is being looked into now. We will have that estimate by Saturday night. I do not think it has been definitely reported upon.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Florida how many copies are to be printed under the estimate just stated by the Senator?

Mr. FLETCHER. The estimate as to the cost of printing the report is based upon a hundred thousand copies.

Mr. CUMMINS. Including the testimony?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the report itself. We have not yet obtained a definite estimate as to the cost of printing the testimony, and the number of copies of that we have not yet determined upon.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator think that the printing of the report would be of any great value unless the testimony were printed, so that opportunity might be given to weigh the soundness of the report?

Mr. FLETCHER. I would say that, personally, so far as I am concerned, I would be in favor of printing the testimony and referring in the print to the exhibits without reprinting the exhibits; but the general view seems to be that perhaps the report is all that would likely be read extensively, and that it would probably serve all the purposes of everyone in connection with that work. That is evidenced by the fact that the other body, the House of Representatives, has passed a resolution to print the report, but has said nothing about the testimony. So that I can answer the Senator upon that point by saying that it is quite clearly in the mind of a number of people and of the other body that the printing of the report is all that is required.

Mr. CUMMINS. It seems to me that, if the investigation was warranted at all, those interested in the matter would a great deal rather see the testimony than the report.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the disposition of the committee is to print the testimony, eliminating what might be called a part of it, namely, the exhibits that are already in print.

ANSHE CHESED CONGREGATION, VICKSBURG, MISS.

Mr. THOMPSON. From the Committee on Public Lands, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 4954) directing the Secretary of War to reconvey a parcel of land to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss., and I submit a report (No. 105) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] to the bill.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill. It will take but a moment to consider it. The Anshe Chesed Congregation of Vicksburg deeded to the Vicksburg National Park 19 acres of land in 1900. It was thought at that time that it would not be needed for cemetery purposes, but since then the Jewish cemetery there has about filled up, and they are asking that the Secretary of War be permitted to deed back to the congregation an acre and a half of this land. The bill has been approved by the Secretary of War and by the president of the Vicksburg National Park Commission. The bill really ought to be passed, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas when the Public Lands Committee passed upon this bill?

Mr. VARDAMAN. It was reported just a moment ago.

Mr. THOMPSON. My recollection is that the committee passed on the bill either yesterday or the day before.

Mr. SMOOT. The Committee on Public Lands have authorized the report of the bill?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMOOT. It must have been at a time when I stepped out of the committee room.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not remember whether the Senator from Utah was present or not. It is a unanimous report, however.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to convey by deed to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss., a small tract of land for cemetery purposes, which land is now part of the Vicksburg National Military Park, and more particularly described by metes and bounds as follows:

Commencing at the southeast corner of a tract of land as described in deed book C C, page 611, in chancery clerk's office, Warren County, Miss.; thence with an astronomical azimuth 100° and 40′ 992 feet to a stone post; then 209° and 10′ 509 feet to a stone post; thence 225° and 55′ 461 feet to a stone post; thence 220° and 50′ 398 feet to a stone post on the south side of the Baldwins Ferry road; thence 296° and 10′ 198 feet; thence 355° and 10′ 105 feet; thence 23° and 15′ 178 feet to the point of beginning.

Thence with an astronomical azimuth 0° and 15′ 534 feet; thence 270° and 15′ 318½ feet; thence 132° and 5′ 251 feet; thence 171° and 20′ 259 feet; thence 134° and 25′ 143 feet to the point of beginning; containing 1.64 acres, more or less, and being part of section 21, township 16, range 4 east: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States in carrying out the provisions of this act.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 4158) granting a pension to Fleming R. Moodie (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SAULSBURY:

A bill (S. 4159) for the relief of the United States Drainage & Irrigation Co.; and

A bill (S. 4160) for the relief of Edward H. Dennison; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4161) granting a pension to Martha Jefferson Crowley;

A bill (S. 4162) granting an increase of pension to John E. Louer;

A bill (S. 4163) granting a pension to Hanna E. Burton;

A bill (S. 4164) granting a pension to Hester Jarman;

A bill (S. 4165) granting a pension to Mary Jane Stewart;

A bill (S. 4166) granting an increase of pension to William H. White;

A bill (S. 4167) granting an increase of pension to David A. Conner;

A bill (S. 4168) granting an increase of pension to Anna L. Cooper;

A bill (S. 4169) granting an increase of pension to Edward P. Payne;

A bill (S. 4170) granting an increase of pension to John R. Megee; and

A bill (S. 4171) granting a pension to Mary Ella McManus; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 4172) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Alphonse Desmare, deceased, and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 4173) granting an increase of pension to Eva Helena Patten; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 4174) authorizing the construction and equipment of an ammunition manufacturing plant at the United States arsenal at Benicia, Cal.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4175) to readjust railway mail pay based on an annual weighing of mail and on space occupied in mail apartment cars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 4176) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain provisions for the care of Federal and Confederate veteran soldiers who served in the War between the States, 1861 to 1865, to enable them to unite in participation of a national reunion and peace jubilee to commemorate the victories and virtues resulting in the half century of peace and prosperity to the American Nation, to be held in the national domain within the Vicksburg National Military Park October 16, 17, 18, and 19, 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 4177) to amend section 8657 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (35 Stat., 65), being act of April 22, 1908, chapter 149, section 1; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 4178) granting an increase of pension to Job D. Marshall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 4179) granting a pension to Martha Hellen Sture (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LIPPITT:

A bill (S. 4180) to correct the military record of Winfield S. Solomon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4181) granting an increase of pension to Mary Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 4182) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Cleavinger (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 4183) granting a pension to Oliver Bryant (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 4184) granting a pension to Maggie Barron;

A bill (S. 4185) granting a pension to Mary Walls;

A bill (S. 4186) granting a pension to Arthur Leland (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4187) granting a pension to William H. Jones (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAGE:

A bill (S. 4188) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Raymond (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 4189) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Charles H. Whipple (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

A bill (S. 4190) authorizing the Yankton County Bridge Co., a corporation, to construct and maintain a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at a point between Yankton County, S. Dak., and Cedar County, Nebr.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 4191) granting an increase of pension to Adonirum C. Harper (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4192) granting an increase of pension to Parley B. West (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4193) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Campman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 4194) for the relief of the Columbia Finance & Trust Co., of Louisville, Ky., and others (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4195) granting an increase of pension to Ella L. Collett (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4196) granting an increase of pension to David Bethurum (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4197) granting a pension to Burnie M. Rogers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 4198) for the relief of the heirs of Henry B. Strevig, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 4199) granting a pension to Ellen Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 4200) granting relief to persons who served in the Military Telegraph Corps of the Army during the Civil War; and

A bill (S. 4201) for the relief of George Fling (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4202) granting a pension to P. H. Dennison (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4203) granting an increase of pension to James W. Mefford (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4204) granting an increase of pension to William Burgess (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4205) granting an increase of pension to Fernandes Sleeth (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4206) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Sherwood (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4207) granting an increase of pension to Lemon M. Stratton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4208) granting an increase of pension to John A. Fike (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4209) granting an increase of pension to Richard Hardesty (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4210) granting an increase of pension to William H. Blackwell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 4211) for the relief of James L. Wallace, his heirs or assigns (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

A bill (S. 4212) for the relief of W. E. Thomas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4213) granting a pension to Thomas Jefferson Rothgeb (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4214) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton Rogers (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4215) granting an increase of pension to James K. Clear (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4216) granting a pension to Daniel Dye (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4217) granting a pension to Perry Abbott (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4218) granting an increase of pension to Martin Parker (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4219) granting a pension to Zilpha Ann Bush (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4220) granting an increase of pension to Shirley M. Nichols (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4221) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Rowland (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4222) granting an increase of pension to Elcazar L. Miner (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4223) granting a pension to Jennie L. Luppie (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4224) granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. Wood (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4225) granting an increase of pension to John P. Ham (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4226) granting an increase of pension to William H. Harris (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4227) granting an increase of pension to William C. Campbell (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4228) granting an increase of pension to Harry D. Cessna (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 4230) authorizing the St. Croix Water Power Co., of Maine, and the Sprague Falls Manufacturing Co. (Ltd.), of Canada, to operate a dam across the St. Croix River at Baileyville, Me. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 4231) granting a pension to Leforest A. Norton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4232) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Cole (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4233) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Low (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4234) granting an increase of pension to Frank Seavey (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4235) granting a pension to Horace A. Gerald (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4236) granting an increase of pension to Edwin E. Lewis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4237) granting an increase of pension to Charles Harris (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4238) granting a pension to Joseph H. Cote (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine (for Mr. BURLEIGH):

A bill (S. 4239) granting an increase of pension to David F. Pierce; and

A bill (S. 4240) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Stevens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 4241) granting an increase of pension to Louis Badger (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4242) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Miller (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 4243) granting an honorable discharge to William H. Wyman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4244) granting a pension to Thomas J. Boice (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEWLANDS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 96) relating to the removal of the Botanic Garden; to the Committee on the Library.

MILITARY TRAINING.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I introduce a bill to encourage military training. The bill is quite an important measure, which I desire to go to the committee at once, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 4229) to encourage military training was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the 1st day of January, A. D. 1917, no person then under the age of 40 years shall be eligible to appointment in the classified service unless prior to such time such person shall have voluntarily received, under rules and regulations made and published under authority of the Secretary of War, such military training for a period of at least two months as shall be provided for in such rules and regulations. No person shall, after such regulations shall have been published 60 days, be eligible to appointment to the classified service who shall not have become enrolled under said regulations as prepared to take the training thereby prescribed and have agreed to take such training regularly, and, so far as time has permitted, have fulfilled such agreement and complied with such regulations.

SEC. 2. That no one shall hereafter, after such rules and regulations have been published, be examined for appointment in the classified service who shall not have become enrolled as aforesaid, have agreed to take the training provided under such rules and regulations, and have fulfilled such agreement so far as the intervening time between enrollment under such regulations and date of any examination has permitted; and from and after the 1st day of January, A. D. 1919, no person under the age of 43 years shall be permitted to take an examination for appointment to the classified service or to remain in said service unless such person shall under said regulations have received the training thereby prescribed for military service or its equivalent.

SEC. 3. That no one shall be permitted or qualified to appear as attorney or solicitor in any court of the United States unless for at least one month in each year for and during four years hereafter, or until he shall reach the age of 45 years, he shall have received the military training provided for by such regulations.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to prepare and publish regulations enabling persons, under the provisions thereof, to become enrolled for and receive the training prescribed under such regulations; for issuing to such persons certificates that such duty has been duly performed; for excusing persons physically or mentally unfit for such training from taking the same; for substituting in case of women, training for hospital or similar service in lieu of such military training; and providing that those members of the Society of Friends, commonly called Quakers, conscientiously opposed to performing military service which may involve the taking of human life, may in lieu of military training, under such regulations, take such training useful to the Nation in time of war as shall be, by said regulations, prescribed as the useful equivalent thereof.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $650,000 for the purchase of all land on Cushing Island, Portland Harbor, Me., not at present owned in part by the Government, intended to be proposed by him to the fortifications appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $1,000 for the improvement of Madison Street from Fourteenth Street to Colorado Avenue NW., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

THE JUDICIAL CODE.

Mr. COLT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1412) further to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. RANSDELL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 91), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress, to hold hearings on S. 4086, a bill to provide for the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy and to prevent the spread of leprosy in the United States; to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to pay the expenses of witnesses under limitations provided by law, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY.

Mr. NEWLANDS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 89), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Library, or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. NEWLANDS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 90), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I move the reference of Senate joint resolution 91, now on the table, creating a joint subcommittee of the Military and Naval Committees of the Senate and House to investigate national defense, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

THE EUROPEAN WAR.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, it is not very often that I ask to have anything inserted in the RECORD, but I hold in my hand a statement from the Washington Post of January 30. It is not an

editorial. It is a compilation of the figures, according to the best estimates, of the indebtedness incurred and loss in life and disability in the European war. I ask to have it inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-SEVEN BILLION SIXTY-ONE MILLION DOLLARS IS SPENT IN 18 MONTHS OF WAR; NO DECISIVE BLOW YET—LOSSES IN KILLED, WOUNDED AND PRISONERS SINCE STRUGGLE BEGAN ARE MORE THAN 15,000,000—BANKRUPTCY MENACES GREAT NATIONS ENGAGED IN TERRIBLE STRUGGLE, IN WHICH NEITHER SIDE HAS BEEN ABLE TO GAIN AN ADVANTAGE—TWO BATTLE LINES, 1,950 MILES LONG, ARE DEADLOCKED AT EVERY POINT, WITH BELLIGERENT COUNTRIES BLEEDING TO DEATH—ALLIES AND GERMANS, CONFIDENT OF RESULT, REFUSE TO CONSIDER PEACE.

The European war will have lasted 18 months to-morrow—the blackest 18 months known to the modern world.

What has been accomplished?

No European country has been benefited, nor has human liberty advanced at any point, nor has any great moral principle triumphed in any place or on any battlefield.

The net result has been 2,990,000 men in the very prime of life killed, more than 2,200,000 made prisoners, and more than 9,830,000 wounded and maimed, many crippled for life.

BLOODSHED THE HEAVIEST TOLL.

This measureless bloodshed and suffering, making millions widows and many more millions orphans, has been the heaviest toll of the war.

Next the money loss—$10,862,000,000 borrowed for war by Germany, Austria, and Hungary; $16,199,000,000 borrowed for war by France, England, Russia, and Italy; a grand total of $27,061,000,000 spent in making war.

WASTE OF MONEY STUPENDOUS.

The mind can not grasp such stupendous figures or such wastage. It means twenty-seven times the total national debt of the United States, incurred in 139 years of history, including five wars.

It means a sum equal to the entire savings or increase in capital of the entire world for 10 years.

It means a debt of about $360 for every family in all belligerent countries—more than the total income of a year of every European peasant family or unskilled laborer in Europe.

It means tax burdens for this generation and for generations yet unborn that will make the burdens of life greater than ever before for all.

ECONOMIC CRASH AT HAND.

In short, as Mr. Diamant, the expert in foreign exchange, wrote last week, bankruptcy is so menacing in all the warring countries that "if political economy does not soon make an end of the war the war will make an end of political economy."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have here an address delivered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] before the Kansas Society of New York City, at the Kansas birthday banquet given on Saturday evening, January 29, 1916. It is a very able address, and I ask that it be incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I could not hear a word the Senator from Texas said, and I should like to have him repeat the request.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I submitted a copy of an address delivered by the Senator from Kansas last Saturday night before the Kansas Society, of New York City.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator ask that it be printed in the RECORD or printed as a public document?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that it be published in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The address referred to is as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR WILLIAM H. THOMPSON BEFORE THE KANSAS SOCIETY, OF NEW YORK CITY, AT THE KANSAS BIRTHDAY BANQUET GIVEN AT THE WALDORF-ASTORIA, SATURDAY EVENING, JANUARY 29, 1916.

"THE ECONOMIC VALUE OF PROHIBITION."

It is a great pleasure to see so many old Kansans here. It is a high honor to address the Kansas Society of New York City. January 29 is an important date to all Kansans. It marks an important time in my life, because on this day three years ago I was elected to the United States Senate by the Kansas Legislature. It is the birthday of Kansas. Our State is 55 years old—only an infant as time is computed in the life of a State or Nation. Fifty-five years ago to-day the "ship of State" was launched, and Kansas's star first appeared in the far West, announcing to the world the birth of a new State to add new life and power to the greatest Republic on earth. With all her thrilling and glorious history, all her failures and successes, that star still shines and has become the brightest in the constellation of States. The late Eugene F. Ware, Kansas's greatest poet, and who was one of her best and ablest men, in his Rhymes of Ironquill, said:

Of all the States, but three will live in story:
Old Massachusetts with her Plymouth Rock,
And old Virginia with her noble stock,
And sunny Kansas with her woes and glory.

The love of an American citizen for his native State is second only to his love for his country. A great deal has been said during these turbulent times about the lack of patriotism in America, with which I do not agree. I still believe that the American people, individually or collectively, are the most patriotic people in the world. If it should ever come to a test it would soon be so demonstrated beyond all question of doubt in the minds of the most skeptical. While I know you have great love for your adopted State—New York—yet I am sure you still appreciate the feeling of the fellow who attended a revival meeting in Kansas, and who, when the evangelist got to that part of his sermon where he asked all who desired to go to heaven to stand up, was the only man to remain seated. The evangelist inquired, "What is the matter with you; why don't you want to go to heaven?" He replied, "Kansas is good enough for me."

The subject to which I have been assigned, "The economic value of prohibition," reduced to common everyday English—the language Kansans delight to speak—presents the simple question, Does prohibition in Kansas pay? Unfortunately, the value of most everything nowadays is measured by dollars and cents. If it pays, it is usually pronounced a good thing. If it is a money loser, it is usually pronounced a bad thing. Measured by this standard prohibition is the best thing we have in Kansas. If I were asked what one law results in greatest financial returns and benefits to the people of Kansas, I would answer "the prohibitory liquor law."

The prohibitory amendment was adopted by the people in the general election of 1880. We have, therefore, had over 35 years of prohibition in Kansas. It is true we have not had complete prohibition in actual practice during all that time, for, much to our shame and chagrin, there were many years in which the law was not strenuously enforced. The saloons were closed, but there was no determined effort to do away with "blind tigers" and other liquor joints, particularly in the larger cities, until the crusade of Carrie Nation along about the year 1900. With the forcible use of her little hatchet upon bottles, mirrors, and bars, and frequently upon the head of a joint keeper, she soon made the life of the "jointist" miserable. She proclaimed the doctrine that it was not unlawful to strike down an unlawful business, even if you had to resort to unlawful means. Whatever criticism may be made of her unlawful method of destroying an unlawful business, yet her strenuous work resulted in great good by calling direct attention of the people to the open and defiant violation of the law, which they had theretofore thought impossible to remedy. The issue was at once raised as to whether these violators of the constitution and the laws of the State were greater than the State itself. This so enraged the people that they demanded action on the part of public officials who had been in the habit, more or less, of winking at the unlawful business, and soon thereafter the liquor laws were enforced everywhere. For the last 10 or 12 years, even in the larger cities, there has not been a saloon, joint, blind tiger, speak-easy, drug store, or any other place generally known to the public where intoxicating liquors have been sold. We have, therefore, for the last decade had complete prohibition everywhere in the State. As we review the past it will be observed that the more strenuously we enforced the law the greater has been our prosperity.

January 1, 1916, we paid off the last dollar of indebtedness against the State. Only five other States in the Union have been financially able to do this. In 1880 when the prohibitory amendment was adopted the bonded indebtedness of the State amounted to $1,881,975. In 1903 it was still $632,000. About this time we commenced the vigorous and determined enforcement of the prohibitory law. We made the first payment of $18,000 on this principal in December, 1908, and the last payment of $159,000 on January 1, 1916. Thus in about seven years of complete prohibition we paid this entire debt.

But the payment of the State's indebtedness does not mark the greatest economic value of prohibition. We have gradually increased in material wealth upon every hand until we have become the wealthiest State in the Union per capita. We have increased in wealth in the past 10 years, during complete prohibition, at the rate of $120,000,000 per year. Our per capita wealth is $1,630, being twice that of the Nation. We have nearly $3,000,000,000 of taxable wealth, requiring only the low-tax levy of $1.25 per thousand—lower than the tax rate of any other State in the Union, except one. The State owns various public institutions valued at $21,500,000. It has a permanent school fund of $10,485,299. It has invested in its school property more than $28,000,000.

We spent last year $12,210,000 for educational purposes. We have enrolled in our colleges 27,000 students—the largest college attendance in proportion to population of any State of the Union. We point with pride to the fact that we have less than 2 per cent of illiteracy—next to the lowest of any State in the Union. Since 1880, during the 35 years of prohibition, the illiteracy of our people has been reduced from 49 per cent to less than 2 per cent.

Kansas municipal bonds are as salable as any other municipal bonds anywhere in the Union and at as low a rate of interest, and at least one-half of these bonds are now owned by Kansas people and $10,000,000 of such bonds are held by the State school funds. So if any of our friends here on Wall Street own Kansas municipal bonds and want to sell them they can easily do so at a premium at any time. They at least need not hesitate to purchase them at a reasonable rate, for they can find no better investment anywhere. The brewery interests of the country spend much time and money in endeavoring to demonstrate by the juggling of figures that Kansas is fast on the road to bankruptcy. But regardless of what they contend, when it comes to investing their own money you will find they have purchased and hold all the Kansas securities they are able to secure. They understand better than anyone else that people who do not spend their money for liquors have plenty of money to pay their debts when they become due, and that they can depend upon any obligations they make being paid.

This is not the only way in which the wealth of the State is shown, much of which results from prohibition. We have about 1,700,000 people. These people have cash on deposit in the State and National banks to the amount of about $225,000,000, being $132 in cash on hand for every man, woman, and child in the State—a greater amount per capita than can be shown by any other State in the Union.

In addition to this, we have helped build up one of the largest and most prosperous cities in the United States on our border at the mouth of the Kaw. While about one-third of this great city—Kansas City—is on the Kansas side of the line and we receive the advantage of its wealth and deposits, yet Kansas has furnished, and is now furnishing, fully 50 per cent of the banking and other business of Kansas City, Mo. Most every bank in Kansas carries a balance in Kansas City, Mo., and these deposits are added to the deposits of Missouri. If we received the benefit of the actual money belonging to the Kansas banks and Kansas people in Missouri, we could point to $500,000,000 deposits for the Sunflower State.

We have about 75,000 automobiles in the State, being 1 car to every fifth family, enough to take every man, woman, and child living in our State an auto ride of 25 miles every day in the year. We have 340,000 telephones—sufficient to supply a telephone for every family of five—the largest percentage of any State.

We have a lower death rate than any other State in the Nation. Of course, people who have more fun at a funeral than anywhere else may not think this a blessing. It is in the Two Orphans, where the boys were forbidden to go to the funeral of a neighbor whom their parents did not like, when one of them remonstrated: "Pa never did want us boys to have any fun." While some people may not think the low death rate an advantage, yet if you do not have too many enemies, it is a point worth considering.

There are no idle men in Kansas. Anybody who really wants work can always find it. There are very few farmers or merchants who really have enough help, and they are unable to get it. There is only one pauper to every 3,000 population, and there are 38 county poor farms which have no inmates, and many counties which have no poor farms at all and have no need for them. We have a half million boys and girls in the State who have never seen a saloon. I have a boy 16 and a girl 18 who had never seen a saloon until we went to Washington. What a sad commentary upon the Capital of our Nation. But this will not exist for long. The Capital of the Nation is soon to be dry, and decisive steps in that direction will be taken by the present Congress.

In addition to all this existing wealth, Kansas coins more wealth every year at the rate of about $650,000,000 from farm products and live stock. In 1915 these items aggregated $652,217,081, and our manufacturing products amounted to $325,000,000. This great production would enable our State alone to pay the entire appropriation for the Army, Navy, and coast defenses necessary for the protection of our country from war and still have plenty of money left for our people. It would, therefore, seem that if one State in the Union alone is able to pay for all the necessary preparation for defense, which we hear so much about every day, the preparedness program of President Wilson can not be regarded as unreasonable when we have the whole Nation to draw upon. If by the appropriation of an additional $75,000,000 or $100,000,000 per year for a short time now we can safely protect the honor and integrity of the Nation and insure our country against war, it will certainly be better than running the risk of war and of spending billions later on. If war should come, this country would not hesitate, and, in my judgment, would be required, to expend $100,000,000 every day the war continued. There is a great difference between preparation for defense to preserve peace and preparation for war. No sane American citizen wants war. Whatever this administration does toward preparedness will be in the interest of preserving peace.

We have in Kansas a sober, industrious, law-abiding, and patriotic people. With such a people, and health, wealth, and prosperity upon every hand, nothing but happiness can result. Kansas does not take second place to any of her sister States in happiness, prosperity, and intelligent citizenship. Kansas prosperity is not mythical; it is real. Kansas property is tangible. It is not made up simply of an aggregation or multiplication of figures and statistics, but you can put your fingers on it. The boys and girls who grow up in the Sunflower State under such moral, healthful, and physical surroundings rapidly forge to the front and outstrip their less fortunate brothers in the rough and tumble struggle of life. Pure minds, strong bodies, stout hearts, and a determination and grit that can not be subdued, tell the story. Our sons are at the top in every great city, from Chicago, in the North, to New Orleans, in the South; from San Francisco, in the West, to New York City, in the East. I congratulate you upon your preferment here.

While prohibition is not the sole cause of all these great blessings, yet it is fair to say that it has contributed largely and, I think, more than any other one factor, to bringing it about. There is one thing sure, and that is that 90 per cent of the people of Kansas are satisfied with it. At the last general election the resubmission proposition received less than 10 per cent of the votes of the people. It is a reform in Kansas that is here to stay, and is a reform gradually growing everywhere, until within another decade it will sweep the entire country, this great city of New York included.

With the millions of dollars unnecessarily expended for intoxicating liquor every year over the country devoted to useful purposes, the time will come when there will not be want anywhere, and the people now homeless and in starving and suffering condition will own their own homes and there will be plenty for everybody. Sixty-four and eight-tenths per cent of the homes owned by the people of Kansas are free from incumbrance, while in license States like New Jersey only 43.3 per cent of the homes are owned free. In a country like this, with the greatest wealth and resources of any nation in the world, there is something wrong when there is a single man, woman, or child anywhere in the land suffering for any necessity. Eradicate the liquor traffic, and you have struck down the worst evil in the country, and have taken a step that will tend more than anything else to bring about comfort, prosperity, patriotism, and happiness everywhere.

MOUNT KEARSARGE AND MOUNT PEQUAWKET, N. H. (S. DOC. NO. 307).

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed as a document the statement compiled by David M. Hildreth, topographer, Post Office Department, and member of the United States Geographic Board, being historical notes relating to the conflicting names of two mountains in the State of New Hampshire. It is a matter of consequence to the people of my State, and as the statement is brief, I ask that it be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that 1,000 additional copies of the statement be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

"BACK TO THE CONSTITUTION" (S. DOC. NO. 308).

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have an article which is a reprint from volume 3 of the Virginia Law Review, entitled "Back to the Constitution," written by Judge Walter Clark, chief justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina. I ask that it be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SUGAR STATISTICS (S. DOC. NO. 309).

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I desire to have printed as a public document a pamphlet of five and a half pages, being statistics relating to the Hawaiian sugar industry, compiled by the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPROVEMENT OF ROADS.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, if there is no other order of business, I desire to make a motion. I have been instructed by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to move that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the consideration of House bill 7617, to provide that in order to promote agriculture, afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm

products, and encourage the development of a general system of improved highways, the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall in certain cases aid the States in the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads which may be used in the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, or postal matter, and that it be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

I understand that this is rather a delicate matter; but the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads have always, so far as I know, had charge of this subject—the building, construction, and maintenance of post roads. The committee have reported one or two bills on this subject, and they feel that they ought to have charge of and the consideration of this bill. It is a very important one. It is a matter that has been recommended in our national platforms by both parties for four and eight years. It seems to me that the time has come when there ought to be some action on the subject, and that that action ought to come from the committee naturally having charge of the subject.

The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. GORE] is absent, and I understand will be away for three weeks or more. The second member of that committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], also a member of the Post Office Committee, believes that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads ought to have jurisdiction of this subject, and that they ought to be permitted, as has heretofore been the case, to consider and report a bill.

I have nothing further to say, except that I think——

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a minute?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. During the last Congress a House bill on this same subject was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; was it not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, in view of the absence of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], I believe we ought not to dispose of the matter finally to-day. I am not sure that he would object, but I think there ought to be an opportunity to communicate with him. The rule provides that the matter may go over on the request of a single Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Before objection is made, I should like to say a few words.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I will say to him that unless the Senator from Oklahoma, the chairman of the committee, has changed his mind since yesterday afternoon, he will object to it, and seriously object.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I thought it was best to allow his clerks an opportunity to communicate with him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is an objection, is there?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No; not at present. I think the Senator from Georgia desires to be heard.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two in reply to the views expressed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

We have in the Agricultural Department a Good Roads Bureau. We have in the Agricultural Department an organization devoted to the study of good roads, engaged in going out and giving aid in the construction of good roads. Any appropriations that have heretofore been made by Congress looking toward the improvement of roads have been administered under the Agricultural Department.

It is true that some of these bills have been referred heretofore to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and some of them have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which this bill has been heretofore referred, has had the bill under consideration. The committee has gone over it. It has taken up certain other bills that have been introduced upon this subject, and has been studying amendments to the House bill with a view of perfecting it. The House bill has for its title "to promote agriculture, afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm products, and encourage the development of a general system of improved highways." It provides that the Secretary of Agriculture, on the part of the United States, shall in certain cases aid the States in the construction and maintenance of the roads which may be used in the transportation, and so forth.

Mr. BRYAN. The transportation of what?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It says, "the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, and postal matters," but the Secretary of Agriculture is to administer the bill. The whole purpose of the bill is, under the Department of Agriculture, to do certain work.

So far as I am personally concerned, I do not care which committee has the bill, except that I feel that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is very favorable to some such legislation. I believe we will have a favorable report from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I know that at the last Congress we had an unfavorable report from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I wish the Senate understood the situation.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. On the contrary, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads reported a bill at the last session of Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; it reported a bill which we knew could not pass. It reported the Bourne bill, which involved an expenditure of $500,000,000—was it not—in the nature of a bond issue.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Did not that look liberal enough?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; but the bill made no progress here at all. It died as a result of the report.

I only wish the Senate to understand the status of the matter, so that when the vote is had we may vote intelligently upon the subject. If I felt confident that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads would report this House bill with proper amendments favorably, and give us an opportunity to pass it, it would be just as satisfactory to me for it to be there as with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Of course I may be mistaken. I hope, if it goes to the Post Office Committee, that a favorable report will be presented.

Mr. TOWNSEND rose.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has had the bill before it, and has been at work upon it, and the members agreed to take certain other bills and study them and bring in suggestions of amendments, and we were to hold another meeting in the near future to act on the bill. If we leave the bill before the Committee on Agriculture we may expect a speedy report favorable to the House bill with, perhaps, some amendments. I had intended to do what the Senator from Arkansas intended to do, make the point as to the time of consideration; but I will not make it until the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] makes any remarks that he wishes to make.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has disclosed the purpose which was in the view of some members of the committee in having this bill referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry instead of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. If that is a proper reference, if the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is not to have anything to do with the subject of post roads, we had better amend the title of the committee.

The Senator from Georgia says that he wants this bill to come to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry because the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is not in favor of the sort of bill he wants to have enacted.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I did not go that far. I said I feared it was not. I said I preferred to have it stay before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry because I was confident it was favorable. I would not undertake to say what the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads would do. I hope, if the bill remains there, that we will have a favorable report.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, this bill, as indicated by its title, after it gets through the compliment to the Secretary of Agriculture, states that the purpose of it is to establish roads for the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, and postal matter. In 1912, in the consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill, the Senate was called upon to consider an item which came from the House in the House bill to establish post roads. The Senate at that time was not able to agree to the plan outlined in the House bill, and instead of passing any legislation at all upon the subject this provision was inserted in the House bill and agreed to in conference:

> That a joint committee shall be appointed, composed of five Members of the Senate, to be designated by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and five Members of the House, to be designated by the chairman of the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to make inquiry into the subject of Federal aid in the construction of post roads and report—

And so forth.

In pursuance of that legislation a joint committee was created. At that time the then Senator from Oregon, Mr. Bourne, was chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. He designated the four other Members of the Senate. Likewise five Members were designated from the House. That commission of the two Houses of Congress began to investigate this subject in order to start right in lending the aid of the

Federal Government to the States in the building and maintenance of good roads.

The term of office of the Senator from Oregon expired, but because of his interest in the subject he remained at Washington through the Sixty-third Congress. Being chairman of that joint commission, he devoted much time and study to this subject; and as the result of that investigation a report was made to Congress that is conceded to be the ablest discussion of the whole subject of good roads that has ever been had.

At the last session of Congress a bill came over from the House of Representatives. It never occurred to a single individual in the Senate to move or suggest that that bill dealing with post roads should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It went, as naturally it should have gone, to the committee established for the purpose of considering post roads. Why, Mr. President, under the Constitution, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was the only committee that would naturally have a right to this bill. The Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was not in sympathy with the kind of legislation the House of Representatives wanted, and instead of reporting favorably the House bill the Senate committee substituted, with a few minor changes, the bill recommended by the joint commission appointed by Congress to investigate this subject.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, he is entirely mistaken. The joint committee never recommended the Bourne bill. In fact, it made no recommendation for any bill. As an individual report of Mr. Bourne——

Mr. BRYAN. Let us see whether it did or not, Mr. President.

Mr. SWANSON. I signed the report; the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] signed the report.

Mr. BRYAN. Senator Bourne says they did, and here is what the Senator from Virginia had to say at that time.

Mr. SWANSON. The report has been published.

Mr. BRYAN. Yes; I will read it. (Reading:)

DECEMBER 31, 1914.

Hon. JONATHAN BOURNE, Jr.,
Chairman Joint Committee on Federal Aid in the Construction of Post Roads, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: We have read the report submitted to us by you, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Federal Aid in the Construction of Post Roads, for our consideration, and we take this opportunity of expressing our approval of the report, with the exception of some parts of chapter 2.

Now, Mr. President, chapter 2 does not deal with the subject, except that in that chapter Senator Bourne proceeded to criticize the activity of some of the executive departments. That is all chapter 2 dealt with. Then this letter proceeds:

The great work you have accomplished in such short time is remarkable, and we think the committee owes you a vote of thanks for your unselfish and untiring devotion in preparing this work for the committee. It will undoubtedly be a great textbook on the subject of good roads.

We, as members of the committee, thank you and appreciate the splendid services you have rendered the committee as its chairman.

Very truly, yours,

CLAUDE A. SWANSON.
LEE S. OVERMAN.

In the body of this it says:

We take this opportunity of expressing our approval of the report, with the exception of some parts of chapter 2.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

Mr. BRYAN. Just a minute. That criticizes what Senator Bourne considered was a grasping after power by the heads of executive departments.

I do not know whether the Senator meant by that language to say he approved of the report otherwise than that, but it leads me to that conclusion.

Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads has devoted four years to a study of this subject. It is a subject that deals with post roads. It was a sharp trick to have a bill referred to a committee that was thought to be favorable to the House bill.

I will say in passing that whichever committee keeps jurisdiction of this bill, whenever it is considered in the Senate the Senate will have an opportunity and will be given the opportunity to compare the merits of the Bourne plan with the merits of this bill. This proposition——

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Did Senator Bourne in his general report recommend the passage of that bill? Does he not recommend it only as an individual?

Mr. BRYAN. He makes the report and the Senator from North Carolina agrees to his report.

Mr. OVERMAN. He made a very valuable report, all of which I agreed to with that exception, but in that report he does not, I understand, recommend the bill.

Mr. BRYAN. The bill that came from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads at the last session embodying the ideas of the bill reported by the joint commission I myself introduced at the request of the chairman of the joint commission. The committee changed it in some respects. It reduced the amount of bonds to be issued. It struck out the provision that would establish a college for mechanical and electrical engineers and for road engineers. We struck out that provision. These were some things we did do, but it can not be argued that it was not in essence and substance the proposition recommended by the joint commission.

Indeed, the Senator from Georgia very frankly says that his objection to its going to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was because he was afraid that committee would come in here again recommending the Bourne plan. I do not know whether they will or not. I hope they will recommend it, but whether they do or not the Senate has control of the bill when it gets here.

This committee is entitled to have the bill referred to it and make its report upon it. If it is not to deal with the subject of post roads, then we had better strike out of the title of the committee the words "and Post Roads."

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator from Florida yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am not very familiar with the rules and precedents and practices of the Senate, having been here only a short time, but I want to know whether bills in this body are referred to a committee because of appropriateness or whether bills are referred to one committee because it is thought they will recommend it, or to another committee because it is thought they are against it and they want to kill it.

Mr. BRYAN. When such bills have been here before they have always been referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, until it was demonstrated at the last session of Congress that the Senate committee, and I believe the Senate, was not in sympathy with the sort of plan worked out by the House of Representatives; and it now occurs to some gentlemen to rob the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the consideration of the subject and give it over to a committee which has no jurisdiction of the question. You might as well refer this bill to the Committee on Revolutionary Claims, which has not had a meeting for a half century or so, and would like to have some business to dispose of.

Mr. President, I am surprised that even a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would object to this bill going to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. That committee has always had jurisdiction of the question, and the only reason for a reference to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, the Senator fears, will not recommend the sort of legislation he would like to see enacted.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is absolutely mistaken as to the Bourne bill being indorsed either by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] or myself, who were members of the commission who investigated Federal aid to public roads. We had repeated meetings, at which Mr. Bourne endeavored to get the joint commission to indorse his bill. After repeated meetings we suggested a report that we would agree on, which is not the Bourne bill, but simply carrying out principles. Mr. Bourne prepared that report in accordance with what was voted on at the meeting of the joint commission. He then might have made an individual report, not as chairman of the commission but giving his own views in reference to the Bourne bill. What was indorsed by members of the commission is the report as chairman, which did not approve the Bourne bill, which purposes to sell a billion dollars of bonds issued by the Federal Government, with State bonds furnished as security.

The Senator from Florida is entirely mistaken, and if he will read the report made by Mr. Bourne as chairman of the commission, and not his individual report, he will find that he has entirely misconceived the letter of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] and myself.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. BRYAN. Let me ask the Senator why he did not draw a distinction between the individual views of Senator Bourne and the views of the chairman of the commission in his letter of indorsement of his report?

Mr. SWANSON. The letter of indorsement distinctly states your report as chairman of the commission. He brought the report here and he could not have it printed until he got a majority of the commission to approve the printing of it as a report.

Mr. BRYAN. What part is it that the Senator objected to?

Mr. SWANSON. I objected entirely to the Bourne plan as contained in it.

Mr. BRYAN. Did the Senator object to any part except chapter 2?

Mr. SWANSON. To chapter 2, the portion that criticizes the administration of executive officers.

Mr. BRYAN. Then, if the Senator objected to the other chapters, why did he not say so?

Mr. SWANSON. The Bourne bill is not indorsed in the report of the chairman. Can not the Senator from Florida understand the difference between a report made by the chairman of the joint commission and a report made by an individual member of the commission? What was said in behalf of the Bourne bill was said on the individual responsibility of Mr. Bourne. What he reported as chairman was voted upon and indorsed by the members of the commission. If the Senator will look at the report he will see that the Bourne bill was never indorsed by the commission.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I have read every word of the report two or three times and I am very familiar with it. I have always understood that the joint commission, acting through Senator Bourne, submitted the result of its investigations and a report in favor of a plan allowing a State to issue bonds at 4 per cent on the credit of the United States, the Government to issue its bonds at 3 per cent, the 1 per cent difference to be compounded annually. The commission estimated that that in 50 years at compound interest would reach an amount which would pay the principal, and the bonds would be canceled.

I do not know what the Senator from Virginia did with reference to the report except what the Senator said he did at the time, and all the objection the Senator raised was because in this report chapter 2 criticizes the turning over of the affairs of the Government to the heads of executive departments.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator is entirely mistaken. If that is his view, he has never read the report carefully. He has never read it if that is what he believes there is in it. Not one member of the commission, as I remember, favored the Bourne bill. They refused to indorse it. They made a report as to the necessity of good roads and as to the cost, and discussed general principles, and that is all the commission agreed on. They could not agree on a bill, because Mr. Bourne would not agree on anything else except the Bourne bill. Not another member of the commission, I think, favored it except Mr. Bourne. What the Senator has read is what Senator Bourne tried to get the commission to indorse and they refused, and are his views as an individual.

Mr. BRYAN. Did he have more influence with the commission in framing the report than the other nine members of the commission? Why did not the Senator from Virginia file a report?

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will allow me, we tried to reach an agreement on all matters we could agree on, to have as much agreement as possible. If my recollection is right, we had a joint session and we decided all things we could agree on, but not on the Bourne bill, and we directed the chairman of the commission to draw a report in accordance with what we had agreed on. He drew a report and the report he drew, with the exception stated, he reported as chairman, not as an individual, was approved by the Senator from North Carolina and myself. It does not contain the remotest indorsement of the Bourne bill. I understand there was but one member there who favored it, and he reserved the right to make an individual report. If the Senator read about the Bourne bill, it was the individual views of Senator Bourne as an individual member and not as chairman. Now, that is clear, and all the Senator has to do to ascertain it is to read the proceedings.

Mr. BRYAN. What part of the report does the Senator indorse?

Mr. SWANSON. I indorse the report he made as chairman, that he was directed to make by a majority of the commission, not as an individual.

Mr. BRYAN. What part is that?

Mr. SWANSON. It is here.

Mr. BRYAN. What is that?

Mr. SWANSON. It just discussed general principles that ought to be followed and does not approve the Bourne bill.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I am interested in the disagreement between the two Senators. I want to ask the Senator from Virginia if there is in the document which has been read any report signed by Senator Bourne as chairman of the commission?

Mr. SWANSON. I think he reserved the right to make a report as an individual. I do not know whether he submitted it or not. He brought his report here as chairman. It was made in pursuance of an agreement between the three members on the part of the Senate. The report of the chairman has been indorsed, with the exception of a certain section in reference to its execution.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I understand that statement; but it seems to me the only way for those of us who are not familiar with the proceedings of that commission to find exactly what the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from North Carolina indorsed would be to have some notion of the report that they indorsed.

Mr. SWANSON. The report is filed here.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I would ask the Senator what portion of the report did he except from his approval of that particular report?

Mr. SWANSON. The portion in connection with the reflection on the executive departments of the Government and their uselessness in enforcing it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That also appears in the report of the chairman?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes; and the report was approved with that exception. Then, as an individual, he reserved the right to make a report. I do not know whether he filed that report or not.

Mr. BRYAN. There is no individual report shown here. I get my information only from the body of the document.

Mr. SWANSON. Let the Senator get the report of the chairman. That is not the report. That is the evidence and all.

Mr. BRYAN. No, sir; this is the report.

Mr. SWANSON. There is nothing here.

Mr. BRYAN. This is all the report in evidence here.

Mr. SWANSON. There is nothing there.

Mr. BRYAN. It is the Report of the Joint Commission on Federal Aid for the Construction of Post Roads.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to have the Senator find a report made by Mr. Bourne as chairman of the commission that indorsed the Bourne bill. Let the Senator find it. The Senator said that he has read it. Now, let him find it.

Mr. BRYAN. Here is the letter signed by the chairman.

Mr. SWANSON. Find the report.

Mr. BRYAN. This is a part of the report.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator has stated that that report indorsed the Bourne bill. Now, find the portion of the report that indorses it.

Mr. BRYAN. I will do it right now.

MY DEAR SIR: We have read the report submitted to us by you, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Federal Aid in the Construction of Post Roads, for our consideration, and we take this opportunity of expressing our approval of the report, with the exception of some parts of chapter 2.

Mr. SWANSON. Now, let the Senator find where the report recommends the Bourne bill.

Mr. BRYAN. The Bourne bill is not there.

Mr. SWANSON. No; it is not in the report that we approved. Find the Bourne bill. It is not here.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator from Virginia said he approved all except chapter 2. I do not know——

Mr. SWANSON. What was submitted to me did not contain any approval or recommendation of the Bourne bill. There is no part of it that recommends it. The Senator can not find it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Will the Senator yield to me just a moment?

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator can not find it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Did the report the Senator refers to as the report of the chairman of the commission contain chapter 2?

Mr. SWANSON. It contained chapter 2. Here is the report.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. But the Senator has just said that that is not the report.

Mr. SWANSON. The report contains what is done in Russia, what is done in France, what is done in England, what is done in various States. It gives the evidence, and then it contains the recommendation. The recommendation does not approve or recommend the passage of the Bourne bill.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Then, will the Senator please read chapter 2 of the report to which he has just referred which does not recommend the passage of the bill?

Mr. SWANSON. It would take about two days to read the report.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. No; I am thoroughly serious. The Senator says there were two reports and two statements, one made by Senator Bourne as an individual and the other made by Senator Bourne as chairman of the commission. Now, he says in his letter to Senator Bourne that he approved of all parts of his report except chapter 2. I should like to have the Senator call our attention to what chapter 2 is to which he objected in the report of the chairman of the commission.

Mr. SWANSON. It is on the desirability of Congress to control. Senator Bourne desired that the improvement of public roads should be controlled, as I understand it, by a joint committee of the House and Senate. That was contained is his report, and we objected to any joint control by the House and Senate in improving roads.

If the Senator will permit me, this report contains every bill that has been introduced in the House and Senate, and all the laws of all the different States. It has the Shackleford bill in it and the Bourne bill, but none of them were approved. No recommendation was made as to the adoption of any bill because the commission could not jointly agree on a plan to submit to Congress. If the Senator from Florida will read it, he will find that all the bills were not approved. No recommendation was made of the Bourne bill any more than of the Shackleford bill, and the joint commission made no recommendation for the Shackleford bill.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President——

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Bourne reserved the right to make an individual report. Whether he filed that report or had it printed I do not know, but I recall that he reserved the right to make a report as an individual member of the commission.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I must be very obtuse, but I understand that the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from North Carolina agreed with some report made by the commission with certain reservations. Is that correct?

Mr. SWANSON. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Now, I am trying to get at what the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from North Caroline did agree to and did believe was a good thing.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will listen, we agreed to certain principles. First, that there ought to be Federal aid. We agreed as to the necessity and importance of it. We agreed to report as to what it would cost generally throughout the country, upon investigations as to the cost of carrying products overland per ton on bad roads. When we came to fix up a specific bill as to whether it should be the Bourne bill, the Shackleford bill, the Overman bill, or the Swanson bill or any bill, no conclusion was reached. No recommendation was made for a specific bill, and the report recommends no particular bill.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I know; but what I am trying to get at is, where is the published thing?

Mr. SWANSON. Here it is [exhibiting].

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Well, does the Senator agree with all that?

Mr. SWANSON. We agree with all that, except chapter 2; that is, the report portion of it. If the Senator will permit me, evidence was brought in, facts were brought in, letters were brought in—and it is an accumulation of what was before us without a recommendation of any bill.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I understand that lots of things went on before the committee, all of which are included within the leaves of that publication?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. But did the Senator mean, in the letter which he and the Senator from North Carolina signed, that they agreed to all of the things contained there, except the specific chapter 2?

Mr. OVERMAN. We agreed to just what the letter says.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I can not find what the letter says. That is what I am trying to get some information about.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will take the report before him, he can ascertain very definitely what was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. But the Senator says that was not the report.

Mr. SWANSON. No, I did not. I said it was not the recommendation of the report.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, it seems to me this discussion has wandered far afield. The question is whether or not this bill ought to go to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I should like to hear the Senator from Virginia discuss that. We are not discussing the merits of any particular bill—that is, such a discussion is not in order at this time. It is a question of whether or not the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is the proper committee to consider legislation of this character.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, I simply rose as a matter of personal privilege on that phase of the matter, to state that the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] was mistaken when he stated that he had the impression that I had ever indorsed by any method, by a report of otherwise, a recommendation for the passage of the Bourne bill.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

Mr. VARDAMAN. I suggest that that ought to be declared a draw.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to make a suggestion, I will say that I did not mention his attitude. He flung that in.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, he read the letter of the Senator from North Carolina and myself and tried to impress on the Senate that that letter conveyed an approval of the Bourne bill, which was not included in the recommendation of the report.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator did not do so, that is all right.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. OVERMAN. I stand by the letter.

Mr. BRYAN. I had not mentioned the rather remarkable position of the Senator from Virginia on this proposition, because I was unable to ascertain what it was. The Senator from Virginia himself said he never approved it. Who approved it? I said the Senator from Virginia did. I will read his letter. That is the way it got in. I did not mention the Senator from Virginia at all until he brought in the question of his position.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from Florida made this mistake: I was a member, on the part of the Senate, of the joint committee to investigate good roads. The Senator said that committee had approved the Bourne bill. I said that it had not; that it had made no recommendation; and that he was mistaken in that statement. Then the Senator read the letter.

Mr. BRYAN. That is right.

Mr. SWANSON. He read the letter of the Senator from North Carolina and myself approving the report. Then I said that that report made no recommendation approving the Bourne bill, which is true; and the Senator can not find that the Senator from North Carolina and myself have ever approved the Bourne bill. We have always antagonized it.

Mr. President, the issue is as to the reference of this bill. I was not in the Chamber, and did not know until after it had occurred, that the bill had been referred to the Agricultural Committee. I shall vote not to discharge that committee; I shall vote for this bill to stay in the Agricultural Committee. The Agricultural Committee reported a bill last year for Federal aid to good roads not in accordance with the Bourne bill. I believe, if you are going to get any legislation at this session of Congress for road improvement, unless you are desirous of supporting the Bourne bill, that you can get it better and easier through the Agricultural Committee.

These bills are for road improvement. It would not be advisable to discharge a committee which is favorable to a bill from its consideration and to send it to a committee which is not as favorable to it. I believe from the experience of last year, if this bill is sent back to the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee, it will be reported back with the Bourne bill as a substitute. I have seen no changes in the committee that would justify a different view. If you want the Bourne bill reported favorably, which proposes to sell $1,000,000,000 worth of bonds, and not have a practical plan for road improvements, vote to discharge this committee from the consideration of the bill and send it to the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee; and I am apprehensive that that will be the result, though there are many members of the committee who do not favor the Bourne bill.

Senators, this issue is distinct; it is clear; it is specific. If you favor a bill somewhat on the lines of the House bill, if you want the Federal Government to aid roads and to make an appropriation accordingly, the place for this bill at this session of Congress is with the Agricultural Committee. If you want the matter delayed, if you want it jeopardized, send the bill to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and I fear that we shall be wrangling there for six months before we get any legislation of any kind or character reported.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me for one moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, it occurs to me that the criticism the Senator from Virginia makes of the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee is not justified. I do not think it is altogether good legislative ethics—it is hardly fair to send a bill to a committee without reference to the subject matter treated in the bill because the committee to which it is referred is leaning toward or against the bill. Committees are created to perform a certain function, and I maintain they should act

with the same poise and patriotic purposes which characterize the courts in the performance of their duties. Now, the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee, as I understand it, is the committee to which all legislation or proposed legislation of this character has heretofore been referred.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No.

Mr. SWANSON. No; the Senator from Mississippi is mistaken.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Listen just one moment, and then the Senator can correct me. Of course I may be mistaken in this, that this bill was not sent to that committee because Senators favorable to the bill had an idea that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was favorable to it and that possibly the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee was not; but if Senators want to pass a bill to which the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is not favorable, but which should go to the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee because of the subject matter of the bill, after the committee has been given an opportunity to act upon it, if it fails to report the bill the proper course to pursue would be to discharge that committee from the consideration of it and then let the Senate deal with it.

I want to say to the Senator in this connection that I am very desirous of having good-roads legislation enacted at this session. I think there is a great deal of virtue and merit in the Bourne bill. I think the plan embodied in that bill is almost ideal; but if I find that I can not get that, then I am going to take the next best thing; but I think, under the Constitution and under the rules and the precedents of the Senate, that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is entitled to consider this bill and that it ought to be recommitted to that committee. This is not the time, however, to discuss the relative merits of the bills.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported a bill for good roads at the last session of Congress. Most bills of this character have been referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, but, under the rules of the Senate, there is no specific designation for the reference of a bill, except in the case of general appropriation bills, which must be referred to the Appropriations Committee. Bills relating to naval appropriations and naval matters the rules specify shall be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and bills proposing appropriations for the Army and relating to the Army are referred to the Committee on Military Affairs; but, outside of that, the Senate has absolute control of the reference of bills introduced, and the rules are silent as to where bills shall be referred except, as I have said, in the case of general appropriation bills and the other bills which I have instanced.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. SWANSON. In a moment. With these exceptions, the question of reference has been left to the Senate, so that the Senate in its wisdom can refer bills to committees that are in accord with the opinions and desires of the Senate.

I am a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, but I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think the legislation itself is more important than pride of committee. If the bill goes to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I can have nothing to do with it until it reaches the floor of the Senate. As I have said, I am a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, but more important than that the bill should go to that committee or that any particular committee should have control of this matter is the fact that it should go to a committee that would be favorable to the legislation desired.

Mr. HARDWICK. Now will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield now.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator has introduced a couple of good-roads bills himself at this session, has he not?

Mr. SWANSON. I have.

Mr. HARDWICK. He had them referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, had he not?

Mr. SWANSON. I had.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is all.

Mr. SWANSON. I have a right to suggest the reference of the bills, and if the Senate does not interpose it is proper for them to go to the committee I may indicate; but the position I take is that the Senate, by its rules, has in the case of only five or six general appropriation bills designated where they shall go. The rules provide to which committees those bills shall be referred; but the reference of other bills is left entirely to the Senate to determine.

I believe that if this bill goes to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, it will go to a committee that is more friendly to road legislation than is the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; and at this time to discharge the Committee on Agriculture from the consideration of the bill and refer it to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I believe would retard, if not injure, the chances of such legislation. That is the reason I shall vote not to discharge the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry from the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Virginia if he is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. SWANSON. I am not.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator is a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator has devoted three years at hard work to the preparation of this report. In the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads we could have the benefit of his research, but the Senator can not get that before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, the committee that had charge of a bill of this kind at the last session had that valuable information. We were wrangling over it about three or four months, and when action was taken a majority reported the Bourne bill, which provided for a sale of $500,000,000 or $1,000,000,000 worth of bonds.

Mr. BRYAN. I have no doubt that was partially induced by the report that the Senator joined in.

Mr. SWANSON. There was no report recommending the Bourne bill. I should like to have the Senator find such a report. He seems now to be suggesting what he has taken back.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia one question. Does he not feel sure that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry understands the measure that his subcommittee reported to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads at the last session and will give it most favorable consideration? I believe I was on the subcommittee with him.

Mr. SWANSON. Under the rules of the Senate, the Senate has a right to dispose of the reference of this bill. There is no rule requiring the reference of this bill to any particular committee; and, as I understand, the question now is whether it shall be referred to a committee more favorable to the legislation or to a committee that is, as constituted, less favorable to it. With that view, I shall vote against discharging the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry from the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber at the time this discussion began. Consequently I do not know what was said with reference to the report to which the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] has referred; but I hold in my hand the bill which has been passed by the House and which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of this body. The chairman of that committee is out of the city; and it seems to me that, pending his return, this matter ought to go over. But outside of that, Mr. President, when I look at this bill, I can not see how anyone can doubt that the appropriate committee to consider it is the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to make a statement just here, reference having been made to the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry from the city, I desire to say that the question came up in the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads as to the re-reference of this bill to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. The suggestion was made that members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should be seen before any motion was made on the floor of the Senate to re-refer the bill. I myself went to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and apprised him of what had been done in the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I am not prepared to say whether he was in favor of the bill being re-referred or whether he was against it; but I am prepared to say that he was thoroughly apprised of the pending action. He was informed that it would be taken in the next few days, if not the approximate date. I simply desired to make that statement.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I feel that just at this moment I should also make a statement. I conferred with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] yesterday, a few moments before he left, and he expressed to me his opposition to referring the bill to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I told him what we intended to do and that I thought the bill ought to be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post

Roads. He said he did not think so, and would antagonize such a reference. I merely want to make the statement. I think it is due the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senate that I should.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, what is this bill and what does it contain that would indicate that it should be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads as against the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry? It is entitled "An act to provide that in order to promote agriculture, afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm products, and encourage the development of a general system of improved highways, the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall in certain cases aid the States in the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads which may be used in the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, or postal matter."

Mr. President, all through this bill the machinery to be used is that of the Agricultural Department. I do not see where the Post Office Department would have any jurisdiction with respect to the matter.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will.

Mr. HARDWICK. The power to appropriate at all depends on the power to construct and maintain post roads, does it not?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no.

Mr. HARDWICK. It does not?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No, sir.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Democratic platform so states.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The right to regulate interstate commerce is just as clearly a Federal right.

Mr. HARDWICK. But the principle the Senator is pledged to support, and that I am pledged to support as members of the Democratic Party, is to aid in the establishment and improvement of post roads.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Post roads also may be involved.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, interstate roads may be post roads.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; a post road may be a part of an interstate road.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to call the Senator's attention to one fact in connection with the position which he has taken, and that is that, although post roads may be involved, is it not true that all the machinery of the Government with reference to the improvement of roads is in the Agricultural Department?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Certainly, it is.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And that there is now a bureau in that department, and the work contemplated by the bill, although it may be upon post roads, will be done by the Agricultural Department and under the supervision of a bureau now established in that department which comes constantly before the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Well, the power that the Agricultural Department has is merely a power created by statute, and we might change it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then, Mr. President, would it not be necessary to reverse our entire policy in the past, take the Bureau of Roads away from the Agricultural Department, break up all we have done there in the line of developing experts in road building, and transfer them to the Post Office Department? Ought not the bill to go to the committee which supervises the department that does the work?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, in this bill the references to the Agricultural Department are numerous. For instance, it provides—

> The Secretary of Agriculture shall examine said surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost, and determine what would be the reasonable cost of such proposed improvements—

And so forth.

Again it provides—

> that upon receipt of such written statement the said State highway department may transmit to the Secretary of Agriculture a statement in writing notifying him that such proposed construction, improvement, or maintenance will be undertaken upon the terms proposed.

Another provision is this:

> That when the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that said construction, improvement, or maintenance of said road has been finished in compliance with said surveys, plans, and specifications he shall cause to be paid to the proper authority of said State whatever remains unpaid of the amount which he has stated, as hereinbefore provided, would be given to aid said State in said proposed construction, improvement, or maintenance of said road.

Again it is provided—

> that the Secretary of Agriculture may make, or cause to be made, such inspection and examinations of any road constructed, improved, or maintained.

Again the bill provides—

> that the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, from time to time make payments upon such construction, improvement, or maintenance as the same progresses.

There is no reference to the Post Office Department in this bill. There is no indication whatever that the Post Office Department shall have any connection with it whatever, and it does not seem to me that this bill should be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads when it is a bill that is confined solely and purely in administration, in the making of contracts, in the completing of contracts, and in approving the same, to the Secretary of Agriculture. It seems to me the only committee to which it should be referred is the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator, I suggest to him that an additional reason is found beginning in line 9, on page 6, where this provision is set forth:

> One of the purposes of this act being to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming communities.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; Mr. President. I do not see that that contains anything that would make it a Post Office matter. There is no reference——

Mr. BRYAN. I was suggesting that as an additional reason why it should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I am glad to have the cooperation of the Senator from Florida. It seems to me that this is a bill which should be kept in the Agricultural Department; and I feel that the matter ought not to be disposed of in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I trust the Senate will not act upon the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] that this matter be postponed or put over until the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may return. I understand the probabilities are that he will be absent from the Chamber for two or three weeks, and I think there is very strong reason why this legislation should be speeded rather than retarded.

I do not see any reason why we should wait for the chairman. His wishes are not to control in this matter. The wishes of the Senate are to control. I believe the Senate desires to get this bill upon the calendar in time to give a reasonable chance for action upon it at this session of Congress.

What I am interested in is in getting this matter before the Senate. Of course, I want, as does every other friend of the measure, a favorable report; but I want to get it on the calendar in due time so that it will not be again, as it has been heretofore, crowded out by other legislation.

Ordinarily I agree with the statement which has been made that all matters should be in the first instance referred to the appropriate committee under our rules and under our practice. I would not, ordinarily, vote to take a matter from a committee that is clearly entitled to it and give it to another committee for the purpose of securing a favorable report or more expeditious action. But, Mr. President, it is clear to my mind from reading this bill that the bill is, to say the least, as appropriately referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as it would be to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. In fact, as the Senator from Colorado has suggested, I think it is more appropriate to refer it to the former committee.

I do not undertake to say whether or not the bill confers powers that we can not under the Constitution confer. I do not think it is necessary now to discuss the question of power at all. The question is where the bill should go as it is written. It may be that the bill is so written as not to make a proper basis of power for congressional action; but the determination of the question of what committee it should go to must depend upon what the bill provides and proposes and not upon whether or not it violates a constitutional provision.

I thought when the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] read a little while ago from the preamble that that was a mere general, loose statement of the purposes of the bill, such as we frequently find in preambles; but I find that the very first enacting section of the bill repeats verbatim the preamble, and the purpose of the legislation is declared to be a specifically rural and agricultural purpose. It is declared to be "in order to promote agriculture." I think Congress has power to appropriate money for that purpose. It is declared to be "to afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm products." I think Congress has power to appropriate money for that purpose.

Those are declared to be the purposes of the bill. That is the express, specific declaration, the legislative intent and purpose. Then follows, Mr. President, the declaration that when these roads have been constructed for that purpose they "may" be

used for the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, or postal routes.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator that in arriving at the amounts to be allotted to the States, after an appropriation of $65,000 to each State, the balance is to be divided equally upon the basis of population and upon the basis that the total amount of mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes in such States bears to the mileage of the whole country of rural free delivery and star mail routes.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not saying, Mr. President, that we do not want this legislation in part for postal purposes.

Mr. BRYAN. I am pointing out to the Senator that one-half of this money is to be spent on rural post roads.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no doubt in the world that that is, in part, the purpose of the bill; but the point I am making is, that the declared purpose is to promote agriculture and to afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm products; and then, after the road is built for that purpose, it is declared that it "may" be put to the Federal uses enumerated, one of them being for postal routes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, one-half of it is on account of census population. We are not going to refer it to the Committee on the Census.

Mr. SIMMONS. I should think not.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Why not?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Because it is to be administered in the Agricultural Department; because it is to be administered under an arm of the Government that reports to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; that discusses its work annually with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and the whole work will be done in connection with that committee.

Mr. SIMMONS. The declaration is made that after they are built for agricultural purposes these roads may be used in interstate commerce and for military purposes or for postal routes—and, by the way, the only reference to postal routes or to the Post Office Department, so far as I have seen, is contained in those two words, "postal routes." All the balance of the bill is with reference to things that are to be done by the Agricultural Department with the machinery that we have prepared by law for doing the work that department is authorized and directed to do under this bill.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida is going to take the position that this bill must go to the Post Office Committee because it says that these roads may be used as postal roads, you might just as well take the position that the bill should be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce because it says they may be used in interstate commerce. You might as well take the position that it has to be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs because it says the roads may be used for military purposes.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, what is the necessity, then, of having a Committee on Roads at all in the Senate?

Mr. SIMMONS. I might with equal pertinence ask the Senator what is the necessity of having a Committee on Interstate Commerce and a Committee on Military Affairs or a Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. BRYAN. Oh, they have other things to consider. This committee deals only with post offices and post roads.

Mr. SIMMONS. What is the necessity for having a Committee on Agriculture if you are going to refer to the Post Office Committee a bill that the Agricultural Department is required by the law, and by its terms, to administer?

Mr. BRYAN. I think there is a very easy answer to that. This is the only committee of the Senate that deals with roads, and its only purpose is to deal with post offices and post roads.

In the case of one-half of this money, the amount is to be arrived at by the proportion of the mileage of free-delivery routes that the mails are carried over in each State.

Mr. SIMMONS. Oh, I would agree with the Senator if the road was being built entirely and exclusively for the purpose of postal routes and nothing else. Then the Post Office Committee would be the only committee of the Senate that would have jurisdiction of it. But it is to be built for other purposes as well as that, and that is not the biggest purpose declared in this bill. So far as the declaration of the purpose of the bill is concerned—I mean the literal, technical declaration of purpose—it is not the most important thing.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida a question.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Since the name "Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads" was given to that committee, has there ever been an appropriation made by that committee for the construction and repair of a road?

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I have not been on the committee during the whole of its existence.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, since the Senator has been on it.

Mr. BRYAN. I am not sure.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I will answer that question, if the Senator will permit me. The first and only appropriation that I recall by any committee for the purpose of aiding in the construction of good roads was favorably reported by the Post Office Committee.

Mr. SHAFROTH. How many such appropriations were made?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Only one.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Only one. That committee has been in existence for 50 or 60 years, has it not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I mean that was in the last two or three years.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I supposed that the word "roads" meant regulating the railroads with relation to mail. That is what I had always supposed was referred to by the word "roads" in connection with that committee.

Mr. SIMMONS. I recall the measure to which the Senator from Alabama has just referred. It was reported by the Post Office Committee; but that was a measure that distinctly concerned itself with building experimental roads for the purpose of obtaining information on the part of the Government as to whether by these modern type roads the Government could effect greater economy in the delivery of our star routes and rural routes mail service.

Mr. President, as I said a little while ago, nowhere in this bill, so far as I have been able to discover, is there any reference to the Post Office Department in connection with the prosecution of the work. The Secretary of Agriculture initiates the whole thing. He decides about the routes, where the money shall be appropriated and expended, whether it shall be used at all, and then it must be used under his supervision.

I think I would be the last one to impugn the purposes of the Post Office Committee. In the first instance I might have had no objections to the bill going to the Post Office Committee, but it was not sent to the Post Office Commitee; it was sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], who is a member of that committee, assures the Senate that the committee has the bill now under consideration and is at work on it. I do not know whether the Senator said there had been hearings on it or not, but he said the committee had begun work upon it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The bill was read and studied, and certain additional bills were sent for; and it was before the committee when the Senate met, and we had to adjourn to come to the floor. It is the first measure to come up at the next meeting of the committee, each member having been requested to study certain additional bills in order that we might act upon it first at the next meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SHAFROTH. And amendments have been suggested?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Again, it has been suggested that the Post Office Committee is wedded to a different character of legislation with respect to this subject. The Post Office Committee, I understand, has heretofore shown its hostility to a measure of like sort. The Agricultural Committee is supposed to be favorable.

Having those facts before me, believing that in the first instance this bill could have been appropriately referred to either committee, but in my judgment more appropriately referred to the Agricultural Committee, and since it has been referred to that committee, being interested in the legislation and a speedy report, and believing we are more likely to get a quicker and a favorable report from that committee than from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, having a right to exercise a choice, because the bill could be appropriately referred to either one of these committees, in these circumstances I would unhesitatingly exercise that choice in favor of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina allow me to make a statement just here?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator said that the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee was opposed to this bill and wedded to some other measure. I want to state, as one member of the committee—and I think there are others who have the same attitude toward it that I have—that the object was to get the most efficient legislation we could in reference to this matter, without any prejudice for or against any bill.

I admit that on account of absence in 1914, and last year in view of the fact that we were not in session, I have not had an opportunity to study all the provisions of the several bills that

came before the committee; but I am of opinion that in view of the parcel post and its direct relation to the rural communities and the emphasis that has been placed upon it; the members of that committee are as heartily in favor of doing all that can be done legitimately for the benefit of the rural communities as are the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I am a member of both committees; and my attitude would be that, as has been pointed out here, this commission was appointed for the purpose of gathering data, and its report was made to the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee. Its members had full and definite knowledge of all the circumstances that are essential in providing for a proper bill. I do not think the question should come before the Senate as to the attitude of a committee which has concurrent jurisdiction, so to speak. The Agricultural Committee has the interests of the rural communities at heart. The Post Office Committee preeminently has the same interests at heart, and the means of reaching the end are identical.

It seems to me that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, if it does its duty, should take every one of these bills and investigate which would best serve the purpose for which the legislation is intended; and I, as a member of both committees—the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—would work just as heartily on the matter without regard to which committee it came before. Whatever bills are there, it seems to me it is the duty of each and every member to take the merits of the bill, and not be wedded to one system as against another or in favor of one bill as against another bill. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is interested in this matter, and I collaborated with him, to the extent of the little opportunity I had, along the very lines that are here set forth in the Shackleford bill. I gave what aid I could at that time to that bill.

In view of the fact that the appropriation is to be administered by the Post Office Department, and in view of the work that department is to do, especially in regard to the parcel post, it seems to me that the Post Office Committee is preeminently the committee to which bills of this character should be referred. Then, if the Senate sees fit, because of prejudice for or against a bill, because of its authorship, or because of what it contains, to amend it here, it has the perfect right to amend any form of good-roads bill in conformity with what it desires, whether it comes from the Agricultural Committee or whether it comes from the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee. As these bills heretofore have been discussed by the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee, and the commission was appointed from that committee, I think that is the proper place for the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, one remark was made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] to which I call attention. He said that by some "sharp trick" this bill reached the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I hardly think he meant what he said. So far as I know, there were several of us watching, intending to move that it be sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I was, but did not get an opportunity to make the motion, because it was laid before the Senate when I was called to the Marble Room, and it was referred to that committee by the Presiding Officer without a motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was the trickster.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I should think it would have been so referred because of the title, no matter what the bill contained.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Undoubtedly; and when we get to the substance of the bill, unquestionably the more you study the substance of the bill the more clearly the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should be charged with its consideration.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 381.

The Senate, as in the Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I notice a misprint in the reprint of the Philippine bill. It appears in line 3, page 36. It reads that "the President shall reserve or acquire such lands and rights and privileges appurtenant thereto as may, in his judgment, be required by the United States for naval bases and coaling stations within the territory of said Philippines." The word "shall" appears in the original amendment. It was amended in the Senate by striking out "shall" and inserting the word "may," so as to read "the President may reserve or acquire," and so forth. I take it for granted that that amendment appears in the official copy. If there is any doubt about it, I direct the attention of the chairman to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAMES in the chair). The Secretary informs the Chair that in the original amendment the word is "may" instead of "shall."

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That is all; I wanted it understood that the word is "may."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], which will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. The sum of $20,000,000 is hereby appropriated to be expended under the direction of the President, through the Philippine Commission, in aid of the instruction of the Filipinos in a common language, in the principles of free government, and in industrial pursuits; and also in aid of an agricultural bank in the Philippines.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Hollis	Myers	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Hughes	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Husting	Newlands	Smoot
Bryan	James	Norris	Sterling
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	O'Gorman	Stone
Chilton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Sutherland
Clapp	Jones	Page	Swanson
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Phelan	Thomas
Colt	La Follette	Pittman	Underwood
Cummins	Lane	Poindexter	Vardaman
Curtis	Lea, Tenn.	Pomerene	Wadsworth
du Pont	Lee, Md.	Ransdell	Walsh
Fletcher	Lewis	Saulsbury	Warren
Gallinger	Lippitt	Shafroth	Williams
Gronna	McCumber	Sheppard	
Harding	McLean	Simmons	
Hardwick	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. CHILTON. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. BRADY] on account of illness. This statement will stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to have the Secretary state the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will again state the amendment to the Senate.

The SECRETARY. Add a new section to the bill, as follows:

SEC. —. The sum of $20,000,000 is hereby appropriated to be expended under the direction of the President, through the Philippine Commission, in aid of the instruction of the Filipinos in a common language, in the principles of free government, and in industrial pursuits; and also in aid of an agricultural bank in the Philippines.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to perfect the amendment by substituting the sum of "$10,000,000" for "$20,000,000" and by adding after the words "agricultural bank" the words "and aid of irrigation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has a right to modify his amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, before that amendment is submitted I wish to say that the people of this country by the thousands need the help of this Government both in securing Federal aid in credit and in educational matters. I do not think it is going to make much difference to them whether the Moros talk the English language or whether they continue to speak their own, or whether a Moro has 400 wives or 1 or none; if he annexes the larger number, the joke will be upon him and not upon us. I am willing to let him fight it out himself. The people of this country need aid, and no money need be appropriated for a people who would be glad to pay an equal sum to get us out of their country. [Laughter.]

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words regarding the amendment I have offered. I assume that it is the desire of every Senator on this floor that the United States should withdraw from the Philippine Islands with credit. Yesterday I stated, and it is well known to the Senate, that the training of the Filipino people in a common language had not yet been accomplished; that it would be utterly impossible for them to conduct self-government without being able to communicate to each other their ideas in a common language, and that whilst much had been done in this direction, much remains to be done. I think that under existing conditions, as we propose to withdraw from those islands within a period at

the most of five years, we should apply a little pressure to the matter of training, and inasmuch as the Filipino people themselves have not sufficient insular or municipal revenues to take care of this matter we ought to add ten or twenty million dollars to the billion dollars which we have already expended, directly and indirectly, in connection with the Philippines in advancing this laudable purpose.

I have received a memorandum from the Insular Bureau regarding the things that might well be done to aid the Filipinos in preparation for the tremendous struggle that will come when the connection between those islands and this protecting Government is cut. I find that I was mistaken in saying that the sum of only $2,000,000 annually is now employed in those islands in the education of 500,000 children out of a total of 2,000,000 children. I find that the total sum of $3,400,000 is being spent, of which about $1,000,000 comes from municipal government and the rest comes from the provincial government and the central government. That means about $7 a head, whereas in this country we expend about $30 a head, and as I stated yesterday only 500,000 out of the 2,000,000 children of school age are being educated. It is suggested by the Insular Bureau that the sum of $1,000,000 a year for five years might well be added to this expenditure.

The memorandum which I have received states what would be done in an intensive way would be the employment of competent teachers, and those teachers must be Americans, because all the competent Filipino teachers who are available are now employed.

> Particularly should these teachers be Americans, if intensive instruction in the English language is to be undertaken.
> It has been heretofore found practicable to maintain in the islands several hundred more American teachers than are at present so employed.
> The money therefore which could be used intelligently and to advantage, without involving the Philippine Government in future expenditures, would be very largely by the employment of American teachers very much as they are at present employed—teachers of domestic science, teachers of manual training, teachers of agriculture—all of whom, in addition, could be teachers of English.
> The amount of money that could be expended for this purpose would be approximately $1,000,000 per annum. This is assuming that the Philippine Government would continue its own expenditures for education, which, of course, we would insist upon.

I assume, of course, that under the power given to the President, he would see that this sum of $1,000,000 per annum in the training of the Filipino people would be added to the expenditure now being annually made by the Filipinos.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator here why he designates a common language. His argument would indicate the English language.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. If he proposes to instruct them in the English language, why does he not say so, instead of using the words "a common language"?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I have no objection to a change in the wording.

Mr. McCUMBER. I did not know but the Senator had in mind practicing upon the Filipinos the new Volupuk language, or whatever it is called.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I assume, of course, that they will continue the use of the English language. A very large proportion of the Filipino people are now trained in it. I presume that perhaps a fourth or perhaps a fifth of the Filipino people can speak, more or less perfectly or imperfectly, the English language.

With reference to agriculture and lands the Insular Bureau declares that—

> The two great needs of agriculture are land surveys, so that titles may be registered and title to public land acquired readily, and irrigation.

These are the two wants.

I am surprised to receive a statement from the Insular Bureau that the estimate of expenditures for surveys will be $25,000,000. I think that sum is so large, possibly, Congress would not be willing to appropriate it, though I recall that when I was there one of the chief difficulties, with reference to the lands of the islands, was the fact that there had been no adequate surveys, that the boundaries of existing holdings were not accurately defined, and that it was difficult, if not impossible, in making grants of public lands to give any adequate description of their location, and also that the registration of title was so imperfect as to make the acquisition of lands there very difficult. I would not expect to cover the subject of surveys in this appropriation.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. There are two things about the amendment concerning which I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada, for I do not understand their application or connection with the bill that is under consideration. The Senator in his amendment provides that the money shall be expended through the Philippine Commission. The bill, not considering the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, abolishes the Philippine Commission. What agency does the Senator from Nevada expect to employ in the expenditure of the money?

Mr. NEWLANDS. In that case I would suggest to substitute the word "government" for "commission."

Mr. CUMMINS. There is a Philippine Legislature established by the bill that takes the place of the Philippine Commission; that is, there is a senate or a higher legislative body that is substituted for the Philippine Commission. Does the Senator expect that the Philippine Legislature will take this money and use it?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Of course the bill does not abolish the office of Governor General. The Governor General will continue, and he is a part of the Philippine government. So I should say that the Philippine government would consist, then, of the Governor General and the legislature.

Mr. CUMMINS. One thing more which bothers me is this: The Senate adopted an amendment yesterday which will authorize the immediate evacuation of the Philippine Islands, our departure to become complete and the sovereignty to be entirely transferred at the end of two years. The Senator does not expect all this money to be expended within two years. Now, what will become of the remainder of the money?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I understand the bill provides that we are to withdraw in not less than two years and not more than four years.

Mr. CUMMINS. No; I do not so understand it. The bill provides for immediate withdrawal, but says that the transfer shall not be complete until two years from this time and not more than four years, but whether it is two years or four years, the Senator from Nevada can not expect to spend all this money even within two years, and what would become of the remainder?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should expect the President of the United States to expend only such part of this appropriation as he can expend with good judgment, and if it is impossible to expend the whole there will be a balance remaining. I believe, however, that within a period of four years and possibly within a period of two years the sum of $10,000,000 could be expended to immense advantage in those islands and to the advantage of the purpose we have in view—the preparation of those people for self-government.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator will allow me, I should like to suggest that I have not any doubt we could expend it in six months to the great advantage of those islands. I think there ought to be some limitation or arrangement as to just how long it is going to take to spend it. There is no trouble about spending American money over there for the benefit of the islands.

Mr. CUMMINS. Did the Senator from Nevada have it in view to spend the $10,000,000 for this purpose within two years?

Mr. NEWLANDS. If the President considers that it is advisable to do it.

Mr. CUMMINS. If the President thinks it can not be expended efficiently within that time, what becomes of the remainder?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I presume it remains in the United States Treasury.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is not the purpose of the Senator to transfer the remainder to the new government to be established there?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Oh, no; I have no such purpose.

Mr. CUMMINS. Why not? Is it not just as important that they should become educated after our sovereignty ceases as before?

Mr. NEWLANDS. My view is that when they withdraw, our connection from them will absolutely cease. I want them to lead a thoroughly individualized life, not under our protection in any form. I have no objection, if the President should so advise hereafter, possibly to appropriate a specific sum for a specific purpose before we withdraw, even though the money may not be expended until after we withdraw; but it is the purpose of the amendment to expend a reasonable sum within the period of two or four years. I believe it will be impossible to accomplish the withdrawal before four years, and I have not the slightest idea but that $10,000,000 could be most profitably expended in those islands in the interest of the Philippine people.

Mr. CUMMINS. One more question, if I may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield further?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. There are a great many people in our own country who need education, a great many more than are permitted to secure an education.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does not the Senator believe that we ought to spend our money for our own people, if they need the money, rather than for the people of the Philippines?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should say so.

Mr. CUMMINS. Where does the Senator expect to get the $20,000,000 or $10,000,000?

Mr. NEWLANDS. By additional taxation, if necessary.

Mr. CUMMINS. But has the Senator any well-defined idea upon whom he will lay this additional burden of taxation?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should levy additional taxes upon incomes and inheritances.

Mr. CUMMINS. Has that been matured upon the Senator's side of the Chamber?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not know that it has. That is my individual opinion. I am not a member of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is the Senator's individual opinion?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, the Senator's inquiry, of course, is a proper one as to whether our first duty is not to our own people. It is; but we have assumed a duty toward the Philippines. We seized those islands. We took possession of them first in a spirit of conquest. Later on we held them in a spirit of altruism and declared that we are there for the benefit of the Filipino people. The assumption of a duty of that kind requires the expenditure of some money. We have expended enormous sums in the past in military and naval expenditures necessary to suppress Filipino independence. I think we may well expend a little more in promoting it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Can the Senator from Nevada state approximately how much money has been expended upon the Philippine Islands since the occupancy of the islands?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Very little has been spent directly upon the Philippine Islands themselves, as I understand. There were some two or three million dollars spent when they had cholera and famine there, and I imagine there have been several million dollars spent in fortifications. Our principal expenditure was in conquering the islands and in the military enlargement both of the Army and Navy made necessary by their acquisition. The total expenditure of the whole Spanish-American War was about $600,000,000; and I think it is safe to say that the enlargement of the Army and Navy caused by our expansion territorially has been some $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 more annually.

Mr. GALLINGER. And we have spent a large sum in the building of schoolhouses, in furnishing education, and giving instruction to the Filipino children, and in the building of roads, as I read it. I do not know how much we have expended, but in the aggregate it is a very large sum.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not think that expenditure came out of the Federal Treasury; I think it came out of the insular treasury.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. McLEAN. I will state to the Senator from New Hampshire that, I think, the total expenditure, outside of the military expenses, was less than $4,000,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is quite surprising to me, as I had supposed it was much greater.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Our main effort has been to make the insular revenues pay all the expenses of those islands; and from that point of view the work has been excellently done. I do not think there ever has been in the history of the world so creditable a piece of colonial administration as that exhibited in the Philippine Islands under Mr. Taft and his successors. It seems to me that the work has been done with the strictest economy and without calling upon the Federal Treasury for any purely insular demands, except the insular demands to which the Senator from Connecticut refers, involving meeting conditions of cholera and in some degree involving good roads.

Now, it is absolutely essential to those islands that they should have a proper agricultural system established. They have not one as yet. Irrigation has not been advanced as it ought to have been. We ought to have sent engineers from our Reclamation Service over there immediately after the acquisition of the islands and mapped out a scheme of irrigation, for they are dependent upon irrigation there; they can not depend upon the natural fall of the waters from the heavens.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If Japan should take the islands, why not let Japanese engineers go over there and establish an irrigation system?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Well, that is a rather cynical view of the matter. I do not share in the view at all that Japan should take the islands. I hope that Japan will have a proper respect for the independence and integrity of those islands, and that every other country also will. I am unwilling that this Government should assume any obligation to protect the independence of those islands; but I think that we should in every way appeal to the moral sentiment of the nations surrounding them, to the acquisitive nations of the world, to give a common protection to those islands in their struggle to maintain self-government.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator from Nevada, however, voted, as I understand, yesterday that the United States should not interfere in any way whatever to protect them.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes; I do not want the Government of the United States to have any problem in the Orient, involving, possibly, complications that will land us in war, the consequences of which we can not measure. I want to confine the United States practically to domestic problems, which are numerous and complicated, which involve the building up of a country that ultimately will have a population of four or five hundred million people, individual States surpassing in population in the future great empires as they exist to-day. That will be a problem which will be sufficient for us. I believe that we ought to have attended to our own affairs from the start; that we ought never to have undertaken this foreign problem; but having undertaken it, it seems the clear duty of the United States in withdrawing from the job is to do it with as much humanity and even generosity to those people as is possible.

When I was interrupted, I was speaking about irrigation. The memorandum from the Insular Bureau which I hold in my hands states:

> Irrigation: The Philippine government has several times in the past 12 years taken up this subject, but has not made considerable progress. As a result land on which three crops per year could be produced, produces with difficulty one crop, and a great deal of land is of little value which would be of immense value.
>
> The difficulty with undertaking hurriedly irrigation work is well recognized by all engineers experienced in that work. It would be very difficult, beginning promptly and with a large amount of money, to complete in four years irrigation works meeting the necessities of any large part of the islands without wastefulness. Generally speaking, the necessary observations preliminary to the work are lacking. These observations should cover a period of years.
>
> In many places the matter is complicated by the ownership of water rights, which would have to be adjusted. It is believed that if $10,000,000 were made immediately available for this purpose the amount could be intelligently expended in such a way as to justify the expenditure, producing thereafter an income to the Philippine government. This, of course, would not by any means mean that all of the necessary irrigation work in the islands would be completed. It would mean that approximately six reasonably large projects could be undertaken and concluded within four years. More than this could not be done to advantage.

I will say, with reference to that, that we have a population of 7,000,000 in those islands; we have been in possession of those islands for over 15 years; a complete system of irrigation is absolutely essential to the development of agriculture in those islands; and yet we have hardly taken the initial step toward the inauguration of a proper system. Why? Simply because it is utterly impossible to raise the revenue from insular sources. Their revenue, as I stated yesterday, is only $11,000,000 per annum, and the municipal and provincial revenues added make a total revenue of only $17,000,000. In our arid region, where perhaps in the arid and semiarid States possibly we have two or three million people, we have already expended within the last 10 years nearly $80,000,000 in irrigation works, Government works alone; but yet during that period practically nothing has been expended in the Philippine Islands.

It is utterly impossible for private capital to take hold of these enterprises. In order to take hold of an irrigation enterprise you must have control over the sources of the water; control of the water rights and of the rivers; and you must also have absolute control of a sufficient area of land to make the construction of the irrigation works profitable in the added value of the land. That is one of the reasons why our Government has entered upon these irrigation works. We have reached the limits of individual and private enterprise in that direction. So the Government was obliged to take it up. The insular government, there, however, is unable to do so. The United States ought

to have undertaken it, and ought to have undertaken it 15 years ago.

I shall ask leave to put into the RECORD my statement at a hearing before the Philippines Committee on this subject many years ago, calling attention to the importance of the speedy perfection of these irrigation schemes and also to the importance of organizing an agricultural bank.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, permission to do so will be granted.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The economic efficiency in the Philippine Islands has hardly been increased at all during our 15 years of stay. It has not increased, because we have applied ourselves simply to questions of government, of education, and of training, instead of to the economic development of the islands. I fear that when our protection is withdrawn and the excellent sanitation of the islands which is now being carried on under American rule is diminished we shall again have outbreaks of diseases, such as cholera and others afflicting men, and the numerous diseases so destructive of cattle and animals.

In addition to that, if those people are not put upon their feet so that the agricultural possibilities of the islands may be developed, we shall find that there will be conditions of suffering and poverty and distress that will overwhelm those islands and practically destroy everything that we have accomplished thus far in fitting them for self-government.

That view does not deter me at all, so far as I am concerned, from pursuing the fixed purpose of withdrawing from those islands as soon as possible; but the possibility of those conditions does induce me, notwithstanding there is a deficit in the Treasury, notwithstanding that we shall need large supplies of money for our military and naval preparations, and notwithstanding that it will be necessary to increase the taxation of the country, now to provide for the discharge of this moral duty which rests upon us.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, the motive that moves the able and learned Senator from Nevada in his effort to confer this benefaction upon the Philippine people is a tribute to his good heart; but I want to ask the Senator if, as a trustee of the American people, many of whom are in a more indigent condition than are the people of the Philippine Islands, is it fair to take the money derived from taxing the American citizen when our own people need assistance and confer it upon the people in the Philippine Islands? It seems to me that our first obligation is to the people at home; that charity begins there. To take this money out of the pockets of the toilers of America, I repeat, many of whom are more needy and abjectly poorer than are the Filipinos, and to give it to the Filipino would not be fair.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I contend that Uncle Sam is rich enough to take care not only of his own children but also of those waifs away out in the Pacific, over whom he has, against their consent, imposed his sovereignty for nearly 20 years. I think we can take care of both of these matters, and my proposal involves no neglect of American interests.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator. He is always eloquent and instructive, but I desire to say that "Uncle Sam" has no wealth of his own. Every dollar in the National Treasury is coined of the sweat and toil of some wealth producer. "Uncle Sam" has nothing save that which is contributed by the laborers of this Republic, and it is the duty of this Congress, as trustees of the wealth producers of America, to be just rather than generous. There are thousands of poor people in the United States to-day who are quite as much in need of assistance from the Government as the people in the Philippine Islands. Personally I want to assist the Filipinos; I want to see them prosper, build up the waste places in their country. I would help them in every legitimate way possible, but my first obligation is to the people of America. When the Americans shall all be provided with the necessities of life, then I shall be glad to join with the able, patriotic, and altruistic Senator from Nevada in his efforts to promote the welfare of the Filipino.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Well, Mr. President, "Uncle Sam," of course, is a myth. When we refer to "Uncle Sam," we mean the American people. The American people have immense wealth to draw upon; no country in the world is so fortunate as is this. The American people have imposed their sovereignty upon the Filipino people, 7,000 miles away, against their will, and have killed Filipinos because they resisted their authority; and now, having pacified them, having entered upon this work of altruism and helpfulness, all I want to do is to fairly round it out, so that the world can say that the work has been performed in a creditable manner, and so that the Filipino people themselves will not have to reproach us hereafter for any act of either commission or omission.

Now, Mr. President, with reference to an agricultural bank, this report from the Insular Bureau says:

> In the way of an agricultural bank, this matter could be taken care of by the Philippine government and its present agencies, provided there were included in the pending bill a provision authorizing the Philippine government to guarantee the land-mortgage bonds issued by such bank and to pay interest and principal of such bonds in case the bank should default.

The Filipino Bank has to-day a capital of $1,500,000, and not $500,000, as I erroneously stated yesterday. That is, of course, insufficient. We are all beginning to realize in this country the necessity of agricultural banks. The question of rural credits is one of the great questions before the country to-day. We are slowly following in the steps of the European countries in this direction, whose efforts have been directed in the line of reducing the rates of interest to the producers of farm products. We all know that in this country the producers of farm products have to pay higher rates of interest than almost any other class of our people, and we are making an effort, through Government aid, through land banks and agricultural banks and rural credits, to bring the interest charged agricultural communities down to the common level of interest that is charged in manufacturing and in commerce.

The difficulties under which we suffer are, however, enormously exaggerated in the Philippine Islands. I can not pretend to state the excessive rates of interest which I heard were charged in the Philippine Islands whilst I was there, rates of interest which kept the producers within the grasp of the money lenders, so that they were in practical slavery, mortgaging one crop after another in advance of its production to the money lenders, and unable ever to get out of their control.

It seems that the Philippine Commission has urged the organization of an agricultural bank. My view was that, inasmuch as the insular revenues were not sufficient to provide a capital for such a bank, the United States ought to have established one 15 years ago; and I urged upon the Philippine Committee the establishment of a bank with a capital of $10,000,000. That was not done. So the insular government struggled feebly with the question itself, and they have utilized, I believe, their gold reserve in some way as a foundation for credit by an agricultural bank, which has a capital of only $1,500,000. It seems to me that we might well appropriate a considerable sum for this purpose. It seems to me that we can either make a gift of an adequate sum to an agricultural bank, properly guarded for this purpose, or we can make a loan which may be subsequently repaid when the insular revenue is in a condition for repayment.

The memorandum which I have received states that the pressing needs of those islands, then, for the next four years will be $4,000,000 for education, $25,000,000 for a survey, and $10,000,000 for irrigation. I eliminate the question of survey, because I do not think that Congress would be disposed to enter upon that work; but I do think that the sum of $10,000,000, put under the control of the President, to be expended by him with the aid of the Philippine government, will do a great deal in the way of providing a basis for an agricultural bank, a proper irrigation system, and for the education of those people in a common language and in industrial pursuits.

So far as the pagan people of the southern islands, numbering over a million, and the savage tribes are concerned, I have made no calculation as to their possible necessities. I think this whole matter should be left to the discretion of the President, and I have no doubt that the recommendations of the very competent insular government which we have established will be such as to insure that the money will be wisely and not foolishly expended. I trust, Mr. President, that the amendment as modified will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if I understand the purpose of this bill it is to carry out the pledge of the Democratic Party to the people of the Philippine Islands to give them their independence as soon as possible. I do not understand that the Democratic Party, or anybody else in this country, has gone so far as to promise those people or assure them anything further than that beyond what may be involved in the detailed work of carrying that policy into successful operation. Now, it is proposed, in addition to withdrawing from the islands, to endow the Philippine people with a part of the revenues of the United

States and devote the sum of $20,000,000 to their uplift and improvement.

Mr. President, I have no idea that the Senate is going to indorse or adopt this amendment. At the same time I want to express my dissent from such a proposition. In this body, indeed in both Houses of Congress, we have incurred the habit of thinking in millions. When it comes to legislation a million dollars amounts to about as much in the contemplation of Congress as an expenditure of 50 cents did at the time of the formation of the Government; but nevertheless $20,000,000 is a great deal of money, especially when it is proposed to give it away.

Where will it come from? That question was very pertinently asked by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], and the reply was that Uncle Sam is very wealthy. That is the case, Mr. President, but the Senator from Mississippi aptly replied that all the money that is used in our public expenditures comes from the people in the form of taxation, direct or indirect. The expenses of the Government are not only enormous, but if the so-called plans for preparation for national defense are to be crystalized into legislation it will be necessary to very largely increase not only our revenues but our taxation. I do not know of anybody in the United States or of any interest in the United States that likes to be taxed. My experience is that every interest wants taxation to be borne by other interests, and of course there is a mutuality of objection which makes all forms of proposed revenue legislation extremely disagreeable and annoying to those charged with the duty of its enactment.

I wish I could see somewhere some evidence of an intention to limit our expenses, instead of constantly increasing them. I would just as soon think of taking $20,000,000 in connection with this bill and putting it in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean as to give it to those people after we have given them their independence or while this proposed law is in process of operation. I do not care personally whether the Filipinos are educated or not; I do not care whether their irrigation systems are completed or not. That is a matter which they must themselves look after when they have been freed from subjection to this country and begin to work out their own destiny.

Personally it makes little difference to me whether Japan takes possession of them or not, or whether some other nation goes and exercises there direct control or suzerainty over them. I think we should get out of there, and get out of there as speedily as possible. The islands have cost us hundreds of millions of dollars; and now it is proposed by this amendment virtually to make them a present of $2 a piece as a sort of premium, I suppose, or a tip, to accompany our final adieu. I hope this amendment will not be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Hollis	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Beckham	Husting	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	James	Newlands	Smoot
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	Norris	Sterling
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Stone
Chilton	Jones	Page	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Pittman	Swanson
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Poindexter	Thomas
Colt	Lane	Pomerene	Thompson
Cummins	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Tillman
Dillingham	Lee, Md.	Reed	Vardaman
du Pont	Lewis	Robinson	Wadsworth
Fall	Lippitt	Saulsbury	Walsh
Fletcher	Lodge	Shafroth	Warren
Gallinger	McCumber	Sheppard	Williams
Harding	McLean	Shields	
Hardwick	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. CHILTON. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, before a vote is taken I should like to perfect this amendment by striking out the words "through the Philippine Commission." I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to perfect his own amendment. That is agreed to.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Then those words are stricken out. I will now ask the Secretary to read the amendment as perfected.

I wish to state, before the vote is taken, that the withdrawal from the Philippines means an immense saving of expenditures hereafter in the complications in the Orient that will be sure to arise out of our holding those islands; that in addition to that it means the saving of an expenditure of at least $25,000,000 in military and naval expense annually; and that out of these savings the United States may well appropriate $10,000,000 toward training these people in a common language, principles of free government, and industrial pursuits, and in aid of an agricultural bank and of irrigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment as perfected by the Senator from Nevada.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add as a new section the following:

SEC. —. That the sum of $10,000,000 is hereby appropriated to be expended under the direction of the President in aid of the instruction of the Filipinos in a common language, in the principles of free government, and in industrial pursuits, and also in aid of an agricultural bank and in aid of irrigation in the Philippines.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada is a statesmanlike forecast of the probable results of the action recently taken by the Senate, indicating a purpose to withdraw from the Philippines; and sooner or later, and in some connection, some provision of that kind must be seriously considered.

The bill now under consideration, however, is a bill of policies and not a bill of details, nor an appropriation bill. The pecuniary provision for the Philippine Islands is made in the sundry civil appropriation bill. It is altogether likely that if the bill now pending shall be passed by the House of Representatives, the situation thus presented will commend itself to the Committee on Appropriations, and some such provision as that indicated by the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada can be made.

I believe that the amendment adds complications to those that are already sufficiently numerous to tax the patience of the Senate in the consideration of the bill. For that reason alone I feel that I must vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARDING (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and for that reason withhold my vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. KERN (when Mr. SHIVELY's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SHIVELY] is paired with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. If I were at liberty to vote—if he were here—I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (after having voted in the negative). I ask if the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. CATRON. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (after having voted in the negative). I desire to inquire if the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has not voted.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have a general pair with that Senator, and as he has not voted I withdraw my vote.

Mr. TILLMAN. I should like to vote, but I have a general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], and in his absence withhold my vote. I should like to vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], and I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CHILTON. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. GOFF] on account of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 4, nays 67, as follows:

YEAS—4.

Jones	Newlands	Saulsbury	Wadsworth

NAYS—67.

Ashurst	Gronna	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Hardwick	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	Hollis	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Bryan	Hughes	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Catron	Husting	Norris	Smoot
Chamberlain	James	O'Gorman	Sterling
Chilton	Johnson, Me.	Page	Sutherland
Clarke, Ark.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Poindexter	Swanson
Colt	Kenyon	Pomerene	Thomas
Cummins	Kern	Ransdell	Thompson
Curtis	Lane	Reed	Townsend
Dillingham	Lea, Tenn.	Robinson	Vardaman
du Pont	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Walsh
Fall	Lewis	Sheppard	Weeks
Fletcher	Lippitt	Shields	Williams
Gallinger	Lodge	Simmons	

NOT VOTING—25.

Borah	Goff	Owen	Tillman
Brady	Gore	Penrose	Underwood
Broussard	Harding	Phelan	Warren
Burleigh	La Follette	Pittman	Works
Clapp	McLean	Sherman	
Clark, Wyo.	Oliver	Shively	
Culberson	Overman	Stone	

So Mr. NEWLANDS's amendment was rejected.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I shall not accept this vote as a test of the altruism, the benevolence, and the philanthropy of the American people, of which we have heard so much during this debate. I shall invite the attention of the President to this subject in the hope that at some time he will make a recommendation to Congress upon it. If that is not forthcoming, I shall press it upon appropriation bills or other legislation in the future, in the hope that Senators like the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], who think that this is not the proper place for an appropriation of this kind, but who perhaps are in sympathy with its purpose, will join with me in seeing that we do something in the few remaining years that we have to fit the Filipino people more effectually for the intellectual and economic struggle that is before them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I will suggest to the Senator from Nevada that he would secure a powerful influence in favor of his amendment if he could attach to the Clarke amendment a proviso that it shall not go into effect until his amendment is adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I await the reading of the next amendment, assuming that it is one I presented.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois offers an amendment which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to the bill a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. That before the independence and sovereignty of the Philippine Islands shall be proclaimed by the President of the United States the government of the Philippine Islands as constituted shall make and execute a perpetual treaty with the United States guaranteeing freedom of trade to the United States and exemption from all import tariff duties upon any goods, merchandise, or trade from the United States.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I beg at this time to ask that the second amendment I tendered shall be read, as I desire to discuss them both, in order that I may not occupy the floor on two consecutive occasions for one single event. The other amendment tendered may be read now, and we may dispose of them both, as one is inconsistent with the other if either is adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the second amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the bill, a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. That there shall be vested in the President and by this act he is authorized to enter into any convention or agreement with the administration in power in the government of the Philippines for payment to the United States of such sum of money, and by such method of installment as may return to the United States the sums of money heretofore paid for and for the purposes and government of the Philippine Islands, or such part of said sum expended by the Government of the United States, as to the President of the United States shall, under all the circumstances, appear equitable.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to indulge me for a few moments while I explain what was the purpose of these amendments as I apprehend them.

It has been stated by Senators participating in this debate, beginning with the statement of the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], that the expenditures put out upon the Philippine Islands would reach, possibly, $800,000,000. Prior to this session, in the sessions of the past, Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, stated the figure of $600,000,000. Yesterday the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] called attention to the figure of $400,000,000. It is evident that an amount between the figure of $800,000,000 and that of $400,000,000 has been expended.

Mr. President, we are about to give up these islands in pursuance of our promise and our duty; but I do not feel, sir, that our altruism should go so far as to permit, through inadvertence or design, a punishment of the United States for its kindnesses when it could be rewarded consistently with justice to the islands and with right to the United States.

I invite the attention of Senators, particularly the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and such other Senators as participated in the matter of the convention between this country and Spain when we came to the terms of peace, to the fact that we had an understanding with Cuba, which we all believed would be carried out, that some preferential privileges would be given the United States by Cuba. Since Cuba received its independence, true to its native blood and its natural affection and its previous affiliations with its mother country, the United States has been compelled to witness a trade with Spain by Cuba exceeding that given to the United States, goods purchased from Spain exceeding those purchased from the United States, notwithstanding the contiguity of this country to Cuba, the saving in freights, and such other considerations as readily arise in the mind.

I beg to suggest that we be not rewarded with such inconsideration by the Philippine Islands; and I tender one of two suggestions: That the President shall have, as a condition precedent to announcing the sovereignty of the islands under the amendment designated as the Clarke amendment, the right to exact a treaty made with the United States by the government then in charge of the Philippine Islands that shall give to the United States the right to trade with the Philippine Islands to this extent—that no tariff duties shall be levied upon any imports or shipments from the United States. In this manner, by exempting us from these customs duties, we will to some small extent recover some of the vast millions we have expended, out of a noble spirit, in behalf of these islands. We will have encouraged the trade and met the objection urged by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], who, in as full a manner as it could be presented from that point of view, disclosed the benefits of the trade feature.

Mr. President, I desire to avoid the penalty that was visited upon us by Cuba. I desire to assure to the United States the rights that I feel she has at this time the privilege of exacting.

Having stated my purpose with regard to the first amendment, I beg now to invite the attention of the Senate to the second.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, before the Senator passes to the second amendment, may I ask him a question?

Mr. LEWIS. Surely; I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Do I understand from the Senator that he proposes to have an agreement made with the Philippine Islands by which no duties of any kind shall be exacted upon goods sent from the United States into the Philippines, but that the United States shall be left free to impose such duties as it chooses upon goods imported from the Philippine Islands into the United States?

Mr. LEWIS. I will say to the Senator that such was in my mind. I realize that reciprocity in these matters is just. Therefore it will be observed that the amendment proposed by me leaves it open to the President of the United States to give such terms as in his judgment may be appropriate. I decline to make an amendment of penalty, such as their failure to enter into this treaty being sufficient to avoid the announcement of the proclamation. The amendment is left so that such provision as suggested by the Senator, if it is then deemed wise by our Government to concede, may be given without any inconsistency with the language of the amendment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Now let me ask the Senator a further question: Do I understand him to say that we had some such arrangement as that with Cuba?

Mr. LEWIS. We had no treaty of the kind suggested by the amendment. We had a trade arrangement with Cuba by which we were to get certain preferential privileges; and these, I think, were extended for a certain length of time. Since then, by virtue of the duties they levy upon us and the different burdens upon us, we have been unable to compete even with Spain.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But that is reciprocal, is it not?

Mr. LEWIS. In sugar only.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Well, but no matter. We agree to admit to this country, under a differential duty, Cuban sugar, which is their chief product, and tobacco, under an arrangement by which we reduce our tariff duties 20 per cent, and in consideration of that the Cuban Government agrees to admit

our products with a like reduction from the tariff duties. That is a reciprocal arrangement; but, as I understand the Senator, he proposes in this case to put the entire burden upon the Philippine Islands, and that the United States shall not reciprocate in any particular whatever.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah, with the sagacity and ability that characterize all his efforts, may tender an amendment to meet the point to which he alludes. For myself, I am very frank to state that I felt that this was due us in return for the vast expenditures we have contributed to the Philippine Islands, and it is no injustice to the Philippine Islands to ask that they grant it now in consideration of the many advantages heretofore obtained from us. But if it shall seem wise to the President, when the time comes to carry out such a plan, to tender that reciprocity, the amendment is in nowise inconsistent with it.

Mr. WEEKS and Mr. CLAPP addressed the Chair.

Mr. LEWIS. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts, who first rose.

Mr. WEEKS. Before the Senator passes to his second amendment, I desire to refer to the discussion which he has just been offering, relating to the trade of a dependency. Undoubtedly it is true that the trade of Cuba, which was established with Spain, naturally continued in the same channel, where it had been established and where the goods were known. Is not that probably the reason why Spain acquired or retained so much of the trade with Cuba, rather than the fact that Spain was formerly the mother country of that island?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, it may be that the previous associations which wedded Cuba to Spain have had material influence in producing the result to which I allude. I am seeking to avoid some of that, I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts, by suggesting a method that makes the price list less than that of Spain in the Philippine Islands as an inducement to trade with the United States.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President.——

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. I rise not in any spirit of criticism, but for an inquiry, as I have not kept much trace of the tariff legislation of Cuba since the so-called Cuban reciprocity treaty. I will ask the Senator if Cuba has a tariff rate preferential to Spain and discriminating against us, having in mind that treaty?

Mr. LEWIS. I am compelled to inform the Senator I have no knowledge on that subject. I am giving my conclusions drawn from the figures of imports, and I have no knowledge whether any preceding preferential treaty with Spain exists or not.

Now, Mr. President, not desiring to occupy the floor and to delay a vote, I have tendered my reason for the first amendment. If it shall be adopted it will be unfair that the second amendment shall be. If the first shall not be adopted, then I tender the second, which is that if we are to have duties laid against us and have the discriminating relation by which our trade must compete with the trade of the world in the Philippine Islands, measured by the wages paid and the other conditions which we know surround the trade of Europe as it can be made with the Philippine Islands, then, I submit, we ought to be permitted some form of compensation from the new government returning to us some of the moneys which we have advanced in behalf of the Philippines. The amount and the method of payment I leave to the President to be negotiated at the time of the announcement of the proclamation. Such is the subject and spirit of the second amendment.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator from Illinois leaves the determination of the amount to the judgment of the President, and it might be one dollar or eight hundred million dollars, according to his statement as to the amount of expenditures. Would the Senator feel free to express to the Senate his view as to what would be equitable under all the circumstances?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Ohio that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] this morning in his observations brought attention to one of the confusing elements, and that is the contradiction in the amount of money we have expended on the islands as distinguished from the amount we have expended for our military support in suppressing insurrections in the islands. I would leave to the President of the United States to charge against the islands only such sum as in equity we would seem to have contributed to the islands, but not charge them the full sum we expended, which might also include what we expended in suppressing insurrection. Such was my object in leaving that in the manner suggested by the amendment. I could not state any exact figure, answering more substantially, for that would have to be evolved from the books of the insular commission, which are not at my service. I have answered the Senator to the best of my ability.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator go back to the first proposed amendment. I wish to inquire of him in reference thereto, whether he has any information as to the proportionate amount of the present revenues of the Philippine Islands that are derived from duties on imports.

Mr. LEWIS. Of all imports over the world?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS. I am not able to give the Senator the reply. I must inform the Senator that in my personal examination of the subject on a visit to the Philippine Islands I watched it, such as a "looker-on in Vienna" might, and I observed that the form of customs levied there is levied by the United States and not by the Philippines, as probably the Senator is aware, and reported to the United States as coming to the Philippine Islands from different countries. I have no memory at this time as to what they are in toto and can not reply to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. I have the impression that they import now from our country the greatest amount of goods coming into the islands.

Mr. LEWIS. I think the Senator is fairly accurate.

Mr. WALSH. So that one-half of the revenue derived by the country through customs will come from imports from the United States. That, I imagine, would be a very considerable source of revenue. The islands would be impoverished, would they not, by the operation of this amendment?

Mr. LEWIS. I invite the Senator's attention to that which I believe to be the existing fact, that the reason why so large a quantity comes from the United States is that the United States is buying from itself. United States officials are in power there; United States families live there; the United States has certain industries established there. But I apprehend when the islands have gone from our sovereignty and come in the hands of those who, for many reasons, feel very kindly toward us, but from racial distinction have lines of industry by virtue of previous relations, the trade will go elsewhere, because there will be none of the inducements to have the trade which previously existed. Such is my view.

Mr. WALSH. That is what I am afraid of. Would not the future operation of this amendment be to induce the Filipinos to establish trade relations with some other country so that they might derive revenues for the sustenance of their Government?

Mr. LEWIS. I answer the Senator that is a most pertinent inquiry, and it would arise naturally, if not for this conclusion—that in the absence of duties charged against us we would have to undersell some competitors and make it an inducement to the Filipinos to purchase from the United States.

I feel I have manifested to the Senate the object of my amendments, and further amplification therefore would be useless.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, we went into the Philippine Islands and took possession of the country of the Filipinos against their will. We whipped them in order to take possession, in order that they might remain quiet in our possession, and now we propose to penalize them for that much of their history.

Mr. President, this penalization is in two forms as presented by the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]. In the first place, we deprive them, if his amendment is adopted, of a prime and necessary source of revenue. We deny them the right to levy an import duty, even for revenue purposes, upon products coming to them from the United States. If we do that, we virtually deprive them of all revenue from import duties, because they can not get along in the family of nations except upon the theory that they treat all nations equally. There will have to be with them, as with all other people, a favored-nation clause. If they permit the products of the United States perpetually to reach their shores without levying any revenue upon it, they are either not an independent nation, capable of making equal treaties with all the world, or, if they are, they consent to the surrender of all revenue duties.

The second amendment would penalize them by subjecting them to a tribute or an indemnity for what? Unless it is because that, without their invitation or their consent, we conquered and whipped them, I do not know what the indemnity or tribute would be for.

It is true that we spent a great deal of money there. It is true that very much of that money went to their benefit as well as to our own. It is true that we have educated a great many of them, built a great many roads—dirt roads and railroads—and that the United States has partially paid for a great many of these benefits to the Philippine people; but in the meantime we were enjoying sovereignty there, and to levy a tribute upon a people because you—of your own will and purpose, not

theirs—chose to assert and exercise sovereignty is rather an unprecedented thing.

But my main objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois goes beyond all that. We have witnessed this morning a queer run from ultra altruism to this proposition. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] a few moments ago wanted us to give them $20,000,000 for educational purposes, when heaven knows $20,000,000 expended for education in certain parts of the United States would do not only us but the world very much more good. Now we go to the other extreme.

But even all that does not constitute my main objection. I do not want to say a thing about parties in connection with this, and yet to a certain extent I must. There are a lot of us, mainly Democrats, who have been fighting for 20 years nearly to get a majority in both Houses of the National Legislature, so that we might undo what we regarded the wrong that was perpetrated by this Government when it took possession and kept possession of the Philippine Islands, a wrong not only to the inhabitants of the archipelago but a wrong to our own institutions, our own traditions, and our own ideals.

When after 20 years we have succeeded in getting a majority in both Houses so that we may turn those people loose, so that we may let them go, to use the Biblical language which was used regarding the children of Israel under Pharaoh, there comes a proposition that we shall let them go only upon the condition precedent that there shall have been a treaty executed between them and us guaranteeing freedom of trade, and so forth and so on, or, under the second amendment, a further guaranteeing payment beyond what we regard as a fair amount of money as indemnity, if you choose to so call it; or as tribute, if you choose to call it that.

After 20 years we have gotten to a point where a majority can let them loose, can let them go; and now we are faced with a proposition to put it in the power of one-third of the United States Senate to refuse to let them go. After 20 years of work, just as we approach the promised land and look down over it and see what we have been yearning for, we will be placed in a position where one-third of the Senate can block our hope, block our further travail, and totally destroy our project of granting these people their independence.

Ah, some one says that the Senate of the United States would not act in bad faith in refusing to vote for the treaty. My reply is that it would not be in bad faith, because I would not vote for a treaty, speaking as one, which put a tribute upon those people equal to one-half even of the amount of money that the United States Government has spent in the Philippine Islands, neither would I vote for a treaty which would deprive them of the right of sovereignty to collect the revenues upon import duties.

Now, treaties can be entered into between them and us if we are friendly in spirit with one another after we part company, under which by reciprocal arrangement we may make terms that will adapt themselves to the best interests of the commerce of both countries. But that ought not to be mixed up with this prime question of giving those people independence. If you are going to give them independence, give them independence with sovereignty attached to it, not independence with a string that would bring about every year the possibility of friction; that would lead to renewed war with those people and possibly a renewed conquest.

For us at the last moment, when we have what we sought within our grasp, to consent to leave the consummation of our hopes to one-third of the Senate instead of to a majority of both Houses, to leave ourselves where we must have two-thirds of this body, seems to me to be suicidal from the standpoint of the policy which we advocate. It would not be in bad faith for a single Senator on the other side or this who is conscientiously opposed to Philippine independence to vote because of that against a treaty which would put that independence beyond question. If I were conscientiously opposed to the independence of the Philippine Archipelago, if I were conscientiously in favor of the proposition that our duty to God and man called upon us to remain there, then I would not vote for a treaty which had been made a condition precedent to their independence and thereby accomplish a thing which I believed to be radically and fundamentally wrong. I would use every legitimate instrumentality to defeat their independence, if I honestly thought that their independence was bad for them and bad for us, as some Senators, equal in honesty and sincerity, do sincerely believe. So I hope this amendment will be defeated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the first amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS].

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the second amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I call up the amendment which I offered on page 30.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 30, line 16, before the word "treaty," insert the word "or"; in the same line strike out the words "title, right, or privilege of the United States is involved" and insert "of the United States is involved, or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is claimed under the Constitution, treaties, or laws of or commission held or authority exercised under the United States, and the decision is against the title, right, privilege, or immunity especially set up or claimed by either party under such Constitution, treaty, statute, commission, or authority."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I have already discussed this amendment, and I do not care to discuss it further. I will ask the Senator from Nebraska whether he has considered it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will say that such examination as I have given it has indicated that it is a perfectly proper amendment. I do not know that it is necessary. My impression is that the language in the bill, which is the language in the organic act, has been operating successfully, and, possibly, it has been construed, but I can see no reason for opposing the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. CLAPP. I ask the Senator if the amendment is designed to give an appeal where the court has denied a right claimed under the Constitution or laws of the United States?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My amendment deals with a case where the title, or right, or privilege, or immunity is claimed under the United States or under the Constitution or laws of the United States.

Mr. CLAPP. When it was up before I suggested that we permit an appeal, whether the right was denied or granted. We find in this country a great deal of embarrassment growing out of our present law, which only allows an appeal where rights are denied. There is a tendency to grant the right rather than to face an appeal.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think there has been any complaint about that with reference to this phase of it. The Senator states that where a statute has been held to be constitutional complaint has been made that no appeal is allowed in that case.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The language which is now in the organic act will admit of an appeal in that case, because it is not worded the same as the section with reference to an appeal from the Supreme Court.

Mr. CLAPP. I did not hear the amendment as read, and that is why I asked the question.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The language, with my amendment, will be:

> That the Supreme Court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to review, revise, reverse, modify, or affirm the final judgments and decrees of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands in all actions, cases, causes, and proceedings now pending therein or hereafter determined thereby in which the Constitution or any statute or treaty of the United States is involved.

Down to that point it will cover the matter which the Senator has in mind. That will allow an appeal, whichever way the decision is. It is only necessary that the Constitution shall be involved, it makes no difference how the question shall be decided. Now, when we come to the second branch of it, "or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is claimed," then the decision must be against the right, title, or immunity in order to allow the appeal. I think that should be so.

Mr. CLAPP. I think not, Mr. President. I know a great deal of complaint has been made for several years and very able articles have appeared on that subject from prominent lawyers throughout the country. I have had letters from them complaining that there is a tendency under such a provision to grant the right, in other words, to hold the act unconstitutional, thus defeating an opportunity to secure an adjudication in the Supreme Court.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I agree with the Senator about that, but that proposition is not involved in this amendment. Under this section, as it will be when amended, an appeal will be allowed where the constitutionality is involved, no matter what the decision may be.

Mr. CLAPP. There was such confusion I did not hear the Senator's amendment read, but as I read it now from the print I see it is as the Senator states.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I will ask the Senator from Nebraska if he has any objection to the change in wording that I suggested on

page 5. It does not alter the bill, but I think makes the wording better.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the change suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts is entirely proper.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 9, after the word "denomination," insert the words "sectarian institution," and in line 12, after the word "dignitary," strike out the words "or sectarian institution."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be agreed to, without objection. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, if this is the proper time to do so, I desire to reserve the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] and all proposed or offered amendments thereto for a separate vote when the bill goes into the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has made certain amendments to the bill. The Senator from Nebraska reserves what is known as the Clarke amendment for a separate vote. The question is on concurring in the other amendments.

The amendments were concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. For that I offer the following substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert as a substitute the following:

That not less than two years nor more than four years from the meeting of the legislature provided for in this act the President shall withdraw the sovereignty of the United States from the Philippine Islands, except such necessary portions thereof as he may select for naval bases or coaling stations. He shall, however, before completing the final steps of this withdrawal, require of the Filipinos the establishment of a stable government, republican in form, and based upon the consent of the people duly ascertained at an election called by act of the legislature, approved by the President. At this election shall be submitted for approval the form of constitution recommended by the legislature, as well as the names of all candidates for elective office in the first provisional government. Said constitution shall provide that the new Philippine Republic shall fulfill the obligations of the United States concerning the Philippine Islands incurred by the treaty of Paris or arising out of the occupation of the islands, including the personal and property rights of individuals and corporations of the United States and other countries and the safeguarding of such Philippine Government loans and other obligations as have heretofore been authorized by act of Congress. Said constitution shall also provide that in all trade relations the United States shall have the benefit of the most-favored-nation clause. If the constitution is approved at said election and the provisional government created, the President shall then, by proclamation, recognize the independence of the Philippine Republic and turn over to the Philippine Government the control and sovereignty of the islands, except such naval bases and coaling stations as are above provided for. If, however, the President shall find at any time within the period of limitation provided above that the condition of the external or internal affairs of the islands or the international relations of the United States require it, or if a constitution as above provided be not adopted, he may, by proclamation, extend for the period of one year beyond the four years above provided the time for taking action under this act and thus afford to Congress an opportunity, in its discretion, to consider further the Philippine question, but any such extension of time by the President shall not otherwise suspend or nullify the operative force of this act unless Congress shall hereafter so direct.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, that is substantially the amendment which was disposed of the other day, and I move to lay it on the table.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I trust the Senator from Arkansas will withhold that motion for two reasons: First, I want to secure unanimous consent to vote upon this bill and all amendments before 5 o'clock to-morrow; second, I should like——

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I think we can vote on the bill before 5 o'clock to-day.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to have the substitute which I have offered printed.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. As I understand, it is the same thing that was voted down the other day, with the substitution of the word "constitution" for the word "treaty."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is mistaken in that. I have changed the limitation from four years and six years down to two years and four years to conform with his own amendment, and I have inserted a clause doing away with the treaty provision that seemed to involve delay and opposition, particularly from the Senator from Colorado, and inserting substantially the same provision that Congress put in the legislation which recognized the independence of Cuba, a provision requiring that the constitution of the Philippine people shall incorporate provisions for the guarantee of certain rights and the observance of the obligations of the United States in the islands. I think that is a substantial difference from the substitute of yesterday, and I think the Senate is entitled to an opportunity to see the substitute in printed form. I trust the Senator will not insist on the gag suggestion that he makes and will permit me to ask unanimous consent for a vote before 5 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, if it had not been for the last remark of the Senator about attempting to gag anybody I believe I could not have resisted any request that he might make. I did not suppose, in making a motion—a perfectly parliamentary motion—to dispose of a matter that had been debated and defeated by a vote of more than two to one that I was attempting to gag anybody. It is simply a proposition now to consume another day, to reverse a deliberate judgment of the Senate. If it were a matter that was new, if it were a matter that had not been debated, if it were a matter that we had not all informed ourselves about, I would consent to the request of the Senator; but I believe I shall insist upon the motion to lay the amendment upon the table.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when Mr. GOFF's name was called). My colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. HARDING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CATRON. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I inquire whether the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has voted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Then I withdraw my vote, having a general pair with that Senator.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. I do not see him present, and I therefore withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY]. He is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr BURLEIGH].

Mr. JAMES. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—33.

Ashurst	Hardwick	Robinson	Swanson
Bankhead	Hughes	Shafroth	Thomas
Borah	James	Sheppard	Thompson
Broussard	Johnson, Me.	Shields	Vardaman
Bryan	La Follette	Simmons	Williams
Chilton	Lane	Smith, Ariz.	Works
Clarke, Ark.	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	
Fall	Martin, Va.	Smith, S. C.	
Fletcher	Overman	Sutherland	

NAYS—43.

Beckham	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Reed
Brandegee	Hollis	Myers	Saulsbury
Catron	Husting	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Clapp	Jones	Norris	Smoot
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	O'Gorman	Sterling
Colt	Kern	Page	Stone
Cummins	Lea, Tenn.	Phelan	Townsend
Curtis	Lee, Md.	Pittman	Wadsworth
du Pont	Lippitt	Poindexter	Walsh
Gallinger	Lodge	Pomerene	Warren
Gronna	McLean	Ransdell	

NOT VOTING—20.

Brady	Goff	Newlands	Shively
Burleigh	Gore	Oliver	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	Harding	Owen	Tillman
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Underwood
Dillingham	Lewis	Sherman	Weeks

So the motion of Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas to lay Mr. HITCHCOCK's amendment on the table was rejected.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Now, Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent that not later than 5 o'clock to-morrow, this bill and all amendments thereto may be put to a final vote.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I object.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Secretary must call the roll before the request is stated, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has hardly been stated as a request for unanimous consent as yet.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Has objection been made?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. Does not the rule provide that the roll must be called before a request for unanimous consent to fix a day for the final vote can be stated?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Before the final request is submitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not see how the Chair would know that there had been a request for a unanimous-consent agreement proposed unless it was first submitted. The Chair is now in possession of the amendment that was made to the rule——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is what I refer to, Mr. President.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, the rule provides that immediately upon the request being made the roll shall be called.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is what I understand.

Mr. JAMES. That is what the rule provides. I looked at it the other day when the same matter was up.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The rule will be found on page 14 of the Manual.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is the rule:

No request by a Senator for unanimous consent for the taking of a final vote on a specified date upon the passage of a bill or joint resolution shall be submitted to the Senate for agreement thereto until, upon a roll call ordered for the purpose by the presiding officer, it shall be disclosed that a quorum of the Senate is present.

That is all that needs to be read at the present time. The Chair is clearly of the opinion that the request for unanimous consent must first be stated, and then the Chair must order the roll call.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I understand that there has been objection made by the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] to the request for unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. May I ask the Chair to read the first line again. My impression was that the rule said that no request for unanimous consent to fix a day for a final vote should be stated——

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; "submitted"——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Well, "submitted" means——

The VICE PRESIDENT. "To the Senate for agreement thereto."

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I wish to submit this thought to the Chair, for this ruling might have a future effect that would be more important than it is at present. I can easily imagine a condition where a request for unanimous consent would be submitted to fix a date to vote on a bill and amendments thereto, and there might not be more than a very small number of Senators present. If there were, for example, a dozen present, and no objection should be made, then, under the ruling of the Chair, the only thing to be done would be to call the roll.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri totally misapprehends the ruling of the Chair. The Chair has made no such ruling. The Chair has ruled that the Chair can not have the roll called to determine the question of a quorum until the Chair knows that some Senator wants to submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement; and the Chair does not believe that that can be accomplished by some Senator stepping up and stating to the Chair that he would like to submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, but that he shall rise in the Senate and say that he wants to submit such a proposed agreement; whereupon it is the duty of the Chair to order the roll to be called to disclose the presence of a quorum.

Mr. STONE. I did misunderstand the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Entirely.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, it seems to me that this discussion is all unnecessary, and that a roll call is unnecessary to disclose the presence of a quorum, when the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] has already objected.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I do not understand how any Senator can object to the granting of a request for unanimous consent before the request has been submitted to the Senate.

If I understand this matter correctly, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] did make a request for unanimous consent, whereupon I made the point of order that the roll must be called before it could be submitted. If I may be permitted a few words—I have no personal interest whatever except to see the rule observed—the rule provides in paragraph 3, rule 12, page 14, as follows:

No request by a Senator for unanimous consent for the taking of a final vote on a specified date upon the passage of a bill or joint resolution shall be submitted to the Senate for agreement thereto until, upon a roll call ordered for the purpose by the Presiding Officer, it shall be disclosed that a quorum of the Senate is present.

The Senator from Nebraska made a request for unanimous consent. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] stated that he objected; but I do not think that the request has been submitted to the Senate, and I think the roll must be called before it is submitted.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the rule is carefully drawn with a view of giving a Senator an opportunity to inquire the attitude of the Senate before a formal submission is made. It was prepared with that in view. It was drawn by my former colleague, and after conference it was so worded that before formally submitting a request for a vote on a specific date a desire to submit the question might be stated so as to ascertain the attitude of the Senate. If some Senator stated on the informal inquiry that he would object, then the Senator desiring to submit the formal request would not make it because it would apparently be useless. That has been the mode of procedure with reference to this rule ever since it has been adopted, just as the Chair and as the Senator from Nebraska have proceeded to-day.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock meridian.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, February 4, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 3, 1916.

SECRETARIES OF EMBASSIES OR LEGATIONS.

CLASS 4.

Francis White to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 4.

CLASS 5.

John Heath to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 5.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Joseph T. Lyons to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 4.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Louis McC. Nulton to be a captain.

Lieut. Commander Mark St. C. Ellis to be a commander.

Ensign Thomas Moran to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Donald Boyden to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Albert Soiland to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps.

George B. Corcoran to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps.

Lieut. Charles W. Early to be a lieutenant commander.

Lieut. Wilson Brown, jr., to be a lieutenant commander.

Ensign Elmer De L. Langworthy to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Jefferson D. Smith to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Lawrence P. Bischoff to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Earl R. Morrissey to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Charles K. Osborne to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Asst. Paymaster Charles C. Copp to be a passed assistant paymaster.

Carpenter William E. Fitzgerald to be a chief carpenter.

Ensign Hugh McC. Branham to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Roy C. Smith, jr., to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Passed Asst. Paymaster Benjamin H. Brooke to be a paymaster.

Professor of Mathematics Paul J. Dashiell to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy, with rank of commander.

POSTMASTERS.

IOWA.

Bezie I. Dee, Akron.

MARYLAND.

J. B. Sweeney, Hagerstown.

MASSACHUSETTS.

William M. Allen, Fairhaven.

MISSISSIPPI.

Hubbard E. McClurg, Ruleville.

NEBRASKA.

Louis H. Deaver, Cody.
August Dickenman, Talmage.
George C. Fox, Bayard.
Grover C. Hoback, Nehawka.
H. P. Wilson, Geneva.

NEW YORK.

John G. Armsby, Petersburg.
Arthur C. Dunning, Yorktown Heights.
Clarence M. Graves, Champlain.
Dennis P. Hayes, Tupper Lake.
Asa G. Neff, Downsville.
William G. Phippin, Red Creek.

NORTH CAROLINA.

J. J. Farriss, High Point.

OHIO.

Frederic C. Betts, Williamsport.
F. B. Biggert, West Jefferson.
O. C. Reynolds, Peebles.
Thomas N. Swearingen, Winchester.

PENNSYLVANIA.

J. L. Davis, Cherry Tree.

PORTO RICO.

Carlos F. Torregrosa, Aguadilla.

TEXAS.

Searcy B. Boulware, Hempstead.

WEST VIRGINIA.

G. A. Porter, Kenova.
M. J. Wilson, Milton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *February 3, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God Almighty, whom we worship as the Father of all souls, how long, oh, how long wilt Thou suffer Thy children to mutilate, murder, and waste each other under the pretext of war to preserve their national liberty and rights! Interpose, oh, we beseech Thee, Thy holy influence to quicken the conscience of the men who are behind the awful holocaust that they may realize the terrible responsibility resting upon them, that their differences may be justly and amicably adjusted by the crucial test of reason, justice, and mercy, that all the world may once more enjoy home, love, and freedom in the fruitful pursuits of peace, and all glory and honor and praise shall be Thine through Him who gave us the new and holy commandment, "That ye love one another as I have loved you." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPEECHES BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed as a House document the speeches which have been made by the President of the United States on his trip through the West.

The SPEAKER. Why not wait until the President gets back and include all of them?

Mr. FOSTER. He will have made his last speech last night or this morning, and I will ask to include that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to print as a House document the speeches made by the President on his trip through the West and those that may be made by him.

Mr. CANNON. I hope that may be done.

Mr. MANN. If the Democratic Members will read them, I am in favor of it.

Mr. FOSTER. I think they will be read generally by the people throughout the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object—of course I have no objection to the publication of the speeches by the President, but it is taking a great deal of liberty to ask to print not only speeches made but those that may hereafter be made.

Mr. FOSTER. There have been a good many speeches printed in the RECORD by the extension of remarks.

Mr. BARNHART. I think it would be proper to wait until the others have been made, and then ask permission to print them as a House document.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course it might be done by asking to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BARNHART. I have no desire to object; but it does not seem proper to give consent that speeches made in the future shall be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. FOSTER. The President made his last speech last night or this morning.

Mr. BARNHART. The Speaker put the request for speeches to be made.

Mr. CANNON. That he may make on this trip.

Mr. FOSTER. I think they have all been made now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Reserving the right to object, do I understand the gentleman's request to be that the speeches the President has made up to this time on the western trip be published as a House document?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I understand he made the last speech this morning at St. Louis.

Mr. MONDELL. I understood the request to include speeches that he might make hereafter.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the gentleman is facetious, he can object if he wants to.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not object; I think the speeches ought to be printed, but it seems to me we ought to have them printed immediately, the speeches that have been made, and not wait for future speeches.

Mr. FOSTER. We are not to wait for them.

Mr. MONDELL. I have no objection; I think they will make an excellent document on the other side of the question.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the gentleman's private opinion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 4954. An act directing the Secretary of War to reconvey a parcel of land to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolutions:

House concurrent resolution 11.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, in two volumes, for the period from March 12, 1914, to December 31, 1915, inclusive, together with accompanying maps, charts, and profiles, be printed as a House document and that 6,000 additional copies be printed, of which 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 1,500 copies for the use of the Senate, and 1,500 copies for the use of the commission.

House concurrent resolution 13.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse, the same to be first revised and brought to date under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, 70,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 30,000 for use of the Senate.

House concurrent resolution 14.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle, the same to be first revised and brought to date, under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, 70,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 30,000 copies for use of the Senate.

AMENDING HOUSE RULE.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 122.

Resolved, That the standing rules of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, amended in the following manner, to wit:

In Rule X insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

"54b. On flood control, to consist of 15 members."

In Rule XI insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

"54b. To flood control, other than appropriations therefor, to the committee on flood control."

Mr. SPARKMAN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Florida rise?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I rise to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if there will be any discussion on this resolution?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes; there is to be discussion. Let me inquire of the gentleman from Kansas as to the matter of time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What suggestion has the gentleman from Tennessee to make?

Mr. GARRETT. We are willing to go ahead pretty rapidly.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have very little time demanded on the rule itself. I suggested to some gentlemen on the other side of the House last night that I would probably have some time that I could yield them; they had asked for time in which to discuss flood conditions in their districts, and it was stated that such discussion could be had under this rule.

Mr. GARRETT. That was the statement made publicly yesterday.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a parliamentary question. I had leave of absence for two years and I do not know what was done in that time. I recall that when I had the honor to preside on this Calendar Wednesday that it was so holy——

A MEMBER. This is Thursday.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I have been watching other matters and I have dropped a stitch. I suppose, without further remark, I ought to say that my losing track of the day is due to the sorrows of a poor old wicked devil. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Remembering the ruling which the gentleman from Illinois made, we carefully refrained from calling this resolution up on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; Calendar Wednesday was so holy that nothing could interfere with it but Calendar Wednesday business. It is still holy, is it?

Mr. GARRETT. So far. Now, the gentleman from Kansas and myself are both for this rule.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; there will be no discussion on the rule itself, I think, for I do not know of any opposition to the rule.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] is opposed to the rule.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say frankly that I am not entirely opposed to it. I have some views that I would like to express.

Mr. GARRETT. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would say 15 minutes would answer my purpose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentleman proceed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report from the Committee on Rules. It provides that the standing rules of the House be amended so as to create a new standing committee and to define the jurisdiction of that committee. The committee to be created is to be entitled the committee on flood control, and in that part of the resolution which defines its jurisdiction it is recited that all matters referring to flood control shall be referred to this committee.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Let me finish the preliminary statement. The Committee on Rules has recognized the tremendous importance of this subject matter, and that committee has felt that there should be created a standing committee of the House which could give scrutiny and attention to that question, that committee having jurisdiction of that subject matter only and, therefore, has reported unanimously this resolution with the recommendation that it pass. I yield now to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the gentleman, in view of the language of the latter part of the resolution, "54b. To flood control, other than appropriations therefor, to the Committee on Flood Control," whether it would not be well to amend the resolution, in line 8, by saying "To flood control and the drainage of swamp and overflowed lands," because "flood control" may not necessarily include a very important element, in my opinion, and that is the drainage of overflowed land.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, that would be broadening the idea which the Committee on Rules had in mind when it reported this resolution. As a matter of fact, I should assume that bills touching that question would be referred to this committee, whether it is provided in the rule or not.

Mr. BORLAND. I thought the gentleman was going to reply that he thought the words "flood control" broad enough; but if he replies that my suggestion would broaden the meaning of the words as the committee used them, then I think an amendment is certainly necessary, because it seems to me that the drainage of overflowed lands being so nearly related to flood control and yet being not necessarily directly included in it, ought to be included within the functions of this committee. There is no other committee to which that matter could appropriately go. It could not appropriately go to the Agricultural Committee and certainly not to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may have been unhappy in my expression in reply to the gentleman's first inquiry, but in the latter part of my inquiry I think I made it clear. I think certainly that all bills of the character mentioned by the gentleman would be referred to this committee.

Mr. BORLAND. Then the gentleman would have no objection to such an amendment? I should like very much to urge the amendment. I do not think there ought to be any substantial objection to it.

Mr. GARRETT. I would prefer not to include those words. I think it would not be proper to include them at this time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to direct the gentleman's attention to the phraseology, more from a grammatical standpoint than anything else. I have considered the rules with this new rule inserted, and find that the reading will be rather awkward. I assume the gentleman intends, so far as the last provision is concerned, to insert it immediately following "54a"; 54a begins as the gentleman will note "To matters relating to the construction or maintenance of roads other than appropriations therefor, to the Committee on Roads"; 54b would come right after that and it would say, "To flood control, other than appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Flood Control.' I would suggest that in order to make it in harmony with the previous section that after the word "to" there be inserted "matters relating to."

Mr. GARRETT. If the gentleman will turn back of 54a and read the other provisions, he will find this language to which he refers is in harmony with all of the other provisions, and that 54a itself is the grammatical exception to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. STAFFORD. I direct the gentleman's attention to the wording in section 53, "All proposed legislation concerning the disposition of useless papers, to the joint committee, and so forth." Now, it is sought to make a subdivision of section 54. Section 54 is as follows:

All proposed legislation concerning the census and the apportionment of representatives; to the Committee on the Census.

The House at the last Congress incorporated a new provision, section 54a, in which it was provided that matters relating to the construction or maintenance of roads should be referred to the Committee on Roads.

If the gentleman is going to have phraseology in consonance with that subsection of which this is a part the language should be similar. To throw into this section of the rule following 54a such language, "54b. To flood control, other than the appropriations therefor, to the committee on flood control," is rather awkward in the extreme. The gentleman should certainly frame it in some language harmonious with the prefatory part of section 54a. I will ask the gentleman whether the committee considered that, because I think it is worthy of consideration.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, that was considered, I will say to the gentleman. If the gentleman will turn to page 287 of the book I have in hand now—the pages may be different—at the beginning of Rule XI it provides:

All proposed legislation shall be referred to the committee named by the preceding rule as follows, namely: Subjects relating, first, to the election of Members—

And so on. And in subsection 39 it runs in exactly that language. The proposition which the gentleman suggests was considered and it was thought that we had adopted the simplest and plainest language that could be adopted.

Mr. STAFFORD. The only criticism that can be lodged against that position is that in the sections following section 37 there is language that does not conform. If that were the rule throughout, the position of the gentleman might be well taken, but in section 54 and section 53 there is adopted different language. Those sections begin with the phrase, "All proposed legislation concerning." Now, section 54a, which the gentleman reported, adopts new language, "To matters relating to the construction and maintenance of roads." To be in harmony with that I insist the gentleman should follow that language, otherwise there is nothing to connect it except that at the very beginning. Here we have interposed a section which has been disjointed by the intervening language that varies with the original phraseology.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, with all possible deference to my friend, who I know studies these matters very carefully, I do not think there will be any trouble about the meaning of this rule if it be adopted.

Mr. STAFFORD. There would be no question about the meaning, but it will be very awkward.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARRETT. I will.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I notice the rule provides for a committee on flood control. I have listened to the gentleman's explanation of the rule, but I do not think he went sufficiently into detail to give the House full information as to what he thinks constitutes flood control. I will illustrate the question by stating what I have in mind: For instance, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors at present has charge of the Mississippi River for all the purposes of navigation.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I assume the discussion now going on on the other side of the aisle is of importance to the House and I should like to hear it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, within certain limitations the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House has had charge of the improvement of the lower Mississippi River, appropriating large sums of money each year, and the language appropriating these amounts is always so guarded as to confine the improvement of the river to the building of levees, to protect against floods, of course, and for the purposes of navigation. What I want to ask is, What effect would this rule, if adopted, or this amendment to the rules and the appointment of this committee under it, have on the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors over that class of work?

Mr. GARRETT. I should say, Mr. Speaker, that bills relating to flood control would be referred to this new committee if the rule be adopted. I do not think that those bills which refer to the question of the navigation of the Mississippi would be referred to this new committee, but that they would be referred, as they have always been since the Committee on Rivers and Harbors was created, to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then the gentleman is of the opinion that if we make an appropriation, as we are likely to do, for the improvement of the Mississippi River below Cairo, using the same language we have been using heretofore, providing that the amount shall be expended in the building of levees and the revetment of banks, and so forth, so far as, in the opinion of the Secretary of War or Chief of Engineers, may be necessary for the purposes of navigation, it would not be subject to a point of order if this committee be created?

Mr. GARRETT. I think not; that is my personal opinion.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman has stated what the rule proposed to do. Now, will the gentleman state why it is proposed to do that? What is the reason for taking part of the jurisdiction away from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and creating a special committee?

Mr. GARRETT. Because of the realization of the fact on the part of the Committee on Rules that there are aspects of the question of flood control which are not related to either navigation or commerce.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I do.

Mr. STERLING. I would like to get at the idea of the gentleman as to the duties of this committee. The same question may have been asked by some of those other gentlemen over there, but I have not been able to get any information. Does this relate to the prevention of floods and matters pertaining to the avoiding of floods or does it pertain to matters of relief in emergencies such as exist at the present time in some parts of the Mississippi Valley, or both?

Mr. GARRETT. Of course it would pertain to both, and, having no appropriating power, I should say this committee could not do much on the question of immediate relief.

Mr. SHERLEY. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. To what committee would the power to appropriate on matters authorized by this committee go?

Mr. GARRETT. To the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SHERLEY. On what theory is that advanced? The present Committee on Rivers and Harbors has appropriating power over this subject matter. Now, you do not take that away by any express statement.

Mr. GARRETT. What I mean is that if this committee which is thus created should bring in a bill and that bill should be enacted into law providing for a continuing contract, that would necessarily, under the rules of the House as they now stand, go to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am just trying to get the facts that are involved in this proposition before the House. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman, but I think that statement ought to have been made. Now, going back to my previous inquiry, is it not true that every committee of the House, dealing with any particular subject matter, has to necessarily deal with a lot of things that are collateral to it, and that the reason advanced would apply to practically every big committee's jurisdiction?

Mr. GARRETT. That is an abstract principle.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to ask the gentleman if the Irrigation Committee could not take care of nearly all the items that are presented, for the reason that these dams and ditches on the heads of all these streams could hold the water and the ditches in the Irrigation Service could keep the water cut off the swamps on the lower part of the river?

Mr. GARRETT. I do not think so, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the subjects are related at all.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If the gentleman will permit me to make a statement there, I have in mind one great project in the Indian Service, known as the Yakima irrigation scheme, under the supervision both of the United States Government and the Indian Service—the reclamation laws of the United States. The two matters can not be separated. You have two committees at work on the same reservation, one putting water on the upper part of the reservation, flooding the lower part of the reservation, and one now making appropriation to take the water away from the lower part of the reservation.

Mr. GARRETT. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I presume it will be impossible to have a committee whose jurisdiction with some other committee of the House might not at some time seem to cross. But I do not think that the Committee on Irrigation could possibly deal with the questions that are presented and that will be referred to the committee on flood control, if it be created.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I am aware that there are some very large rivers that would not come under this rule.

Mr. STERLING. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Just a moment. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker? I want to treat these gentlemen fairly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 40 minutes remaining.

Mr. STERLING. I would like to ask just one question.

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. STERLING. The Government has done considerable work in view of preventing floods. What committee had jurisdiction over that work? Was it the Committee on Rivers and Harbors?

Mr. GARRETT. To what work does the gentleman refer?

Mr. STERLING. I think they have appropriated money for building levees, have they not?

Mr. GARRETT. The levees to which the gentleman refers have always been built on the theory that they were in the interest of navigation, and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors had jurisdiction of that—that is, if the gentleman refers to the Mississippi River levees.

Mr. STERLING. I do refer to that, and many others that have been built.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not overlook the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River that has been in existence for many years without a meeting.

Mr. GARRETT. The Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River never had jurisdiction while I was a member of it. I cut my eyeteeth in that committee, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LONGWORTH and Mr. STERLING rose.

The SPEAKER. To whom will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING].

Mr. STERLING. This rule would take away from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors the jurisdiction it has exercised in the past on the question of levees?

Mr. GARRETT. It would not take away jurisdiction of any question affecting navigation or commerce.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

Mr. LONGWORTH. That was about the question I was going to ask the gentleman. I could not hear the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors; but what I wanted to know was precisely how much jurisdiction this would actually take away from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. GARRETT. I can only repeat the answer which I made to the gentleman from Illinois, that it will not, in my opinion, take away the jurisdiction of any question affecting directly navigation or commerce.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is the gentleman able to state whether the adoption of this rule will facilitate or retard expenditures from the Public Treasury?

Mr. GARRETT. I did not get the gentleman's question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I asked, will it facilitate or retard the getting of appropriations? [Laughter.]

Mr. GARRETT. I can not tell about that until the bills come in. The rule itself carries no appropriation.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask whether I am correct in assuming that this resolution was introduced on the day before yesterday and that that was the first knowledge the House had of the proposition to create this committee? Is that correct?

Mr. GARRETT. It was introduced day before yesterday, as I recall it.

Mr. TREADWAY. And I understand the Committee on Rules reports it back now and expects that the House will at once act pro or con on the subject?

Mr. GARRETT. No; the Committee on Rules reported it back yesterday. It is now before the House for consideration, and it is expected that the House will act pro or con to-day.

Mr. TREADWAY. At once?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask, Mr. Speaker, since it is a new subject, sprung so quickly, without opportunity for consideration either on the part of the committees that will be affected by it or of the House as a whole, that in deference to the Members considering the subject it might not take a later place on the calendar and be brought up at a future day? Or is it introduced with the idea that it is so important that it must be acted upon immediately?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the report of the committee is before the House. I do not know whether I can answer the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts or not. It has certainly been a much-agitated question for a long while. The Committee on Rules has considered it.

Now I desire to yield some time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I wish the gentleman would yield and take care of some gentlemen on that side, and then I will take the floor in my own right and yield to some gentlemen here.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], reserving, of course, my right to resume the floor.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman does that, will he yield to a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GARRETT. I had yielded. If the gentleman will pardon me, there are a number of gentlemen wanting time now, since this matter has risen. I wonder if we can not agree upon some time for debate now. I shall be very glad, indeed, to yield if I can, if there is any desire for time. If not, of course, I shall have to retain the floor, and move the previous question at the end of the hour.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] say?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, the demand for time is growing on this side. I promised 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR], and I think we had better run on for a limited time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this resolution shall conclude in 1 hour and 30 minutes; 30 minutes of that time to be controlled by myself, 30 minutes by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], and 30 minutes by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], and that at the end of that time the previous question may be considered as ordered.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I have requests for more than 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I suggest an hour on a side.

Mr. GARRETT. I am endeavoring, Mr. Speaker, to arrange the time so that those who, as I understand, are opposed to the rule may have control of some time. I am perfectly willing to agree to an hour on a side.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. In just a moment, and I will yield out of that hour 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] if the gentleman from Kansas will yield 10 minutes to him.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will yield to some one who is opposed to the rule, if there is anyone on this side.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman in favor of the rule?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Apparently, then, some one ought to be represented in opposition. I want to secure some information.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is my position. I would like to get 10 minutes.

Mr. HULBERT. I desire to get 10 minutes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no control of it.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if we can get order for a few moments——

Mr. CAMPBELL. The gentleman from Tennessee suggested an hour and thirty minutes, to be divided 30 minutes to myself, 30 minutes to himself, and 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida. I have suggested an hour, to be divided between the gentleman from Tennessee and myself, and I will give 10 minutes of that time to any gentleman on this side who is opposed to the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman's suggestion one hour from the present time?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No; one hour each.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee may have an hour, or 45 minutes, as he desires——

Mr. GARRETT. That will be sufficient——

Mr. MANN. And the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] 45 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee shall have 45 minutes at his disposal, and the gentleman from Kansas 45 minutes at his disposal, and the gentleman from Florida 45 minutes at his disposal.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I merely want to ask whether I can have 10 minutes from any one of these three gentlemen?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if we can get order for a moment, I will undertake to ascertain how many gentlemen here desire time.

Mr. SMALL. I desire some time.

Mr. MANN. The whole House desires time.

Mr. GARRETT. I do not propose to lose control of the floor. If we can not reach an agreement, of course, I shall have to move the previous question. If we can just have a moment to see how much time is desired, I will undertake to submit a proposition. In the meantime will the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] find out how much time is desired on that side?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request to make it an hour to each one of three gentlemen, and that at the end of that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] renews his request for unanimous consent——

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think we will come to an agreement here in a moment.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this resolution may be continued for 2 hours and 30 minutes, 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], 1 hour to be controlled by myself, and half an hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], and that at the end of that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] asks unanimous consent that the debate continue two hours and a half, 1 hour to be controlled by himself, 1 hour by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], 30 minutes by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN]. Is there objection?

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know whether I can have 10 minutes out of that allotment.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman for or against the resolution?

Mr. SMALL. Against the resolution.

Mr. GARRETT. Then the gentleman can get his time from the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my present inclination is to favor this resolution; but at the same time, in view of the circumstances, I think the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Mr. SPARKMAN, should be given more time, and unless he is given the time he wants, I shall object.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Washington permit me to say that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] submitted a request to me for 20 minutes, and I voluntarily increased the time to 30 minutes. If the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] desires more time, I shall be very glad to try to arrange it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think the gentleman from Florida should have sufficient time so that he can yield time to any Members who are opposed to the resolution. I have no doubt that the distinguished gentlemen who have control of the time on either side will deal fairly, but at the same time I think the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] ought to have the time that he wishes. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should think 45 minutes would be sufficient. I find there are more gentlemen who wish to speak on this than I had supposed.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the debate upon this matter may proceed for 2 hours and 45 minutes, 1 hour to be controlled by myself, 1 hour by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], and 45 minutes by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN]; and that at the end of that time the previous question may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] asks unanimous consent that the debate be limited to 2 hours and 45 minutes, 1 hour to be controlled by himself, 1 hour by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], and 45 minutes by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN]; and that at the end of that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] whether in yielding time they are going to divide it impartially, or are they going to give time only to those who favor the resolution?

Mr. GARRETT. I shall yield time indiscriminately to gentlemen, whether they are for or against this resolution.

Mr. MANN. My friend from Washington goes over to the Democratic side of the House to propound that question. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hope these Republicans will compose their differences in private. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HULBERT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HULBERT] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Speaker, I should consider myself remiss in the duty which devolves upon me, representing the constituency I do, which forms a part of the commercial center of the world, located on the largest harbor in the world, dependent as it is, not upon local conditions therein involved, but drawing upon the entire country for the world-renowned supremacy which it enjoys, if I did not avail myself of this opportunity to express the sentiments of the people of my district as favoring the resolution which has been reported. I say that because in every instance when nations, States, or local communities have been stricken by floods or other terrible catastrophes, the people of New York have responded with a commendable promptness to meet the requirements of the situation.

Not so very long ago, at the time of the Galveston flood, trainload after trainload of provisions was gathered at stations established by the sympathetic people of our city and dispatched to the relief of the stricken. That has been repeated with every flood upon the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, and even in every international disaster of note.

I realize that the conditions involved in these flood times along the Mississippi Valley are so important and extensive that it is impossible for the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, owing to enormous number of matters requiring attention, to give due and adequate consideration to all the elements involved; and for the same reason I feel that it is incumbent upon this House to recognize those conditions wherever they exist throughout this land, as it expands and advances along the pathway of progress, and it is incumbent upon the House to develop accordingly proper conveniences for the administration of national affairs to meet the needs which arise under those conditions.

I should like in this connection to discuss the necessity for a similar resolution, which I propose to introduce at no distant date, and to have referred to the Committee on Rules, relating to the harbor of New York, where from a commercial standpoint we are just as much affected as are the people of the Mississippi Valley from a humanitarian standpoint. If it were in order for me to do so, I would rise upon the floor of this House and move to discharge the Committee on Rivers and Harbors from the consideration of a bill introduced by me on the 6th of last December, and upon which no action has been taken by the committee. It was intended by this bill to cover the pending and contemplated improvements of New York Harbor. When it is realized that since the administration of Washington down to that of Wilson less than 3 per cent of all the moneys appropriated by Congress for river and harbor improvements has been allotted to the greatest harbor in the world, I hope and believe it will arrest the attention of the Members of the Sixty-fourth Congress in the same serious way as does the resolution which is under consideration at the present time. The improvement of New York Harbor is not a matter local in its nature, but it concerns the people of the entire United States, just as does the Valley of the Mississippi. It belongs to the Nation. It argues its own case, merely requiring my agency as an instrument of presentation; for truth knows on preferences. It seeks no favors and it makes no apologies. It simply demands a hearing.

Approximately one-half of the exports and imports of the United States pass through New York Harbor, and 100,000,000 tons of commerce, if apportioned per capita, making 1 ton for each man, woman, and child in the United States, accommodates every section of this country; and from the merchandise imported through the port of New York more than double the amount of duties is collected and turned into the Federal Treasury than from all other ports of the United States together. And I had almost overlooked the fact and nearly failed to mention that New York State contributed in addition thereto $17,417,537.60, nearly one-half of the individual income tax, and $10,221,206.65, or more than one-fourth, of the corporation income tax collected during the year 1915. Do not these facts appeal to your sense of justice in securing your favorable consideration of that which I am now about to submit? The magnitude of New York City's industrial and commercial possessions, its wealth and population, can be comprehended only by comparison. In every decade since 1840 New York has shown a greater numerical increase in population than any other American city. One-thirteenth of the entire population of the United States now lives in the New York metropolitan district. New York City produces one-tenth of the entire manufactured product of the United States, more than any other State except Pennsylvania.

The value of New York's taxable property exceeds that of Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, and St. Louis combined. New York City banks handle 60 per cent of the clearings of the United States.

New York is the terminus of all but one of the great eastern railroad systems.

Thirty per cent of the entire population of the United States and 42 per cent of all the taxable property lie within 350 miles of New York City. The population in New York City increased since 1900, 47½ per cent. New York manufactures increased between 1900 and 1910, 70 per cent. The foreign commerce of New York increased from 1898 to 1913, 131 per cent. And yet in the improvement of this great harbor the Federal Government has not only failed to keep abreast of the needs of the times but has fallen far in the rear.

I would like to put the New York Harbor situation before you in concrete form:

Improvement.	Adopted.	Appropriated.	Required to complete.	Total.	Commerce.
East River	1868	$6,505,203	$13,400,000	$19,905,203	[2] $1,537,220,286
Hudson River	1875	641,479	995,000	1,636,479	[3] 2,559,180,809
Harlem River	1879	2,068,000	1,520,656	3,588,656	882,389,737
Newtown Creek	1880	525,900	[1] 10,000	535,900	147,739,825
Sheepshead Bay	1880	44,600	.....	44,600	144,777
Bay Ridge and Red Hook Channel	1881	4,421,100	384,000	4,805,100	498,[illegible]361
Bronx River	1896	326,500	703,931	1,030,431	[4] 1,947,786
Ambrose Channel	1899	7,600,013	[1] 40,000	7,640,013	2,056,547,222
Coney Island Channel	1907	114,300	.....	114,300	[5] 5,256,370
Jamaica Bay	1910	709,500	6,730,000	7,439,500	[5] 171,668
Harlem or Bronx Kills, recommended	1902	Nothing.	1,900,000	1,900,000	None.
		22,947,592	25,683,587	48,631,179	7,304,375,730

[1] Maintenance only.
[2] 22,436,151 passengers.
[3] 106,253,639 passengers.
[4] Only 14 per cent completed.
[5] 1,178,168 passengers.
[6] State Barge Canal not yet open.

In addition to the foregoing evidence, that the improvement of New York Harbor is not a "pork-barrel" proposition, let it be noted that the Ambrose Channel was constructed at a saving of about $1,500,000; that the balance to be expended, under the old project, for the improvement of the East River—$2,551,939—can be turned over to, and credited upon, the new project and will suffice to do the work required in the next five years; that the Coney Island Channel improvement was authorized upon an estimate of $168,300, and work to date, costing only $114,300, meets present-day needs and no further appropriations have been asked for.

You are now probably asking yourselves what it is that we seek.

In 1868 the first project was adopted for the improvement of New York Harbor, to wit, East River, a tidal strait, of which the world-renowned Hell Gate is a part, about 16 miles long, extending from the Battery to Throg Neck, separating Long Island from the Boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx, and connecting up New York Bay with the sheltered waters of Long Island Sound, providing a double entrance and exist to New York Harbor, and establishing a marine trench, which will be more efficient in the defense of that portion of the United States, which nearly all military and naval experts agree would be the first objective point of attack, than a dozen battleships, under present conditions, and at the cost of less than one battleship. With its subsequent modifications, this project had for its object extending the depth of the channel over projecting rocks at an estimated cost of $8,757,183.

Work called for under existing project.

Locality.	Distance by water from the Battery.	Least original depth.	Least present depth.	Projected depth.	Remarks.
	Miles.	*Feet.*	*Feet.*	*Feet.*	
Battery Reef		12.8	12.8	26	
South Ferry Reef		17	19	26	
Diamond Reef	¼	15.7	26	26	Completed.
Reef off Diamond Reef	¼	19	26	26	Do.
Coenties Reef	¼	14.3	25.3	26	
Third Street Reef	3	15.9	26	26	Do.
Shell Reef	2¼-4	7.5	13	18	
Pilgrim Rock	3¼	12	24	26	
Twenty-sixth Street Reef	4	16.1	26	26	Do.
Charlotte Rock	4¼	14.7	26	26	Do.
Ferry Reef	4½	7	24	26	
Man-of-War Rock	4⅝	+0.8	26	26	Do.
Middle Reef (includes Negro Head, Flood Rock, Hen and Chickens, and Gridiron).[1]	7½	+6	14.9	26	95 per cent completed.
Heel Tap Rock	7¾	12.1	20.5	26	
Hallets Point Reef	7¾	+4	26	26	Completed.
Frying Pan Reef	7¾	9	23.8	26	
Pot Rock	8	8	26	26	Do.
Shell Drake Rock	8	8	26	26	Do.
Ways Reef	8¼	5	26	26	Do.
Rock off Negro Point	9	.....	.....	26	Reported completed.
Scaly Rock	9¼	.....	.....	.....	
Middle Ground[2]	10	11	17.8	26	
Reef off North Brother Island.	10¾	16	.....	.....	
Channel between North Brother and South Brother Islands.[3]	10¼-11¼	19	19	26	
Baretto Reef	11¾	17	25	26	Completed.

[1] Under contract for completing removal.
[2] Under contract for part removal.
[3] Under contract for deepening for a width of about 300 feet.

About 70 per cent of the work has been completed.

On March 2, 1912, Col. W. M. Black, United States district engineer at New York, under acts of Congress approved March 2, 1907, and March 3, 1909, submitted a report of the survey of the East River and Hell Gate (H. Doc. 188, 63d Cong., 1st sess.), in which he reported favorably upon an amendment of the project for further improvement at an expense of $32,533,501, providing for a through channel 35 feet deep, with access to the wharves to a depth of 30 feet, and the improvement of the Harlem or Bronx Kills, to provide a short cut for boats passing from the Harlem, which will be the natural outlet for the State barge canal into the East River; and Little Hell Gate, as a means of reducing the tidal velocities and diminishing, if not avoiding, the consequent dangers at Hell Gate. The Chief of Engineers modified the recommendations of Col. Black by reducing the estimate "for the present" to $13,400,000, which, largely through the efforts of our late lamented colleague, Col. Joseph A. Goulden, was included in the bill reported by the Rivers and Harbors Committee and passed the House in the Sixty-third Congress, first session, but failed in the Senate. Meanwhile no further appropriations have been made for the improvement of the East River; and while there is an unexpended balance of $2,551,939 now of the amount originally authorized, the Chief of Engineers reported in 1914 and again in 1915:

It is believed that the present 26-foot project has been outgrown by the commercial interests involved, and that further work on this project is now economically inadvisable. No estimate is therefore submitted for operations in connection with said project during the fiscal year 1917.

And I may add that nothing has been expended since 1912 upon this great waterway. And if the immediate decisive action is not taken by Congress before we are able to secure the adoption of the modified project for $13,400,000 "to meet the present demands," it will be then as obsolete as is now the project of 1868; so that by the time we will be able to secure the ultimate adoption of the project for $33,000,000, as recommended by Col. Black, the commercial interest involved will so far have outgrown the port of New York that it will live only in history. In fact, its commerce is being most seriously interfered with to-day, because the Interstate Commerce Commission has established differential rates against New York, and which, I am told, has diverted enormous shipments of grain and other freight through Canadian and southern ports. I do not believe that the patriotism of our people will sanction discrimination against New York in favor of foreign ports.

The report of the Chief of Engineers adds:

As a result of a careful canvas the commerce of the East River in the calendar year 1914 appears to have amounted to 46,553,605 short tons, valued at $1,537,239,286, and that the number of passengers carried was 22,436,151.

And the fact that the 30-foot and 31-foot battleships built, and now being built, at the Brooklyn Navy Yard can only be floated in or out on high tide at the rate of one ship per day was recently called to the attention of this House by the Secretary of the Navy, who urged the immediate necessity of this improvement. But it is reported that the Rivers and Harbors Committee will not take on any new projects at this session, which settles the question, unless you gentlemen give us unanimous consent for the consideration of this matter in a separate bill or resolution.

Is there anyone who doubts that the unusual commercial importance of the East River, Harlem River, and the Harlem or Bronx Kills and their continued improvement to meet the insistent demands of the commerce of the metropolis differentiates these to a large degree from any other project; and should not, therefore, the harbor of New York be made a matter of special consideration and not included in the river and harbor bill? Let us take, for instance, the question of the improvement of the Harlem or Bronx Kills.

The rivers and harbors act of June 13, 1902, directed a preliminary examination of the Harlem or Bronx Kills, which was made and reported by Col. Mansfield on July 28, 1902, whose report was reviewed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and their report, dated November 11, 1903, concludes with the words:

In view of the great present and prospective benefits that would result, it is advisable to undertake the improvement of the Harlem Kills to a depth of 18 feet at mean low water, at a cost of $1,899,480.

There is a recommendation made 14 years ago, and what has been done meanwhile?

In 1903 the Legislature of the State of New York adopted a project for the improvement of the Erie and connecting canals to a depth of 12 feet, and authorized a bond issue of $101,000,000 and $7,000,000, to which have been added by subsequent enactments $19,000,000 and $27,000,000, making a total of $154,000,000 to complete the project and construct terminals. Yet while the people of the State of New York, with far-sighted statesmanship, and appreciating the necessity of this development in order to accommodate the commerce of the great Northwest and to regain that which has been diverted through Canadian ports—and upon the completion of the pending improvements of the Welland Canal even greater will be the competition to the port of New York—have expended upon the development of their interior waterways more than $200,000,000—that is, a State having 10 per cent of the population of the whole United States have appropriated an amount equal to 25 per cent of that appropriated by the Federal Congress for the whole United States, and yet have been unable to secure the cooperation of the Federal Government in the development of this improvement of the Harlem or Bronx Kills, the importance of which can not be overestimated, because the tremendous tonnage which will be brought from the great Northwest down the State Barge Canal and the Hudson River must be diverted in order to relieve congestion in the lower Hudson River, through the Harlem River, and under present conditions boats intending to go up the East River and Long Island Sound are compelled to continue on their course down to Ninety-first Street and through tortuous Hell Gate, whereas upon the improvement of the Harlem or Bronx Kills

these vessels can cut through between Randalls Island and the mainland, making a saving in distance of approximately 11 miles and avoiding the danger of Hell Gate. Moreover, Col. Black in his report says:

It is considered that this channel would be commercially advantageous in four ways: (1) By assisting in the reduction of the excessive current velocities in Hell Gate, by permitting more water to pass between the upper East River and the basin about Mill Rock through the lower Harlem River, instead of having to pass through Hell Gate; (2) by affording a direct and short passage to traffic between the upper East River and the Harlem and Hudson Rivers; (3) by diverting a portion of the traffic from the crooked, narrow, and overcrowded reaches of the East River to west and south of Wards Island; and (4) by increasing the circulation of water in the Harlem River south of the entrance to the Kills, thus reducing the annual deposit of silt in that reach.

Further, Col. Black says with respect to the current velocities through Hell Gate, which, through certain stages of the tide, are so great as to endanger navigation seriously, that by careful investigation he has arrived at the conclusion that if the Harlem Kills were improved, the maximum mean velocities of a mean tide in Hell Gate would be reduced by 1.1 miles per hour, or 28 per cent, for north-bound currents and by a proportionate amount for south bound, and that these results would be attended by favorable influences on navigation and sanitation in the Harlem River.

I am astounded to find that there never has been an examination and report by the engineers upon the effect of the $154,000,000 improvement of the State Barge Canal with reference to the commercial development of the lower Harlem and East Rivers since the State Barge Canal improvement act was adopted; and there has been no action by any Congress since that time tending to effect cooperation at this point with the State authorities. I do not criticize the members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, but, to my mind, this fully illustrates the absolute necessity for the consideration of the conditions in the port of New York by special legislation and not as a part of the great and laborious work of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. The conditions at New York are such they can not be controlled by a rule adopted to govern conditions in rural localities.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shall presently introduce a resolution to meet the needs of the situation at New York with a view to authorizing an appropriation sufficient to undertake and carry forward all pending and reported improvements of the harbor of New York in accordance with the commercial necessities not only of the present day but as the best judgment of this House can determine as to the future.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. RAUCH.

Mr. RAUCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. CARAWAY.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Speaker, representing the district I do, I shall support this measure. That district I have the honor to represent is composed of 11 counties, and a portion of every one of those counties is now under water. We have in the State of Arkansas at this time flood conditions extending up and down the Mississippi River for a distance of 72 miles, and in some places 60 miles in width and between 2,000 and 3,000 square miles of our territory is now under water from 2 to 7 feet in depth. The district I represent has 350 miles of Mississippi River front. Crossing it are five navigable streams. Every one of those streams subjects the country surrounding it to overflow. The subject of this resolution, therefore, vitally affects everybody residing in my district. For that reason I realize I shall be charged with self-motives if I urge its passage. I therefor shall say only that I intend to support it. The remainder of my time I shall devote to a discussion of the local conditions now prevailing in my State, and do this in support of a resolution I introduced yesterday asking for immediate relief.

For quite a while I lived on the banks of the Mississippi River. From the front door of my house to the levees that confined the waters of that mighty river to its channel was not greater than the distance across this Chamber. I have seen every man and woman, white and black, spend days and nights fighting floods. I have seen these waters when they were more than 20 feet above the level of the land kept within an embankment 2 feet of which were but sacks of sand. Anyone who has never gone through the experience of an overflow in the Mississippi Valley will never know what it is.

The conditions are peculiar there. I have heard it charged that we come here and ask relief when we are able to help ourselves. That statement is not true. While the State of Arkansas has been admitted to the Union for nearly 100 years—it was admitted in 1836—there was no substantial progress made in that section of the State bordering on the Mississippi River until within the last generation. It is common knowledge to all that the people who go into a country to be pioneers are usually poor. Rich people prefer to stay in that part of the country where the battles for civilization and ease have been fought and won. Within the last 15 years 75 per cent of some of the counties in my district were so subject to overflow that I have seen land of the finest quality covered with fine timber sell at $1.25 an acre. We have paid there within that time for the purpose of building levees and digging ditches to carry off the surface water, in taxes voluntarily levied upon ourselves, a greater sum, twice over, than the original value of the land when we took possession of it. I have seen people without means other than the ownership of some fruitful soil that frequently overflowed, voluntarily vote upon themselves for drainage and flood protection a tax of $10 an acre or more on their land. The people who own that property do not stop at that when it comes to protection of their country against floods. In Mississippi County, in my district, I know a gentleman who spent out of his private means in one year more than $20,000 to fight floods in that county, never asked the Federal Government or anyone else to repay him a cent of this sum.

In my own town during times of distress caused by overflow I have seen practically every home thrown open to receive refugees from the flooded districts. I myself have received them until they slept four to a bed. We have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for temporary relief for those driven from their homes by floods. This relief has been extended to all who were afflicted, regardless of race or color. It has been given freely, with the full knowledge that not one cent was ever to be returned, and there was no desire that it should be.

As I said a minute ago, ordinarily those people who are pioneers in any country, and it is doubly true in this flooded area, are people without means. They are full of energy and courage. They have gone into this section because it has great promise for the future. What they have earned in most instances they have devoted to the building of their homes and to the fight to protect them from the ravages of the rivers. They are therefore, or a great percentage of them are, poorly provided for against emergencies of this kind. The destruction of their crops and of their stock leaves them helpless, and in many instances absolute destitution and want face them. They must depend either upon private charity or upon the aid of their common country.

We have not been niggardly in providing for the relief of those who suffer disaster in other sections. I voted to extend relief to the people in Salem, Mass., when it was visited by a disastrous fire; I voted to relieve the situation of the people in Dayton, Ohio, when the floods swept away their homes; I have voted to appropriate money to relieve distress wherever it has been found; to preserve the public health and protect the public morals, and I think it therefore not unreasonable that in times like this we should look to the Federal Government for aid. We have extended it freely to all other sections and all other people. I feel certain it will not be denied to these. We are an independent people in my State. We have provided liberally for the relief of those who have been unfortunate. We have institutions where those whom nature has afflicted may be cared for in comfort, and their conditions made as pleasant as possible. We have taxed ourselves to redeem the country in which we live in far greater sums than our aggregate assessed wealth now is. We do not ask to be relieved against those burdens that are common to all sections of our country. We ask only that the Government shall in part relieve the distress of the people who have been visited by great national disasters such as this. I venture the assertion that if all the people who are now suffering and distressed from the flooded condition in my State dwelled together in one city, and such a distaster were to overtake them, it would create such public sentiment and excite such public sympathy that the Congress of the United States would rush to their relief within the hour. Then shall it be denied to these because they dwell in remote places and most of them are poor and unknown? By far the majority of these people who are at this time afflicted belong to the colored race. These have been looked upon as the wards of the Nation, but we do not now ask that the National Government shall expend one-tenth as great a sum to relieve their distress as the white people among whom they live will expend in their behalf.

We ask only that they be assisted to the extent that they may live and not suffer until this disaster shall have passed away.

I hope the Committee on Appropriations will immediately report out my resolution so that a vote may be had on it, and relief extended to those who now cry out for it.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote in favor of the adoption of this resolution. As I understand the purpose of our honored Speaker in introducing this measure, it is intended to create a committee having jurisdiction over all bills relating to flood control whether the floods occur on navigable or nonnavigable streams. Heretofore all such bills have been referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, but that committee insists that its jurisdiction is limited to the improvement of the navigation of streams in order that commerce might be promoted. It is true that in carrying out this policy levees have been ostensibly constructed to confine the rivers to their channels but which have actually prevented the inundation of riparian lands and contiguous sections. This work, however, was all done under the guise of improving the navigation of the rivers for the benefit of commerce.

I come from a State where we have dry rivers and no harbors, and I want to see a committee established that will give consideration to the flood problems on nonnavigable streams. I can best illustrate the nature of the relief that the people of Arizona are seeking by recounting the damage done by the recent floods on the Gila River. I shall begin by reading an article printed in the Graham Guardian, published at Safford, Ariz. At least 6,000 acres of rich alfalfa land in Graham County, every acre of it worth more than a hundred dollars, have been washed away by successive floods, and if something is not done to stop this devastation even greater areas will be turned from fruitful farms into wastes of sand and bowlders.

GILA RIVER OVERFLOWS BANKS.

The continuous rains of the past week culminated Wednesday in the biggest snowstorm that the valley has seen in 39 years.

* * * * * * *

The snowstorm was not all the valley had as a result of the week's rain. The Gila River cleared both banks and for a time things looked serious. The waters swept over the farming lands bordering the river, carrying away land and everything in its path.

At Solomonville it almost reached the town. It spread over William Gillespie's ranch and destroyed a new crop of barley valued at $1,500.

Nearer here it swept over part of Walter McIntyre's ranch and carried away 40 hogs.

North of Safford the river overflowed into the lower fields of the Prina and Layton ranches. On the Thorpe ranch, which is located on the south bank of the river, the waters ran several feet deep and through the lumber house where the ranch hands lived.

On the Clayton ranch, east of the Thorpe ranch, the water covered the entire ranch to a depth of several feet. About 12 hogs were reported lost at this place Wednesday night.

About 2 o'clock Wednesday afternoon Herman Foster, Denzyl Thorpe, and Claude Bledsoe drove to the Thorpe ranch in a wagon and got all the bedding and clothing out of the house and then started to save the stock.

They got 6 cows and a calf to a place of safety and saved about 30 hogs, including young pigs, out of 65.

Hinton Mullenax and several others went to the rescue of Mrs. Blanche Edwards, who lives on the ranch adjoining Thorpe's, and saved all her household goods. Twelve hogs, all she owned, were last seen marooned on an island back of the ranch house.

The river overflowed its banks all the way down the valley. The roar of the waters could be heard for a considerable distance.

At Pima it was feared the bridge would go out, but the structure stood firm against the attacks of the maddened stream. The waters finally overflowed and broke through the protection of piling and rocks on the north side of the river and east of the bridge, which had been placed to turn the current. The water found a weak spot and washed out the road leading to the north approach of the bridge.

On the Pima side the road to the approach was not damaged by the river, but was overflowed by the waters from Cottonwood wash.

About 10 o'clock yesterday morning a stream about 100 feet wide was going over the road that led to the north approach, leaving only the wood part of the approach next to the bridge.

The following editorial sums up the situation:

SAVE THE RIVER LANDS.

There is so much of the farming land going into the Gila River since the recent high water that our farmers have woke up to the necessity of taking immediate steps to stop the depredations of the river.

Acre after acre has been engulfed in this vicious stream the last three weeks, and more going in daily. Some ranches have lost from 5 to 20 acres, and the total losses will aggregate nearly $50,000.

It is time our valley farmers got busy on some proposition that will lead to united action in the saving of these valuable lands bordering on both sides of the river. Further delay in the matter may mean that it will be impossible to do anything in the way of straightening the Gila River.

Already the river has made great headway east of town and in direct line with the railroad tracks. Some day, unless something is done at this point of the river, the old Gila will come flowing down Twelfth Street and head straight for Thatcher.

It is no wonder that every time I visit the upper Gila Valley the stricken citizens say to me, "Why is it that Congress can do nothing for our relief?" I am always compelled to make the same old answer, which every Congressman has made for the last hundred years, that no money is spent by the Federal Government except to promote commerce on navigable streams, and that, therefore, I can hold out no hope to them.

At Winkelman, farther down the stream, four persons were drowned in the flood waters of the Gila according to the following press dispatches:

WINKELMAN, ARIZ., *January 20.*

Last night the river broke in around the race track in the vicinity of the James Pruitt property. George McClaine, a teamster named Johnson, and two women—a woman known only as Ollie, and Ellen Smith—were drowned. A woman named Jean Elliott was saved.

Three men floated down the river on top of a house. The house struck some obstacle and the three men went under the water, but were rescued. Charles Osborne, Bert Vallentine, and P. H. Smith were those rescued.

—

WINKELMAN, *January 22.*

The flood is entirely over here, but the results still remain. The bridge across the Gila is entirely gone. The town is entirely cut off from the outside as far as the railroad service is concerned.

The Gila has dropped, and a search has been started for the bodies of those drowned several days ago. The body of Ollie Devore, one of the women drowned, was found about 9 miles down the river.

All those made homeless by the high water are being taken care of by local people. It is expected that many whose homes are still left will return in a day or so and start to clean things up.

Continuing down the stream the floods spread destruction in Pinal County, as is shown by the following account taken from the Arizona Blade-Tribune, of Florence, under date of January 22, 1916:

GILA OUT OF BANKS—THE BIGGEST FLOOD SINCE 1884—MUCH DAMAGE DONE.

For the second time almost within a year the Gila River bridge is impassable, made so by extremely high waters that this time caused a tremendous washout in the graded approach on the south side of the bridge, which occurred on Wednesday of this week, and all vehicle communication with the north side of the river is at a standstill, and will be until the waters recede so the river may be forded.

At dark Wednesday evening the gap between the south end of the bridge and the mainland was fully 250 feet wide. By 8 o'clock the next morning it was no less than 500 feet wide, and the water was fast eating its way farther into the mainland, until finally the entire graded approach to the bridge was eaten away and the main channel of the river had changed from its former course on the north side to the extreme south bank and is now entirely south of the south end of the bridge and is rapidly cutting away and ruining valuable farms along the river. Just how badly farms are being damaged can not be told until the water subsides.

More than half a mile of road leading to the approach to the bridge has been badly washed out, and it will cost several thousand dollars to replace it in its former condition, and little of this work can be done until the water has fallen to a low point.

The condition of some of the Mexicans living on the edge of the mesa was most pitiable. Their meager belongings were soaked with the muddy waters from the river and their houses flooded. This was caused by the water running over into the lowland just at the northern limit of the city and being backed up by the sewer levee, which finally broke, and the water flowed through onto the Kelner lands, completely inundating that property.

To save a break in the sewer line right at the north end of Main Street a dozen or more men were kept busy for several hours, and the levee was raised a foot and a half. However, farther out, the line went out in two places, taking away a hundred feet or more of the sewer.

The issue of this newspaper for the following week continues the account of the damage:

LOCAL DAMAGE BY STORM.

While no loss of life was suffered in this county as a result of the big flood of last week, a great deal of damage to lands lying along the Gila River is reported. The greatest damage done in this immediate vicinity was the washing away of a large portion of the ranch of Juan Aguilar, which lies along the south bank of the river just east of the roadway leading to the bridge. Out of between 70 and 80 acres, Mr. Aguilar now has not more than 15 or 20 acres left, and a great deal of fencing on the remaining acres was washed away. Mr. Aguilar places his loss at $3,000.

L. K. Drais also lost nearly half of his 23-acre ranch west of the Aguilar lands across the road.

The Kelner ranch, still farther down the river half a mile, lost fully 60 acres of land, which were washed away by the raging torrent of flood waters. This ranch suffered the loss of about 20 acres during the big flood of a year ago. At this point the land was not overflowed, but being a sand loam was easily washed out by the flood.

Adjoining the Kelner ranch was the 40-acre ranch of Mrs. Mattie L. Dart, and not more than 5 acres of this place remains. Mrs. Dart had just completed installing a pumping plant on her place, and was due to prove up on her desert entry yesterday. A house and barn on this place were saved from the flood by being hauled to higher ground before the water reached them. The land where these buildings stood has been washed away.

Across the river considerable damage was done to the Nicholas irrigation ditch and to lands on that side of the river. J. R. Treat is probably the heaviest loser, some 20 acres of his land having been washed away. It is also reported that Mrs. Watson's 160-acre ranch was considerably damaged, but no one has been over the property and it is not known just how badly this property was washed.

Emile Pierson, who lives 7½ miles of Florence on the opposite side of the river, was in Florence Monday, and stated that his property had not been damaged by the flood, but stated that G. W. Pattee, who recently purchased the George and Adrain Pierson ranches, had lost between 10 and 15 acres.

The J. J. Fraser ranch of 800 acres, just west of Florence on this side of the river, which is now being farmed by T. E. Moody, was damaged by loss of half a mile of ditch and the washing away of possibly 4 acres of land.

The Clemans ranch at Adamsville lost something like 10 acres of land and half a mile of ditch and some fencing.

On down the river 8 miles C. M. Shannon lost nearly a mile and a half of ditch. No damage was done to his pumping plant nor to his 600-acre ranch.

The matter of repairing the break in the south approach to the Gila River bridge has not yet been definitely determined upon. Engineer G. F. Twitchell was here Wednesday but made no statement in regard to the matter.

It is conceded that it would be a waste of time and money to rebuild the approach on its former lines and that nothing short of several hundred feet of concrete work should be considered. The gap washed in the approach is fully 1,000 feet wide and to rebuild it with earth and gravel would be folly as the next big flood would be most likely to wipe it out again.

The Gila River Indian Reservation lies just below Florence, and our Indian wards have suffered great losses that they can ill afford to bear, as is shown by the following telegram that I have just received from the superintendent of the Pima Agency at Sacaton:

SACATON VIA CASA GRANDE, ARIZ., *February 3, 1916.*

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Recent flood damage to Indian lands and canals is more than $100,000 on Pima Reservation. Immediate relief urgent.

THACKERY, *Superintendent.*

That part of the valley of the Gila in Maricopa County, Ariz., known as the Buckeye Valley also suffered severe damage from the recent floods. The Buckeye Valley News of January 20, 1916, contains the following account of the flood conditions:

BIGGEST FLOOD IN MANY YEARS—RAILROADS, CANAL SYSTEMS, AND PUBLIC HIGHWAYS SUFFER BIG LOSSES.

The Buckeye Valley has been subjected to the biggest flood the past week ever known; that is, a greater volume of water has passed down the Gila River. Old-timers admit this. Several years ago the Gila was on a rampage and reached a point farther up on the highlands, but that was before the channel of the river was as pronounced as at the present time.

The water is higher, much higher than last year and damage greater. The individual loss in this valley is not very great, but the stockholders of both canals, Buckeye and Arlington, will sustain a loss greater than in 1915. The Flower Pot's Enterprise headgates, we understand, escaped damage. The water is so high at the present writing that it is impossible to ascertain just what fate the Buckeye Dam has met, but is presumed that it is entirely swept away. The canal is uninjured. The Arlington Canal suffered quite a severe loss, and the current of the river is sweeping down through their canal for quite a distance. The dam is supposed to be intact, but a new current has been formed on the north of their headgate and has probably caused considerable damage. The Hassayampa River was also higher than for several years and this flood water undermined the flume of the Arlington Canal Co. and either destroyed or badly damaged it. The water in the Hassayampa has subsided and the river is fordable.

The Arizona Eastern Railroad, as usual, came in for their share of loss from the storm. From reliable information we learn that their loss will be greater than last year. The bridge is still standing in spite of the thousand and one reports to the contrary. The approaches on both sides are washed out in numerous places, on the west side as far up as where the wagon road crosses the railroad. We have had no mail since Monday, and it is impossible to make an intelligent guess as to when mail service will be resumed. For two days the telephone line between here and Phoenix has been out, but is now in working order.

The same newspaper gives this story of a second flood:

THE AFTERMATH.

Scarcely had the News been delivered at the post office last week when word was received that another flood was coming down the Agua Frio, Salt, and Gila Rivers. By noon Friday the gauge at the mouth of the Agua Frio above the Buckeye Dam indicated that the water was within 2 inches of the mark made by the high flood of two weeks ago. The Salt did not quite reach the high mark made by the former flood, but the Gila at this point was about the same as two weeks ago, and the damage is fully as great. There is considerable snow in the mountains and the indications are that the Gila will be a troublesome stream for weeks to come.

The Valley received no mail from Thursday of last week until Monday of this week. The long-distance telephone line was also out of commission during this time, and Buckeye was shut out from the world, and apparently by the world forgot. The telephone line is now in working order, and we are getting mail semioccasionally.

The Arizona Eastern Railroad sustained further damage on their Buckeye branch by losing more of their fill leading up to the Agua Frio bridge, but the bridge still stands.

The Buckeye Canal system is in about the same condition as the former flood left it in, except that the water from the slough north of the headgate broke into the upper end of the canal and filled it with silt and sand, but the canal is uninjured, and it will be a small matter to clean this portion of the canal.

Ranchers along the Gila River suffered fully as great a loss as they sustained 10 days ago, and some greater. Mrs. McDonald's ranch, between here and Liberty, has been toppling into the river for the past four or five days; also the Slagel ranch. Monday evening the river had eaten its way to within 120 feet of the McDonald residence, and it was necessary to move the house and other buildings up to the north line of the ranch Tuesday morning. The Slagel house, tank, and other buildings were also moved.

The Arlington Canal Co. also sustained additional heavy loss. From reliable information we learn that the headgate is badly damaged, and the upper end of the canal for quite a distance is completely washed away, and it is doubtful in the minds of many whether it will be possible to reconstruct that portion of the canal that is washed away. However, when the water recedes it may be found that the damage is not as great as is now feared.

The ranch of Thomas H. Bell, just south of the C. B. Parker place, is again almost entirely submerged and the house and outbuilding have toppled over; how badly the land is washed we are unable to state, but it is certainly in a deplorable condition now.

George Schmidt, on the old Haigler ranch, met with an additional loss of land to the amount of 5 acres, making a total of 7 acres of good rich soil that has toppled into the Gila and is forever gone.

The danger to none of these properties is past. The Gila will be high for several weeks to come, falling in the daytime and rising at night. It is not the excessively high water that does the damage; the receding water appears to undermine the bank and it falls into the river, the next high water washes this soil away, and as the water recedes again it undermines the bank and another large chunk of hundred-dollar land falls into the river.

These newspaper accounts mention but a part of the damage done by floods along the entire course of the Gila, and I would have you remember that I have confined my remarks to this one stream. As a matter of fact, great losses annually occur on every river in Arizona.

Neither shall I go into the details of the flood at the mouth of the Gila at Yuma, where the water ran 4 feet deep through the principal streets of that city, and where nearly a thousand people were left homeless. The destruction at Yuma does not come within the scope of my remarks, because the Colorado has been declared to be a navigable stream. It was a levee built by an appropriation in the river and harbor act of 1892 that broke, flooding the city. I hope to obtain an appropriation to repair this levee on the same theory which justified its original construction; that is, for the purpose of confining the Colorado to its channel in order to make it more navigable. Such an appropriation for the levee at Yuma can be recommended by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and I am hopeful that they will do so at an early date, even though it is admitted that the interests of navigation are slight.

No one doubts that Congress has power to make appropriations to promote commerce on navigable streams, for we have been spending Federal funds for this purpose for over a century, but whenever we ask for an appropriation to control the floods on nonnavigable streams the constitutionality of such a law is immediately questioned. There is no greater authority on the Constitution than Story, and this is the rule that he lays down:

> The only limitations upon the power (to appropriate money in aid of internal improvements) are those prescribed by the terms of the Constitution, that the objects shall be for the common defense or the general welfare of the Union.
>
> The true test is whether the object be of a local character and local use or whether it be of general benefit to the States. If it be purely local, Congress can not constitutionally appropriate money for the object. But if the benefit be general, it matters not whether in point of locality it be in one State or several, whether it be of large or of small extent, its nature and character determine the right, and Congress may appropriate money in aid of it, for it is then, in a just sense, for the general welfare.

In one sense the control of floods on a nonnavigable stream would confer nothing but a local benefit, and, therefore, Congress would have no right to authorize the expenditure of Federal funds for this purpose. But I maintain that no part of our common country can suffer an injury without affecting, in some degree, the general welfare, and, therefore, in whatever measure the general welfare may be promoted Congress can lawfully appropriate money to that extent.

For example, take the money that has been spent in the reclamation of arid land. Congress has said that since the benefits conferred are to a large extent local in their character the Government can not properly make the irrigation works a free gift to the settlers whose lands are thus made valuable. It does, however, promote the general welfare of the whole country to have the deserts and waste places changed into cultivated fields, and, therefore, the Federal Government can, under the Constitution, loan the money necessary to construct canals and reservoirs without interest.

And so it appeals to me that there could be no doubt about the constitutionality of an act which provided that the Federal Government might loan money to landowners along a nonnavigable stream for the purpose of controlling the floods that are now destroying their farms. Certainly those who receive the major portion of the benefit should pay the larger share of the cost, but to the extent that all of our people are benefited the Government of the United States should also pay its share.

Aside from promoting the general welfare, the Federal Government has a further interest in the control of floods on nonnavigable streams. A flood rarely occurs that it does not interrupt traffic on the railroads, thus interfering with interstate commerce. Every argument that can be made for appropriations in behalf of commerce on navigable streams applies with equal, if not greater, force to the safeguarding of commerce by rail.

At one time commerce, both interstate and international, was chiefly by water, but in recent years our commerce has come to be carried on mainly by railroads. Under the Constitution Congress now exercises the same jurisdiction over these artificial highways that it has always had over waterways, although there was not a railway in existence at the time the Constitution was adopted. It certainly follows that Congress has power to appropriate money, to some extent, for the control of floods that interfere with interstate commerce by rail, and it matters not

whether the flood occurs on a navigable or a nonnavigable stream.

There is still another reason why our Government has an interest in flood control everywhere. Congress has power to establish post offices and post roads, yet there is not a destructive flood on any stream that does not interfere with the delivery of the mails. The United States, therefore, has a right to contribute something for the control of floods if the Postal Service is promoted and protected by doing so. This same reasoning would also justify such appropriations as means of national defense, because troops can not be readily moved or supplied when the rivers are in flood.

In order to arrive at a practical working basis for determining what interest the Federal Government has in the control of floods on any stream, and thus measuring the appropriations that can be legitimately made, it seems to me that this new committee must adopt a rule, similar to the rule now in force respecting appropriations by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, that no new project shall be undertaken until after an investigation has first been made by a board of engineers. The Government engineers should be required to make findings in their report which shall include the following subjects:

First. A plan for the control of floods on the stream and the estimated cost thereof.

Second. The proportionate interest that the United States has in the project, taking into consideration the general welfare, interference with interstate commerce, the delivery of the mails, and so forth.

Third. The proportionate share of the cost of the flood-protection works that should be paid by the riparian owners whose lands would be benefited.

With this data, prepared by competent engineers, available for consideration, the committee and the Congress could act intelligently in making appropriations for flood control.

I realize that there is no greater economic question before this Congress than the adoption of a proper policy for flood control, a question that affects not only the material welfare but the very lives of our citizens. It is the bounden and solemn duty of this Government to promote the safety, happiness, and prosperity of our people by every act of legislation, within constitutional limits, which Congress may deem conducive to these ends. I know only too well that the machinery of this great Government moves with exasperating slowness, but I believe that the establishment of this committee will hasten the day when real and substantial relief can be given to those who now suffer from the devastation wrought by floods. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the pending resolution to create a flood control committee bears the indorsement of our great Speaker of the House, which shows to me that it has had his thoughtful consideration. The Committee on Rules has also given it serious thought and reported it favorably to the House. I shall give it my support, although the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of which I am a member, Mr. SPARKMAN, of Florida, may enter some objections to it. I always dislike to vote in opposition to this distinguished southerner. I shall do so in this case if he takes the view of the resolution he has indicated.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I am sorry, but my time is short, I can not yield. Now, gentlemen of the House, and if there be members of the Appropriation Committee present—I see some present—I should like to have the benefit of their attention, I will say that down in the southeastern part of the State of Arkansas, mostly in my district, all along the Mississippi River, flood conditions there are reported to me as being horrible. My home city of Pine Bluff is located on the Arkansas River about 100 miles from the Mississippi, and nearly all the country from Pine Bluff to the Mississippi is under water, so to speak. Hundreds and hundreds of people are in destitute and in a terrible flood condition to-day. That is true not only in my district but out of my district. In the district represented by my colleague, Mr. CARAWAY, and in the district represented by my colleague, Mr. GOODWIN, similar conditions prevail. On the 27th day of January I received the first information concerning the flood and destitution through a telegram from the governor of my State. This great water that is in the Mississippi is unusual. The Arkansas River is on a rise now unprecedented in the history of that river. In front of my home city it is nearly 3 feet higher than ever known before. I have telegrams here that the flood water is backing up now into this city with alarming rapidity, which portends, I fear, terrible results.

So soon as I got information from the governor of the distressed situation I immediately visited the War Department for assistance, and was informed that no relief could be granted by the department; that the Congress of the United States in February—I believe it was—1913, passed a law prohibiting the department from sending food, tents, or clothing to sufferers of any character or from any cause. Because of my alarm and fear and seeing that prompt action should be taken and that a great emergency existed, I went to the American Red Cross Association of this city and called for relief. I was promised that they would send an agent down to the stricken district to investigate conditions. I have gotten nothing from any source up to date. It is said in the Good Book that "charity is the paramount virtue; all else is but as a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal." And now, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, in this hour of great and dire distress of our people and while the citizens of my district and below and above me are appealing to you and the Senate, who constitute the Nation's Congress, for aid—for clothing, for tents, for shelter, and for rescue boats—I hope that you will not deny them. Since I have been a Member of this Congress I have always voted for the distressed and suffering people of this Nation everywhere when called upon for relief. I remember casting my vote to help the distressed fire-stricken people in the State of Massachusetts, at Salem. The same I did last year or the year before in the great flood disaster in the Ohio River Valley. I desire to read a few telegrams that I have received. Here is one from the governor of my State:

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *January 27, 1916.*

HON. SAM M. TAYLOR,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Mr. Stone, of Watson, Desha County, just phoned me to request immediate aid from Federal Government for 500 families in that vicinity who are in destitute circumstances on account of flood conditions on Arkansas River. If anything can be done, send in haste to Burnett Landing, on Arkansas River.

GEO. W. HAYS, *Governor.*

Here is another from people who are marooned:

WATSON, ARK., *January 29, 1916.*

HON. SAMUEL M. TAYLOR,
Congress Hall Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

We are surrounded by water all the way from 8 to 20 feet deep. About 500 families are homeless. We need immediate assistance. About 1,000 head of live stock need feed. We are cut off from train service. We have lost a lot of stock and feed. Get us assistance as soon as possible. The only way to reach us is by boat to Redfork, Burnetts Landing.

M. WOLCHANSKY,
R. A. EMERSON,
CHAS. MORGAN,
B. T. OUTLAW,
H. STROUD,
H. ALCORN,
T. J. HALFORD,
DR. HYDRICK,
Committee.

One boat was found in the Arkansas River. That was sent down to take suffering people out of the flood. The other boats is a Government dredge boat and is disabled and can not travel, it is said. I want to impress this fact upon you. It is about a hundred miles from the city where I live to the Mississippi River. The Arkansas River to the Mississippi is leveed by the money of the people who own land within the levee districts, and they voted to tax themselves to build these levees, as explained by Mr. CARAWAY. Those levees have broken. Here is a telegram from McGehee, from S. P. Dixon:

MCGEHEE, ARK., *February 1, 1916.*

HON. SAM TAYLOR, Member Congress,
Washington:

Levees broke at Cummins, Goree, and Douglas last night. Water covering entire territory between Grady south to Watson from Iron Mountain Railway tracks to Arkansas River. Dr. C. W. Dixon and Wallace Douglas, at Douglas, advise that immediate help is necessary. Hundreds of negroes are homeless and destitute. We want boats with 2,000 rations to come to Douglas at once. All communication cut off except telephone at Douglas. This is expected to go out at any time. Have appealed to governor.

S. P. DIXON.

I have another telegram here which I received last night from my son Dan, and you know I think that he would not exaggerate conditions. He says:

PINE BLUFF, ARK., *February 2, 1916.*

HON. S. M. TAYLOR, Member Congress,
362 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Levee in front of State farm broken for several miles and whole surrounding country inundated. Towns of Gould, Pendleton, and Douglas all under water; immediate vicinity of Varner and Dumas flooded. A large number of convicts at Cummins marooned. Conditions appalling and weather intensely cold. Government boats in this river are needed for relief; their use has been denied by engineer in charge at Little Rock, saying it is dangerous for them to pass Robroy bridge. Conditions existing justify the risk. Do your best to obtain boats and all other relief the Government can afford. East end of town, from about Alabama Street to first ward school and Cotton Belt shops, under water.

DAN.

Imagine, gentlemen, the situation—people in trees, on the tops of floating houses, to escape the flood, in cold weather such as we had here in Washington last night.

Here is a letter which I have just received, written by a lawyer of prominence, residing on the Mississippi River at the county seat, Arkansas City:

ARKANSAS CITY, ARK., *January 31, 1916.*

Hon. S. M. TAYLOR, *Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SIR: Well, we are in for the deepest flood ever known. Practically all of Desha County will be under from 1 to 7 feet deep, Chicot County will get the same, and the Tensas Basin in Louisiana will be very nearly all submerged. Would not be at all surprised if we have to beg for rations.

Your friend, F. M. ROGERS.

Mr. Speaker, this is a true story of great trouble and suffering. A friend said to me the other day, "Why can not local contributions take care of the situation?" "Local contributions?" I replied; "why, our people are doing everything they can, but it takes thousands of dollars to undertake to take care of a situation so great and terrible as the one that I have described." The locality is great and all affected. Those citizens in times of normal conditions, when the water does not come from the breaking of the levees, can and do take care of every situation that comes up; but when you find them helpless, as now, away out, 20 or 30 miles, in the middle of a flooded country that is like an ocean, you can imagine how hard and costly it is to take care of the sufferers.

I have other telegrams here, which I ask consent to insert. I have messages stating lives have been lost.

The telegrams referred to are as follows:

ARKANSAS CITY, ARK., *January 31.*

S. M. TAYLOR, *Washington:*

Send me at Arkansas City 100 Government tents; 500 families in destitute condition; need supplies at once, whole country under water here. Answer.

C. C. HEMINGWAY, *Mayor.*

—

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *January 28, 1916.*

Hon. SAM M. TAYLOR,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Flood sufferers at Watson and vicinity are in destitute circumstances for food and shelter, many families have had to leave their homes. Should you need more definite information wire Elbert Stone, Watson, Ark.

GEO. W. HAYS, *Governor.*

—

PINE BLUFF, ARK., *February 1, 1916.*

Congressman SAM M. TAYLOR,
Congress Hall, Washington, D. C.:

Between 1,000 and 1,500 people in Douglas section destitute, need supplies, result of flood. Others in this section similarly situated; need urgent. Can you get Government aid? We are starting subscription here to-night and will do what we can. Wire reply.

THE GRAPHIC.

—

PINE BLUFF, ARK., *February 1, 1916.*

Congressman S. M. TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Residents of Douglas and that vicinity in a perilous situation owing to breaks in levees in Auburn and Linwood districts. Our two packet boats unable to meet all demands. Snagboat *Arkansas* tied up here, but Engineer Dent at Little Rock states she is unsafe to make the trip to Douglas. Old river men claim she can go to Douglas without even getting into the current or channel or in any dangerous position. Twenty-five families marooned at Douglas. Would like *Arkansas* for use as houseboat if nothing better. Can you render any assistance. Lateness of this dispatch caused by promise of Maj. Dent to send boat, which this afternoon was countermanded for reasons above stated.

E. B. BLOOM,
Secretary Chamber of Commerce.

—

DOUGLAS, ARK., *February 1, 1916.*

S. M. TAYLOR, *Washington, D. C.:*

Levees broken in three places on both ends of State farm and at Douglas. Send provisions for 300 families and hay for stock. Thousands of acres flooded.

C. W. DIXON.
W. W. DOUGLAS.
R. E. LAKE.

—

WATSON, ARK., *February 1, 1916.*

Hon. S. M. TAYLOR, *Washington, D. C.:*

We the undersigned ask of you to get feed and rations on account of floods for 1,500 people and 1,000 head of stock.

A. S. TOUNE.
J. E. HARRIS.
DR. E. C. HYDRICK.
R. A. EMERSON.
M. W. OLCHANSKY.
S. L. BOYD.
BEN OUTLAW.
CHAS. MORGAN.

—

ARKANSAS CITY, ARK., *February 2, 1916.*

Hon. SAML. M. TAYLOR,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to earnestly support emergency appropriation bill in Congress to make high-water fight.

DR. VERNON MCCAMMON.
JOE DEMARKE.
GEORGE R. LACY.

McGEHEE, ARK., *February 3, 1916.*

Hon. S. M. TAYLOR,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your efforts on big appropriation. What is needed now is immediate relief along Arkansas River. Situation desperate at Douglas and Red Fork, and Pendleton Levee broke at Pendleton yesterday, drowning hundreds of cattle which had been driven there from Watson and other low territory. Doubtless some lives lost. Freezing weather. Suggest you obtain Mississippi River steamboat, provision same, and send up Arkansas River with 2,000 rations for Red Fork, Pendleton, South Bend, and Douglas. Upper territory can be handled from Pine Bluff.

S. P. DIXON.

—

ARKANSAS CITY, ARK., *February 3, 1916.*

Hon. SAM M. TAYLOR,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Our town inundated. All parties who are able have left the town. There is still several hundred people remaining who were unable to leave. We will be in need of assistance. Make every effort to help us.

C. T. SMITH, M. D.

Telegraph and railway facilities to flooded districts cut off—have just received the following message:

SAM TAYLOR:

Your messages of this morning to C. W. Dixon, Douglas, Ark., also one to Rice, Varner, Ark., are being held at Little Rock, Ark., account of the floods. No wires or mail trains.

W. U. TEL. CO.

Before concluding my remarks I wish to appeal to the Appropriations Committee of the House to report immediately out the joint resolution favorably which I introduced calling for $250,000 to be paid out for the relief and benefit of the suffering people in eastern Arkansas, in the district I have the honor to represent, as also for the relief of those sufferers above and below my district. There need be no fear that this money will be expended unnecessarily, because the resolution provides that it shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War. He will take care that no money is extravagantly used, but that it shall go directly to those who are in want and in great distress; and if it should turn out that all of this appropriation should not be needed, then what is not properly expended will be covered back into the Treasury of the United States. And if our Appropriations Committee will report the resolution favorably to this House, I feel that I know that the great throbbing hearts of its membership and their disposition to do a great charity to worthy citizens and to poor suffering men, women, and children, that the resolution will be promptly passed.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the great city of Philadelphia has never been wanting in extending the hand of relief and assistance when needed elsewhere throughout the country. She has taken high rank as a city readily equipped and able to assist those who happen to suffer calamity, but the situation before us now is one that involves other questions than that of relieving distress such as now prevails along the Mississippi Valley and these Arkansas rivers, for which the gentlemen from that State have so well spoken. There is distress there, and all of us, I am sure, would be glad to relieve that distress; but suddenly, and without notice, a very important resolution is presented to the House which proposes to create a committee, not to meet an emergency that now exists but to establish a permanent new force in this House, which may not only work for temporary relief in such an emergency as this, but which will seek, in the course of time, the expenditure of vast sums of money for permanent uses.

I have no particular quarrel with the proposition to spend money for emergency relief or for permanent relief where it may be necessary, but I call the attention of the House to the fact that if we are to spend money we must also raise money. We do not raise money, when we extend relief through some newly-created committee, on the ground that those in distress live along streams that happen to be interstate or even wholly within a State. It is by improving streams for commerce and navigation that we raise revenues of the Government, and such navigable streams should be improved if we are to obtain money to relieve such distress as is here depicted.

But overnight, Mr. Chairman, a resolution comes in here which apparently takes away from the great Committee on Rivers and Harbors its duty, to a limited degree at least, of looking after the navigation and commerce interests of the country. Heretofore the work such as is now contemplated, if I understand the purpose of the new rule, has been done with appropriations made through the Committee on Rivers and Harbors working under a systematic plan, having the approval of the engineers of the United States Government. Due to this emergency, however, and because the time is ripe—although it may not be the ripest time to talk of increased expenditures

through new committees raised for special purposes—it is thus suddenly proposed to limit the work of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and give to a new committee comparatively the limited powers in recommending expenditures.

In 1879, I think it was, Congress created the Mississippi River Commission, which was to take entire charge of the work of the Mississippi River and its tributaries. That commission was not to last long, but it has lasted from that time to this, and each year increasing appropriations have been made to it through the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for the work along the Mississippi Valley. It has not been work wholly in the line of commerce and navigation. Most waterways men will concede that the Rivers and Harbors Committee has been up against the problem of making appropriations for the Mississippi and other flood rivers through the medium and excuse of commerce and navigation, much to the disadvantage of legitimate commercial waterways.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I have some of the time of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Now, it may be that the work of flood prevention, the construction of levees along the Mississippi to control the current of the river, or of any other levees on any other river, may not properly be the work of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I will not dispute that now. I believe that on one occasion I undertook by an amendment to separate the work and to take this great business of the conservation of our resources and flood control away from a purely commerce and navigation committee. But the amendment did not succeed. I am not sure that I object to the separation now, but I think there should have been some discussion of the subject, not incident to a flood emergency, but in the usual deliberative manner. I would have no objection to considering this rule if it had not come in overnight in the nature of a surprise. There is a big question here. We are confronted, for one thing, with the problem of diverting commerce and navigation money for the purposes of flood prevention. We ought not to detract from commerce and navigation.

Charges of "pork barrel" are being made in the great newspapers of the country against perfectly legitimate commerce and navigation projects. They have already suffered considerably. It has not been the fault of these legitimate projects. The attacks have been based largely upon the fact that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has been obliged at times to go beyond its ordinary commerce and navigation jurisdiction and appropriate for the construction of levees which primarily were for the prevention of floods.

Of course we all want to prevent floods; we want to prevent them along the shores of New Jersey, where the sea waves sometimes sweep property into the ocean and where men and women lose their lives, just as we want protection down in the Mississippi Valley, where floods come periodically. We want to stop floods that rush over a dam at Johnstown and carrying 4,000 lives into eternity at one fell swoop, just as we want to prevent floods that course down the streams of the Middle West, even from the Northern States, until they inundate the plantations of the South. That we want to do in a general and fair way, and I do not object to the Government contributing; but I do not want for a moment to permit this resolution to go through without a protest, if it be necessary, against the plan, if there be such a plan, of reducing the earning power of the Government through legitimate commerce and navigation and turning rivers and harbors funds over to flood prevention.

The States of the South have contributed to the building of levees along their streams, and we can not charge it up to them that in the matter of self-preservation in the protection of their own property they have not done their best. But every river and harbor bill that has come in within my recollection has included appropriations, earned in part from commerce and navigation, that have gone grudgingly for the purposes of navigation and liberally for the building up of river banks to protect private property against the ravages of flood. While we are considering this resolution, therefore, we should also remember that some important legitimate projects have been unduly postponed in recent river and harbor bills, and that the revenue-earning power of the Government has suffered in consequence. I would relieve distress, but I would not check legitimate river and harbor work in doing it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Does the gentleman from Florida care to consume more time at this point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] desires to use some time now.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker and gentleman of the House, as a member of the Rules Committee I was constrained to give this resolution my most hearty support, and I rise at this time for the purpose of speaking in favor of it.

It is my steadfast belief, based upon a good many years of intimate study and acquaintance and association and professional connection with this problem, that there is no project that can be devised by this Congress, save the one of preparation for the national defense, that is a more legitimate object for Federal aid and Federal support than the subject of flood control and flood prevention. [Applause.]

I can see, perhaps more clearly than some of those who have been Members of this House for a longer time, the questions that are about to arise because of a conflict of jurisdiction of committees, but the fact remains, gentlemen, that practically since the Government has been founded and established this question of flood control has been presenting itself at periodical times, year by year, and it is still as near unsolved as it was at the day when the first President of the United States raised his hand to be inaugurated.

It has not been settled, and it has been made a game of battledore and shuttlecock between the committees of this House, one saying that it did not have jurisdiction and jurisdiction being denied to another.

In my humble judgment and opinion, for which I claim no particular merit, it is time that there should be a committee that should have control of this question and at once commence to make the plans for the relief that is so much needed.

Gentlemen, while we talk here to-day, and as we have failed to act in years gone by, the lives of men and women and children have gone out, destroyed by the great floods of our rivers, and millions of dollars worth of property has been destroyed every year.

If any farmer or any ordinary business man in all the United States would handle a problem as the problem of flood control has been handled in the United States, it would be denounced by all who knew of it as being absolutely idiotic.

Now, let no gentlemen misapprehend what I have said. It shall be my course while I am in this House to endeavor to fully and properly observe the courtesies of debate and to refrain at all times from any harsh words.

But I do speak of the policy.

It is idiotic.

There is only one way the question of flood control can be handled, and that is by recognizing the fact that each year, or very often if not each year, a flood is coming down the channels of the great rivers and the lesser streams of the United States, that its quantity can be measured and estimated, and there must be left in the channel of that river a sufficient carrying capacity, within which man does not invade, to make safe the carrying away of these waters and insure their rapid exit either to the sea or the larger rivers.

This work can not be done in a day. The expense would be prohibitive. It can not be commenced perhaps at this time because of the more pressing needs for the appropriations and moneys of the country, but the demand for relief from floods goes up, and it does exist, and will not be satisfied until it is answered by relief being afforded the people from flood loss in practically every State in this Union.

It is in no sense of the word a local question. Take, for instance, the Mississippi River. It is fed from the streams up in Wisconsin, over in Indiana, in Illinois, in Missouri, Minnesota, the Dakotas, and other States, and then by the Ohio River with all its branches, until the streams from some 31 States go to make up the stream that flows so majestically and mightily to the Gulf.

In time of flood in the Mississippi River 2,000,000 cubic feet of water per second is flowing through the middle portion of the South; 120,000,000 cubic feet a minute, making a total of nearly 1,000,000,000 gallons of water every minute flowing in this stream, that spreads out through the country without let or hindrance, when there is a crevasse or when the levees break, carrying devastation and destruction with it.

It is a problem that must be met with a broad national spirit. It is one that must be met now, so far as plans are concerned. It is one that is crying out for solution, and it is one that will no longer tolerate delay while committees claim and disclaim jurisdiction.

There is not a President of the United States but has declared himself to be in favor of this policy for the last 15 or 20 years. When the great parties have met in convention each and every one of them went upon record as being in favor of the conservation of the life and the conservation of the property and the restraining of the waters of these streams, and to do less now would be to refuse to commence to discharge a duty that is apparent and insistent and plain.

Now, though we can not at this time, perhaps, proceed to do the actual work, a committee of Congress can take steps that will be the commencement of the relief that is demanded.

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman is on the Committee on Rules and unquestionably has studied this resolution. One of the main criticisms I have is as to the language "subjects relating to flood control," which go to this committee. Now, presumably legislation will be sought to prevent damage from flood. Does the gentleman understand that that includes damage to contiguous lands and, for their preservation, a reclamation of lands? Does it also include the building of levees for the purpose of preserving contiguous lands? Does it include, for instance, the construction of revetments along the river banks? Will the gentleman kindly say which one of those it includes?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. To enter into any discussion at the present time of the engineering problems that are involved, with the minute or two remaining to me, would be absolutely impossible.

The jurisdiction that is voted to this committee and will be conferred upon it, if it is established by this resolution, is for the purpose of controlling floods.

I apprehend that if the committee acts it will act in a broad spirit. I apprehend that when this provision of the resolution attempting to "control floods" will be construed, it will be construed as provisions of the Constitution are construed—broadly, and in such a way as will accomplish the purpose for which it was sought to be enacted—and, of course, the purpose for which it is sought to be enacted, upon its face and as a matter of current history, is not to relieve a temporary emergency of flooding, but to produce a condition that will relieve the recurrent floods from year to year, and thus "control floods."

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman permit another interruption?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMALL. Floods do damage to channels of rivers. Will this committee have jurisdiction of damages to channels from flood waters?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I would take it, with sincere respect to the gentleman, that my friend is either opposed to the resolution or is an extremely strict constructionist, for the construction which he places upon it would be strained and unnatural and, it occurs to me, entirely unreasonable. The damage to channels from flood waters might possibly be considered, but it would not be the main power of the committee but only an incidental one.

No. The construction that should be placed upon this, unless common sense has departed from us, is in the face of emergency, when life is being lost and property is being destroyed and welfare is being threatened, to take those steps, or to commence to take those steps, that will afford an ultimate control of floods and their prevention.

It is idle to say that it can not be done. The solution of this problem affects nearly every State. It concerns us all. It concerns the good people of Illinois who have honored me with a membership in this House. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Merely for the purpose of making further reply to the questions asked me, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPARKMAN addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD].

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that I am in favor of this resolution, but I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this resolution. I am not in favor of it because of any emergency that exists, but I am in favor of it as a permanent committee of this House. There is an urgent necessity for just such a committee. I live on the Mississippi River, and this committee is of first importance to all those who live along its banks. If the jurisdiction of the committee was confined alone to the leveeing of the Mississippi River for the prevention of floods, the committee would have ample to do.

The Mississippi River drains the waters of 31 States and a small portion of Canada. Probably about one-half of the entire territory of the continental United States is drained by this river and its branches. All of this immense volume of water coming from this enormous territory goes through what is known as the lower Mississippi. In recent years, probably due very largely to the cutting out of the timber in this territory, floods have become frequent and have from time to time caused great loss of life and property and great distress. Before levees were built in the seasons of floods the Mississippi from St. Louis down just spreads over the whole valley. This valley is one of the richest territories in the world; indeed, no other valley can be compared with it. Before levees were built, because of the annual overflow, the lands were of little value; but not long after the Civil War a system of levees were begun, confining the waters of the Mississippi and protecting the lands along its low-water shores. It has taken a long time to build these levees, and they are not yet complete. The Government spends annually several million dollars in building and maintaining them, and the several States through which they pass contribute many millions more for a like purpose. Under this dual system much has been accomplished; yet, as lands are cleared up above, the floods become much larger, and from time to time these levees in weak spots give way, often causing loss of life and great loss of property.

Appropriations for the building and maintenance of these levees are provided for by the Rivers and Harbors Committee and are included in the annual rivers and harbors bill. Ordinarily a lump sum is appropriated and turned over to the Mississippi River Commission for allotment, and that commission allots as it sees proper and in connection with allotments coming from the various levee districts up and down the river.

It is easy to see, therefore, that this method of dealing with a great national question, like the question of the control of the flood waters of the Mississippi River, is, to say the least of it, a very haphazard one. There ought to be a general, uniform plan to control the flood waters of this great river and for the protection of the people and lands along its banks. The task ought to be performed methodically. It ought to be taken up as a separate project, just as the Panama Canal was constructed, and levees should be built and maintained which are efficient for the purpose. There is no reason whatever why there should be floods along this river. Competent engineers have testified that if the Government would expend its money with a definite fixed plan and purpose within a term of five or six years these levees could be constructed so as to control absolutely the flood waters of the Mississippi, and at the same time give absolute protection to all that vast territory of rich lands over which without levees these waters would flow.

In determining the question of flood control in the Mississippi River there are other questions to be considered at the same time. One of these is the proper care and protection of those who live within the confines of these levees, and the other is the rights of riparian owners.

All of these questions would be under the specific jurisdiction of this committee, and it is, in my judgment, of vital importance to all those States that border on the Mississippi River. For these reasons I am heartily in favor of the bill.

I feel that I ought to say to the House that I can consider this question without reference to local conditions. Two years ago and four years ago I went before the Rivers and Harbors Committee and endeavored in every way I could to get assistance of Congress in aiding the city of Memphis in protecting itself from the flood waters caused by the building up of levees on the Arkansas side. Before the building of these levees, Memphis was high and dry, but the erection of levees caused the water to rise higher on the Tennessee side, with the result that after a number of years the upper part of our city was flooded; and two or three years ago we had a flood that greatly injured our water system, our gas system, our street car service, and caused thousands of people to be run out of their homes. It was estimated that the loss of property was over a million dollars in that one flood to the citizens of Memphis. These

facts were all brought before the committee, but Congress would not help us. Thereupon the city of Memphis bonded itself for $1,500,000 and has erected within its borders for its protection a concrete levee that fully protects. These floods were thrown upon Memphis without any fault of her own. They came from some twenty-odd States of the Union. Memphis ought not to have been compelled to have spent this money for her own protection. But she has done so, and we are now protected, and for this reason I say that it is with no specific selfish reason that I favor the establishment of this committee. I do so because I believe it is the initial step of a practical, methodical, and sensible system of confining the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I think the serious objection to this resolution is the fact that by reason of its brevity it is ambiguous and will give rise to confusion in construction and to conflict of authority in committees. That is quite evident from the queries propounded to the last gentleman who spoke, Mr. SPARKMAN. There is not a proponent of this resolution who will undertake clearly to define the jurisdiction of this committee. Is it intended to take away jurisdiction from the River and Harbor Committee as it exists at present? That committee, according to the rules, has jurisdiction as follows: "Subjects relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors." By custom and practice it has been assumed that that committee has jurisdiction of all subjects of legislation affecting the navigability of rivers and harbors and improving them for commerce.

Does any gentleman say it is the purpose of this rule to diminish the power of the River and Harbor Committee as it at present exists? If so, I would like for him to say so. If not, then perhaps it is intended to give this committee jurisdiction of subjects of which no present standing committee has jurisdiction. Then, what are the subjects? The language used here are two words, "flood control." The complete rule as amended would read, "Subjects relating to flood control other than appropriations therefor, to the committee on flood control." What do gentlemen intend to convey by the words "flood control?" Presumably to prevent damage arising from floods. Damages to what? Do they mean to riparian lands and contiguous sections, to preserve them from devastation of flood waters? Is that their meaning? We have had an agitation during the recent years asking Congress for legislation to aid in the reclamation of lands subject to overflow through drainage. Is it intended under the words "flood control" that this committee shall have jurisdiction of legislation seeking to extend aid in the drainage of land so as to prevent flood waters from going over them, impairing the fertility of the land and destroying the crops? If so, why not have said so? Why have used two words the meaning of which no Member is able to explain?

The chairman of the River and Harbor Committee [Mr. SPARKMAN] asked the gentleman from Tennessee having charge of the resolution if it was intended to give this committee control of any legislation affecting the navigability of rivers, and he said, "No."

Then why not have made the rule definite and said so? The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] grew eloquent and made a fine speech about the importance of flood control, which we all admit. The devastations of flood waters, both local and along those rivers which are interstate in their character, and along which flows such vast volumes of water as to be a constant menace to property and life, arouse the sympathy and invoke the aid of every Member.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Just one minute. But while we all admit the dangers of flood waters and, in so far as we may, would seek to avert them, if it was the purpose to protect riparian lands or to aid in drainage, why not have made it definite and said so, so that we might know what was the jurisdiction of this committee. I now yield.

Mr. EMERSON. Then the gentleman favors flood control, does he?

Mr. SMALL. What is flood control, please?

Mr. EMERSON. I ask the gentleman if he favors flood control—the control of these waters that devastate the land and destroy the crops.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I have always had great sympathy with those localities which were subject to damage from these floods. As a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and as a Member of this House, I have voted millions of dollars for the protection of the Mississippi River, all of which was done under the guise of improving the navigation of the river and promoting commerce, and yet, in large degree, as we knew, it was really intended to control the flood waters of the Mississippi against riparian lands.

Mr. EMERSON. Why does the gentleman quibble over mere words? Why does he not suggest some way of changing the rule instead of criticizing it?

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen who have considered this probably have given it very serious consideration. I never heard of the resolution until yesterday afternoon, and I think the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors heard of it only yesterday after it had been considered and agreed to by the Committee on Rules. By way of parenthesis I might suggest that if the jurisdiction of a great committee of this House is to be diminished there should have been some consultation with the chairman of that committee. With the few minutes allotted to me I might suggest some amendment to this rule which would express in clear terms the jurisdiction of this new committee, but I would like to know in advance from the proponents of the rule what jurisdiction they wish to give it, and then I will try to formulate language which will express their thoughts. If the gentleman can say what he wishes the jurisdiction of this committee to be, I will try and express it for him. But a rule has been proposed, considered by the Committee on Rules, unanimously reported, and not a member of that committee can stand up and say what legislative jurisdiction is to be given to that new committee. Was it purposely of such brevity as to be made ambiguous, subject to conflicting construction? Were gentlemen who were proposing this rule really seeking to protect riparian lands from flood waters and secure action by Congress for drainage and afraid to put it in the rule either because of constitutional objection or for fear of creating prejudice or was it done ignorantly?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think that the language in the rule as proposed is quite as explicit as it is in the rule now relating to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, which is "to the improvement of rivers and harbors"? Who knows what that means?

Mr. SMALL. The improvement of rivers and harbors, if the gentleman is asking me for an answer, means by universal consent improvement for the purpose of making them more easily navigable and promoting commerce.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman just stated that we have raised levees for the protection of adjoining property through the Rivers and Harbors Committee under that language.

Mr. SMALL. Well, nominally. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Then nobody knows what it means?

Mr. SMALL. Nominally it was for the improvement of the navigability of the river. Let us be frank and candid with one another. Every intelligent Member of this House has voted for millions of dollars for the Mississippi River, knowing what he was doing, knowing that a large part of that money was for the protection of those fertile lands along that great river against floods; and yet, because we realized that the problem was so stupendous that it was beyond the financial capacity of any State to protect its lands against that river, we have shut our eyes and have voted these millions of appropriations, and have done it gladly, under the guise of improving the navigability of the Mississippi. That is the truth, and every intelligent Member knows it is the truth.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. Inasmuch as the Committee on Rivers and Harbors have been doing that with their eyes shut, would it not be just as well to have a committee that might do it with their eyes open?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. But they do not have any power to appropriate anything.

Mr. SMALL. Then put it in your rule that that is the purpose of their jurisdiction. If the gentleman is a friend of this rule, let him propose an amendment to it defining its jurisdiction.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If that is the real purpose of the rule, would the gentleman object to the separation of the two lines of work?

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the gentleman, I will make this answer: Take the great Mississippi River, if you please, and the Missouri and similar great rivers, interstate streams, the banks of which are subject to overflow, rivers which carry such immense volumes of water that in time of flood they are capable of and do inflict great damage to land and property and life.

I have always believed that by some means Congress ought to take jurisdiction of that matter in a way to solve the problem

as a great national problem ought to be solved. But the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the past has been criticized because it has reported large appropriations for such streams, and river and harbor improvements have been prejudiced before the country to some extent by reason of those criticisms. Personally, I have said, and I doubt not it has been the sentiment of other Members of the House, that it would be best that the question of protecting riparian lands, property, and life from the devastation of these rivers in flood time, while a national problem, ought to be divorced from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and if this rule were so expressed as to include such activity, so that Members could intelligently know that for which they were voting and could feel that no conflict of jurisdiction would arise, I would gladly vote for this rule and would think it a proper rule.

Mr. OGLESBY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. OGLESBY. If it were divorced from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, under what provision of the Constitution does the gentleman think that this work of flood prevention could be carried on and money appropriated therefor out of the Federal Treasury?

Mr. SMALL. I can not go into that question; and yet I may say just briefly, that for a great river like the Mississippi River I think authority could be found for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman from Florida yield me five minutes more?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I can only give the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield one minute to the gentleman.

Mr. SMALL. Then, Mr. Speaker, I have three minutes.

Now, unless necessary I would like to proceed without interruption, because there is just one more thought I want to give to the House. I said that this rule, in the language which it contains, would give rise to confusion and conflict of jurisdiction. Flood control, as I tried to explain, might and does mean protection against damage to contiguous land, and perhaps by any means which may be deemed advisable and proper, but flood control also involves the maintenance of channels in rivers. There are various important rivers in the United States, the improvement of which Congress has assumed the jurisdiction where flood waters are not overflowing the banks, but yet are constantly changing the location of the channel; sand bars are created and various diversions of the channel are brought about, and the maintenance of those channels involves the removal of those bars and other obstructions caused by flood waters, in order that an open channel may be maintained for navigation and commerce. And they are very important rivers, and there is your question of flood control. Will this new committee claim jurisdiction of flood control against damage to the channels of navigable rivers? If not, why not? If not, why not fix this rule so that such a construction can not be given to it, but under this language proposed this committee can have, and we know will claim, jurisdiction of flood control as it affects the channels of navigable rivers.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this rule was insufficiently considered. As I say, I do not know whether this language, brief as it is—and as I believe everyone will admit, because no Member has arisen to deny it—is ambiguous and will involve conflict of jurisdiction. I say that this rule as reported did not receive sufficient consideration, or else it was done inadvertently, or else it was done purposely in order to keep the real purpose of this rule within the constitutional jurisdiction of Congress, or in order to invade the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMALL. And gentlemen can take either horn of that dilemma. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have neither the desire nor the time to criticize the langugae of this rule, as some who oppose it have done. I understand that it was reported to the House by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Rules, and I believe that they understand the English language well enough to express the purpose of this rule. It reads for flood control. I do not believe there is a man in this House who does not know what a flood is, neither is there a man in this House who does not know what control means, and the purpose of this rule is to try to control the great floods that carry devastation through some part of the country almost every week of the year. You can hardly find a newspaper for any one week that does not give an account of a flood somewhere in Ohio, Arizona, Georgia, Kentucky, Missouri, or somewhere else. I shall not speak of them, but I will speak for a moment about the grave importance of the floods that often devastate a portion of the district, that I have the honor to represent, upon the Mississippi River. I believe that you do not always stop to think of the serious aspect of these great floods. I want to call your attention to a brief sentence in a report made by Ernest Bicknell, the national director of the American Red Cross, after the great flood of 1912. I read this sentence:

> In speaking of the number of people who were driven from their homes in that flood, while the number of persons requiring temporary help in the form of food and shelter was approximately 250,000, the number for whom further help in the form of seeds for planting, repairs to buildings, fences, furniture, clothing, farm implements, and so on, was necessary, may be estimated at approximately 50,000 people.

There is a flood in the Mississippi Valley to-day only 1 foot lower than it was at that time. It is rising every day now and promises to be a record-breaking flood in the Mississippi Valley. If that flood of 1912 drove from their homes 250,000 people, whom the Red Cross helped to relieve, I have no doubt that there is the same number of people in that country driven from their homes to-day. I do not know how many, but believe that there are hundreds of people to-day from my district in the hills of Kentucky, where they have fled to get out of the water and to save their lives. It is a dreadful condition. There is in Missouri, appointed by the governor, a waterways commission. That commission made a report of the results of the flood of 1912, and in that report they state that the damage to the five counties in my district affected by the flood of 1912 was $13,255,000. More than $13,000,000 in five counties in one flood. We have had several floods since and have one now. I speak of this to show you the great importance of flood control. I have great respect for the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors; I have great respect for every member on that committee. They have relieved us as best they could, but that committee was required by the rules that gave it power only to entertain and consider bills for the improvement of rivers. They have often said they could not consider bills that were exclusively for the control of floods unless they also affected the navigation of rivers. If it is true that you have got to have written in the rules, as my friend from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] seems to understand, everything that a committee of this House can do, then the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has never had any power whatever to consider bills for the relief of flood sufferers or for protection from floods, because that rule only gives that committee power to consider bills for the improvement of rivers and harbors. I hope this resolution will pass, so as to give us a committee with undoubted jurisdiction over flood control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how the time stands now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 44 minutes and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has 35 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARRETT. Has the time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] expired?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] has just spoken in reference to the necessity for some committee which has jurisdiction over the investigation of floods of this country. I wish to supplement that very briefly by calling the attention of this House to a condition that is now prevalent in the State of Indiana. There are more than 300 people in the little city of Martinsville to-day who have been driven from their homes. There are more than a thousand families along the Wabash River that have been driven from their homes. The Wabash River is denominated a navigable stream, but it is not navigated. So there is absolutely no chance for relief for the flood conditions along the Wabash River through the medium of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, because of the fact that they have not the jurisdiction to relieve the flood condition because it is not interfering with the navigability of that stream. And what may be said of the Wabash River may be likewise said of the White River, that is causing the devastation down at Martinsville. As to the flood spoken of by the gentleman from Missouri, we had a like one all along the Wabash River and throughout the State of Ohio. The city of Dayton was almost wiped out, many people lost their lives, and thousands of people not only had their homes destroyed but other property as well.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman say that this flood-control committee would have jurisdiction over the Miami River at Dayton, Ohio?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Of course they would have jurisdiction over the Miami River. There is not a river but finds its outlet to the sea, and of necessity finds its outlet in a navigable stream.

Mr. CURRY. The Miami River is all in one State, is it not?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Suppose it is?

Mr. CURRY. That is what we want to get at.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. My idea is that it is the purpose of government to subserve the interests of its people, and that it is the purpose of government to protect its people. It is the purpose of this preparation we are now talking much about to protect our people against the invasion of a foreign foe. We have the same jurisdiction, it seems to me, to protect our people from the invasion of the elements, from the invasion of high water. After the flood of 1913 the various States—Ohio, Indiana, and these other States—appointed scientific men for the purpose of studying the causes of these great floods. The floods are increasing constantly in number, and constantly in violence, by reason of the fact of the great drainage that is going on in the country constantly, taking the water that used to percolate through the ground and take months and months to get away, now drains suddenly into these streams. The rain that preceded the great floods of 1912 was an ordinary rain. It commenced on Saturday night and continued for about four days. It was not a hard rain anywhere. There have been harder rains throughout our country many times, and the same experience was had in the State of Ohio.

Mr. CURRY. It has been the understanding in Congress in the past that they have no authority to appropriate for flood control on waters within the confines of one State.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The same objection was raised the other day, in that we had no authority to appropriate money for the improvement of highways entirely within one State, and it was said that the only way that jurisdiction could be extended was by reason of the fact that it might possibly be used for a post road.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The town of Seabright, on the coast of New Jersey, was inundated last year, and a great deal of damage was done, with some loss of life. Does the gentleman think this new committee would have jurisdiction to afford relief in a case of that kind?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I think it would. There is not any question but that the United States has jurisdiction to improve harbors that are entirely within the jurisdiction of one State. Why? Because they have taken jurisdiction of those harbors.

Mr. CURRY. That is according to the Constitution. They have the control over navigable rivers and harbors.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It strikes me, gentlemen, that the quibble as to the constitutionality of this question is very far-fetched, for certainly the Government can find within its organic law a means by which it can protect these people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I live between the Little Miami and the Great Miami Rivers, in Ohio, within 17 miles of Dayton. Dayton was visited three years ago by one of the most destructive floods that city has known. Columbus is only a little distance from us, on the Scioto River, and it was visited by a like flood. It is not a question of whether we have a constitutional jurisdiction over those rivers, because they do empty into a navigable stream, the Ohio River. I shall vote for this rule, because it presupposes an increase of work due to an increase of floods. Floods are growing to be more disastrous every year, largely due to the deforestation of the country and also to the system of drainage, and, I might say, the encroachment of civilization upon our navigable streams. It seems to be that this is cumulative, and if it does take some work away from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors it would not hurt that committee. It will relieve the Rivers and Harbors Committee and give fuller opportunity to meet this growing necessity caused by the increase of injuries every year due to floods. Therefore I shall freely vote for the measure, believing that I am justified in so doing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that the Federal Government sooner or later would have to change the somewhat narrow policy it has pursued in the past in regard to our rivers and inland streams. I believe it will be necessary to view the river and its tributaries as a scientific whole. Of course, the great trunks are navigable streams.

I know that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has jurisdiction of the improvement of the navigable streams, or such portions of the navigable streams as they think commercial conditions require should be improved. But that is rather a narrow conception of the possibilities of improving the rivers. There are a great many streams of which the commercial possibilities would not justify improvement, and upon which there might be an increasing demand upon the Committee on Rivers and Harbors that they be improved under the color of commercial improvement. Unquestionably there are a great many tributaries of streams which are navigable and which cause the disturbance of navigation by flood conditions, but which are not themselves navigable from a commercial standpoint. So that the points of conflict, as I see them, between the jurisdiction of this proposed committee and the jurisdiction of the existing Committee on Rivers and Harbors are very few. So far as I can see, they are limited to the one single exception of the Mississippi River below Cairo.

So far as I know, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has not undertaken upon any broad scale works connected with both navigation and flood protection except upon the lower Mississippi. So far as I know, upon all the other propositions which the Committee on Rivers and Harbors handles, they limit it entirely to the question of navigation, and this leaves out two great elements of the control of the rivers. One is the reclamation of the adjoining land and the other is the control of floods, so far as damages to cities and crops are concerned. It is that particular portion which this new committee is designed to handle.

As to the constitutionality of any plan of flood control, I would not undertake at this time and in this brief moment to discuss it; but I do know that we have expended more than $100,000,000 in trying to put water onto irrigable land, where there was no water and which land in many cases was in private ownership. This could not be justified purely as an improvement of our own Government land. If we have that power, we certainly have the same power to take water off land where there is too much water.

As to the commercial demand and necessity for it, there is no question. These floods are devastating and damaging to a great extent. Year after year the producers and toilers and commercial people of this country suffer heavy tribute in the damages caused by these floods, and a tribute of which the State or the community can not relieve them. Where water congests at a great junction point, like the mouth of the Kaw and the mouth of the Missouri, where is located Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans., the cause is not within local control. The waters causing the floods do not come from the States of Missouri and Kansas, but they come from the States of Iowa and Nebraska and Montana and the Dakotas. We have not control over the conditions that produce that flood. When the lower Mississippi is suffering from flood it is because the great torrents of the Missouri with all of its tributaries have poured in there. The Illinois and the Wisconsin and the Ohio have thrown their great tributary waters into the Mississippi. The people who chance to live in the Mississippi Valley, at St. Louis or at Cairo, for example, are not suffering from water collected in their community, over which they have control, but from water collected all over the Mississippi Valley higher up. That tribute every year is enormous, and it is a question for the American people whether they will make up their minds to stop the cause, and to effect the control of the floods by a broad scientific system of governmental activity, or whether the work should be limited to State, municipal, or local control, which has been wholly ineffectual in the past.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Rules, which reported this rule, and one who was present and voted to report it, I desire to say that nothing that I have heard in the debate has at all made me regret that vote.

I think that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] can be very readily answered in all of his arguments. He says that no one can define "flood control." Why, the gentleman is an able and a distinguished lawyer, and he knows that the best test of a phrase in a statute is to ascertain what has ordinarily, necessarily, or usually been done under that phrase. Now, in the River Danube and other rivers in Europe they have been working out the problems of flood control for over 500 years, and therefore what has ordinarily, necessarily, or usually been done under the head of flood control has a mass of precedents behind it, reaching back to a time prior to the discovery of the United States of America. If we had endeavored to put into the rule all of the things that have been done under the head of "flood control" which the gentleman from North Carolina says we should have done, we would have had a rule longer than the justly celebated bill reported by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] in relation to printing, and we would not have gotten it up even for consideration in the House. There is nothing in that objection.

As to the time devoted to discussion, this question of flood control has been discussed in this House to my knowledge for 10 years, and certainly that is long enough for the ordinary Member of Congress to make up his mind.

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. BENNET. I will yield for a question.

Mr. OGLESBY. Under what particular provision of the Constitution have the men who have advocated this flood control during these long years thought they could get money out of the Federal Treasury?

Mr. BENNET. Without taking too much of my precious time, for I have only five minutes, I will say to the gentleman that if he will read the somewhat celebrated reply of Mr. Webster to Mr. Hayne he will find that subject far more adequately discussed than I can discuss it in my brief time. I must decline to yield further, because I have not the time.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman an easy question.

Mr. BENNET. If I yielded to the gentleman, I would have to yield to others, and so, without meaning any discourtesy, I must decline to yield.

I voted for this rule in the committee because it seemed to me that it was right; and not only is it right, but it affords me one opportunity at least, representing the largest Democratic congressional district in the State of New York, and, so far as I have found out, the largest Democratic congressional district in the United States, to vote according to the Baltimore platform of the Democratic Party on one subject.

I have been informed by those who were here in the Sixty-third Congress that it was not at all times possible apparently for gentlemen on the other side of the aisle to vote in accordance with the provisions of the Democratic platform. I know it will please the 27,757 enrolled Democrats in my district to know that I am able to vote in accordance with that provision of the Democratic platform which says:

> We hold that the control of the Mississippi River is a national problem. The preservation of the depth of its water for the purpose of navigation, the building of levees to maintain the integrity of its channel, and the prevention of the overflow of the land and its consequent devastation, resulting in the interruption of interstate commerce, the disorganization of the mail service, and the enormous loss of life and property, impose an obligation which alone can be discharged by the General Government.

And I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], in answer to his question, and to my colleague from New York [Mr. OGLESBY] that they both probably can find an answer to their several questions in the platform, which no doubt they heartily advocated on the stump both in 1912 and 1914. [Applause.]

Equally strong declarations the same way are in the platforms of the respective parties of the 13,968 Republicans and of the 2,345 Progressives. In voting to create this committee I am voting to carry out the platform pledges of the parties whose aggregate enrollment comprises about 90 per cent of the voting strength of the district. As I am old-fashioned enough to believe in carrying out party platform promises, this opportunity to do so gives me particular pleasure.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I would not take the time to address the House on this matter were it not for the fact that we have a flood situation in Delaware which is of a peculiar sort. A few minutes ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] asked about Sea Bright, N. J., which was devastated by a flood tide from the ocean accompanied by a northeast storm. We had a similar case at Rehoboth, in Delaware, where the entire ocean front for 5 miles or more was washed out last year, together with several blocks of city property and the houses thereon. We also have a flood situation in connection with the Rehoboth and Indian River Bays, in Delaware, and should the House create this committee on flood control, and the Federal Government be given additional authority through the creation of this new committee, I believe the situations mentioned above worthy of notice and consideration. I feel, therefore, that I should say a few words in the general debate on this resolution which I favor and intend to vote for.

In my opinion the question of flood control should be taken in charge by the National Government, and the circumstances that have been related here to-day by the Arkansas delegation in particular should impress those who are not familiar with the subject, and who are not touched by that particular matter. I realize that there will be differences of opinion between the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and this proposed committee on the matter of jurisdiction over certain bills, but in my opinion we should look beyond the mere interference of jurisdiction in the House here between committees, and consider this question as it relates to the country in its national importance.

As was shown in my few remarks on the road bill, I do not favor the Government going into expenditures such as that bill might have called forth. But flood regulation is a question that concerns people all over the country who live on navigable rivers and other streams. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, it concerns them vitally, for when people need relief from floods and the attendant circumstances it is generally in an emergency, and the relief must be immediately provided. All of us have the greatest sympathy for the people living in the great Mississippi Valley, whose lands are inundated and whose property is destroyed by floods many times in a single decade. The National Government is the only governmental agency that is capable of dealing with the flood situation, and it certainly is patent to all that the time has come for the creation of a committee in this House whose duty it will be to deal with this great problem.

I for one would be willing to enlarge the scope of this committee, for the rule as amended by this resolution does not give the proposed committee the power to make appropriations. At this point I beg to state that I trust no embarrassment will come to the members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors by the creation of this new committee. I have listened to the arguments of the several distinguished members of that committee against this proposition, but I believe that the question of flood control is a question well unto itself and one which well warrants the creation of a committee of this House to consider matters relating thereto.

In the first part of my remarks I referred to the disastrous experience which befell Rehoboth Beach in my State. This is a large and populous summer resort located along the shores of the Atlantic Ocean. In the fall of 1914 a terrific flood tide, whipped into fury by a northeast storm of several days' duration, completely wrecked a large part of this town located along the ocean front, besides destroying the board walk and bulkheads, while a number of blocks of houses fronting along the ocean were swept bodily into the sea and their contents spread broadcast over the waters. The experience of this community in my State was only a repetition of what happened at Sea Bright, N. J., to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has referred, as well as other places along the coast. The citizens of this community in my State bravely set about repairing the damage wrought by this crushing blow, paying for the same out of their pockets. When the general assembly met in the following January, they were appealed to for State aid to erect a system of bulkheads which would protect the coast in the future. It was my great good fortune to be able to assist in the passage of this bill through the general assembly, as I was then serving as secretary of state and was in daily contact with the general assembly. I am glad that I am able to take part in a small way in advocating and assisting in the passage of this resolution, which is national in its scope, and if the committee on flood control can solve this problem which confronts a great portion of our country to-day its existence will be amply justified.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to oppose the adoption of this rule, very largely out of the great respect I hold for its proposer. Looking at the brief document submitted to us, I find that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], our honored and respected Speaker, is the author of the resolution. Out of regard for him personally I wish it were in my power to vote for the resolution. However, it does not seem to me that this is an opportune time for the introduction of such a resolution. I wish he had proposed it at the beginning of the session of Congress, when the various committees of this House were being made up. So far as I know it was not brought to the attention of the Members of the House until day before yesterday. The Committee on Rules evidently gave it very marked consideration and deep study, because one of the members takes particular pains to inform us that he was present when the rule was considered. Out of regard for the remaining members of the committee, I do not think we had better ask for a call of the roll of the attendance of the Committee on Rules when the matter was under consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I should like to know if there was some member present at the meeting of the committee who favored this rule? I wanted to ask that question a moment ago, but got no opportunity.

Mr. MANN. Both gentlemen know that it would not be a legitimate question to be asked here in the House.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It would be legitimate to know who appeared——

Mr. MANN. Not under the rules of the House, and it would not be permissible for a member of either committee to state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Suppose the hearings had been published. Would it be permissible for us to read them?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, is this coming out of my time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair supposes so. The gentleman yielded.

Mr. TREADWAY. I did not yield for a general discussion of parliamentary procedure in the committee room.

I am very glad that the member of the Committee on Rules from New York [Mr. BENNET], who has recently spoken, is able in one respect to satisfy his 27,000 Democratic constituents. He said he was voting to sustain one plank in the Democratic platform by supporting this rule, as the platform adopted at Baltimore expressly states the party is in favor of flood control. Happy man! He can satisfy his Republican as well as his Democratic constituents. Why did he not speak of the large number of Republicans who, of course, voted for him? The Republican platform has a strong plank on the very same question to which he referred, namely, flood control of the Mississippi River. I quote the Republican plank on the subject:

> The Mississippi River is the Nation's drainage ditch. Its flood waters, gathered from 31 States and the Dominion of Canada, constitute an overpowering force which breaks the levees and pours its torrents over many million acres of the richest land in the Union, stopping mails, impeding commerce, and causing great loss of life and property. These floods are national in scope, and the disasters they produce seriously affect the general welfare. The States unaided can not cope with this giant problem. Hence we believe the Federal Government should assume a fair proportion of the burden of its control so as to prevent the disasters from recurring floods.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this question is brought up at this time owing to the horrible conditions that we know to exist in some Western States. My colleague on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas, has shown you the conditions existing in his district, with which we all have the greatest sympathy. But, so far as I know, no request has been presented to this House looking for relief of that condition. If they need instant relief, why have they not introduced some resolution for that purpose? There is no man on this floor but will stand ready and willing to vote such assistance as may be desired, and no red tape of committee action will stand in the way of relieving the distress and suffering of our fellow countrymen.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the whole subject of that condition as it may exist there, now temporary in its nature, is being used as a means of appealing to this House to adopt a permanent rule, incorporating it in our rules, simply using present conditions as a psychological opportunity to appeal to the sympathies of the Members of the House. The member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois, who eloquently debated the subject, seemed to consider that the establishment of a committee, calling it the committee on flood control, would of itself prevent nature from allowing water to run down hill. It will not do it. [Laughter and applause.]

Further, I feel that there will arise conflict of authority and jurisdiction between this new committee, if created, and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I have no feeling in the matter whatever, but I do think it fair to call attention to the fact that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has been very generous in its allotment of appropriations to the Mississippi River, the very cause for which it is evidently the intent of the proposers to establish a new committee.

Under the cloak of navigation we have made appropriations of millions of dollars and placed the amounts in the hands of the Mississippi River Commission, to expend in such manner as it might deem wise. It is, of course, true that the primary object of this commission is the construction of levees, revetment of banks, and similar work, all for the purpose of flood control and reclamation. Therefore, so far as fair treatment to the Mississippi River is concerned, the establishment of this new committee is entirely unnecessary.

I feel I must add one word of criticism to the method employed in securing such quick action on this proposed amendment to the rules. The resolution was introduced by Speaker CLARK on February 1; the Committee on Rules states that it considered it on February 2, and on February 3 action upon it comes up with only those Members having knowledge that it was to be considered to-day who were directly interested in its passage. It is not for me to criticize methods used at this time, but certainly a certain amount of courtesy is due fellow Members.

Knowing, as I do, the ability of the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee [Mr. SPARKMAN], and appreciating the hard work he does in his capacity as chairman of that committee, I feel constrained to express regret that the advocates of the establishment of this new committee did not see fit to take him into their confidence. Mr. Speaker, irrespective of the merits of the proposition before us, certainly this courtesy should have been extended to that most courteous of all gentlemen, the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, if I were to argue in favor of this rule on the same basis as some members of the committee have I would be opposed to it, because I have no personal interest in it, as I represent a congressional district that is probably as nearly immune from serious floods as any district in the United States. However, long before I became a Member of this House I read—and have remembered it ever since, and hope I may remember it as long as I am a Member of the House—a statement by Mr. Justice Cooley, who said that when a man went to Congress and held up his hand and took the oath of office it became his patriotic duty to say, "Not what is best for my district only, but what is best for my country."

I see all over the country a growing danger and terror of floods. I apprehend that it is largely due to the fact that in building bridges, and so forth, we are encroaching too much on the channels of the streams, and that in building bridges we do not build them high enough. I am not one who believes that the committee created by this rule could have any means of controlling the elements, although I have seen stranger things happen on the floor of this House than an undertaking of that kind. But from what I have seen of the devastation of floods and the damages, and all that follows the ravages of such calamities, I am certainly in favor of this proposition, because, if it does no more, it will show to the people of the country who are sufferers from these floods that we, their Representatives, are interested in preventing distress wherever it is possible for Congress to do so.

Such a committee can find out and report on the possibility of flood prevention and protection; and surely such frequent misfortunes demand our prompt, earnest, and most intelligent action. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the Committee on Rules yesterday when it reported out this resolution. Had I been present, I should not have voted for it in its present form. I expect the rule will be adopted, but I am clear that it ought not to be adopted in the form in which it is presented. It is entirely clear to me, as I think it must be to the membership of this House after this debate, that in its present form it will give rise to great confusion between the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and this committee on flood control.

What is meant by flood control? If they speak of unusual floods that destroy levees and property I can not conceive of

a situation where navigation is not involved in that kind of flood. Do you seek to prevent floods by building reservoirs at the heads of the great rivers? That squarely involves the question of navigation. Do you want to prevent floods by revetments and levees on the Mississippi River? That, too, inevitably involves a question of navigation. Where will the Speaker draw the line in referring bills, with this new committee created? What will happen is that a bill will be presented having directly to do with navigation but declared upon its face to prevent floods. It will go to the committee on flood control, while the navigation proposition involved will be quite as important, perhaps, as that of flood control.

If we have a new committee at all on this subejet, it seems entirely clear that the jurisdiction of each of these committees should be specifically defined. If I might have had the framing of this rule, it clearly would have provided that no bills relating to navigation should go to this committee. If that had been done, there would have been no objection to it. But, possibly, Mr. Speaker, the principal object of this new committee is to consider bills not for the prevention of the kind of floods I have spoken of but those kinds of floods, not unusual in their character, but which recur year after year, overflowing bottom land on some rivers; and the design of this may be to seek appropriations not for the saving of life and property but to reclaim lands, valueless to-day, and do it at the public expense without the lands contributing one dollar to the cost of their reclamation. I, of course, do not believe the author of the rule had this in mind. So while I expect the rule to be adopted, I do say it ought not to be adopted in its present form, and I prophesy now that it will give trouble in the future on the matter of jurisdiction if it be adopted. If this rule was defeated to-day, there would be no difficulty in the Committee on Rules again taking it up and framing a new rule and presenting it to this House defining the jurisdiction of these respective committees. [Applause.]

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. CURRY. Does the gentleman think the adoption of this rule would transfer jursdiction of the Rivers and Harbors Committee over the flood control of navigable streams, the waters of which rise and flow through one State only?

Mr. LENROOT. I think it would.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. HULBERT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks this situation could be more effectively dealt with if the duties of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors were divided so that we would have a Committee on Rivers and a Committee on Harbors?

Mr. LENROOT. That might be a very good suggestion.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not undertake, in five minutes, to discuss the technical phraseology of this resolution. I am in favor of the resolution and expect to support it not simply because of any emergency that may exist at the present time but because of the possibility that exists all of the time of an emergency being created in the matter of floods. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] a moment ago suggested that no bill or resolution had been introduced here for the relief of flood sufferers in the localities where the conditions exist. The gentleman is mistaken about that. I am sure a number of resolutions and bills have been introduced. I know that two have been introduced by myself. I know the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR] has a resolution, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] has introduced resolutions. Every man whose people are affected by the floods that are now in progress, and that come every year, have introduced resolutions seeking to relieve the people who are involved in the floods. But it is a difficult proposition to get a bill through this House, or the Congress, for the relief of any particular locality; and there is only one form of efficient relief that can come in the long run, and that is relief that takes care of the whole situation and prepares the Government to take care of the situations whether they be local or general in their nature.

In addition to what the gentleman from New York said a while ago about the platform of the Democratic Party upon this subject, I desire to call attention to the platform of the Republican Party. In 1912 both political parties now represented on this floor took the position that the Mississippi River, being a stream that drains 31 States of the Union and 41 per cent of the territory of the United States, is of sufficient national importance to justify Congress taking it up as a separate proposition. I have no criticism to make of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I think they have performed their duties as far as they could with efficiency and patriotism and with a desire to render the greatest benefit to the people of the United States; but here is a great stream that is not a local stream, the most treacherous stream that flows anywhere in the world, and now from the mouth of the Ohio River, down to the Gulf of Mexico the water of 31 States of the Union is flowing through it, and by reason of the fact that heretofore the Government has constructed levees along the Mississippi River and thereby invited men to build up their homes and cultivate the soil adjacent thereto and which is now in danger, I think there is such a national problem as ought to be dealt with by Congress.

In the city of Hickman, in my district, a city of more than 6,000 people, every able-bodied man is at this moment at work seeking to protect the levee that has been constructed by the Government from destruction by the Mississippi River, and the consequent inundation of hundreds of thousands of acres of land and the homes of the people in that city. They do it not only in the daytime but in the nighttime. They do it every year; and as Judge RUSSELL suggested a moment ago, there are thousands of people from his district and from Arkansas and Missouri who have gone across the Mississippi River and are now seeking refuge in the hills of Kentucky. Is not that a national problem—to undertake to care for those people, to undertake to preserve their property and lives—and is it fair to expect the local communities, which are doing everything they can and which have exhausted their powers of taxation and their resources from a charitable standpoint and from every standpoint, to take care of the situation created by the water of 31 States which flows by their doors and inundates their homes? We speak a great deal about preparation for national defense. Mr. Speaker, there are other enemies of the country than foreign enemies, and the Mississippi River is one of the most fearful enemies to the people who live in its valley, and I think we should protect them as far as is possible from its recurring ravages. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I can not hope, in the limited time allowed me under the rules, to say what I desire to say upon this question. Sometime during this session I am going to ask the privilege of addressing the House at more length upon the importance of the question of flood control to the people of my State and district. I do not believe there is a question that will come before this Congress that is of more vital interest to the people I represent than that of flood control. If you gentlemen when you go back to your offices will get a map of the United States and look right at the center of the country, at that point situated in the lap of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers where they come together at the extreme southern part of Illinois, you will see the district that I have the honor to represent. It consists of the eight lower counties of the State, five of which border upon the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. I can not state exactly what part of the district is lowland and what part is highland, but I will say that perhaps a fourth of my district, if not a third, is what might be called lowlands, and a great part of this would be subject to overflow from the floods and back waters of these two great rivers were it not for the protection which they receive from the levees that have been constructed.

Mr. Speaker, that part of Illinois has been under cultivation since the early part of the century; and I want to say that there can not be found anywhere in the United States more beautiful, more productive, or better improved farms than those along the bottoms of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers in the southern part of Illinois; and there can not be found anywhere a class of farmers that are more thrifty, industrious, persevering, and patriotic than those who have reclaimed those fertile fields from the floods of the father of waters, protected them as best they could by the construction of levees, and converted them into beautiful and prosperous farms. Mr. Speaker, these farmers of my district have liberally expended hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars in the construction of levees along the two rivers, and the money they have saved and invested in their homes and other improvements are dependent for protection upon the frail levees which they have built with their own means. But year after year the great flood of waters that comes sweeping down the Mississippi River from the north and the Ohio River from the east is a source of constant terror to the people of these valleys, not infrequently washing away the banks of the rivers, altering or dividing the thread of the streams, and eating into and destroying the levees which the people have built. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in my judgment a great deal of the money which the farmers of that region have expended in the construction of levees for the pro-

tection of their farms will, before long, have been wasted unless the National Government takes hold of this flood question and assists in protecting from the ravages of these waters the levees that have already been built, and helps to build them higher and stronger.

Now, this question of controlling the flood waters of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers is not a local question. It is one of the Nation's problems. It has long been recognized to be such, but has never been properly handled. I believe that the time has come when the Federal Government should take hold of this, one of its greatest problems, and solve it. The control of the flood waters of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries should be made a separate national project, like the building of the Panama Canal or the Alaskan Railroad. A plan should be worked out by which a coordinated system of levees and other river improvements would be constructed under scientific and continuous methods, and I do not doubt that the floods of these great rivers can ultimately be controlled, millions of acres of rich land reclaimed, and millions of dollars saved to the people each year.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members of Congress could happen to be in the Mississippi Valley during the winter and spring floods, when the melting snows from the mountains of the West and the rains from the plains of the North and Northwest come roaring down the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers to join those from the Ohio, Tennessee, and other rivers from the East, and see the terrible destruction of property and even the loss of life that the people of those valleys suffer, I do not believe that there is one of you who would not know that the question of controlling these annual floods is one for the whole Nation to solve and that it ought to begin doing so right now. Even while we are discussing this question, I am advised that the flood has reached 53 feet at Cairo and that the people all up and down the valley are being driven from their homes, while stock and grain and other property are being washed away.

No one who has not lived there or been there during these trying times can fully appreciate the awful terrors and the suffering and privation to which those people are exposed when these unusual floods occur. Yesterday I received a telegram from the president of the Chamber of Commerce of Cairo appealing to me to ask the War Department to send the Government boats from places where they were stationed on the river to aid in rescuing the people and the stock from their perilous positions in the flooded districts. I called upon the Acting Secretary of War, and I want to say that he responded promptly and assured me that instructions would be sent forward to give aid wherever possible. I found that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and other Members from Kentucky, Missouri, and Arkansas were urgently appealing to the War Department for its assistance in this great calamity. Mr. Speaker, the people of the city of Cairo are not asking any aid for themselves. They are doing so for others who are not so well protected from the floods as they. Cairo has heretofore appealed to Congress for aid, and aid was generously given when asked; and I want to say here that every citizen of that thriving busy little city is profoundly grateful for the assistance Congress has given them, which, with the aid received from the State of Illinois, has enabled them to raise and strengthen the levees which protect the city. This has been a heavy burden upon the people of Cairo, but they have met it bravely and cheerfully.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there can be found anywhere a braver, more courageous, persevering, hopeful, and resourceful people than those of Cairo and other cities and towns in that valley, who year after year have spent their money, patrolled their levees, and day after day and night and day fought back the waters which almost half the Nation sends down upon them in a mad rush to the sea. I hope that whenever the Members of this House chance to pass that way they will take the time to stop off in Cairo and see what a wonderfully thriving, prosperous, and attractive little city has been builded at the confluence of those two great rivers by the virtues and the capital of its citizens, with the aid of the State and Nation. And, Mr. Speaker, a visit to Cairo, with its prosperous mills, factories, railroads, and river commerce, and its 25,000 busy and contented people, working by day and by night with faith in the protection of their wonderful levees, the gem and future metropolis of the Mississippi Valley, would, I think, be the strongest argument that could be offered for national aid in the construction of levees wherever they are needed for protection from the floods of these great rivers.

I think the time has come for the Government to declare its policy toward the Mississippi River. We can not hope for help from the Rivers and Harbors Committee, whose jurisdiction extends only to questions of navigation and commerce. I had occasion, Mr. Speaker, to take a trip down the Mississippi River this last fall from Grand Tower to Cairo, in company with some of my constituents who have studied this river question all their lives and are deeply interested. We were on a Government boat and accompanied by the Army officer in charge, and a representative of the Mississippi River Commission. I pointed out different places along the River where a little work by the Government would save a great deal of protection work that had been done in former years and now only needed repairing. I called attention to places here and there, where the Government, by a small expenditure, could prevent a cutting of the bank, or diversion of the channel, or save the levees of some of the drainage districts from ruin, and protect thousands of acres of fertile farms from overflow. To all of these suggestions we were met with the same old reply that under the present policy of the Government the department could only consider questions of navigation; that it would aid navigation for the river to remain crooked and the waters be held back, even though they did overflow and destroy the farms of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I think this whole question should be taken out of the hands of the Rivers and Harbors Committee; it should be divorced from the question of navigation. A separate committee should be provided to handle all questions of flood control. And if it should be found that the problem of flood control and the problem of navigation or commerce conflict, then it would be for Congress in its wisdom to harmonize them in the interest of the greatest number of the people. I hope the House will adopt this resolution and appoint this new committee, and that the committee when appointed will enter upon an investigation of this great national question and report out a bill at this session that will at least offer the people of the Mississippi Valley some hope for the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 23 minutes and the gentleman from Kansas 15.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GOODWIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, in the very limited time allowed me I shall not attempt to go into elaborate detail and explain to the House the awful condition in which some part of my district is placed, one county in part bordering on the Mississippi on the east and two counties bordering upon the Red River upon the west, because in a measure that has been detailed to you by my colleagues, Messrs. TAYLOR and CARAWAY; and the same condition that affects their district likewise affects mine. I think the passage of this resolution, and the creating of the committee on the control of floods will be a long step in the right direction. As time goes on we become more and more progressive, and we yield to the needs of people who are stricken. In the evolution of government we can not be guided by the past nor by precedent alone, we must make a step forward. Some gentlemen have said that inasmuch as they live remote from the overflow districts or from inundations, up in the mountainous sections of this great country, their people should not bear part of the burden of those who live upon the lowlands.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that no considerable number of the membership of this House have such a narrow and restricted view and vision. Who is thy neighbor? I can not answer that, nor can you, half so well as that great Teacher of men who while on earth answered the question for all time to come. Upon one occasion He was asked by a lawyer who sought to confuse and mystify Him by saying, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" And the Savior said, "Hast thou read the law, and art thou familiar with the scriptures?" He said, "Yes; I have read them." "What do they say?" "Why, the law says, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy mind, with all thy strength, and with all thy soul, and thy neighbor as thyself.'" The great Teacher said, "Thou hast answered correctly." But, Mr. Speaker, not content and still determined to mystify his Maker, he said, "Master, who is my neighbor?" Now, the Master never answered any question directly; His answers to all questions were not local, but were intended for all time, for generations then not born. He said, "Upon one occasion a man came down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and he fell among thieves, who stripped him of his raiment and inflicted wounds upon his body; and, leaving him half dead, they went away. Presently

a priest came along, and, deaf to the importunities of the suffering man, he passed on the other side. Later on a Levite came by, and he, too, turned a deaf ear to his importunities. Then a Samaritan came along. He did not turn from him, but he went in his direction and gave relief and succor to the stricken man. He put on his raiment, bound up his wounds with oil and ointment and wine. He set him upon his beast and took him to a near-by inn and stayed there over the night; and on the morrow as he left he placed 2 shillings in the hand of the host and said, 'Take this for thy trouble, and upon my return I will pay you the residue,' and he went his way. Who," said the Saviour, "was this man's neighbor?" "Manifestly," the lawyer said, "the man who gave succor and relief to the stricken one." "Then," said the Lord, "go thou and do likewise."

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that the American Congress has always been responsive, duly responsive, to the great catastrophes that have come over this country. Need I recall that about two years ago we made an appropriation to the stricken people of Salem, Mass., where millions of dollars of property had been destroyed and thousands of poor people lost all of their worldly possessions and were driven out into the cold without money and without labor? [Applause.]

Why, Mr. Speaker, I have been criticized by those who now oppose me for voting for this bill, but I am glad that in my charity my heart goes out to stricken humanity wherever it may be found, and that my vision and my sympathies are not confined to the pigsty in my back lot, or even to my own front gate, but that in my generosity of soul and heart I would have this Government to extend a helping hand, as far as it is able so to do, where great bodies of people are sorely stricken by sudden catastrophes, where the local communities or the States are unable to give succor and relief.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, how many people it would take to pay only one dollar of that appropriation that was voted for the poor, unfortunate, homeless people of Salem, Mass., on account of that fire? I have just made the figures. We have 100,000,000 American citizens, and here was an appropriation for these stricken, unfortunate people, and it would take 500 people, all being taxed equally to contribute only $1 of this amount. There are many communities in my own district, sir, which have a population of about 500, and if all of these 500 people contributed the same amount the whole 500 paid but $1 of this appropriation. Sir, the Congress of the United States has upon many occasions voted money out of the Treasury for the relief of great communities which suffered from floods and fires and volcanic eruptions, not only in the United States but to many parts of the world beyond the American Continent. Sir, my own district, the county of Chicot and the eastern part of Ashley County, in 1911 and 1912, when I first came to Congress, received many thousands of dollars in supplies, food, and the like, furnished by the United States through an earnest effort put forth by me, when all of Chicot County and a part of the eastern part of Ashley County suffered from overflows and floods; and the people of the North and the East and the West came to our rescue down there with a generous and an appreciative impulse.

Sixteen years ago the city of Galveston, Tex., was visited by a great flood which almost destroyed that great city, and you, sir, Mr. Speaker, and many other gentlemen now upon this floor were Members of Congress at that time; and you gentlemen of the North and from the West and from the East responded liberally to the stricken people of that southern city. Ten years ago next April the great city of San Francisco was visited by an earthquake, and I do not have to repeat the awful condition visited upon many of the citizens of that metropolis nor the aid and appropriation made by Congress then in their behalf. Nor need I speak of the generosity of Congress upon several occasions when fire and flood and volcanic eruptions have visited other parts of the world, notably in Martinique, Italy, in Sicily, and other places. The generous hand of this Government was responsive to the suffering thousands where their own Governments were unable to properly care for their own suffering humanity.

I only speak of this, Mr. Speaker, in reply to those upon this floor who take a narrow and less generous view of the duty of the Federal Government now in their opposition to the creation of this committee on the control of floods, for the reason, they say, the Federal Government has no authority and no right to give aid and protection to build levees; likewise as an aid and protection for the prevention of floods, when back of those levees live many millions of people who by the labor of their hands help to feed and clothe the world, and who likewise defend our country's flag in times of war and make her glorious in times of peace.

Sir, we must keep step with the demands of the times and with the growth of civilization. Unfortunately for the people of this country as well as for the people of all countries, legislation has been confined largely to the protection of property rights to the exclusion of human rights. One of the great questions to-day confronting the American Republic and to which the Congress of the United States must give increasing attention is the question of conservation—not to conserve one or two or three material aspects of the question, but conservation in its broadest and most liberal sense—to come to the assistance of the States and communities in the conservation of our soil, to prevent its erosion, and the conservation of our Government-owned forests in a system finally of reforestation; to the conservation of our mines by seeing that these are not monopolized by the greed and avarice of a few men who, unfortunately, already have seized too much of this part of the public domain, appropriating the same to their own use and behoof; to the conservation of the waters of the country, not only to prevent overflows and inundations, but likewise, Mr. Speaker, to house and reservoir these waters, that the same may be let loose from time to time not only as an aid to navigation, but to the irrigation of the dry and arid lands of many parts of our country, notably in the western and southwestern portions of the United States; and last, but not least, sir, to the conservation not only of these property rights, a few of which I have named, but, higher and above all these, to the conservation of the rights and liberties and the possibilities of the people in human endeavor, in the lengthening of their lives, and in the restoration of the health and the giving of renewed strength and vigor to the physical activities of the people.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that this view is a little more liberal and possibly a little more broad than some of my friends here in the House will agree to; but what, sir, is the function of government, for what purpose were governments created and instituted, if not for the protection of the people, to give hope and courage to their aspirations and to their ambitions. And I hope the time will never come, sir, when, as a Member of this House, in keeping with the Constitution, which all of us have taken an oath to support, that I shall fail and refuse to lift my voice and to give my vote to those things of which I have spoken, conserving not only property rights, but granting to the people what the legislation of most countries has denied—still greater rights, the rights of humanity itself.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE].

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this resolution because my district has suffered from floods more than any other district in Indiana. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OGLESBY].

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. OGLESBY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I make a like request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GOODWIN] makes a like request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen may have leave to print on this rule for five legislative days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks that all gentlemen may have leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject for five legislative days. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER].

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am for this resolution. It seems to me that it is one of so great importance as any that could be introduced into the House. What scheme may be worked out in reference to flood control, of course, is only to be determined in the future by the action of this committee and finally by Congress. But it is such a large problem, especially in the Mississippi Valley, that the States, the municipalities, and the people generally, can not take care of it with the great amount of water that goes down the Mississippi River

from the tributaries that flow into that river. It is a matter of national importance.

The Federal Government has spent up to and including June 30, 1915, $32,320,178 on the levees of the Mississippi River from Cape Girardeau to its mouth. The people living along this river have incurred a debt and spent $91,105,990. In many of the localities they have taxed themselves every way possible to secure money to build these levees. Navigation can not be maintained on the Mississippi River without some plan to prevent the constant washing of its banks.

The burden of the building of these levees and attempting to prevent floods is so heavy that these people can not alone carry on this work. All parties in their platforms have declared in favor of flood control, or, at least, for the Federal Government having control of the problem of floods in the Mississippi. The value of reclamation of lands which are now overflowed would amount, if that work were done, to hundreds of millions of dollars throughout the United States. We have inaugurated the system of reclamation of lands in the West which has been of great benefit in that part of the country, but I submit that throughout all of the United States, and especially is this so in the great Mississippi Valley, that millions of acres of the very best land can be reclaimed if some feasible way is found whereby that work can be done. I do not know, and no Member of this House knows, what the future may develop in reference to flood control; but aside from the loss of property that occurs whenever these great floods come in the rivers there is a problem of the control of floods so that these lands may become farming lands—so they will become productive each year.

In the State of Illinois the Wabash and other streams overflow thousands of acres of the most productive lands in the world, and a feasible plan has not been found whereby these floods may be prevented and in that way these lands made profitable. The system of drainage which has been inaugurated in many places along these streams puts so much water in them and so quickly it is impossible as conditions now exist to prevent these serious overflows, and as a result millions of dollars of damage to the owner of the land occurs each year. No man in this House knows now what means may be worked out for preventing these serious floods, but it is to be hoped that a committee may study this problem and arrive at some solution of what can be done. Congress would hardly be expected to appropriate money for the drainage of private land, but it can at least afford information in some way whereby it can be done and, if necessary, assist the people as is now being done in the Reclamation Service. It is a problem that must be solved in the future, and we hope this will be a start in the right direction.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reforms come and go, and another reform has gone glimmering. When our Democratic friends obtained control of the House in the Sixty-second Congress the first thing they did in the interest of economy in the public service was to abolish the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River. That committee had been in existence for years under Republican control of the House. Now, after a few years have passed since this reform was inaugurated it is proposed to establish this same committee under a different name. And I congratulate the gentlemen on the other side of the House in now admitting that a few years ago they were mistaken when they attempted to leave no committee with jurisdiction over the flood and levee problems of the Mississippi River.

Mr. Speaker, I have served in this House under four distinguished Speakers—the great parliamentarian and Speaker, Thomas B. Reed; the gallant soldier and great Speaker, David B. Henderson, of Iowa; and the Speaker who, in my opinion, will always be ranked among the great Speakers and the great men of this country, the man with the iron nerve, my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. [Applause.] And I serve with pleasure under the present distinguished Speaker.

Gentlemen have said here to-day that this was a new proposition. Session after session, or term after term, the present distinguished Speaker of the House has introduced into the House bills, full in character, relating to the question of drainage and control of flood waters. I do not recall whether those bills have been referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors or not; but if so, they have been contributions to the waste basket. Wherever they have gone, no committee has had real jurisdiction to do anything with them. I am not in favor of the Government spending vast sums of money in the drainage of lands, either public or private, but we have reached the time in the consideration of our country when these problems must at least be investigated, and perhaps we shall be compelled to contribute something to their help, both on and off the Mississippi River.

The present distinguished Speaker of the House, whom we all admire and love [applause], seldom has made a request to this House involving his personal opinions or his personal desires. But the resolution reported to-day by the Committee on Rules reads:

Mr. CLARK of Missouri submitted the following resolution.

It is a resolution of the Speaker of the House. After long study of this subject of drainage and flood control, the Speaker of the House asks us to favorably consider a proposition to authorize a committee of the House to have jurisdiction over these subjects. I am quite willing, irrespective of the other merits of the proposition, to accede to this request of the Speaker, who so seldom makes personal requests of the House. [Applause.] And I hope that the resolution will be treated both as its merits and its source deserve, and that it may receive the unanimous vote of both sides of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the State of Louisiana is vitally interested in this problem, and the prosperity and welfare of her people are, in my opinion, largely dependent upon the passage of this resolution, the purpose of which is to create a committee the functions of which shall be to deal with the problems arising out of recurrent floods upon the Mississippi and other rivers in the United States. We have heard here this afternoon the statements of the gentlemen from Ohio, from Illinois, from Missouri, from Tennessee, and from Arkansas concerning the great volume of water coming down from the various streams in those States.

Mr. Speaker, all this flood of water, with all of its destructive force coming from all those States, and from 32 States of this Union, must eventually pass through the State of Louisiana, and this entire volume of water must, in its course, pass through the fifth congressional district of Louisiana, the great district which I have the honor to represent on this floor; and as this flood now proceeds from the rivers of those States, rushing into the mighty Mississippi, with Louisiana as its ultimate destination, there are at this hour, in order to protect our lands and the property and lives of our people on the line of levees from the imperial city of New Orleans to the Arkansas line, thousands of men who work by day and by night to avoid, if possible, the awful consequences of this oncoming flood. Mr. Speaker, this constitutes with us a flood problem, and we feel that if given a committee of this House, that could concentrate its collective thought and combined energies upon the problem of flood protection, this problem could be worked out and a final solution reached. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the State of Louisiana is in favor of this resolution. We have more at stake, in connection with this problem, we suffer more from floods, and expend more money on flood protection than any other State in this Union. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas, Judge TAYLOR, has just given a description of the loss of property and intense suffering of the people along the valley of the Arkansas River, and has told you that the flood waters of that stream must soon pass into the great Tensas Basin in Louisiana. I live in this great basin, and to show you that the charges made here by a few Members of the House that the appropriations asked for flood protection along the Mississippi is an attempt to secure money to drain private lands in the States affected is totally and wholly unfounded, I will explain that all the levee taxes collected in the Tensas Basin levee district, one of the largest districts in the State of Louisiana, is spent in building levees in the State of Arkansas, in the districts represented here by Mr. GOODWIN, Mr. CARAWAY, and Judge TAYLOR, and for the purpose of protecting the lands in that great district from just such floods as seem imminent at this time.

The fifth congressional district of Louisiana has a frontage of 200 miles along the Mississippi River, all protected by great levees, constructed by the State, the various levee boards, in connection with the Federal Government. The lands are taxed, the produce is taxed, and the citizens of that district are contributing voluntarily and gladly all the means and energy within their power, and it is our firm conviction, after years of study and experiment, that the rich domain of the Mississippi Valley and the valleys of its tributary rivers can be protected, can be made available for habitation and cultivation, and that it will become, when so protected and made available for settlement and cultivation, the richest and the most prosperous section of this Republic; that it will add more to the national wealth and provide better homes for our overteeming population than can be secured by any other means or in any other section of this country. No one doubts that this is a national problem.

Every political party has so acknowledged in its platform and each President for four administrations has so declared, and it should and must be dealt with as such.

All the great engineers who have studied and dealt with this problem have been convinced and declared that these valleys can be protected, and experience with like problems in other countries confirm their opinions. The money and the means for this purpose should be provided, not as a donation or a gift, but in the high and noble discharge of a supreme national duty. The people of my district and of my State are fighting nobly and bravely for the solution of this problem. They remain behind these levees planning and working, carrying the problem with them day and night, striving with a courage and heroism unsurpassed in history, and they are there now with the full confidence and belief that this great Government will come to their relief and provide the means and protection that will add so much to its wealth, to its power, and to its greatness. No man can foresee or describe the possibilities of this section, but we can say that the time is rapidly approaching when this country can not develop and reach the ultimate extent of its manifest destiny without what this great valley, when finally protected and made available, will produce.

The tide of our population has reached its western limit and is now returning toward the east, and the rich lands of the Mississippi Valley is the most inviting field for settlement. Millions of dollars from the North, from the Central States, and from the East have been invested there, and the entire Nation is interested from every standpoint. This resolution is national in its scope and purpose, and will afford the means of solving one of the greatest problems now before the American people, and in the correct solution of which is lodged the prosperity and happiness of millions of our people and the conservation of the greatest asset to our national wealth.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I hope and believe that the adoption of this resolution will be the beginning of what I am persuaded every man considers the greatest internal improvement enterprise that this Nation has ever undertaken. I am sure that it lies back in the mind of every man who has given any attention to this flood problem that the present organization of committees of this House has made it practically impossible to do these things that everybody admits should be done with the flood problem, especially in the Mississippi Valley.

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors feel themselves naturally compelled to stay in the stream when much, if not most, of the work that needs to be done must needs at times be done at some distance from the stream. The improvement of navigation will be a part of this problem and incidental to the work that must come out of it. The conservation of land that will eventually be of almost priceless worth to the Nation will also be incidental. Both things will be wrought out eventually by a program that we as well as the business men of this Nation realize that we might just as well get ourselves ready to carry out, and that is to take care of that river problem from the Gulf upward, so that it can no longer devastate the hundreds of thousands of acres of the best land on earth, and save it for the people of the world, and not alone for those in that territory. [Applause.]

I hope that the resolution, which has been offered by a gentleman who certainly understands the English language, will pass, and that this rule will go through. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire about the time again?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 14 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has 18 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. There will probably be only one other speech on this side.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended until this very moment to take any time on this resolution. The gentleman to whom I had given the time has just sent word that he will not be here.

I favored this resolution in the committee, and I favor it here, because I believe that it will result in some good. The question of the conflict of jurisdiction between the proposed committee and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors gives me very little trouble. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors no doubt does a great deal of good. The Mississippi River has been the recipient of a great deal of attention from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, with a view to promoting navigation. But navigation has decreased as their attention to the river has increased in the last 25 years. There is practically no navigation on the Mississippi River.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he knew how much tonnage is carried on the Mississippi River?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not know what it is, but I know that it is not one-tenth of what it was 10 years ago.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thought the gentleman did not know.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And I know that it is not one-tenth of what it was 40 years ago. I know that if some committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter will undertake the prevention of floods, the inundation of large areas of land, that committee will accomplish some benefit to the people of the United States. The people are not suffering for want of navigation. The fact that they do not use the waters they already have justifies that statement. They do suffer from floods and overflows of streams throughout the entire country.

I accepted on one occasion a very important chairmanship of a committee in this House—the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River. A vast number of bills and resolutions were referred to that committee from every section of the United States. While it referred only to the Mississippi River, every stream that finally flowed into the Mississippi River claimed that it should have attention from the Congress of the United States, and those resolutions and bills were of course referred to the only committee that had anything to do with rivers at all and did not deal solely with navigation. The committee had no power to report bills, because it dealt with the improvement of the Mississippi River and all of its tributaries, under the authorities cited to the committee and such as were available to the committee, and that fact prevented any sort of action beneficial to the country, such as it is hoped will result from the creation of this committee and from the work that it shall do.

I do not belittle the work of the Committee on Harbors, but I magnify the importance of the work that may be done by the committee that is proposed to be created by this resolution, and I therefore give it my unqualified support.

Mr. Speaker, I turn over the remainder of my time, if I have any, to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has used six minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. I understand, and I suppose the House understands, that the previous question has been ordered. That was the agreement by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That was the agreement, that the previous question be considered as ordered.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is recognized for 16 minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I am greatly obliged to Brother MANN for his compliments to me, and I indorse what he said about my three illustrious predecessors under whom I served.

This resolution or rule was introduced for the sole purpose of investigating what I think is the greatest economic question that the American people must deal with in the next quarter of a century; and for the subsidiary purpose of expediting the business of the House.

Before I forget it I wish to say that there is not a committee in the House, in my judgment, that works more faithfully, earnestly, and industriously than does the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. [Applause.]

The history of committees in this House is very interesting. In the first instance, and for years, there were no standing committees in the House. When Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg called the First Congress to order under the Constitution he presided over 56 men. Rhode Island and North Carolina had not yet gotten into the Union. After they came in he had a House of 65 Members. There are 435 Members of this House. The day that President Wilson and myself went over to Philadelphia to rededicate the old Congressional Hall I figured it out that if we had the same ratio now for membership that we had under the first census, and the same population we have now, we would have 2,776 Members in this House.

Government is not an exact science. It is an experimental science. The conduct of the House is not an exact science. It is an experimental science. Originally a special committee was appointed for every particular bill or resolution. That was all right as long as they had 65 Members or a few more. As the

membership of the House increased the standing committees came about as a result of parliamentary evolution. There ought to be enough of them to transact the business of the House, and no more. There ought not to be any dead committees around here.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is entirely correct in his criticism of the abolition of the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River. That committee had fallen into what President Cleveland called "inocuous desuetude," growing partly out of the fact of the narrow jurisdiction that it had, and partly out of the fact that the Speakers for some reason referred every bill that they could to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. The Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River ought never to have been abolished. Everybody makes mistakes, and that was one of the small mistakes that we have made since we got hold of the House. [Laughter.] It is a minor mistake. That committee ought to have been revivified and its jurisdiction enlarged and made certain, so as to embrace the whole country. The other day I resurrected a sleeping committee in this House, the Committee on Railways and Canals. That committee has been in existence ever since I have been here, and if it ever did anything I never heard of it. Some gentlemen introduced bills about canals, and I referred them to the Committee on Railways and Canals. I think the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has been exercising that jurisdiction for some time; but I notified the chairman of the Committee on Railways and Canals that I wanted his committee to go to work and consider these bills, and he was very eager to do it. So much for that.

There are certain committees in this House—not very many—which are overworked; which have more work than they can attend to. In my judgment, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is one of them. It does not have any subcommittees, so each member of that committee is supposed to be informed about all the rivers and harbors in America, and that is too much to expect of any 21 gentlemen.

The Committee on Appropriations is overworked, although I do not see any way in the world to relieve it. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is overworked. Sometimes gentlemen on that committee suggest that I take away bills that ought to go to that committee. I take away from it every bill that I have a good excuse for passing to any other committee, simply because that committee does more work than any other committee in this House, barring perhaps the Appropriations Committee. It has too large a task. Human energy has its limitations.

In the days gone by the House has not been at all tenderfooted about creating a new committee when it needed it. It may surprise some of you to know that originally the Ways and Means Committee discharged all the functions of the Committee on Appropriations. When the Civil War came on, however, it created such a vast amount of business that went to the Ways and Means Committee, and so much more business that ought to have gone to an Appropriations Committee that Hon. Thaddeus Stevens, one of the ablest men that ever sat in the House of Representatives, who was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee—perhaps it was on account of his poor health—had that committee cut in two—Ways and Means and Appropriations—and he chose to be chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. So for years the Committee on Appropriations reported all the appropriations in this House, until the Carlisle wing of the Democratic Party concluded they would clip the wings of Hon. Samuel J. Randall, who was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, because he always moved to strike out the enacting clause of a Democratic tariff bill or to strike out everything after the enacting clause, which amounted to the same thing exactly. They did not want to demote him in terms, so they simply resorted to the process of clipping his wings, by giving the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and other committees the right to bring in appropriation bills. All this is by way of preface.

In my judgment, the control of floods and incidentally the drainage of overflowed lands is, as I said before, the greatest economic question to which the American mind is going to be directed in the next 25 years. When I was a child my father used to put me to sleep of a night by singing to me a song that—

Uncle Sam is rich enough to give us all a farm—

And at that time Uncle Sam was rich enough to do that; but now all of his good land is gone, and men who have children lie awake o'nights studying about where their children are going to find homes in the days to come. Now, here we are. There is enough overflowed land on the Mississippi River and its tributaries—I take that simply because it is the greatest river system on the face of the earth—every acre of that land equal to the best acre of land under the sun, to make a State as big as the State of Missouri, which has 69,815 square miles of territory. This overflowed land lies right in the heart of civilization, with churches and schoolhouses and railroads and markets, and all of the facilities for American life. If that land was drained and put under cultivation it would support a population of 25,000,000 human beings. Now, I do not believe that Congress is ever going to drain the public lands, or the private lands either at public expense, but I will tell you what I believe it will do. It will rig up a scheme like the irrigation scheme, except exactly the reverse as to the subject matter, by which these overflowed lands will be drained and the men who own the lands will pay for the drainage.

I am one of the men that got up the irrigation scheme. I was not very prominent in it for I was a new Member and green, but I did the best I could. It took years to get it. A man who took any part in that irrigation scheme can not ride from here to California over any great railroad route without rejoicing that he participated in that beneficent work. [Applause.]

The theory of irrigation is that all the irrigation works will be completed and not cost the Government a single cent. It is the same way with the drainage business. Last year, I undertake to say without fear of contradiction, that in the great States of Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, and Iowa alone there was destroyed a hundred million dollars worth of corn, wheat, and other foodstuffs that the people of the world ought to have had to eat.

The River and Harbor Committee had so much work to do—it was not any lack of intention, but it is so occupied with legitimate duties and it had a very shadowy kind of jurisdiction over this question—that it had not the time to attend to it. So, after consulting with several people—I could not consult with everybody—I introduced this resolution for the purpose of appointing a committee whose sole business it shall be to investigate from the best sources of information attainable to see if it is possible to prevent this destruction of property and life by curtailing the overflows of the rivers. It so happened that last year was an extraordinarily rainy year in the Mississippi Valley. It rained 12 or 15 inches more between Pittsburgh and the dry belt in the extreme West than usual. These floods were extraordinary; but at this very minute a great flood is working vast destruction.

I will confess that I do not know whether it is possible to control these floods at all; but from the way we have been going I know that we would never find out whether it was possible or not. The only thing to do, it seems to me, is to appoint a committee that will take the best advice it can get, see if a system can be devised to curtail, if that is the word, the vast amount of water that goes down the rivers, overflowing the whole country, and make them go down more gradually.

The truth is that what tends to make these great floods more than anything else is that the whole country is nearly denuded of trees and foliage. The water which took when we were boys, or before we were born, two weeks to seep into the streams runs down the furrows into the streams now in 24 or 48 hours. Something has got to be done about it.

In the meantime, if they can devise a scheme that will meet the indorsement of Congress and the country, make suggestions as to how to drain the overflowed land, they ought to do that. There has been some controversy here to-day about what jurisdiction this committee will have. If the resolution passes, as soon as the committee is organized I am going to refer to that committee all the bills having reference to the question of drainage and overflow, and that committee will have enough to do. And remember the proposed new committee can not report appropriations—not a penny. I am in favor of constituting the committee. I have no personal interest in it except that I happen to live in a district that is bordered on one side by the Mississippi, split wide open by the Missouri, and has in it four other rivers, navigable by act of Congress, and in no other way. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The previous question having been ordered, the question now is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of further considering the bill 10385, the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. FOSTER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10385, the Indian appropriation bill, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For commencing the construction of a dam with bridge superstructure and necessary controlling works for diverting water from the Gila River for the irrigation of Indian land and allotments on the Gila River Indian Reservation, Ariz., as recommended by the Board of Engineers of the United States Army in paragraph 217 of its report to the Secretary of War of February 14, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 791), $75,000, to remain available until expended, reimbursable under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, the total cost not to exceed $200,000.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that paragraph.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. BORLAND. I will reserve the point of order if the gentleman wants to make a speech.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman will read the hearings before the committee, he will find that this appropriation is amply justified. The department asked for an appropriation of $200,000 for this purpose, but the committee thought best to advance but $75,000 at this time, limiting the total cost of the project to $200,000. The United States has already constructed at great expense a canal on the north side of the Gila River which irrigates 10,000 acres of Indian land. There is a similar canal on the south side, but the Indians do not get the full benefit of these canals, although they have tried to do the best they can with brush diversion dams. This appropriation is justified by the report of a board of Army engineers appointed by direction of the Congress to look into this matter. I would like to know on what grounds the gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order, and if he has any justification for his attitude in the matter.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, this work here is estimated to cost $200,000, but so far as I know that is a very small estimate and probably an underestimate. There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, but what it is new legislation subject to a point of order. Now, as to the justification, I might say this about it. As I understand, the Gila River carries very little water anyway, and all the irrigation that is possible is by diverting the flood water.

It is possible to occasionally divert water from the floods of the Gila River, but unless there are built storage works on the Gila River near the headwaters of the river there is no permanent source of water in the Gila River. The project has been fully considered several times by the Reclamation Commission and has been universally condemned by them as a business proposition. It is feasible from an engineering standpoint, because the Army engineers say so, but I doubt very much whether they can limit the cost to $200,000 or whether it would be feasible even at that. This proposition, as I understand it, contemplates only a diversion canal. That could not store any water.

Mr. HAYDEN. It does not contemplate the storage of any water.

Mr. BORLAND. And there is no water available there for constant irrigation without some storage works.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman will remember that when he visited the Salt River project he saw the diversion dam at Granite Reef, and that it cost very much less than the reservoir.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. And if the farmers in the Salt River Valley to-day were compelled either to do without the Roosevelt Reservoir and maintain the Granite Reef Dam or have the reservoir and do without a permanent diversion dam, they would prefer to do without the reservoir. The people in all countries where they get water from torrential streams lose more by floods than they do by droughts. I was born under a canal system where we irrigate about 20,000 acres, and formerly we built little brush dams just as the Pima Indians do. A flood would come along and wash the dam out, and before we could repair it the flood had passed, so that there was no water for irrigation. Now we have a permanent diversion dam and we get the benefit of every flood that comes. That is what these Indians can do, and it is absolutely necessary that such a permanent diversion dam be constructed in order to properly cultivate their lands on the Pima Reservation.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman knows as well as I do that in that country a diversion dam without storage works is practically ineffective.

Mr. HAYDEN. On the contrary, such a dam is of immense benefit.

Mr. BORLAND. The whole proposition has been on the Gila River to create storage works, and that particular storage-works proposition has been an alternative proposition with the Salt. When the Salt River was adopted it was because it was considered a better proposition than the Gila. In other words, the Gila was condemned.

Mr. HAYDEN. This appropriation is justified on its own merits, whether any storage works are ever built on the Gila River or not.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to say further to the gentleman that irrigation has not proceeded very rapidly for the white settlers. That is, the white settlers have not been able to avail themselves, even under favorable conditions, of the advantages of irrigation, but it has not proceeded rapidly at all for the Indians. In the Blackfeet Reservation they have spent nearly a million dollars of money, which is supposed to be reimbursable—though whether it will be or not I do not know—on that Two Medicine Lake diversion dam and storage works for the Blackfeet Indians. About 26,000 acres can be furnished with water. It was originally calculated at 40,000 acres. Out of those 26,000 acres last year 600 were cultivated, and this year it is said that perhaps a thousand acres will be cultivated. In other words, it has cost the Indians, if they pay for it, $900 an acre for storage works, and that does not take into consideration the maintenance of those works, and if you assess the maintenance of those works against the Indians, even while bringing them under cultivation, you would find that the cost was so prohibitive that the Indians would not do it.

Mr. HAYDEN. The difference between an Indian irrigation project in Montana and one in Arizona is this: When the first Spaniards came into Arizona they found the Pima Indians watering their crops. They are familiar with irrigation and know what to do with any irrigation works that may be provided for them. You take a blanket Indian, accustomed to hunting on the prairies, bring him onto a reservation, and although you may give him the benefit of the very best irrigation works, yet he does not know how to take advantage of water for irrigation. You will find that the Pimas in all their history have made beneficial use of all the water that they could get. They have been deprived of their water by appropriations farther up the stream, but they will use this diversion dam and use it well. If the gentleman will take the trouble to read the hearings, he will find that all the money heretofore spent on the Pimas for irrigation has been profitably expended.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have read the hearings, and they were very much less in their scope than the hearings we have already had on that same subject. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the hearings we have had on this very same subject when we had this proposition under consideration last year, and I want to say in this connection that the next item following is the same proposition, so that what I will read applies to both of them.

This is in relation to the San Carlos project, and I read from the hearings of last year:

Mr. BORLAND. You are also being importuned to start a project at San Carlos on the Gila?

Mr. NEWELL. That is a matter before Congress. I have been in former years enthusiastic about it, but as the years have gone by I have become less and less so. The last examination was ordered by Congress and was put into the hands of the Army engineers, rather than into our hands, it being thought possibly we were not as optimistic as we might be.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that Mr. Newell has reported in favor of that?

Mr. BORLAND. He says so, and he says that further experience convinced him. He says:

The report of that board is extremely interesting. It shows that on the basis of the water supply that we are furnishing to the Salt River Valley it will cost, I think, nearly $144 an acre. But they propose to furnish only 2 acre-feet per acre at the land, while we furnish at the head of the canal 4.5 acre-feet, based on many years of experience. If they furnish as much water as we do, it will cut the project down, I think, to about 44,000 acres, barely enough for the area on the Indian reservation.

He says this will not furnish over 2 acre-feet, and that it will require 4½ acre-feet per man:

Mr. BORLAND. So the report has been rather unfavorable to the Government carrying on the San Carlos project?

Mr. NEWELL. I would not say unfavorable; it has simply pointed out the difficulty, and that we should not go into the San Carlos project expecting to get as good a supply as we have on the Salt River project at the same price.

And further down:

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Newell, in addition to the very considerable cost, or estimated cost, per acre of the irrigation of the lands on the Gila, I recall that former examinations there developed the fact, or was said to have developed the fact, that the Gila carries enormous quantities of silt, and that any storage reservoir built would fill up with silt in a few years. And the later examinations bore out those former statements or former expressions of opinion relative to the silting.

Mr. NEWELL. In general they have. The accumulation of silt is a most serious problem. The Board of Army Engineers in reporting upon

it recommended that after a certain number of years works should be built or devices installed for getting rid of the silt—

And so forth.

Mr. BORLAND. So that you see that the cost of such a work will——

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman will be fair enough to the House to state that what he has read relates only to storage works?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. What I am talking about is a diversion dam, a totally separate and distinct matter, and which stands on its own merits and has nothing to do with the San Carlos project.

Mr. BORLAND. I think the gentleman will agree with the experience of this House, that if we spend $75,000 or $200,000 in starting some diversion works there, the next step will be storage works, because complaint will be made, and based upon good evidence, that the particular works we have built are not available until they get some storage. When they get the storage, then they will do the same way, and say they will not be available until some method is provided for relieving the river of silt. In other words, the estimate is not anywhere near complete.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have offered this amendment in good faith, and I believe that the works can be constructed within the amount stated. The two diversion dams stand on their merits and have nothing whatever to do with the construction of a reservoir at San Carlos.

Mr. BORLAND. I insist it is hardly a beginning of what is going to be a great big project, a project of perhaps $6,000,000.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If the gentleman will permit a suggestion, the object of these diversion dams is the same as every other diversion dam at various points in the West. I have in mind the Rio Grande. It is to stop the underflow underneath the sand and silt, so that these diversion dams will hold water that will be turned loose through the ditches on the farms below, whereas if there is no diversion dam it will sink underneath the sand, and every man who lives in the West knows that under the quicksand of these broad rivers in the West, this one especially, you can dig down 1 or 2 feet and get plenty of water, and then if you can stop the underflow from escaping you can impound it. That is why these diversion dams are built down to hardpan, either clay or something impervious to water, so it can not seep through.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. I make the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will reserve the point of order if he intends to make it.

Mr. BORLAND. If possible, I will reserve it.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I agree very largely with what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has said. I think, however, that what he said applies to the following item rather than to this item. I am of the opinion that it would not be wise to adopt the following item without further consideration of the matter by Congress, because the item is clearly a feature of a great project on the Gila, which would cost, as the gentleman from Missouri suggests, at least $6,000,000. But the item now under discussion is not necessarily a part of that general project. I think there is objection to the language of the paragraph which says, "as recommended by the Board of Army Engineers." As a matter of fact, the Board of Army Engineers did not, as I recall, recommend a diversion dam at this point.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman will pardon me, in the finding of the board, page 65 of the report, to the Secretary of War—

(d) That in case the project is not undertaken until after an adjudication, a diversion dam on the reservation be constructed to improve irrigation conditions on the Pima Reservation.

In other words, whether the reservoir is constructed or not, this diversion dam ought to be built immediately.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MONDELL. In a moment. That particular suggestion of the Board of Engineers had escaped me. What I had in mind was that the diversion dam which was proposed by the Board of Engineers was not a diversion dam at this point, but at an entirely different point. What I started to say was this: The Board of Army Engineers did not, as a matter of fact, recommend this project at all, except under certain conditions, to wit, if on investigation it was discovered that there was a sufficient water supply available, if it was discovered that certain conditions might be met as to the acre cost.

Quite a number of "ifs" in the recommendations of the board, but none of those "ifs," so far as I know, have been met.

Mr. HAYDEN. All of those "ifs" were as to the construction of the storage reservoir; but there are no "ifs and ands" about the construction of this diversion dam, as recommended by the Army board.

Mr. MONDELL. I agree with the gentleman from Arizona, that while this is expensive work for what it would probably accomplish, it would, in the first place, give the people a good bridge at this point, and that, in my opinion, is a meritorious feature of the proposition.

Mr. HAYDEN. I will be perfectly willing to see the bridge feature stricken out rather than see the whole appropriation fail.

Mr. MONDELL. I think the gentleman ought to leave the bridge feature in it. I think it is an important one, and it does not greatly increase the cost of the structure very much. The structure would make available, more than at the present time, the waters of the Gila River for irrigation through the ditch that was made by the Reclamation Service.

Mr. BORLAND. Now, the gentleman is more familiar technically and practically with irrigation than any man in this House. As I understand from the hearings on this particular item, they now have a ditch there?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Which is intended to divert the flood waters of the Gila, or whatever water there is in the Gila, and that ditch has not been sufficient, because there is no water in the Gila at the irrigating season of the year. Would this dam supply water for that ditch throughout the irrigating season of the year?

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman from Missouri had read the hearings in the matter——

Mr. BORLAND. I did read them.

Mr. MONDELL. I mean the hearings before the Committee on Indian Affairs——

Mr. BORLAND. I did so.

Mr. MONDELL. He would recall that the lock diversion dam at the intake of the ditch of the Reclamation Service——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am withholding my point of order for that purpose.

Mr. MONDELL. As I said, he would recall the fact that the lack of a diversion dam at that point rendered the ditch that had been built for the Reclamation Service of comparatively little value. That is the situation, as I understand it.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman from Wyoming states what is exactly true.

Mr. MONDELL. And this diversion dam would at least do this. That it is going to be beneficial there can be no question, because, first, it will make that ditch heretofore built by the Government available so far as there is water in the river. It will make it available much later in the season than it is now, and it will prevent the heading being constantly and annually washed out; second, it will make possible the building of a ditch on the other side, if that is advisable, for the use of water on the other side of the river, and undoubtedly it will add very much to the value of what they already have there in the way of development. In addition to that, I am still inclined to think that the bridge feature of it is one that should not be overlooked, because there is an enormous stretch of country that would be benefited.

Mr. BORLAND. It is clear from what the gentleman says that the whole plan is problematic. Its benefit to the Indians is entirely problematic and has not been worked out by these engineers, who are specially charged with it.

Mr. MONDELL. But what I want to emphasize is this: That this work will be of a very considerable benefit. It will make useful a project we already have, and this particular work does not in any way necessarily involve entering upon the large project.

Mr. BORLAND. I think the gentleman will agree with me that we have entered hastily into these irrigation projects in the hope that they would do some good, and in many cases we have been disappointed. And this is particularly true with these Indian projects, because we always hear that the amounts spent are reimbursable from the Indians, and if they do not do any good the Indians will have to pay for them anyway. But that is not always the case. I think if we have a scientific body especially charged with that kind of work of irrigation we ought to defer to their opinion about the practicability of these works and not go into the matter simply because of the hope that they may do some good.

Mr. HAYDEN. This matter has been investigated by two different authorities: First, by a board of Army engineers, who were on the ground and spent $25,000 in making the investigation; and, second, by the engineers of the Indian Service, who

have been on the ground and have drawn plans and specifications for the dam and bridge and estimated the cost. I can not see why the gentleman continues to talk about a storage reservoir and says nothing about this diversion dam.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Davis says:

Yes, sir. I wish to say, though, that I do not agree with that report and never did.

Mr. BORLAND. You did not agree with that report?

Mr. A. P. DAVIS. No, sir; it was issued before I came back from Nicaragua.

Mr. BORLAND. What discrepancy did you find in that report?

Mr. A. P. DAVIS. I thought the area to be irrigated was overestimated and the cost was greatly underestimated.

That is the same man who is still in charge of the Reclamation Service. Mr. Newell was the former chief, and this is the present chief.

Mr. MONDELL. Let me call my friend's attention to the fact, as the gentleman from Arizona is attempting to do, that what he is discussing is not the proposition we have now before us.

Mr. BORLAND. I think I understand he is not discussing the San Carlos Dam or the proposition at Florence, but he is discussing simply this diversion dam to divert water for the Pima Indians. That is a part of this general plan, which, in general, has been condemned. The only question is whether—and it is a very serious question—this $200,000 dam can be built and the land can respond to its cost as a single proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has expired. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] make the point of order?

Mr. BORLAND. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For beginning the construction by the Indian Service of a dam and necessary controlling works for diverting water from the Gila River at a site above Florence, Ariz., for the irrigation of Indian lands on the Gila River Indian Reservation and private and public lands in Pinal County, Ariz., as estimated by the Board of Engineer Officers of the United States Army in paragraph 138 of its report to the Secretary of War of February 14, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 791), $75,000, to remain available until expended, the total cost not to exceed $175,000: *Provided*, That the water diverted from the Gila River by said dam shall be distributed by the Secretary of the Interior to the Indian lands of said reservation and to the private and public lands in said county in accordance with the respective rights and priorities of such lands to the beneficial use of said water as may be determined by a court of competent jurisdiction: *Provided further*, That the construction charge for the actual cost of said dam and other works shall be divided pro rata by the Secretary of the Interior between the Indian lands and the public and private lands in said county in accordance with the area of land entitled to water, as decreed by said court; and said charge as fixed for said Indian lands shall be reimbursable as provided in section 2 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L., p. 522); but the construction charge as fixed for the public and private lands in said county shall be paid by the owner or entryman in accordance with the terms of an act extending the period of payment under reclamation projects, approved August 13, 1914.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order for a moment?

Mr. BORLAND. I will, long enough to give the gentleman a chance to make a statement about it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation for the construction of a diversion dam on the Gila River above Florence has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, which is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, January 21, 1916.

MY DEAR MR. STEPHENS: Further consideration has been given the draft of an amendment intended to be made to the Indian appropriation bill, for the construction of a dam across the Gila River above Florence, Ariz., referred with your letter of December 24, 1915, requesting the views of this department thereon.

The proposed work meets the approval of this department. The provisions under which the money is to be expended relating to the control of the works, the water to be diverted thereby, and the reimbursement to the United States thereof by the owners of lands irrigable thereunder, seem to provide satisfactorily for the management and financing of the project. In order that there may be no question of the supervision of the construction of this dam, it is recommended that the words "by the Indian Service" be inserted in line 1, after the word "construction."

The amount proposed to be appropriated is $100,000, which is only part of the total cost of $175,000. For a structure of this kind it is believed that serious risk would be run in attempting to build only part of it, owing to the danger from floods and the shifting channels of the Gila River. It is therefore recommended that the amount to be appropriated be increased to $175,000, and that the item be amended by striking out the figures "$175,000" and substituting therefor the words "said sum" (line 13). This change would make it necessary to strike out the word "beginning" in the first line.

The second page of the proposed amendment contains a reference to the act of August 24, 1914, as the act under which reimbursement by the Indians of their proportionate cost of the project is to be made. This is apparently a typographical error, as no doubt the act of August 24, 1912, is intended.

A similar item which was included in the bill H. R. 20150, Sixty-third Congress, second session, was the subject of my report of January 28, 1915, a copy of which is inclosed and which has been printed in the hearings before the Committee on Indian Affairs of the United States Senate, volume 1, page 498 et seq.

In addition to the information therein exhibited, the proposed work will benefit a large number of Indians on the Gila River Reservation, approximately 3,000, by providing under existing conditions for the diversion of water to irrigate an area of over 20,000 acres of fine agricultural land on the reservation. With storage provided, the area of land would be limited only by the available water supply.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE, *Secretary.*

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS,
Chairman Committee on Indian Affairs, House of Representatives.

A similar item was included in the Indian appropriation bill in the Senate last year. That bill failed to become a law owing to the filibuster at the close of the session. In his report made at that time the Secretary of the Interior said:

JANUARY 28, 1915.

MY DEAR SENATOR ASHURST: I have received your communication of January 19, 1915, requesting report upon a proposed amendment to the Indian bill making an appropriation of $75,000 for beginning the construction of a dam and necessary controlling works for diverting water from the Gila River at a site above Florence, Ariz., for the irrigation of Indian land and allotments on the Gila River Indian Reservation and private lands in Pinal County, as estimated by the Board of Engineer Officers of the United States Army in its report to the Secretary of War, page 46, paragraphs 136–138 (H. Doc. 791, 63d Cong., 2d sess.).

This report describes the situation with regard to the diversion dam which it will be necessary to construct in order to utilize the waters of the Gila River when the San Carlos Dam is built. However, the usefulness of this diversion dam does not depend entirely upon the construction of the San Carlos Reservoir, because for many years past considerable areas of land have been irrigated by diversion through various headings of the flood flow of the Gila River above Florence. To irrigate the lands of the Pima Indian Reservation upon the south side of the Gila River at the upper or eastern end of the reservation will require the construction of such a dam in order to conserve the flow of the river to as great an extent as possible. The proposed site, about 12 miles above Florence, is at the mouth of a series of canyons through which the river flows uninterruptedly from San Carlos, but from this point on the river course is through a broad flat valley, with an immense river bed, consisting of broad deep deposits of silt and gravel. When the flow of the river is low, and when, of course, water is most valuable, the stream disappears entirely soon after emerging from the mountains above Florence.

Aside from the use which the Indian reservation may eventually make of this diversion dam, practically all of the landowners off the reservation who have been irrigating in this vicinity may receive their supply of flood water from this point of diversion.

The Gila River has just experienced one of the most disastrous floods in its history, and all the headings of the various canals above Florence have been washed away, and the earth covering through which these canals ran has been entirely removed, so that these channels can not be again constructed. The superintendent of the reservation reports also that at least one canal heading for the Indian reservation, on the south side of the river, is washed out, and the large canal, known as the Little Gila, has been very badly damaged. The land which this canal supplies with water could be reached from channels heading at the diversion dam which it is proposed to build, and when so supplied would be past all danger of future damage or destruction.

The white owners who have suffered by the recent floods might possibly secure means of constructing a dam at the point mentioned, thus insuring to themselves immunity from a recurring flood, but it might be necessary for the Government to oppose such a step in order to protect the water right now claimed for the Indians.

While there is no doubt but that, as a matter of law, the Pima Indians have a prior right to the waters of the Gila River as against all other appropriators on that stream, yet they have not been receiving a sufficient quantity of water to irrigate their lands for lack of the physical means of obtaining the same. The construction of a diversion dam at this point will give the Indians an advantage of location that they have not heretofore enjoyed, because the Government of the United States will thus actually control the only feasible point where the waters of the Gila may be diverted. The Indians are entitled to control this strategic position in order to adequately preserve and perpetuate the Government's claim to water in their behalf, and for this reason alone, whether the San Carlos Reservoir is ever constructed or not, this appropriation is amply justified.

The cost of the diversion dam itself is estimated by the board of Army engineers as $150,000, and an additional item of $25,000 should be included in order to make the necessary excavation through the rock heading, so that connection may be made with the present canal systems of the Florence district. The site of the proposed diversion is an ideal one compared with others along the Gila River, as on both sides of the river are massive outcroppings of rock. The river bed is comparatively narrow and confined between hills to this one channel, and a railroad upon which to bring in supplies and materials parallels the river at this point, so that the cost would be the minimum for such work. The railroad track is high enough above the river so that no interference with its operation will result even after the dam is built. The dam will not be high enough for storage purposes, but simply a low weir a few feet above the normal surface of the river, so that water may be properly diverted into the canal, and that all of the flow at the low stages, when the water is most valuable, and which occur for long periods, may be available.

It is recommended that the proposed amendment receive favorable consideration by Congress.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE,

Hon. H. F. ASHURST,
Chairman Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate.

That a diversion dam can be constructed for the amount named in this bill is shown by the report of the Board of Engineer officers of the Army, three paragraphs of which discuss this subject:

136. At the several sites for a diversion dam ledge rock is found at one or both abutments, but investigation has shown that toward the

center of the river rock is not within practicable reach. However, for the lift desired, not to exceed 10 feet, a dam of the Indian type will answer.

137. Through the courtesy of Mr. G. S. Binckley, member of the American Society of Civil Engineers, the board has been able to consult the design for a diversion dam for this place prepared by the late Mr. J. D. Schuyler in 1911 and a later design prepared by Messrs. Schuyler and Binckley.

138. From a consideration of these designs and the quantities of materials required for a dam following the second design the board is able to state that the cost of the diversion dam, including head gate and silt sluice, need not exceed $150,000.

Worse floods than the high water in the Gila mentioned in the original report of the Secretary of the Interior have recently occurred, as is shown by this telegram which I have received from Mr. F. H. Thackery, the superintendent at Sacaton:

SACATON VIA CASA GRANDE, ARIZ., *February 3, 1916.*

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
House of Representatives, Washington D. C.:

Recent flood damage to Indian lands and canals is more than $100,000 on Pima Reservation. Immediate relief urgent.

THACKERY, *Superintendent.*

I have also received three other telegrams which will give the House an idea of the necessity for this appropriation:

FLORENCE, ARIZ., *February 3, 1916.*

Hon. CARL HAYDEN, M. C.,
Washington:

Recent flood of Gila River damaged various canals and heads and other properties of white settlers to amount of $40,000. Have conferred with Thackery, superintendent Pima Indian Reservation, and he estimates their damage sustained by same flood as not less than $100,000.

E. W. COKER.

—

CASA GRANDE, ARIZ., *February 2, 1916.*

Hon. CARL HAYDEN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

Conditions here serious. Demand prompt attention to avoid great suffering. Canals badly broken. Head gates and dams all washed out. Much other damage done by recent floods. Three thousand Indians and large number of white settlers dependent on waters of Gila River to mature crops. Unless something is done immediately will be left in destitute circumstances. Appropriation should be made and work started on diversion dam above Florence at once. Such dam would solve problem and be salvation of country.

J. F. BROWN.

—

CASA GRANDE, ARIZ., *February 2, 1916.*

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Chamber of Commerce of Casa Grande, Ariz., urges passage of your amendment in Indian appropriation bill for diversion dam on Gila River above Florence. Absolutely necessary to enable Indians, settlers, and farmers to save crops. Situation most critical. Temporary dams out by recent floods. Much suffering unless Congress gives relief. Wire result.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
A. A. JAYNE, *President.*

This calamity which has fallen on the white settlers and Indians alike has forced everybody to recognize that they have a community of interest in the waters of the Gila, and that the only way that these flood waters can be put to a beneficial use is by the construction of a reinforced concrete diversion dam by the Government. These same waters that now spread destruction along the valley of the Gila can thus be controlled and made to serve the irrigators, both red and white, who are most anxious for this relief. The Indians and the white men must live together in this valley for all time to come. They have suffered alike from floods and from drought, and I want to see them prosper together in equal measure, as I know they will if Congress appropriates the money for this diversion dam above Florence.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, this is the larger project that the gentleman was speaking about. When the reclamation law was first passed, one of the projects that was then being considered by the Geological Survey, which had a good deal of influence on passing the bill, was the storage works on the Gila River, but after the law was passed private interests in the Salt River Valley were so much more influential and powerful that they succeeded in killing the Gila River project and in substituting for it the Roosevelt Dam on the Salt River, on which we have expended $11,000,000. It was thought by some Members at that time that we were making a mistake with respect to the relative advantages of the two projects; that we ought to have gone on with the Gila River project and not undertaken the Salt River project. But in their anxiety to kill the Gila River project, the Salt River interest did it effectually, and they secured various engineer's reports showing that the Gila project was impracticable. The great objection was that a dam on the Gila would fill up with silt in a short time. We asked them during the hearings, "If a dam silts up, what will you do?" and they answered that in India, where such projects were carried on, when a dam silts up they let it go and proceed to build another dam. You will find that given in the testimony.

I am talking about the general project, and I admit that, as a pure business proposition in all these southwestern streams, like the Gila River and the Salt River, storage works are the essential features. I do not think it would be two sessions of Congress, or maybe one, after action was had here before local interests would be here again asking for storage works. The Government might invest $400,000 in these two projects, and then it would be argued that it would be a moral crime not to give the people water, and the only way to do that would be to put in storage works.

The local interests secured the Salt River project, and now, on the Indian bill, they are trying to put in the Gila project also, before a dollar has been returned to the Reclamation Service for the construction charges on the other project, although the Salt River Valley is eminently prosperous, as I think the gentleman will admit, and is one of the most beautiful valleys in the world and full of active and energetic and prosperous people.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am coming here asking this Congress for an appropriation for this project on its own merits, it having nothing to do with the construction of the San Carlos Reservoir. Regardless of whether the San Carlos Reservoir is ever constructed or not, this appropriation is amply justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] makes a point of order on the paragraph. Unless gentlemen wish to be heard further on the point of order, the Chair will rule. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to furnish in perpetuity for the irrigation of 631 Salt River Indian allotments of 10 acres each, to be designated by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, water from works constructed under the provision of the reclamation act, and acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto: *Provided*, That the reclamation fund shall be reimbursed therefor upon terms the same as those provided in said act or acts for reimbursement by entrymen on lands irrigated by said works, and there is hereby appropriated $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the initial installment of the charges when made for said water.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. It may be lack of knowledge or intelligence, but I can not tell from the reading of this paragraph whether this water is to be furnished without the Indians making a contribution for the maintenance charges or not.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Indians take the water out of the main canal and handle it themselves, so there is no charge for maintenance.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has not answered my suggestion at all. The bill says, "The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to furnish in perpetuity," and so forth. That directs him to furnish it. Are they to pay for the maintenance charges of it?

Mr. BORLAND. I think the law already covers that.

Mr. MANN. The law could not cover it, because this is new law.

Mr. BORLAND. The law under which it was begun, as I recollect, provided that the Indians were to contribute a certain amount toward that Salt River project, and they were to have a certain amount of water. What they really got was some wells and a transmission line for power. They were not satisfied with that. Now, it is proposed to give them the water. The original act provided that their lands should be assessed, the same as those of the white settlers.

Mr. HAYDEN. This act says that the Indians shall receive water on an additional area of land within their reservation.

Mr. MANN. What act says that?

Mr. HAYDEN. This section here. The Secretary of the Interior shall furnish water for 6,310 acres of land.

Mr. MANN. Then it provides that the reclamation fund shall be reimbursed therefor on the terms provided in a certain act. If we make an appropriation for maintenance charges, I take it that under the terms of this provision we will make an appropriation every year, probably in perpetuity, for those maintenance charges.

Mr. HAYDEN. Congress will be required to make an appropriation every year for the construction and maintenance charges. Instead of making an appropriation for the whole amount of $65 an acre for 6,310 acres, we will appropriate the amount that probably will be due next year and so on thereafter.

Mr. MANN. Will the Indian allottees pay their proportionate share of the maintenance charges of this project?

Mr. HAYDEN. They will have to, unless Congress appropriates the money.

Mr. MANN. Suppose they do not do it?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Indians will not get any water until somebody pays for it.

Mr. MANN. The Secretary of the Interior is empowered to furnish in perpetuity this water, whether they pay anything for it or not.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. NORTON. This appropriation here is for the purpose of purchasing the water right. The water right is worth $65 an acre. That does not pay for the charge each year for water, for the operating expenses, but it pays for the construction charges of the project.

Mr. MANN. I will ask the gentleman from North Dakota the simple, easy, plain question that I have asked already and that no gentleman has answered.

Mr. NORTON. I will answer it.

Mr. MANN. Will these Indian allottees, under this provision, pay their proportion of the maintenance charges of this project?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is sure of that?

Mr. NORTON. Outside of——

Mr. MANN. Oh, not outside of anything.

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman says he is sure about that, I will withdraw the point of order, but I do not want to get fooled on it. I want somebody who knows to answer it. The gentlemen over there on the other side will not answer.

Mr. MONDELL. May I suggest——

Mr. MANN. No; I want somebody on the committee, who is responsible for the item, to make the statement.

Mr. NORTON. I will say to the gentleman that it is not contemplated that out of this item the maintenance charges will be paid; and I will say to the gentleman that I do not know whether they will be paid by the Indian Bureau out of some other fund for the Indians; but I can answer the gentleman as to this item.

Mr. MANN. I am going to hold the gentleman to his first statement. I did not ask anything about the appropriation in this item. Here is a provision directing the Secretary of the Interior to furnish water in perpetuity. He has to do it or he is subject to impeachment, whether they pay anything or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Then I will expire also, and will withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. I renew the point of order, or reserve it, rather.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield to me for a suggestion?

Mr. MONDELL. I was going to say to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] that I do not intend to make the point of order, provided we can amend this paragraph——

Mr. BORLAND. Suppose we strike out all after the word "works," in line 10.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not intend to make the point of order, if we can amend this paragraph so as to make it very clear what we are trying to do.

Mr. BORLAND. Why not strike out all after the word "works," in line 10, page 19, simply providing that the reclamation fund shall be reimbursed upon terms the same as those provided for reimbursement by entrymen, and so forth, and stop there?

Mr. MONDELL. That would strike out this first appropriation.

Mr. BORLAND. That would strike out the first appropriation.

Mr. MONDELL. We do not want to do that.

Mr. BORLAND. That would leave the lands clearly subject to maintenance charges.

Mr. MONDELL. I think an amendment there might be in order; but what I had in mind was to meet the suggestion made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. The language of the section is that the Secretary is authorized and directed to furnish water in perpetuity. Well, that language could only be used properly if in some way or other the Secretary of the Interior as an official had some water rights or some water which he in perpetuity could continue to furnish. What you intend to do is to provide perpetual water rights. That can be done by striking out the word "furnish" and inserting the words "provide for water rights."

The section would then read that the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to provide for water rights in perpetuity for the irrigation of these lands from the reclamation project.

Mr. HAYDEN. I did not write this section, and I think the amendment suggested by the gentleman is a good one.

Mr. MONDELL. With that language there would be no question but what these lands would be subject to the construction charge, and they would be on the same basis as other lands in regard to charges for maintenance; and if that amendment were adopted, I think the objection, which was a very pertinent one, made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] would be met. On page 19, line 2, I would strike out the word "furnish" and insert the words "provide for water rights."

Mr. Chairman, if I may offer an amendment with a point of order pending——

Mr. BORLAND. I will renew the point of order, but I will yield to the gentleman to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming can not offer an amendment while the point of order is pending.

Mr. MONDELL. I take it that the gentleman from Arizona has no objection.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I think the item is a very proper one, and I think all those who are familiar with the situation there realize the necessity for some provision whereby these lands which lie under the Salt River project can be irrigated from that project. I want to ask the gentleman from Arizona what his knowledge or information is as to the extent to which these lands have at this time been provided with ditches and laterals. In other words, I would like to know whether this item will necessitate any considerable expenditure by the Reclamation Service.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Indians are irrigating 65,000 or 75,000 acres of land at no expense to the Reclamation Service or anybody else for laterals. They have built their own laterals and they can build such additional ones as are necessary. I do not believe that they will require any aid from the Reclamation Service.

Mr. MONDELL. I am quite certain that the service did build some of these laterals. These lands are many miles from the lands that the gentleman from Missouri has in mind. They are just below where the big canal on the north side takes out of the Salt River. The gentleman will recall that he saw some of these lands from above as a party of which he was a member went over the embankment of the big ditch last summer. I am under the impression there have been some canals built over these lands by the Reclamation Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

[By unanimous consent, Mr. MONDELL was given five minutes more.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think the item should remain in, but if it does it is important that we should know whether it will require additional appropriation for that project.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The Indians are undertaking to cultivate 7,000 acres of this land, and the water is insufficient. The $20,000 would be quite an advantage in supplying them with the water that they do not now have. I think it is very necessary unless you desire to cripple the whole irrigation project. There is not a finer body of land or a richer body of land or one more available to the reservation than this is.

Mr. BORLAND. Let me ask the gentleman, Is this $20,000 reimbursable?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes; the item provides:

That the reclamation fund shall be reimbursed therefor upon terms the same as those provided in said act or acts for reimbursement by entrymen on lands irrigated by said works, and there is hereby appropriated $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the initial installment of the charges when made for said water.

Mr. BORLAND. Do these Indians have any tribal funds?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No; but they have some very valuable land.

Mr. BORLAND. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, against the paragraph; and then I will offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, insert at the head of the page, the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to furnish in perpetuity for the irrigation of 631 Salt River Indian allotments of 10 acres each, to be designated by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, water from works constructed under the provision of the reclamation act, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto: *Provided*, That the reclamation fund shall be reimbursed

therefor upon terms the same as those provided in said act or acts for reimbursement by entrymen on lands irrigated by said works."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. BORLAND. It seems to me there can be no objection to that.

Mr. HAYDEN. It seems to me that that amendment is useless. The Indians have no money and they can not pay for it. If you say they shall get something and you do not appropriate the money for it, it is useless to them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Arizona withhold his point of order? I make the suggestion to the gentleman that he allow the amendment to be considered in order, then it is permissible for him to offer an amendment carrying an appropriation. He will only be spiting himself by making the point of order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment by striking out in the second line the word "furnish" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "provide for water rights."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, amend the amendment in line 2 by striking out the word "furnish" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "provide for water rights."

Mr. HAYDEN. That is all right.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. We accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming to the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to add at the end of the amendment the words "and there is hereby appropriated $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the initial charges when made for said water."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by adding, at the end of the amendment, the words "and there is hereby appropriated $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the initial charges when made for said water."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment by striking out the figures "$20,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$25,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming would not be in order. It is an amendment in the third degree. There is an amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] and also an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri as amended.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri by striking out "$20,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$25,000."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. That would not be in order, as it would be striking out something which the committee has already agreed to. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction of a bridge across the Little Colorado River, at or near the town of Winslow, Ariz., $15,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be expended until the Secretary of the Interior shall have obtained from the proper authorities of the State of Arizona, or the county of Navajo, satisfactory guaranties of the payment by the said State of Arizona, or by the county of Navajo, of at least one-half of the cost of said bridge, and that the proper authorities of the said State of Arizona, or the said county of Navajo, shall assume full responsibility for, and will at all times maintain and repair, said bridge and the approaches thereto: *And provided further*, That any and all expenses above the amount herein named in connection with the building and maintaining of said bridge shall be borne either by the said State of Arizona or the said county of Navajo.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. For whose benefit is this bridge to be constructed?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Navajo Indians.

Mr. MANN. They have a large fund out there, have they not?

Mr. HAYDEN. They have no tribal funds at all. They have about 9,000,000 acres of land in their reservation.

Mr. MANN. That is "a large fund out there." Why should they not pay for this bridge?

Mr. HAYDEN. It was a mistake that there was not language included in that paragraph providing that the cost of the bridge should be reimbursable, and I should be glad to accept any amendment the gentleman may suggest.

Mr. MANN. I have not prepared an amendment, but I am perfectly willing to let it go over and have the gentleman prepare an amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. I make the point of order, if the gentleman from Illinois withdraws it.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order. The gentleman can make use of that at any time.

Mr. BORLAND. I thought the gentleman was about to withdraw it.

Mr. MANN. No; but I am perfectly willing to have it go over, with the point of order pending, until the gentleman prepares an amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest an amendment, after the word "interior," by inserting the words "and to be reimbursable from any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of said Indians." That is the language that we have been using right along.

Mr. MANN. I am willing to accept that, and will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then I offer that as an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri insist on the point of order?

Mr. BORLAND. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "interior," in line 21, page 19, insert the following: "And to be reimbursable from any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of said Indians."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

California.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, having reached "California," I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 10385, the Indian appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Friday, February 4, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of San Diego Harbor, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 648); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting list of documents and files of papers which are not needed or useful in the transaction of current business of the department and have no permanent value or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 649); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers submitting abstracts of proposals received, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, for materials and labor in connection with works under the Engineer Department (H. Doc. No. 650); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 655) to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars from 1865 to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 115), which said bill and report were

referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GANDY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7817) to validate the homestead entry of George S. Clark, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 116), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10537) granting a pension to Peter Harper; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1530) granting a pension to Daniel J. Noonan; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 10749) amending section 3285 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STOUT: A bill (H. R. 10750) permitting the Mondak Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 10751) to provide for the purchase of additional land for the erection thereon of an addition to the Federal building at Flint, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10752) authorizing the establishment of a naval base on the Columbia River, near Astoria, Oreg., and making appropriation for the beginning of construction; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 10753) to entitle accused in criminal cases compulsory process for witnesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10754) to extend the time for filing claims for arrears of pensions under the act approved March 3, 1879; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10755) to regulate the interstate transportation of immature calves; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10756) to prohibit the slaughter, sale, purchase, shipment, and transportation through interstate commerce of calves and cows under certain conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 10757) to authorize the incorporated town of Juneau, Alaska, to issue bonds for the construction and equipment of schools therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10758) making appropriation for the construction of a jetty and the improvement of Nome Harbor, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10759) making an appropriation for the improvement of Dry Strait, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10760) providing for a survey and removal of the log-jam obstructions to navigation in the Tolovana River, Alaska, and an estimate of the cost of removing the same; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 10761) to provide capital for agricultural development, to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgages, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to provide a method of applying postal savings deposits to the promotion of the public welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCRACKEN: A bill (H. R. 10762) for the improvement of the Columbia River to the mouth of Snake River within the States of Oregon and Washington; for the improvement of the Snake River in the States of Washington and Idaho to Pittsburg Landing, on said river; and for the improvement of the Clearwater River from its mouth to Orofino in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10763) to extend the provisions of the act of February 8, 1887, as amended, to lands purchased for Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 10764) to amend the naturalization laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10765) making an appropriation for improving the harbor at Santa Cruz, Cal.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 10766) providing for the establishment of a term of the district court for the middle district of Tennessee at Winchester, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 10767) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Almedia Cemetery, in the town of Espy, in the State of Pennsylvania, two bronze cannon or field-pieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 10768) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 10769) to authorize the issuance of a warrant for the arrest and removal of persons under indictment for offenses against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 10770) to increase the limit of cost of the public building for Wilson, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DAVIS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10771) to make classifications for military and naval service, to promote preparedness, to provide for adequate and efficient national defense, to require that in all naval and military service of the United States, whether in time of peace or war, wealth shall bear and perform its proportional part of the service, and that money shall be made to fight for its country the same as men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 10772) to regulate appointments and promotions in the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10773) to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 10774) authorizing the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 133) making appropriations for the relief of sufferers from floods in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 134) for the relief of the destitute sufferers from the flood waters in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 135) for the relief of the destitute sufferers from flood waters in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WINGO: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 136) for the relief of the destitute sufferers from flood waters in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SISSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 137) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) to amend the Constitution of the United States so that Congress may pass a national divorce law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 15) to authorize the printing of 50,000 copies of document entitled "Soil Reconnoissance in Alaska"; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 10775) granting a pension to Lulu M. Lehman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 10776) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Hazlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10777) granting an increase of pension to Charles Caludius Early; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10778) granting a pension to Mary E. Tanner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10779) granting a pension to William F. Abshier; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10780) granting an increase of pension to John T. McCollister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10781) for the relief of John M. Daniel; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 10782) granting an increase of pension to Daniel S. Kriner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10783) granting a pension to Eliza Speake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10784) granting a pension to Joseph Bessi; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 10785) granting an increase of pension to William B. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10786) granting an increase of pension to William M. Simms; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 10787) granting an increase of pension to John W. Moon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 10788) for the relief of Joseph W. Skill; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10789) for the relief of John A. Ryan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: A bill (H. R. 10790) for the relief of Frank Payne Selby; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 10791) for the relief of the occupants of the Tuttle town site; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 10792) for the relief of George F. Nicholson; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10793) granting an increase of pension to Luke R. Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10794) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10795) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10796) granting an increase of pension to James Ratchord; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 10797) for the relief of Jacob F. Schild; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 10798) granting an increase of pension to Jay C. Randall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 10799) for the relief of Edward W. Whitaker; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 10800) granting a pension to Mae Crockett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10801) granting a pension to John R. Jordan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10802) granting an increase of pension to Matthew Farley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 10803) granting an increase of pension to Mary Van Wormer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 10804) granting an increase of pension to John List; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 10805) granting a pension to Jacob M. Stratiff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10806) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Lieb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10807) to correct the military record of John Magill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 10808) granting a pension to William D. Swatzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10809) granting a pension to Tide Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10810) granting a pension to Louis F. Pampe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 10811) granting a pension to Marcelle M. Muller, Anthony N. Muller, jr., and Maud Muller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 10812) granting an increase of pension to Lewis A. Rominger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10813) granting a pension to Mary E. Donham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10814) for the relief of Andrew B. Ritter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTH: A bill (H. R. 10815) granting an increase of pension to James C. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10816) granting an increase of pension to John Blose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 10817) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 10818) granting an increase of pension to Angie O. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 10819) granting a pension to Minnie Rifle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10820) granting an increase of pension to Druilla E. Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 10821) granting a pension to Richard C. McGriff; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10822) granting a pension to Leon W. Sims; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10823) for the relief of the Farmers & Merchants Bank, of Headland, Ala.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 10824) granting a pension to Jacob Hicks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10825) granting a pension to Robert B. Hawkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10826) to complete the military record of Cyrus E. Burnett and for an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10827) to reimburse the Navajo Timber Co. of Delaware for a deposit made to cover the purchase of timber; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10828) to reimburse the Navajo Lumber & Timber Co. of Arizona for a deposit made to cover the purchase of timber; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific coast, urging appropriations for coast and geodetic survey and the Alaskan railroad; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also (by request), memorial of the Ocean-to-Ocean Highway Association, urging adoption of the Pikes Peak highway as the national highway; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Missouri Grain Dealers' Association, indorsing House bill 4646, the Moss bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Cooper College, Kansas, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of Sons of American Revolution, of Kentucky, urging building a national-archives building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of C. H. Riddall, of Pittsburgh, Pa., against prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens in Pennsylvania, against censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of International Union of United Brewery Workmen of America, against increase of tax on beer, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Brief of Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts, of Washington, D. C., for Federal censorship of films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of F. C. Schoch, George Patchen, William E. Seibel, J. S. Eagan, F. B. Newland, W. H. Dempsey, F. J. Tangher, George Hamilton, L. J. Anderson, Charles L. Kunz, A. C. Hansen, F. C. Sterling, F. A. Miller, Carl Hansen, and E. F. Miller, all of Milwaukee, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of William Bergenthal Co., D. D. Weschler & Sons, Milwaukee Western Malt Co., Louis Schuette, G. A. Fehrs, George McFarlane, Emil Teitgen, F. T. Zentner, Jacob J. Stangel, Thomas Torrison, Fred Scheutte, Elias Gunnell, Joseph Koenig, Henry Wernecke, Julius Lindstedt, Charles Fechter, Charles Spindler, W. H. Murphy, John P. Reiss, Peter Reiss, J. A. Rummelle, Henry Ritts, and W. C. Dickie, all of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Jacob Dudenhoefer, Figgee Doyle Co., W. J. Armstrong Co., and Bishop Babcock Co., all of Milwaukee, Wis.,

protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Ernest G. Miller, G. P. Kissinger Co., Adam Billmaur & Co., and Lakeside Distilling Co., all of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY: Petition of Presbyterian Church of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Alice E. Wilson and Edward Losson, favoring passage of House bill 9814, relative to purchase of land granted to Oregon & California Railroad; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Quarter Century Society of Port of New York, favoring passage of House bill 9054, relative to sick leave of Government employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petitions of Michael L. Sutter and R. H. Ketcham, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring appropriation for construction of Government railroad in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring two new vessels for United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of E. T. Trotter & Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring appropriation for two new vessels in United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring appropriation for construction of Government railroad in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Pittsburgh-Hungarian Political Club, relative to preventing belligerents from interfering with the mails; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, relative to appropriation for carrying on Government railroad in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring appropriation for two new vessels in United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany House bill 9734, for the relief of Hannah J. Stahl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: Petition of citizens of Winnetka, Ill., favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FREEMAN: Petitions of Boston Store and others, of Norwich; Ernest C. Morse and others, of Putnam; John C. Tracy and others, of Willimantic; N. A. Jordon and others, of Danielson; J. H. Bunce & Co. and others, of Middletown; E. B. Steele and others, of New London, all in the State of Connecticut, favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Holland Manufacturing Co., of Willimantic, Conn., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of United Spanish War Veterans, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of Pittsburgh Hungarian Political Club, of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of the United States providing mail facilities with all countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, in favor of an emergency appropriation for the Alaskan railroad; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, in favor of appropriations for the aid of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Massachusetts rural letter carriers, that 24 miles constitute a standard rural route; that all miles over 24 miles be paid for at the same rate that is taken off for miles less than 24 miles; and that maintenance be allowed for all equipment used on rural routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GLASS: Petition of business men of Roanoke, Va., in favor of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Papers to accompany House bill 10527, granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Pitner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of California, favoring censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Elizabeth Lowe Watson, of Cupertino, Cal., against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IGOE: Memorial of Kansas City (Mo.) Millers' Club, against the repeal of the mixed-flour law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Missouri Grain Dealers' Association, favoring passage of House bill 4646 for grading of grain; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 1,500 members of International Union of Brewery Workmen, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINKAID: Petitions of citizens of Cushing and Cotesfield, Howard County, Nebr., against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of Associated Chambers of Commerce of Pacific Coast, indorsing appropriation for United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, indorsing appropriation for railroad work in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of Woodside Methodist Episcopal Church, of Montgomery County, Md., favoring censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of W. J. Sanford and 33 other merchants of Big Rapids, Mich., against House bill 967—the Stephens bill—to prevent discrimination in prices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLEMORE: Petitions of District Unions of Farmers' Educational Cooperative Union of Texas against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petitions of Sheet Metal Workers' Union, local No. 349; Building Trades Council; International Union of Steam Operating Engineers, local No. 315; International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers, local No. 276; Travelers' Protective Association; Tobacco Workers' International Union, local No. 1; Web Printing Pressmen's Union, No. 2; United Upholsterers' Union of St. Louis and Vicinity, local No. 21; Beer Drivers' and Stablemen's Union, No. 43; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffers, Stablemen, and Helpers, local No. 405; Switchmen's Union, lodge No. 54; International Moulders' Union, No. 59, all of St. Louis, Mo.; and a number of citizens of St. Louis and vicinity, praying for the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Lewis A. Rominger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of W. T. Hornaday, in favor of the Hayden bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), memorial of Triangle Film Corporation, against the Hughes-Smith Federal motion-picture censorship bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also (by request), memorial of New York Zoological Society of New York, favoring converting any or all forest reserves into game refuges; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), petition of D. W. Northrup, secretary of Robert N. Basse Co., of Derby, Conn., indorsing the plans of the General Staff of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Horace A. Reeves, jr., of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the Small pilotage bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NORTON: Resolution by the Minot (N. Dak.) Association of Commerce, protesting against the imposition of a Federal tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution adopted by the Sixth District Medical Society, Bismarck, N. Dak., favoring the making of adequate provision in the reorganization of the Army for a sufficient number of medical officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OAKEY: Petition of Rattan Manufacturing Co., of New Britain, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Petition of C. A. Smith and 28 others, of Baldwinsville, Mass., in favor of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWE: Memorial of Travelers' Protective Association of America, in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Jessup & Moore Paper Co., of New York City, in favor of the Small pilotage bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the department of social betterment of the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Board of Charities, in favor of the Kern-McGillicuddy bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Edwin H. Burr, of New York City, protesting against any curtailment of mail deliveries in New York City; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Carroll Council, No. 321, Knights of Columbus, of Brooklyn, N. Y., in favor of making October 12, Columbus Day, a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCULLY: Memorial of Crystal Wave Council, No. 54, of North Long Branch, N. J., favoring the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of Freedom Council, No. 36, Daughters of Liberty, of Keyport, N. J., in favor of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of U. C. Rose, of South River, N. J., in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chamber of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, in favor of an appropriation to aid the Alaskan railroad; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, in favor of an appropriation to aid the Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Pittsburgh Hungarian Political Club, of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of the United States taking steps to secure mail service with all countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: Petitions of St. Marys Church and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Storm Lake, Iowa, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of citizens of Gayly, Pa., favoring abolishing polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring Senate joint resolution 60, creating joint subcommittee to amend present interstate-commerce law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

NOV 27 1916

